

**KOREAN EFL TEACHERS' THOUGHTS AND MOTIVATIONS FOR
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND THEIR USE OF KNOWLEDGE**

By

Yeoreum Lee

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Curriculum, Instruction, and Teacher Education- Doctor of Philosophy

2015

ABSTRACT

KOREAN EFL TEACHERS' THOUGHTS AND MOTIVATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND THEIR USE OF KNOWLEDGE

By

Yeoreum Lee

This study explores how teachers think about the effectiveness of PD depending on the contents, types, and schedules as well as their motivations for PD participation and reasons of non- participation. In addition, whether teachers use, modify, and discard the information and knowledge they obtain from PD as well as reasons of non-use. The author surveyed 97 elementary Korean EFL teachers with experience of PD and interviewed eight focal teachers among survey participants. Teachers' survey and interview suggested that teachers prefer and value PD offers active participation, such as providing hands- on activities, interaction with other EFL teachers, language practice, and activities that can be used in teaching practice. Since the ultimate goal of PD is the improvement of teaching practice, it is important to note that information and ideas of PD are more likely to be implemented if the resources provided are for immediate use with directions for modification provided. Teachers mainly look for the information from PD for immediate use and treat the information for potential use as not practical. Moreover, one type of PD that is designed for a teacher group may not work for another teacher group since teachers have various yet different needs, expectations, and motivations for PD depending on their backgrounds, such as teaching experience and type of qualification. This study confirmed that the location of the schools also plays an important role on their perspectives about PD and the motivation to PD participation for Korean EFL teachers. There are so many competing demands that teachers consider for PD participation and they try to balance them in order to get the best outcomes of PD.

To God who gives me strength
To my family who have always been there for me

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to thank the teachers who participated in my research. I could never even start and complete this dissertation study without their help.

I am heartily thankful to my advisor, Cheryl Rosaen who gives me inspiration and the best guidance through difficult times. There is no doubt in my mind that, she is the best teacher I have ever met and gives me the support not only academically but also emotionally. It has been a huge honor to have her as my advisor.

Thanks also to the rest of my committee, Randi Stanulis, Avener Segall, and Sandra Crespo. They have generously given their time and expertise to help me to complete this research. I thank them for their contribution and their support.

I also thank to Jeff Bale and Peter Youngs, who have previously been in my committee and supported me at their best.

Thanks to my family for their endless love and support, especially, my parents, Kwanghee Lee and Heasuk Kim, along with my sister—Bom Lee, and my fiancé -Younsuk Dong.

Last, thanks to my church members who have prayed for me, especially Pastor, Youngho Cho, and his wife Hyunshim Cho, Deacon, Sangheop Jeong, and his wife Keumyoung Kim.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS	x
Chapter1: Introduction	1
Research Questions	2
Problem Statement	2
Purpose of the Study	4
Chapter2: Literature Review	6
Effectiveness of Professional Development.....	6
Important Features of Professional Development.....	9
Motivation	14
Teacher Perspectives on Professional Development.....	15
Theoretical Framework	17
Chapter 3: Method	20
Participants and Settings	21
Data Collection.....	27
Background information questionnaire.	28
Surveys.	28
Interviews.	30
Data Analysis	31
Contributions.....	35
Chapter 4: Teachers’ Thoughts about Effectiveness of PD	38
Survey Results: Effectiveness of PD.....	38
Teachers’ thoughts on helpfulness of PD contents and approach to PD.	38
Teachers’ beliefs about PD.....	48
Helpfulness of PD regarding different types of PD.....	57
Interview: Teachers’ Explanations about the Effectiveness of PD	70
Types of participation.....	70
PD quality.	74
Types of PD.....	78
Self-efficacy and self-esteem.....	83
Summary and Discussion	86
Chapter 5: Teachers’ Motivation and Other Influential Factors	89
Survey Results: Motivations for PD Participation and Reasons for non-Participation.....	89

Motivations for PD participation.....	89
Influential factors for PD participation.....	102
Reasons for non- participation in PD.	110
Interview Results: Motivation for Participation and Reasons for non-Participation	114
Teachers' interests.	114
Psychological and physical barriers.	117
Summary and Discussion.....	120
 Chapter 6: Usage, modification, and non-usage of Knowledge from Professional Development	126
Survey Results: Usage of PD Information	127
Interview Result: Teachers' Episodes of the Usage of Information Obtained from PD.....	129
Ready to use.....	130
Practicality	133
Theory and practice.....	134
Ideality and reality.	136
Cultural gap.....	140
Possibilities of modification.	143
Summary and Discussion	146
 Chapter 7: Conclusion.....	148
Social Nature of PD.....	148
One Size Does Not Fit All	151
Practicality of PD Information	156
Competing Balance Demands	157
Limitations of the Study	162
Future Study	163
 APPENDICES	165
Appendix A : Background information.....	166
Appendix B: Survey	169
Appendix C: Interview Question.....	178
 REFERENCES	181

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Background Information of Interviewers	26
Table 2: Effectiveness Regarding the Contents of the PD.....	39
Table 3: Effectiveness Regarding Approach to PD	40
Table 4: Significant Difference of Teaching Experience on Teachers' Thoughts.....	43
Table 5: Significant Difference of Teaching Experience on Teachers' Thoughts.....	44
Table 6: Significant Difference of Teaching Experience on Teachers' Thoughts.....	46
Table 7: Significant Difference of Qualification on Teachers' Thoughts	47
Table 8: Teachers' Thoughts and Beliefs about PD	48
Table 9: Significant Difference of Location and Teaching Experience on Teachers' Responses	51
Table 10: Significant Difference of Teaching Experience and Location on Teachers' Responses	54
Table 11: Significant Difference of Teaching Experience on Teachers' Responses.....	55
Table 12: Helpfulness of PD with Different Schedule	59
Table 13: Significant Difference of Location on Teachers' Responses	63
Table 14: Significant Difference of Qualification on Teachers' Responses.....	64
Table 15: Significant Difference of Qualification on Teachers' Responses.....	65

Table 16: Significant of Teaching Experience on Teachers' responses	66
Table 17: Significant of Location on Teachers' Responses.....	68
Table 18: Motivations for PD Participation.....	90
Table 19: Motivation for PD Participation: Effort to Stay Current in EFL Field.....	92
Table 20: Motivation for PD Participation: Promotion	94
Table 21: Motivation for PD Participation: Practical and Pedagogical Knowledge Development	96
Table 22: Motivation for PD Participation: Acquiring Teaching resources	97
Table 23: Motivation for PD Participation: Language Proficiency Development	98
Table 24: Motivation for PD Participation: Improvement of Teaching in General.....	99
Table 25: Motivation for PD Participation: Requirement of School or Government.....	100
Table 26: Motivation for PD Participation: Social Networks.....	102
Table 27: Influential Factors for PD Participation.....	103
Table 28: Influential Factors of PD Participation: Personal Schedules	105
Table 29: Influential Factors of PD Participation: PD Location.....	108
Table 30: Influential Factors of PD Participation: Cost and Budget of the School	109
Table 31: Reasons for non-PD Participation	111
Table 32: Reasons of non-Participation of PD: Busy School Schedule	113

Table 33: Implementation of PD Information	127
--	-----

Table 34: Self-reflect of Implementation of PD Information	128
--	-----

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Full Word
PD	Professional Development
EFL	English as a Foreign Language

Chapter1: Introduction

Teachers are a very important resource for student learning in the classroom. Teachers' knowledge and practices have direct effects on students' motivations for learning and their academic achievement. Therefore, teacher quality has become important and teacher education provides professional development (PD) for various aspects of teaching as a way of supporting the improvement of teacher quality. Wu (1999) emphasized the importance of PD, stating that any improvement in education must start with improving the teachers already in the classroom. It has also been suggested that a continual deepening of knowledge and skills is a fundamental part of teaching (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989; Shulman & Sparks, 1992).

The importance of PD can never be overemphasized as Gallitano and Jackson (2011) advocated that much effort and sufficient resources must be put into professional-development programs for educators. Therefore, continuous, ongoing, high-quality, and effective professional-development programs are necessary in order to support teachers in their efforts to keep “up-to-date on new research on how students learn, emerging technology tools for the classroom, new curriculum resources, and more” (Edutopia Staff, 2008). Also, PD helps teachers “not only to stay current and enhance their teaching, but also to positively enhance their attitudes toward various aspects of their teaching” (Gallitano & Jackson, 2011, p. 342).

Since the teachers' knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs influence their judgment and practice in their classroom (Kagan, 1992; Pajares, 1992), it is important to investigate teachers' knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs about the PD programs and how they affect their teaching practice. Therefore, in order to maximize the effect of professional development, Fishman, Marx, Best and Tal (2003) suggested that program creators should build an empirical knowledge base

that links teachers' needs, perspectives, expectations, and motivations in order to create effective professional development programs. For that reason, it is important to look at teachers' perspectives on professional development, motivation to participate in professional development, and reasons for not participating in professional development, to provide insights for professional-development providers and policy makers. Also, a close examination of how PD affects teacher learning will inform school and district organizational change and policy initiatives related to teachers' PD (Gallucci, 2008; Nielsen, Barry, & Staab, 2008).

Therefore, this study aims to explore English as Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' thoughts and beliefs about PD that is offered in South Korea. In addition to how teachers perceive the usefulness of PD, I look into teachers' motivation of participating or not participating the PD. This study also explores how and why teachers use, modify, or do not use knowledge that they receive from the PD program. The research questions are as follows.

Research Questions

1. How do EFL teachers think about the effectiveness of EFL PD?
2. What are EFL teachers' motivations for participating in professional development and their reasons for not participating in PD programs?
3. Do EFL teachers use or modify information from PD and if so, what types of information they use or modify? If not, why not?

Problem Statement

According to the Korean Times, English skill is the first thing you need to have in order to enter a university, get a job, and get promotion in Korea whether the job description requires English skills or not. English education became more important since the government of

President Lee announced the new policy about English education focusing on communicative English education in 2008. As a result, there are strong demands for effective and high quality English instruction, and not only has the quantity of EFL teachers been in increasing demand, but also the quality of EFL teachers have been illuminated. EFL teachers in South Korea are expected to have a high level of expertise and skills according to the recent government policy emphasizing the importance of English teaching.

Traditionally and officially, teacher candidates become eligible to take the teacher certification examination after they obtain a teacher's license, which is automatically given when people either graduate from the college of education or take some educational courses from their university, in order to be a teacher in Korea in general. However, especially for the EFL teacher, the problem is that not only is the teacher certification examination difficult, but also it is even more difficult to find teachers who are fluent in English among teachers with certification. As a result, the shortage phenomenon of EFL teachers became a big problem (Kang, 2010). In order to resolve this, the department of English education sought to expand opportunities for people who did not pass the teacher certification examination. As a part of an effort, there is a new phenomenon in education of South Korea that people with a certain qualifications can have an opportunity to be fixed-term or intern EFL teachers without passing the teacher certification examination.

Usually, regular EFL teachers who are registered and belong to the ministry of education in South Korea are required to take 90 hours of PD courses every third year and in addition to that they are also eligible to enroll in a 5-week (180 hours) PD program in order to acquire an advanced certificate (Kang & Hong, 2008). However, not all the teachers take full advantage of these government provided PD programs since many are fixed-term teachers. It is difficult for

the ministry of education to administrate these opportunities for fixed-term teachers and supervise them to take an adequate number of PD programs. Fixed-term teachers voluntarily and actively look for the opportunities of participation in PD programs for their professional growth.

Due to the shift in educational policy for hiring fixed-term teachers, there are teachers with various qualifications and various circumstances who might have different motivations, perspectives, and needs. In addition to that, there are many different kinds of PD from different organizations other than those officially required programs provided by the ministry of education. There are more PD opportunities for teachers from various organizations that teachers can choose to participate in according to their individual interest, needs, and situations.

Therefore, considering these complex pictures of new growing populations of Korean EFL teachers and various opportunities for PD, it is a good time to re-illuminate and pay attention to the (a) motivations of teachers who participate in PD, (b) how teachers perceive the PD, (c) and whether and how they implement lessons, activities, and theories into their practice.

Purpose of the Study

This study is grounded upon the statement “ Professional development should fundamentally be about teacher learning: changes in the knowledge, beliefs, and attitude of teachers that lead to the acquisition of new skills, new concepts, and new process related to the work of teaching” (Fishman, Marx, Best, & Tal, 2003, p.645). As it was advocated that research in teacher education should continue to make progress toward a linkage between PD and teacher learning which has proved to be a difficult relationship to establish (Loucks-Horsley & Matsumoto, 1999), this study is one effort to discover the relationship between teachers’ motivations and their perception of outcomes through teachers’ self-report.

This research started from this researcher's interest in students' learning by using a bottom-up approach. In order for effective learning to occur, there should be effective teaching, which can be achieved through effective professional development programs. In order to provide effective professional development, teachers' interests, motivations to participate in PD, and usage of information from PD should be identified and considered. However, as teachers are individual learners, their set of needs and interests are various yet different. Even though their individual differences caused by personal characteristics cannot be controlled, differences caused by their background, such as teaching experience, qualification, and location of the school can be looked at in detail and analyzed.

In addition to that, there has been some information and research about teachers' motivation to participate in PD from other countries; however, many studies simply focus on making comparison between external and internal motivation of learning to teach, or how teachers' perception of PD has an effect on application of acquired knowledge from PD. In addition to that, information about Korean EFL teachers is not sufficient since little attention has been paid to Korean EFL teachers' motivations and their perspectives on PD, when considering the fever for English education in Korea. Therefore, this study can possibly provide the information about what Korean EFL teachers want to get from PD, what makes or does not make them participate in PD, and what they actually learn through PD and use them in classroom.

Chapter2: Literature Review

A wide range of studies will be reviewed to provide a better understanding of PD, evaluating its effectiveness, characteristics to be successful, teachers' motivations, and perspectives. Studies are chosen to include different perspectives, different types of methods, different samples, and different focuses, because the purpose of this review is to build a background for PD overall. Also, this review section will provide a critical evaluation of the studies based on their provenance, objectives, persuasiveness, and value.

Effectiveness of Professional Development

Studies regarding the effectiveness of professional development (PD) prove its effectiveness through teachers' improvement and students' improvement. Some research explores how PD has affected different aspects of teacher development. For example, researchers have studied how teachers' curricular knowledge and understanding about subjects or certain topics have changed after the PD (Cherubini et al., 2002; Ermeling, 2010; Frey & Fisher, 2009; Kennedy, 1998; Levine & Marcus, 2010; Morais et al., 2005; Seymour & Osana, 2003), how PD has resulted in instructional changes and increases in teachers' use of practice (Desimone et al., 2002; Garet et al., 2001; Hughes, 2005; Loucks-Horsley et al., 1998), and how PD has influence on teachers' attitude toward students learning (Benton & Richardson, 1993; Day & Sachs, 2004; Lessing & De Witt, 2007). Many researchers have also suggested that teachers' participation in a professional-development program improved their confidence and helped them to become more effective and efficient (Elmore, 2002; Farrel, Kerry, & Kerry, 1995; Pennell & Firestone, 1996; Guskey, 2000; Oldroyd, Elsner, & Poster, 1996).

On the other hand, some researchers explored how PD eventually affects students' improvement. For example, studies have focused on how PD for teachers has resulted changes in

student performance and achievement (Borko, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 1998, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Elmore & Burney, 1997; Killion, 2002a; Wilson, Darling-Hammond, & Berry, 2001; Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997) and some explored how PD has influenced student behavior (Baker-Henningham & Walker, 2009; Martin & Dowson, 2009; Mikami, Gregory, Allen, Pianta, & Lun, 2011; Pianta, Mashburn, Downer, Hamre, & Justice, 2008). Even though these studies have reported different results of effectiveness of PD on student improvement such as positive effects, little effects, or no effects depending on the variables, participants, and settings, it is worth noting that PD has the potential to effect changes for not only teachers but also students. There is a premise that the improvement of students only occurs through the improvement of teachers from PD. Kubitskey and Fishman (2007) stated PD should be about shaping teachers' knowledge/ beliefs, and attitudes, and the success of PD should be determined based on student outcomes. As the purpose of PD is to provide the teacher with quality learning, which connects to quality teaching, which, in turn, eventually affects students' achievements. Several researchers support the relationship between teaching improvement and student achievement. Schmoker (2002) claimed that students' achievement would result from a focus on effective teaching. Therefore, implementing effective PD for teachers, students will have higher achievement (Elmore, 2002; Odden, & Archibald, 2009).

Stronge (2002) claimed that student achievement ultimately proves teacher effectiveness. Based on this claim, Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, and Orphanos (2009) emphasized the effectiveness of PD by stating that PD helps teachers to develop their capacity and transform it into teaching practice, which helps to improve student achievement. In addition, Reese (2010) pointed out that teachers are responsible for students' academic achievement as

well as in meeting standardized-test and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) goals, and this pressure requires ongoing professional development.

However, research indicates that there are complexities and challenges for research connecting PD to student learning (Guskey & Yoon, 2009; Knapp, 2003; Nielsen et al., 2008). Even though student outcomes can be a good indicator of which PD strategies have the biggest impact on students' learning (Mokhtari, Rosemary, & Edwards, 2007), a direct relationship between the effectiveness of PD and students' achievement is difficult to measure as there are other variables related to the students' outcomes. Guskey and Sparks (1996) criticized PD, stating that the relationship between PD and students' performances has been overemphasized and overvalued, and there is little known about the impact on the change in teachers' professional practice.

For that reason, there are studies that examine how PD has affected both teacher improvement and student achievement (Cohen & Hill, 2001; Higgins & Parsons, 2009; Wenglinsky, 2002; Zetlin, Macleod, & Michener, 1998). These studies are in agreement that PD not only deepened teachers' content knowledge, improved pedagogical strategies, and improved overall instructional practices, but also improved students' overall performance. Also, it was reported that PD contributed to a reduction in disparities in the achievements of different ethnic groups and to an improvement in students' achievement. It was also reported that the improvements in professional behavior affected students' behavior and learning motivation by accelerating learning, increasing social skills, and improving motivation for learning.

However, the limitations of these studies are that objective measures of improvement for teaching practice were absent and teachers' improvement was self-reported through interviews

and surveys. Nevertheless, teachers' self-efficacy and self-evaluation are somewhat related to the actual performance of teaching practice, because if teachers feel that their teaching practices have been improved after the PD, it helps teachers to be confident about what they are teaching. Moreover, the authors of the studies also confirmed that the PD project increased teachers' responsiveness to students' diverse learning needs.

However, although PD generally delivers overall improvement for teachers, some argue that not all PD leads to effective professional learning, despite its intent (Easton, 2008; Fullan, 2007). Fullan (2007) argued that existing PD is sometimes not "powerful enough, specific enough, or sustained enough to alter the culture of the classroom and school" (p. 35). Studies have proved that only high quality PD for teachers can be connected to an increase in students' achievement (Odden & Archibald, 2009; Odden, Archibald, Fermanich, & Gallagher, 2002)

Because there are many factors that affect PD and teacher learning, in the next section, studies on the important features of PD, or those that make it more effective, will be reviewed.

Important Features of Professional Development

Considering of the fact that various features affect PD, and research directions and findings may vary greatly depending on the focus of the study, research regarding various features, such as length of the program, intensiveness, and content, will be examined in order to see from various perspectives.

Previous studies have shown that providing PD over a longer time period is more effective for teachers' learning. For example, Supovitz and Turner (2000) found that teachers with 80 or more hours of PD had more inquiry-oriented teaching practice than teachers with 79 hours or fewer of PD. Brinkerhoff (2006) concluded that teachers who participated in 90 hours of

a PD program on technology skills through direct instruction and projects had increases in self-assessed technology skills, as it was found that significant differences were only found between the second and third terms.

Furthermore, there is a study that a longer time period of PD has a significant effect on teachers' attitude. Gallitano and Jackson (2011) found that a one-week PD session had a significant effect on attitudes toward the use of technology in the mathematics classroom as compared with mathematics teachers who had a one-day PD session. The studies are in agreement that professional learning occurs with an extended length of time in professional-development programs, and some studies have suggested that shorter PD programs do not result in teacher improvement.

However, it is not valid to conclude that longer period of PD has greater effect since the amount of the input provided through PD was not controlled. Therefore, there is a possibility that teachers gain more skills, knowledge and confidence as they cumulatively participated for a longer period.

In contrast to the recent studies supporting the effectiveness of a longer duration of a PD program, earlier studies have paid attention to the intensity rather the duration. The following studies advocate that the intensity of the PD program is more crucial than the duration. Kennedy (1998) suggested that shorter programs with more intensity sometimes result in a greater effect on teacher improvement than longer programs. In her literature review, Kennedy (1998) looked over many studies that deal with student math and science outcomes from PD in various aspects such as subjects, content focus, forms, skill level, and intensity. She found no relationship between the duration of a program and high-quality program content. Cohen and Hill (2001)

observed that teachers with intensive, curriculum-based PD were much more likely to have changed their teaching practice to align with what they learned from the programs than teachers who participated in a conventional professional-development program, and these changes positively affected student performance. Banilower (2002) also studied the relationship between the intensiveness of the PD and student achievement. Higher students' test scores resulted from teachers' participation in intensive PD and students' increased exposure to the new, reform-based instruction. Intensity of the professional-development not only has an effect on teachers' teaching practice and student achievement, but also on teachers' attitudes toward instructional reforms. Supovitz, Mayer, and Kahle (2000) found that teachers who participated in the intensive professional-development program had a more positive attitude toward instructional reforms and had more chances to use the inquiry-based instruction they learned about in the PD program. This particular study suggested that intensive PD has a positive effect on teachers' attitudes; therefore, PD can also be used not only for the improvement of teaching practice, but also for changing teachers' attitudes toward various new theories, practices, philosophies, technologies, reforms and so on.

Based on the findings from these studies, it can be summarized that the studies supporting a longer period of PD were only focused on the programs' duration, and their intensity was not put into consideration. Therefore, these studies tell us simply that a program over a longer period is more effective than a program over a shorter period when it is of same intensity, and an intensive program is more effective than a less intensive program when it has same duration. Ideally, an intensive program over a longer period might have a greater effect on teaching practice and student achievement; however, this might not be realistic due to budget and lack of time. Therefore, it would be interesting to see if further studies comparing improvements

in teaching practice and student achievement between an intensive program of a shorter duration and a less intensive program of a longer duration would clearly outline what is more effective when the amount of input provided are controlled.

In addition to duration and intensity, content is also considered an important feature of PD, and several studies have shown that program content is a crucial factor that defines the effectiveness of PD. Kennedy (1998) compared program content with other variables such as contact hours, distribution of contact hours, in-class visits, and coaching, using a meta-analysis of 93 studies. Results indicated that PD programs that concentrated on subject-matter knowledge and student learning of particular subject matter had the largest effects on student performance. Kennedy concluded that the content relevance of PD has the highest relative influence on teacher effectiveness in the classroom, which eventually has influence on student achievement, and found little relationship between other variables and student achievement.

Saxe, Gearhart, and Nasir (2001) found that student achievement was most improved when teachers participated in continuous, cooperative PD that focused on content knowledge and instructional practice. They also found that students taught by teachers who participated in an integrated mathematics assessment (IMA) program performed the best in testing conceptual understanding, as compared with those who participated in a traditional professional-development workshop or a professional, community-based activity. IMA provided teachers with direct engagement in learning mathematics in the new curriculum and engaged them in discussions on pedagogical content knowledge, while professional, community-based programs generally only provide instructional skills for new curriculum units.

Among many studies regarding the content of the PD, there are studies that compare the

relative effectiveness of different types of PD, such as those of Cohen and Hill (1998) and Kennedy (1998). Both studies found that PD focused on specific content for mathematics and science is more effective than PD focused on general content. These studies suggested that PD that focused on subject matters and content is more effective on teacher performance and student achievement than general PD. More specifically, there are studies that focus on narrower topics and specific content or skills of the PD. Carpenter, Fennema, Peterson, & Cary (1988) found that teachers participating in the program focused on a specific approach to teaching mathematics had more emphasis on problem solving, listened more to students, encouraged students to use multiple strategies, and had a greater understanding of students' thinking. Students taught by a teacher participating in the program showed higher-level problem-solving abilities and a greater recall of number facts than students taught by the control-group teachers. Moreover, Suh (1996) found that teachers reported PD focusing on English conversation and teaching skills were especially effective for elementary EFL teachers in Korea.

Garet et al. (2001) found that PD focused on subject matter (content) helps teachers encourage active learning through hands-on activities and produces enhanced knowledge and skills among students. They concluded that the duration, collective participation, content, active learning, and coherence of professional-development activities are more important than the type of professional-development program. In agreement with the results of Kennedy (1998), the teachers reported that a sustained, intensive professional-development program that focuses on a specific academic subject matter and is provided over a longer period had the strongest impact on their learning.

Motivation

Motivation has been considered an important factor for effective PD, and many studies indicate that PD should be aware of and address the specific needs of teachers (Bredeson, 2003; Muijs, Day, Harris, & Lindsay, 2004). A technical definition of motivation is the psychological processes and vital forces that stimulate arousal and drive one's behavior toward action (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, & Weick, 1970; Huse & Bowditch, 1977; Kast & Rosenzweig, 1979; Korman, 1974). Motivation is a crucial factor for achievement, so teachers must have a striving force (Johri, 2005) as they participate in PD since education is considered as a lifelong process. It was suggested that if teachers are motivated, it makes a difference in their learning and teaching practices (Bobrowsky, Marx, & Fishman, 2001; Supovitz & Zeif, 2000).

Skelton (2005) summarized the motivation of teachers participating in PD as stemming from the requirement that teachers submit themselves to a process of continuous improvement from pervading cultures of excellence. Studies investigating the direct motivations of teachers who participated in professional development programs (Bradley, 1991; Craft, 2000; Sybouts & Wendel, 1994) have shown that teachers have various reasons to undertake PD, such as improving their job performance skills, extending their experience as a teacher for career development or promotion purposes, developing professional knowledge and understanding, fulfilling teacher responsibilities, extending education, increasing job satisfaction, developing an enhanced view of the job, preparing for change, and making a positive contribution to the school.

Giavrimis, Giossi, and Papastamatis (2011) found that the majority of teachers were motivated to participate in the PD program for internal and professional reasons, such as using it for course preparation and teaching issues; facilitating professional growth; and communicating with, becoming acquainted with, and developing closer relationships with other colleagues. Few

teachers participated in the ICT program for external reasons, such as escaping from the school for the particular time period, enriching their CV, meeting the mandatory participation requirements of their institution, and obtaining a salary increase.

Mestry, Hendricks, and Bisschoff (2009) conducted a study with primary and secondary teachers in South Africa and found that the teachers' greatest motivation for participating in professional-development programs was to improve their teaching techniques and performance, engage in cooperative work with other teachers, establish social networks, and contribute to the school development. Other motivations included improvement of self-efficacy and competence, and promotion to higher position.

There has been a limited number of studies about teachers' motivation for participating in PD compared to the extensive studies conducted on the effectiveness of PD and how it affects to students' achievement. Noting the suggestion of Elliott, Kratochwill, Cook, and Travers (2000) that more motivated people have greater achievements, it would be relevant to study the relationship between teachers' motivation and their outcomes from PD. There is a possibility that studies on the effectiveness of PD have mixed results because of teachers' motivation of participating in PD.

Teacher Perspectives on Professional Development

In relation to teachers' motivation for participating in PD, teachers' perspectives on professional development are also important aspects to consider, because they may show how teachers feel about PD, what teachers' need and expect from PD, and how they apply the knowledge they learn from PD to their teaching in the classroom. Studies regarding teachers' perspectives on PD will inform whether or not PD was effective and actually applied to teaching

practices, as there is a relationship between teachers' beliefs and what they do in their classroom (Jones & Eick, 2007).

Due to pre-existing beliefs, participants in PD may reject the rationales underlying the pedagogical strategies of the PD, according to practical theory (Holt-Reynold, 1992). Therefore, it is important to find out what pedagogical moves were most likely to engage participants in surfacing and reframing their beliefs, which would help them to find the content of the course reasonable and worth learning. In other words, participants' beliefs are able to mediate what is learned in a PD course. Ball (1996) also stated, "What teachers bring to the process of learning to teach affects what they learn. Increasingly, teachers' own personal and professional theories are thought to play an important role in determining what they learn from professional-development opportunities" (p. 501).

Studies regarding teachers' perspectives on PD are somewhat similar. Gibson and Brooks (2012) revealed 93% of the teachers reported that they became more familiar with the new curriculum and more knowledgeable about content, but they were overwhelmed and concerned about their teaching ability because so much information was delivered over such a short time. Also, most of the participants struggled to find the appropriate related resources after the PD. It was reported from teachers' interviews that failure to provide teaching resources, lack of focus on assessments, and lack of follow up are the biggest challenges to PD programs, and makes them less effective. This study discovered that none of these concerns were anticipated by the PD coordinators, so they were not adequately addressed. This may be the reason why pedagogy and content learned from PD is not reflected in classroom observation.

In McLaughlin and Oberman's (1996) study, they found that teachers were left feeling

overwhelmed with the increasing overflow of new things to learn and to practice, because the PD was mainly focused on adding new thinking and skills without helping teachers to reorganize and reject or transform their previous thinking and beliefs.

Moreover, Kim (2008) found that modification of instructional strategies occur after they participated in PD as they gained enhanced knowledge from the workshops and courses. Teachers insisted that PD content and delivery model should be adjusted for participant teachers' needs.

Also, regarding teachers' attitude toward PD, Torff and Session (2008) claimed that teaching experience is the best predictor of teachers' attitudes about PD. They found that professional development manifested significant changes in teaching practices and teachers' beliefs within the first 10 years of teaching, but there's no effect thereafter.

Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in several theories, which can support and explain teachers' motivations and perspectives on PD. First of all, the theory of constructivism will help to understand how teachers as learners are involved in learning processes. Constructivism has been discussed as the best method of learning (Powell & Kalina, 2009) and it basically offers an explanation that learners construct or create new understandings using what they already know (based on their prior knowledge), learners actively participate in learning process, and instructors take a role of facilitators instead of knowledge deliverers (Applefield, Huber, & Moallem, 2000; Dewey, 1961; Piaget, 1973). Constructivists consider knowledge as acquired through active involvement with content through problem-solving skills (Kroll & LaBoskey, 1996). While constructivist such as Dewey (1961) and Piaget (1973) discuss the process of learning for individual sense -making, social constructivists (e.g. Vygotsky, 1978; Bruner, 1996) added social

aspects of learning into the constructivism and view learning as a result of interaction, reflection, and experience while they are engaged in a community and social interactions (Howard et al, 2000). Therefore, social constructivists view knowledge as constructed through social interaction with other people. Therefore, constructivism can explain how teachers construct new information they acquire from the PD upon their previous knowledge of content and pedagogy. Moreover, even their previous experience of PD affects the judgment of PD participation and knowledge use of PD information, where social constructivism can help to explain how social interaction plays an important role for teachers who participate in PD.

Secondly, self-determination theory can help to understand if one's behavior is self-determined, they are motivated to take an action and their regulatory process is a choice, but when it is controlled, their regulatory process is either in compliance or defiance (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991). This theory made a distinction between being self-determined and controlled with locus of causality (deCharms, 1968; Ryan, & Connell, 1989). It explains that if the behavior is self-determined, the locus of causality is internal to his or her self, whereas the locus of causality is external to the self when it is controlled. Even though both self-determined and controlled behaviors are motivated or intentional, they eventually lead to certain actions, but the qualities of their experiential and behavioral components are different in terms of willingness, creativeness, and demonstration of conceptual or intuitive understanding (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991). Therefore, by looking at intrinsic and extrinsic motivations of teachers' participation on PD, it can explain the relationship between teacher perspectives on PD and how they implement acquired knowledge from PD into their practice.

Finally, social capital theory first proposed by Bourdieu (1985) and followed by many researchers (e.g Loury, 1977; Coleman, 1988; Baker, 1990) can help understand how teachers'

perspectives and motivations about PD are influenced by other teachers who are in their close network. Bourdieu (1985) explained the definition of social capital as “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition” (p. 248). Even though there have been various ways to define and discuss the concept of ‘social capital’, World Bank (Grootaert et al., 2004) concluded that “social capital is most frequently defined in terms of the groups, networks, norms, and trust that people have available to them for productive purposes” (p. 3). In addition to the generally accepted definition, it continued to make a distinction between different forms of social capital; ‘bonding’, ‘bridging’, and ‘linking’. In relation to this study ‘bonding’ refers to people who are sharing similar demographical characteristics such as teacher colleagues within the same school, same district, and close teacher network; ‘bridging’ refers to people who do not share many of same characteristics, have a more or less equal social standing in horizontal nature such as a more experienced teacher or novice teacher; and ‘linking’ refers to people who are in a power differential position, in other words, people with more authority such as principals, political parties like government, department of education and so on (Grootaert et al, 2004). Therefore, with the help of this social capital theory, the reasons why teachers’ perspectives and motivations are influenced and how they affect them can be understood and explained.

Chapter 3: Method

The research questions of this study were designed to examine how EFL teachers in Korea think about the effectiveness of PD, their motivations to participate and reasons to not participate in the PD program, and in what ways teachers report that they use or modify knowledge from PD and why. For these purposes, a mixed design of quantitative and qualitative was adopted and used in this study since biases inherent in any single method could neutralize or cancel the biases of other methods (Creswell, 2009). The results from one method can help develop or inform the other method (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989), and mixed method research design can not only counterbalance strength and weakness from each method but also, comprehensive empirical documentation illuminates a set of common principles (Axinn, & Pearce, 2006).

Since collecting diverse types of data sets best provides a more complete and deeper understanding about the study (Creswell, 2009), a mixed methods design is useful to capture the best of both quantitative and qualitative approaches when a researcher wants to both generalize the findings in a population and develop a detailed view of the meaning of a phenomenon or concept for individuals (Creswell, 2009).

Therefore, a quantitative study design will briefly inform what most of the EFL teachers' general thoughts, beliefs, and perspectives are about the PD. Moreover, a qualitative study design will inform beyond the numbers and help to explore teachers' thoughts and beliefs in terms of understanding "human experience to reveal both the processes by which people construct meaning about their worlds and to report what those meanings are" (Hull, 1997, p. 14).

Therefore, this study first began with a survey in order to generalize results to a population and then conducted open-ended interviews to collect more detailed information about a small number of teachers' actual thoughts, beliefs, and perspectives that the questionnaire may be missing. Case studies are known not only to have importance in qualitative educational research (Stake, 2000), but also allow in-depth study in a holistic manner about the real-life phenomenon and participants' perspectives (Gall, Borg, and Gall, 1996; Chapelle and Duff, 2003; Yin, 2006).

A quantitative research design with more qualitative research design is particularly suitable for this study since the primary purpose of this study is to find the participants' perspectives, and researchers attempt to understand the world from participants' frames of reference and the meaning people have constructed of their experiences (Eisner, 1991; Hull, 1997; Lee, Mitchell, and Sablynski, 1999; Merriam, 2002; Nasser, 2001).

Therefore, the survey and follow-up interviews were collected to answer three research questions in this study.

Participants and Settings

For the main purpose of this study, which was to explore teachers' motivation and perceptions about PD and how and why teachers say they use, modify, or discard the knowledge from the PD program, elementary EFL teachers in Korea who have previously participated in a PD program participated in the survey. With the help of teachers and schools, 120 EFL teachers who previously had PD related to EFL were contacted by the researcher aiming for 100 participants and asked to participate in the study. Since the goal of the elementary EFL curriculum is more focused on communicative language use than middle and high school, where

the focus is grammar, reading, and writing, participants were limited to elementary EFL teachers who have experience in PD in order to have a common focus.

Although 120 teachers were contacted and asked to participate in this study, 108 teachers responded to participate, and 97 teachers actually completed the survey and returned them to the researcher. Among teachers who participated and completed surveys, eight teachers, were asked to participate for the in-depth case study in order to maximize the comparability of each case and to ensure rich data for the study. The weakness of the case study has been criticized of selecting participants for “single unit research designs often fall short in their representativeness the degree to which casual relationships evidenced by that single unit may be assumed to be true for a larger set of unstudied units” (Gerring, 2004, p. 348).

In order to avoid the criticism, the eight focal teachers in this study have different educational backgrounds and teacher qualifications, which not only “represents” different types of EFL teachers in Korea, but also makes good cases for understanding the complexities of teacher motivation and perspectives of PD programs. Four fixed-term teachers from different local contexts with different teaching experience, and different educational background and four regular EFL teachers from different local contexts with different teaching experience and different educational background were interviewed for qualitative data.

It is worth noting that the eight focal teachers not only have different backgrounds, but also have different characteristics as people. Some of the personal characteristics may or may not be related with the backgrounds they have. Pseudonyms were used to conceal their identity.

Participants were asked to specify the location of their school in both survey and interview. Specific school location will be used to identify the educational environment of the school, which can be categorized as good school district in Seoul, average (and below average) school

district in Seoul, and suburban school. Due to the environmental uniqueness, invisible dividing lines between school districts exist in Korea. Differences in terms of placement test scores, reputation of the schools, level of curriculum, level of teachers' education, and number of teacher –student ratio exist not only between suburban and urban schools, but also among schools within urban cities. School districts in urban cities can be divided into “good school districts” and the rest of them. There are visual differences depending on the location of the school, which is originated from invisible dividing lines. Therefore, by categorizing the location of the schools, the explanation for better understanding about the differences in PD motivation, and perspectives about PD will be provided between teachers from different locations of the schools due to their different environments.

Lee is a fixed term teacher with 10 years of teaching experience who works in a school just outside of Seoul. She used to work at a private school until she became 34 years old. But since her school has closed, she got laid- off for eight years, and she came back to school two years ago as a fixed term teacher. She raised her children while she was laid- off, then she started working again since her children entered elementary school. Since she was out of the field, everything such as educational policy, trends, expectations of parents, and even characteristics of students have changed and she has been trying to catch up to the environmental changes.

Overall, she is satisfied with her current school and she was happy that she was back.

Kim is a fixed term teacher with four years of teaching experience who works in a school that is in a good district of Seoul. She has been trying to pass the teaching placement test for four years and she was too stressed out as she failed her fourth try. So she chose an alternative way to become a teacher. She first became a fixed term teacher in school just outside of Seoul that is close to a good school district of Seoul. So when her contract ended, she was recommended for

the position by a former fixed term teacher of her current school, and it was during her first year of teaching in her current school when she was interviewed. She was very proud to be a teacher in a school in a good district of Seoul as she talked about how she started working in current school. She loves her job, her school, and her students although she has a heavier workload and extra after-school activities when compared to her previous school in the suburbs. She mentioned it was worth working in a good school district of Seoul since there is a big difference on students' motivation, parents' interest in children's learning, and the attitude toward teachers, which makes her more motivated to teach in a good school district of Seoul.

Park is also a fixed term teacher with two years of teaching experience who works in a school that is an hour from Seoul. She did not pass the teaching placement test, and she did not want to wait for another year to try again, since she had her master's degree from a graduate school of education, and she did not want to waste her time. She started looking to be a fixed term teacher, and there was a job opening in a suburban area. She moved to the city where her current school is, since she wanted to be a teacher so badly. However, she had hard time adjusting to the new environment, and most of her friends passed the teaching placement test and had become teachers in Seoul, causing her to be a little depressed. However, she was passionate about teaching and she wanted to motivate students to learn English. Therefore, she came up with several events and after-school activities to try new things in her current school.

Jeong is a fixed term teacher with six years of teaching experience who works in a school in an average district of Seoul. She has a long history of education. First of all, she went to community college for an associate degree in child development. After she graduated from community college, she transferred her credits to a university for a bachelor degree in English. While she was in the university, she went to Australia for the language program for a year. After

she graduated from the university, she went to the graduate school of education. After her second try of the teaching placement test, she decided she could not wait any longer since she felt like she had spent enough years in school and studying for the test. That is when she became a fixed term teacher. Her original plan was to take the teaching placement test every year while she was working as a fixed term teacher, but it was not possible with all of the work she has in her school.

Cha is a regular teacher with eight years of teaching experience who works in a private school in a good school district of Seoul. She graduated as an English major in Korea and went to school in the USA for the TESOL master program. Since her school is in a good district and is private, the pressure of proving excellence in English proficiency has influenced her PD participation. She mentioned that students in her school have a higher English proficiency level than other schools. More than half of the students graduated from English immersion preschool and there are number of students who have lived in English speaking countries.

Kwon is a regular teacher with 20 years of teaching experience who works in a school in an average school district of Seoul. She is the most experienced and oldest teacher of the eight focal teachers who were interviewed. Since she is the head of the English department in her school, she teaches fewer classes than other teachers, but works more on administrative tasks such as attending meetings, English related events, participates in decision-making and etc. Since she has both roles of teacher and administrator, she seems to know a great deal about the teachers' side and the PD organizer.

Son is a regular teacher with one year of teaching experience who works in a private school just outside of Seoul. She has the most unique background of all eight focal teachers. She originally graduated from the university as an airline flight attendant and became a flight

attendant for Korean Airline, which is the largest airline company in Korea. After two years of working as a flight attendant for Korean Airline, she decided to be a teacher. So she went to graduate school for TESOL master's degree. Since she decided to work in private school, she did not have to take a teaching placement test, so she started working at the current school. As the second year of her teaching just started, she was very passionate about teaching and her will to teach was the highest of all the teachers in the interview. She explained how she actively participates in PD and even asks if there is anything she can do to help make the PD environment better.

Yoon is a regular teacher with 12 years of teaching experience who works in a school that is an hour and a half away from Seoul. She was the only EFL teacher in her school, so she has a heavier duty than other subject teachers in this study. She has to take care of lesson plans, class preparation, evaluations, the English camp, and PD participation. She wished that they had more EFL teachers in her school who can share her responsibility and work as a team.

Focal teachers' backgrounds are displayed below with a table in order to provide a clearer distinction between their backgrounds (see Table 1).

Table 1: Background Information of Interviewers

Name Character istic	Lee	Kim	Park	Jeong	Cha	Kwon	Son	Yoon
Qualifica tion type	Fixed term	Fixed term	Fixed term	Fixed term	Regular	Regul ar	Regul ar	Regul ar

Table 1 (cont'd)

School location	Suburban	Urban (good)	Suburban	Urban	Urban	Urban	Suburban	Suburban
Age	44	32	28	36	34	53	29	46
Teaching Experience	10yrs	4yrs	2yrs	6yrs	8yrs	20yrs	1yrs	12yrs
Job title	Homeroom teacher	Homeroom teacher	Homeroom teacher	Homeroom teacher	Homeroom teacher	Subject teacher	Subject teacher	Subject teacher

Focal teachers' different educational backgrounds, teaching experiences, local contexts, and teacher qualification may provide interesting comparisons and contrasts among them. Consequently, it may help to understand the variety and complexity of Korean EFL teachers' motivation and perspectives of PD programs.

Data Collection

Three different sources of data are used for data triangulation (Guion, Diehl, and McDonald, 2011): background information questionnaires, surveys, and interviews. The benefits of triangulation is that it provides a clearer and in -depth understanding of the issues, and increasing confidence in research data and in the findings of qualitative studies (Thurmond, 2001). Therefore, data triangulation using background information, surveys, and interviews contributed to the diversity of data collection, which gave validity for data analysis and utility of

the findings that would not have been possible using a single-strategy study (Guion, Diehl, and McDonald, 2002).

Background information questionnaire. All participating teachers were asked to complete questionnaires (Appendix A) to collect the background information about them. It consists of 3 parts: (a) teaching experience, (b) contextual factors including location of the school, resources, time, support from administrators, school policy, and (c) previous experience of PD in terms of quantity and quality. This questionnaire helped to reveal the relationship between (a) contextual factors and motivation of PD participation, (b) teaching experience and PD participation, (c) previous experience and perceptions of PD, and (d) how all these factors affected the modification of PD knowledge into practice.

Surveys. After participants completed questionnaires about their background information, survey questions (Appendix B) were provided for them to complete. Commonly used types of survey such as Likert's scale, multiple choices, yes/no questions, and short answer were used to ask their perspectives about PD programs.

Likert-type scale is usually presented with statements or questions that can be responded in terms of an agreement or preference continuum ranged between extreme such as strongly agree and strongly disagree (Adelson and McCoach, 2010). In this study, a 4 point Likert's scale was used instead of a 5 point scale, which is more common, because providing odd numbers possibly allows respondents to choose a neutral response and avoid their decision making, but even numbers allow them to be more thoughtful and make definite decisions (Reid, 1990; Garland, 1991; Busch, 1993). This is especially pertinent to the research context since a lot of people in Korea tend to prefer midpoint and are hesitant to express their attitude either positive

or negative. As Busch (1993) indicated, “Neutrality can lead to indecisive data, particularly among those ethnic groups whose cultures value indirect responses” (p. 735).

Survey questions included the sections asking the importance (e.g. Is EFL PD important for effective teaching?), effectiveness (e.g. Is current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are effective?), motivation (e.g. Is practical and pedagogical knowledge development your motivation to PD participation?), beliefs (e.g. Should professional development programs be only for novice teachers?), important factors (Is length of the PD important factor to your participation?), preferences (What types of PD do you prefer?), and their experience of implementing PD information (Have you tried to implement the knowledge, research result, pedagogy, or activities that you learned about or acquired in your classroom?). However, participants were not specifically informed regarding what each question was targeting to ask.

Basically web-based background information questionnaire and surveys were used to collect quantitative data but a hard copy was provided if participants preferred or needed alternatives due to web accessibility. A web-based survey has several benefits: (a) fast and convenient, (b) low-cost, (c) enables immediate and accurate accumulation of survey results, (d) available any time in any location, (e) respondents are required to answer all the questions without missing or passing (Perkins, 2004; Bonometti and Tang, 2006). However, a hard copy survey was prepared for the desired participants since web-based survey has a weakness of accessibility due to economic or age reason (Perkins, 2004) in order to ensure a high rate of response.

Moreover, in order to ensure high response rates, Dillman’s (2007) a five- contact approach was modified as four-step approach and used. First of all, an e-mail that introduced the

study and asked for participation was sent to 120 Korean EFL teachers. Secondly, an e-mail with a link to the electronic survey with background questionnaire was sent to those 108 teachers who agreed to participate and 82 participants completed the survey. Then, a third e-mail to complete the survey was sent to 26 remained participants. Lastly, a hard copy of the survey was sent for 18 teachers who had not yet completed their survey. Between each contact there was a 7-day interval to remind them and encourage them to participate. In addition to that, a prize of a coffee coupon was sent for those who completed the survey questions. This was informed in the initial email and at the top of the electronic and hard copy surveys. I believe that all these efforts of providing a hard copy survey, robust participant-recruitment methods (Dillman, 2007), and offering a coupon were helpful to achieve a response rate of 80% and above.

Interviews. After completion of survey questionnaires, in -depth interviews were conducted with 8 teachers the aim of exploring in more detail, teachers' thoughts and beliefs about professional development (e.g., Groth and Bergner, 2007; Gore and Gitlin, 2004; Joram, 2007). Focal teachers were selected from each group of teacher qualification according to their survey and background questionnaires with the purpose of including participants who are representative [of various contexts, type of position, and individual characteristics] (see Table1). They were interviewed with a semi-structure interview protocol (Appendix C). For example, participants were asked to describe their best and worst PD experience, if they have tried to implement any knowledge, activities, resources, pedagogies that they learned from professional development, and if there were any difficulties of implementing PD information, and etc. This protocol served as guidelines but did not have a limitation within it. Each interview was allowed to take its own direction once it started and each interview was numbered and transcribed. The benefit of in-depth interview is that researchers more possibly gain true responses from

participants since it helps participants clarify and articulate their thoughts and beliefs about PD that they may not recognize until they think about them and say them out loud. However, observation was not an approach taken in this study since this study is only concerned with teachers' thoughts and beliefs about the PD rather than their actual practice. Moreover, it is not the focus of the study to evaluate teachers' use and modification of the knowledge they learn from the PD. There might be a risk of being subjective when including the observations of actual practice and it is difficult to evaluate whether a teacher actually modified and implemented particular information from the PD or not.

Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. After the interview transcriptions, member checking was used as Lincoln and Guba (1985) stated, "Using member checking is a crucial technique for establishing credibility" (p.314). It gives the participants an opportunity to make sure their intentions, correct errors, and add more information. Interview transcriptions were sent to the participants through email, fax, or in person according to their preference and participants made changes and assessed documents to verify accuracy when it was necessary.

Data Analysis

For the quantitative data set, a Microsoft Excel software program was used to analyze the answers from teachers. The percentage of each answer for the questions was calculated and simple statistics will be presented for the comparison. It shows how teachers' thought and beliefs are distributed and ranks of the motivations to participate in professional development. In addition to Microsoft Excel software program for simple comparison of survey responses, IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to see if participants' background such as teaching experience, qualification and school location was a significant factor for inclination for certain questions. The multinomial logistics regression model in SPSS was tested

in order to find out significant factors and which participant backgrounds had an effect on their responses.

During the qualitative data analysis process, an articulation of two of the best known general strategies in qualitative research were involved: analytic induction and grounded theory. During and after data was collected and interviews were transcribed, data was carefully looked at repeatedly with a strategy of analytic induction (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994), as it was defined, “A logic of qualitative research which employs a systematic and exhaustive examination of a limited number of cases in order to provide generalizations” (Marshall, 1998).

With the guidance of grounded theory, key issues were identified and grouped for perceptions, motivations and use of knowledge about PD through ‘initial coding’ (Charmaz 1983, Glaser 1978), which is a process of “Breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing data’ (Strauss & Corbin 1990, p.61). For example, in teachers’ explanations of effectiveness of PD in Korea, whenever the interview contained terms related to physical or psychological status such as *tired*, *burned out*, *exhausted*, and so on, then the physical or psychological barrier was marked by the excerpts by using Nvivo. Another example would be types of participation; whenever the interview contained terms related to force/spontaneity of the act such as *requirement*, *have to participate*, *dragged to participate*, *choose to participate* and so on, then either the mandatory or voluntary participation was marked by the excerpts. Then, representation of highlighted patterns or relationships among codes were categorized and grouped. For example, types of participation, teachers’ interest, physical or psychological barrier were categorized and grouped as internal factors that have an effect on the teachers’ perception of the effectiveness of PD. Charmaz (2000) stated that data can be defined

and categorized through coding and codes are created through grounded theory coding.

A number of comparisons in data analysis took place. First, comparison between participants' background information and their survey responses for perception of the effectiveness of the PD was analyzed. For example, I compared participants' responses and their background information category such as teacher qualification, teaching experience, local context, and so on. These categories were used to see if there is a relationship or pattern between their background information and their perceptions about the effectiveness of PD, motivation of participation, and the usage of acquired knowledge. Throughout this process, patterns in which participants with certain types of qualifications tend to think or respond in a certain way can be found. Second, comparison among interview data was looked at to find out if there is a relationship between their perceptions and knowledge use. For example, participants' interview explaining their perceptions about the PD can be compared with how teachers said it had an effect on their knowledge use in their teaching practice. This way, I sought to detect the factors that influence teachers' perception, motivation, and reported knowledge use from various perspectives. Stake (2000) stated that by using multiple perceptions, clarification of meaning and validation of repeatability of an interpretation would be accomplished.

While analyzing data, theoretical frameworks that were explained in Chapter 2 helped me to understand the qualitative data. First of all, constructivism (e.g Dewey, 1961; Piaget, 1973) has a notion that new knowledge is constructed based upon their prior knowledge. Which means, in other words, that these teachers' previous knowledge and experience may have an effect on new knowledge construction. This concept helped me to see the patterns of responses that their previous experience (constructed knowledge) about certain types, contents, and schedules of PD helped to establish prejudice (either positively or negatively), which worked with or against their

new constructions of experience. Moreover, it also applied to the usage of PD information that teachers construct knowledge from their practice through an active dialogue with materials, which constitute their field of action (Schon, 1987). In other words, teachers not only take raw knowledge as it is from PD, but they work with the material and modify it on some level with their previous field experience and use. Therefore, whether teachers discard, use, or modify the information from PD, the process of doing so can be viewed as working and interacting with the knowledge and materials from PD. Through these processes, professional development can be viewed as a process of personal growth (Stenhouse, 1975), and it is also in line with the constructivists' view of learning since PD does not take the role of delivering the information but takes the role of facilitator, which provides the opportunities of learning and growing as a teacher through problem solving and decision making.

Secondly, social constructivism (Vygotsky, 1978; Bruner, 1996) claims that learning occurs as a result of the interactions, reflections, and experience (Howard et al, 2000) that teachers have as they are actively involved in communication with others. Social constructivist theory helped me to make a link between what teachers reported in the surveys and interviews about their preference for more interactive PD, such as hands on activities, discussion forums with other EFL teachers, and language practices rather than lecture types of PD. Also, it helped me to understand that one of the strongest motivations for teachers to participate in PD was participating in a social network.

In addition to the social constructivism, social capital theory (e.g Loury, 1977; Coleman, 1988; Baker, 1990) helped me to make a connection to why teachers prefer social interaction with other EFL teachers rather than EFL experts, as it was found in the survey. Among three types of social capital, teachers prefer bonding and bridging rather than linking as found in their

preference to communicate with EFL teachers who have experience and share the same concerns, rather than EFL experts.

Finally, self-determination theory (e.g Deci , Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991, deCharms, 1968; Ryan, & Connell, 1989) explains why the voluntary versus mandatory type of PD participation is considered an important factor of effectiveness of PD. As was found in the survey and confirmed in the interview, voluntary and mandatory participation holds the key to the effectiveness of PD. It provides better quality of learning for teachers and also gives them an opportunity to choose what they need, which is directly related to the learning outcomes of PD.

Some theories are interconnected with each other and develop one another to create a theme, which is that learning is a complicated process for teachers and PD should reflect that. Therefore, this study also tries to identify factors that make PD participation complicated.

Contributions

As it was stated earlier, not only has there been a limited amount of research about the motivations of participating in the PD and little is known about how teachers perceive the knowledge from the professional development in Korea (Kim, 2008), but also there is a new phenomenon of hiring short-term EFL teachers with different qualifications. Therefore, this study has its significance to the field of language teacher education in Korea in a number of ways.

First, this study provides information about teachers' thoughts and beliefs of professional development. It is important to know how teachers feel about professional development in terms of effectiveness, content, terms, frequency and so on. The reason why I focus on teacher thoughts is because internal factors such as teachers' beliefs and understanding about PD may be

more influential in teachers' motivation than external factors. By examining teachers' perspectives about professional development, specific needs of foreign language teachers will be also addressed and fulfilling their needs has the potential to have a huge effect on teachers' learning and their classroom instruction. Also, it will help us to understand how teachers' needs are related to the motivation of participation in PD.

Second, this study provides information about what encourages or discourages teachers' participation in PD. It is important to know what teachers need from the professional development to provide better outlooks for PD providers and policy makers. By examining what factors affect teachers' motivation of participation, this study provides educators with information about what needs to be implemented for more successful and effective professional development.

Finally, this study would contribute to South Korean educators' understanding about effectiveness of teachers' PD on teachers' reported knowledge and practices and the importance of both the quantity and quality of PD to help teachers to improve their practice. It can help us to find out the way of enlarging teachers' performances in the classroom in Korea through PD. High quality professional development can help teachers to have higher confidence, more content and practical knowledge and a willingness to change their practices.

Therefore, by examining focal teachers' motivation, perceptions, and modification process of professional development, this study may also shed light on the field of foreign language teacher education in general and provide further direction. For example, this study has potential to inform other countries that may have similar circumstances for providing EFL PD where different types of teacher such as regular teachers or contract teachers exist.

In the next 3 chapters, the main findings of the study will be presented, and they are organized according to the three research questions. Chapter 4 focuses on how Korean EFL teachers think about the effectiveness of PD, chapter 5 focuses on what teachers' motivation to PD participation, and chapter 6 focuses on the characteristics of use or non-use information acquired from PD. Chapter 7 will include conclusion for the key findings with limitation of the study and future study suggestion.

Chapter 4: Teachers' Thoughts about Effectiveness of PD

In this chapter, I address my first research question and describe EFL teachers' thoughts about the various formats of PD including the effectiveness of PD for EFL teachers in Korea. First, I report the survey results that show what teachers think and believe about the PD for EFL teachers in Korea. Then, I describe more in depth why teachers believe PD for Korean EFL teachers is effective or ineffective and how these PD experiences are helpful or not helpful in their teaching practice. These findings came from teachers' responses to the survey as well as interviews.

Survey Results: Effectiveness of PD

As described earlier, when surveying EFL teachers in Korea, I collected their thoughts on PD and the effectiveness of various PD formats, along with their background information. The survey mainly had 3 sets of questions. The first set addressed their thoughts on the helpfulness of PD in regards to its content. The second set addressed their thoughts about PD in general. The third set addressed the helpfulness of PD regarding the types of PD and consisted of questions on whether different types of PD had different levels of effectiveness. In addition, the survey asked their preference regarding the duration, time period and intensity, as well as their perspectives on qualities of PD being effective or ineffective.

Teachers' thoughts on helpfulness of PD contents and approach to PD. Table 2 and 3 present the survey results of the teachers' thoughts and beliefs about PD content and the approaches used in the PD. Questions 1 to 3 in Table 2 ask about their thoughts whether specific contents of PD are helpful or not helpful, whereas questions 4 to 9 in Table 3 ask about their thoughts whether specific approaches to PD are helpful or not helpful.

Table 2: Effectiveness Regarding the Contents of the PD

		Not helpful at all	Not helpful	Helpful	Very helpful	Mean	SD
1	PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL	56.70%	24.74%	13.40%	5.15%	1.67	0.89
2	PD introducing new ideas about pedagogy	0.00%	6.18%	43.29%	50.51%	3.44	0.61
3	PD introducing new teaching resources such as software programs, books, etc.	8.24%	6.18%	42.26%	43.29%	3.21	0.88

As Table 2 indicates, most of the teachers responded positively about the effectiveness of PD content when PD introduces new ideas about pedagogy and new teaching resources, except when PD introduces new research findings or theories about EFL. 81.44% of participants found PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL is either not helpful or not helpful at all whereas 93.81% of participants and 85.57% of participants responded PD introducing new ideas about pedagogy and PD introducing new teaching resources is either helpful or very helpful. It is obvious that the mean of PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL is much lower than other 2 questions, which shows how teachers feel about the helpfulness of PD depending on the contents. As it was found, the majority of teachers think PD introducing new ideas of pedagogy and new teaching resources are more helpful than PD introducing research and theories. Each standard deviation shows most of the responses for question 1-3 are clustered around the mean.

Questions 4 to 9 in Table 3 are more focused on forms of PD and types of approaches used for PD. Teachers responded whether they thought certain approaches of PD were helpful or not helpful.

Table 3: Effectiveness Regarding Approach to PD

		Not helpful at all	Not helpful	Helpful	Very helpful	Mean	SD
4	PD providing discussion forums with other EFL teachers	4.12%	18.55%	60.82%	16.49%	2.90	0.80
5	PD in the form of formal mentoring	0%	34.02%	36.08%	29.89%	2.96	0.80
6	PD in the form of lecture sessions from EFL experts	23.71%	24.74%	26.80%	24.74%	2.53	1.10
7	PD providing discussion forums with EFL experts	7.21%	45.36%	40.20%	7.21%	2.47	0.73
8	PD providing hands-on activities	5.15%	4.12%	47.42%	43.29%	3.29	0.77
9	PD providing English language practice experience	1.03%	23.71%	49.48%	25.77%	3.00	0.73

As Table 3 indicates, the majority of participants thought 4) PD providing discussion forum with other EFL teachers (77.32%) , 5) PD providing formal mentoring (65.98%), 8) PD providing hands-on activities (90.07%), and 9) PD providing language practice experience (75.26%) are either helpful or very helpful.

On the other hand, responses for question 6) PD in the form of lecture sessions from EFL experts were almost evenly distributed through the chi-square test ($p\text{-value}=0.9783$) with 5% significant level. This means that a quarter of the participants thought PD in the form of lecture sessions from EFL experts were very helpful, a quarter of the participant teachers thought it was helpful, a quarter of the participant teachers thought it was not helpful, and a quarter of the participant teachers thought it was not helpful at all. The reason that responses for question 6 are consistent is that everyone felt differently about the lecture forms of PD. How they conceive lecture PD as effective and as favorable is a different matter, will be explained later with discussion of the interview data. Although it seems like there is no clear overall preference for lecture session PD, it was found that qualification has an effect on the responses for this question, which will be explained in a later section.

It is worth noting that forms of PD that provide practical experience such as PD introducing new ideas about pedagogy, PD introducing new teaching resources, PD providing discussion forums with other EFL teachers, PD providing hands-on activities, and PD providing English language practice experience have higher means than forms of PD that provide theoretical experience such as PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL and PD in the form of lecture sessions from EFL experts and discussion forums.

Also, unlike responses for other questions, it was found that teachers' responses for 7) PD providing discussion forum with EFL experts tend to be gathered in the middle of the spectrum as either not helpful or helpful rather than spread out at the end of the spectrum for extreme scales such as not helpful at all or very helpful ($\text{mean}=2.47$, $\text{SD}=0.73$). Possible explanation can be that the effectiveness of a discussion forum in PD can be varied depending on the contents, discussion participants, topics, length, and flow of discussion.

From these survey results, it can be inferred that participants for this study tend to have a stronger preference for the following; 2) PD introducing new ideas about pedagogy (mean= 3.44, sd=0.61), 3) PD introducing new teaching resources such as software programs, books, etc (mean= 3.21, sd=0.88), 4) PD providing discussion forums with other EFL teachers (mean= 2.90, sd=0.80), 5) PD in the form of formal mentoring (mean= 2.96, sd=0.80), 8) PD providing hands-on activities (mean= 3.29, sd=0.77), and 9) PD providing English language practice experience (mean= 3.00, sd=0.73). However, they have stronger reluctance for 1) PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL (mean= 1.67, sd=0.89). Moreover, participants have no strong preference or reluctance for 6) PD in the form of lecture sessions from EFL experts (mean= 2.53, sd=1.10) , and 7) PD providing discussion forums with EFL experts (mean= 2.47, sd=0.73).

Furthermore, this research found interesting patterns of responses regarding participants' background factors. The multinomial logistics regression model was used to find out if there is significance between teachers' responses regarding participants' qualification. The result shows that teaching experience has an effect on 3 responses for survey questions, and qualification has an effect on 1 survey question among questions asking teachers' thoughts on helpfulness of PD contents and approach to PD (question 1 to 9). Surveys questions with significance (p-value < 0.005) will be only listed below and explained; any survey questions not listed below have no significance (p-value > 0.05).

As it was reported, teaching experience was the most important significant factor on the teachers' thoughts on helpfulness of PD contents and approach to PD. It has effect on the questions of 1) helpfulness of PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL, 5)

PD providing formal mentoring, and 8) PD providing hands-on activities. Each question will be presented below with tables and explanation.

It was found that the participants' teaching experience was a significant factor on teachers' thoughts about the helpfulness of PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL ($p\text{-value}=0.001$). As Table 4 indicates, participants with less teaching experience tend to think PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL are not helpful at all while participants with more teaching experience tend to think PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL are helpful.

Table 4: Significant Difference of Teaching Experience on Teachers' Thoughts

Do you think PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL is helpful?				
Responses Teaching experience	Not helpful at all	Not helpful	Helpful	Very helpful
1-5yrs	64.8%	27.9%	6.4%	1.0%
6-10yrs	60.6%	26.4%	10.7%	2.3%
11-15yrs	53.9%	23.8%	17.1%	5.2%
16-20yrs	44.2%	19.8%	25.1%	10.8%
21-25yrs	32.3%	14.7%	32.8%	20.1%
26-30yrs	20.6%	9.5%	37.4%	32.6%
31-35yrs	11.4%	5.3%	37.2%	46.0%

A possible explanation of why participants with less experience tend to think of PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL as not helpful is that they recently have graduated from college, which allows them to be familiar with new research findings or theories about EFL. On the other hand, as participants gain more experiences, they need to update knowledge and information about the research findings and theory. Moreover, it can also be assumed that as teachers have more experience, they may start seeing teaching as more complex work and have better understanding of how theory corporate, blend, and support in their teaching practice. In other words, teachers with more experience possibly see teaching as collaboration of theory and practice rather than separate work. Therefore, participants with more experience seem to feel PD providing new research findings or theories about EFL are helpful, whereas participants with less experience may find them repetitive.

Participants' teaching experience is a significant factor ($p\text{-value}=0.000$) for the responses about helpfulness of PD in the form of formal mentoring. The majority of participants with 1-5 years teaching experience tend to think PD in the form of mentoring is very helpful whereas responses of participants with more teaching experience find it less helpful as presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Significant Difference of Teaching Experience on Teachers' Thoughts

Do you think PD in the form of formal mentoring is helpful?				
Responses Teaching experience	Not helpful at all	Not helpful	Helpful	Very helpful
1-5yrs	0.0%	11.2%	10.4%	78.4%

Table 5 (cont'd)

6-10yrs	0.0%	49.9%	50.1%	0.0%
11-15yrs	0.0%	48.2%	51.8%	0.0%
16-20yrs	0.0%	46.4%	53.6%	0.0%
21-25yrs	0.0%	44.6%	55.4%	0.0%
26-30yrs	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	0.0%
31-35yrs	0.0%	41.2%	58.5%	0.0%

When teachers have teaching experience of 5 or less years, they tend look for the help from more experienced teachers or experts and they found PD providing formal mentoring is very helpful in terms of building a mentoring relationship. However, as they gain more experience, either they become one of the more experienced teachers and experts, so they may feel PD providing formal mentoring is not helpful, or perhaps they can find a mentor for themselves, so they don't need PD to find one for them. That might be why teachers with more experience found PD providing formal mentoring less helpful than relatively newer teachers.

Also, teaching experience was a significant factor in responses about the helpfulness of PD providing hands-on activities ($p\text{-value}=0.000$). Teachers with less teaching experience responded PD providing hands-on activities as helpful or very helpful whereas teachers with more experience responded not helpful or not helpful at all.

Table 6: Significant Difference of Teaching Experience on Teachers' Thoughts

Do you think PD providing hands-on activities is helpful?				
Responses Teaching experience	1	2	3	4
1-5yrs	0.1%	1.0%	46.3%	52.6%
6-10yrs	0.6%	2.3%	50.7%	46.4%
11-15yrs	2.4%	5.1%	53.2%	39.3%
16-20yrs	9.3%	10.3%	50.4%	30.0%
21-25yrs	27.9%	16.4%	37.6%	18.1%
26-30yrs	56.2%	17.6%	18.9%	7.3%
31-35yrs	78.3%	13.1%	6.5%	2.0%

As Table 6 indicates, the result shows that teachers considered PD providing hands-on activities less helpful as their teaching experience increases. It may be because when teachers have less experience, they tend to try out new things and learn through doing them. As was found in the interview (to be discussed below), that is why teachers with less experience work through trial and error. They have to experience whether something will work or not. However, when teachers have more teaching experience, they learn quickly without experiencing and can learn by just listening to them. That might be why teachers with more experience think that PD providing hands-on activities is not helpful since it takes more time for less information.

Also, qualification has an effect on response about the helpfulness of PD in the form of lecture ($p\text{-value}=0.000$). A majority of regular teachers responded that PD in the form of lecture is not helpful (36.7%) or not helpful at all (35.0%) whereas a majority of contract teachers responded that it is helpful (43.2%) or very helpful (45.9%) as presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Significant Difference of Qualification on Teachers' Thoughts

Do you think PD in the form of lecture is helpful?				
Responses Qualification	1	2	3	4
Regular teachers	35.0%	36.7%	16.7%	11.7%
Contract teachers	5.4%	5.4%	43.2%	45.9%

The reason contract teachers tend to favor the lecture types of PD might be that they have weaker background knowledge about EFL education than regular teachers. Contract teachers in Korea are usually the people who have teacher qualification (either graduated teachers college or graduated with completion of course in education) but do not pass or do not take the teacher certification exam for some reasons. Since the teacher certification exam is very challenging and requires extensive and profound knowledge for theory and practice, teachers who have passed the exam may have stronger background knowledge than teachers who have not. That might be the reason that contract teachers feel that lecture types of PD helps them to have background knowledge they need.

By looking at the survey results, this study provides how teachers feel about the helpfulness of PD regarding its contents and approaches. Also, possible explanation of response

tendency on helpfulness of PD regarding teaching experiences and qualification has been provided through a multinomial logistics regression model. Teachers' general thoughts and beliefs about PD will be presented and explained in the next section.

Teachers' beliefs about PD. Question 10 to 14 asked teachers to agree or disagree with the statement regarding their thinking about PD in general. For the questions of teachers' beliefs about PD, most of the teachers responded positively about the importance of PD, except for the statement asking about the effectiveness and sufficiency of current PD in Korea (13,14).

Table 8: Teachers' Thoughts and Beliefs about PD

		Strongly disagree	disagree	agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
10	Professional development programs should be only for novice teachers.	55.67%	26.80%	9.27%	8.24%	1.70	0.94
11	All EFL teachers should make an effort to stay current in the EFL field by participating in PD.	2.06%	7.21%	40.20%	50.51%	3.39	0.71
12	EFL PD is important for effective teaching.	0%	11.34%	45.36%	43.29%	3.32	0.66
13	Current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are sufficient.	17.52%	19.58%	27.83%	35.05%	2.80	1.10

Table 8 (cont'd)

14	Current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are effective.	23.71%	21.64%	29.89%	24.74%	2.56	1.10
----	--	--------	--------	--------	--------	------	------

As Table 8 indicates, a majority of participants either disagree or strongly disagree with 10) PD should be only for novice teachers (82.47%), which means that they think PD should be for teachers in all stages of their careers. And teachers either agree or strongly agree with 11) All EFL teachers should make an effort to stay current in the EFL field by participating in PD (90.72%), and 12) EFL PD is important for effective teaching (88.66%). These results suggest that most of the teachers are well aware of the necessity of PD in all stages of their career in order to stay current in the EFL field and to have effective teaching.

However, through the chi-square test, it was found that responses for question 13) Current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are sufficient ($p\text{-value}=0.056$) and 14) Current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are effective ($p\text{-value}=0.697$) were not rejected, which means that responses were almost evenly distributed and a fair number of participants responded on each scale almost equally. Unlike responses for other survey questions, responses for these questions are only consistent because responses for these particular questions are individualized for different participants. The possible reason that responses for question 13 and 14 are consistent is that participants might have various opinions about the effectiveness and sufficiency depending on situations they are in. For example, if the participants are in urban school contexts, their opportunities for PD participation

are different than participants in rural school contexts. Also, they might have different perspectives about effectiveness of PD as they gain more experience. How teachers feel about the effectiveness and sufficiency might be different and polarized depending on the situation they are in. Although it seems like there is no clear overall agreement or disagreement for sufficiency and effectiveness of PD in Korea, it was found that teaching experience and school location have an effect on the responses for this question, which will be explained later in this chapter.

It is worth noting that the majority of participants are aware of the importance of PD in order to stay current in the EFL field (mean=3.39) and effectiveness of PD on teaching (mean=3.32), which seems to lead them to disagree that Professional development programs should only be for novice teachers (mean=1.70). Also, the even distribution of responses for question 13 and 14 tells us that current EFL PD in Korea is effective and sufficient for some teachers and not effective and sufficient for other teachers, depending on the situation they are in.

As stated earlier, in order to find out a more specific relationship between background factors and responses for questions, a multinomial logistics regression model was used. It was found that teaching experience in company with school location is a significant factor for 2 survey questions and teaching experience was a significant factor for 1 survey question.

Although the majority of the participants either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement “Professional development programs should be only for novice teachers”, it looks a little different when we take a close look at the responses regarding their school location and teaching experience. First of all, teachers in good urban school districts tend to disagree with the statement and there is a little decrease in responses as they have more experience. However,

participants with less teaching experience from average urban school districts disagree but there is just a little difference in numbers as participants' teaching experience increases. However, a majority of teachers with more experience in suburban schools strongly agree that Professional development programs should be only for novice teachers, as Table 9 presents. N/a indicates that there are no participants with those specific teaching experiences who work at a school location.

Table 9: Significant Difference of Location and Teaching Experience on Teachers' Responses

Professional development programs should be only for novice teachers.												
Location Experience	Urban (Good school district)				Urban (Average school district)				Suburban			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1-5yrs	63.5	29.2	7.3	0.0	74.5	22.5	2.7	0.3	73.3	15.2	9.7	1.9
6-10yrs	55.1	34.6	10.2	0.1	67.0	27.7	3.8	1.4	61.4	17.4	13.0	8.3
11-15yrs	46.3	39.8	13.6	0.3	56.5	31.9	5.2	6.4	41.2	15.9	13.9	28.9
16-20yrs	37.4	43.9	17.5	1.2	39.9	30.8	5.8	23.5	17.5	9.2	9.4	64.0
21-25yrs	28.4	45.6	21.2	4.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.6	3.3	3.9	88.1

Table 9 (cont'd)

26-30yrs	19.0	41.6	22.5	17.0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.0	1.0	1.3	96.8
31-35yrs	9.5	28.4	17.9	44.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

This result tells us that as teaching experience increases, responses for disagreement decrease and responses for agreement increase overall. That means that as teachers have more experience they tend to think that PD is only for novice teachers. More specifically, there is not much difference for teachers with 15 or less years of teaching experience across the school location, but there is a difference for teachers with 16 or more years of teaching experience regarding their school location. On the other hand, a majority of participants with 11-25 years of teaching experience from urban schools (good and average school districts) tend to favor for disagree or strongly disagree, whereas only participants with 11-15 years of teaching experience from suburban schools disagree or strongly disagree, and participants with 16-25 years of teaching experience from suburban school agree or strongly agree with the statement. Moreover, responses are extremely skewed for participants with 21-30 years of teaching experience from suburban schools as almost of all participants strongly agree with the statement, whereas responses for participants with 21 or more years of teaching experience are in the middle of the scale, such as agree or disagree instead of the extreme ends of the scale such as strongly disagree or strongly agree.

It can be interpreted that teachers with 15 or less years of teaching experience from all school locations, teachers with 16-30 years of teaching experience from urban good school

districts, and teachers with 16-20 years of teaching experience from urban average school districts think they still need PD throughout all their careers. However, teachers with 31 or more years of teaching experience from good urban district schools and teachers with 16 or more years of teaching experience from suburban schools do not think they need PD through all stages of their career. The possible reason that teachers from urban schools and teachers with less experience agree more with the statement is pressure of being excellent are heavier for those teachers. Therefore either they actually feel the necessity of PD throughout their careers because PD helps them to be effective teachers or they feel like participating in PD proves their improvement of efficacy and shows they are trying to be an effective teacher. However, as urban school teachers have longer experience, either they have less pressures with higher positions or they found PD is not helpful for them to be an effective teacher.

Also, participants' teaching experience in company with school location is a significant factor ($p\text{-value}=0.000$) for the statement "Current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are sufficient". A majority of urban teachers (good and average school districts) agree or strongly agree with the statement and it is consistent with teaching experience. Even though the result of the multinomial logistics regression model says that experience was one of the significant factors for this question, no distinctive difference is found regarding experience, except with teachers from suburban schools. As Table 10 presents, a majority of suburban teachers disagree with the statement and show an increase of responses for strongly disagree as teaching experience increases.

Table 10: Significant Difference of Teaching Experience and Location on Teachers' Responses

Current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are sufficient												
Location Experience	Urban (Good school district)				Urban (Average school district)				Suburban			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1-5yrs	1.5	11.8	24.0	62.7	0.0	27.9	31.6	40.5	44.2	42.2	0.0	13.6
6-10yrs	2.1	10.0	32.7	55.2	0.0	23.1	42.0	34.9	55.4	33.4	0.0	11.2
11-15yrs	2.7	8.1	42.6	46.6	0.0	18.2	53.3	28.5	66.0	25.2	0.0	8.8
16-20yrs	3.3	6.3	53.0	37.4	0.0	13.6	64.2	22.2	75.3	18.2	0.0	6.6
21-25yrs	3.8	4.6	62.9	28.7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	82.7	12.6	0.0	4.7
26-30yrs	4.3	3.3	71.4	21.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	88.2	8.5	0.0	3.3
31-35yrs	4.6	2.2	78.3	14.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

The reason for distinctive differences between teachers from urban schools and suburban schools may be the difference between being given an opportunity for PD. Urban school teachers have more opportunities regarding location, frequency, and school support than teachers from suburban schools. Even though a majority of teachers from suburban schools responded that current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are not sufficient, there are higher numbers of responses from less experienced teachers about current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea being sufficient. Regardless of fewer

opportunities for PD for suburban schools, teachers with less experience from suburban schools may be motivated enough to search for PD and participate. So those who have been given opportunities to participate may feel that current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are sufficient and those who have not may feel the opposite. Also, it may be the difference between expectation and actualities. Those who expected to have more PD opportunities in terms of quantity and quality may feel current PD is not sufficient. Moreover, responses about the sufficiency for current PD programs in Korea can also be related to their thoughts on the effectiveness of PD. Existing PD programs may not be sufficient for those who believe in PD being effective, so they may search actively for more opportunities, and participate. However those who think PD is not effective may be hesitant to participate in PD and feel that existing programs are enough and sometimes too many already.

Furthermore, teaching experience is a significant factor ($p\text{-value}=0.009$) for the statement “Current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are effective”. As Table 11 presents, teachers with more teaching experience tend to respond that they disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 11: Significant Difference of Teaching Experience on Teachers’ Responses

Current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are effective.				
Responses Teaching experience	1	2	3	4
1-5yrs	21.6	11.7	30.7	36.0
6-10yrs	24.7	18.3	31.8	25.1

Table 11 (cont'd)

11-15yrs	26.3	26.8	30.7	16.3
16-20yrs	26.0	36.5	27.6	9.8
21-25yrs	24.2	46.8	23.4	5.6
26-30yrs	21.4	56.8	18.8	3.0
31-35yrs	18.1	66.0	14.4	1.6

A majority of participants with 1-10 years of teaching experience tend to respond that they agree or strongly agree that current PD in Korea is effective, whereas it became evenly split with the participants with 11-15 years of teaching experience. On the other hand, a majority of participants with 16-35 years of teaching experience responded that they disagree or strongly disagree that current PD in Korea is effective. The possible explanations why teachers with more experience tend to respond that current PD in Korea is not effective are 1) teachers with more experience may think PD repeats information that they are well aware of, or 2) PD organization and instructors have low credibility from more experienced teachers through previous PD experience as was found from interview data and other survey questions.

Although teachers' thoughts on helpfulness of PD content and approaches to PD were looked at, it is important to investigate their actual experience with PD programs. Since teachers can have different experiences with different kinds of PD regarding its schedules, each category

asking about teachers' experience on the helpfulness of PD regarding different schedules was analyzed.

Helpfulness of PD regarding different types of PD. The second set of survey questions was asked to see whether teachers have different experience and thoughts with different PD schedules or types, such as PD on weekdays, PD during weekend, PD during summer/winter vacation, or PD through online. Since not all the participants experienced PD held in different times, they were asked to only answer the PD they have experience with. Different PD schedules do not simply mean that PD is held in different time periods, but it includes more complex matters such as locations that PD is held at, whether it provides accommodation or not, intensities, duration, and so on. Strengths and weaknesses that are related with these complexities will be discussed later with interview data. Since teachers were allowed to answer multiple sections as long as they participate in certain types of PD, participants' numbers do not reflect the total numbers of participants of the study. Results are displayed in Table 12.

First of all, 52 teachers, making up 53.61% of participants, had experience of PD during weekdays. As Table 12 presents, a majority of participants disagree or strongly disagree PD during weekdays has helped them to gain theoretical knowledge about EFL teaching (90.38%) and knowledge about EFL learners (98.08%), provided too much information, but does not make them overwhelmed (71.15 %), and provided too much information and makes them overwhelmed (78.85 %).

On the other hand, PD during weekdays has some positive effect on teachers' responses. The majority of participants either agree or strongly agree that PD during weekdays has helped them to gain practical knowledge (82.69%), has helped them to have greater self-confidence and

higher efficacy (80.77 %), will eventually have an effect on students' achievement (73.08 %), and is applicable to their teaching practice (90.38 %).

Secondly, none of the participants had experience of PD during weekends. However, this is not a reflection of PD not occurring on weekends nor it is a reflection of teachers' lack of participation in PD on weekends. It is just the participants of this study don't happen to participate in PD during weekends for some reason, which will be explained later.

Third, 64 teachers making up 65.98% of participants had experience of PD during vacation. Different from PD during weekdays, there are more positive responses from participants. The majority of participants either agree or strongly agree that PD during vacation has helped them to gain theoretical knowledge about EFL teaching (87.5%) and practical knowledge (71.88%), has helped them to have greater self-confidence and higher efficacy (89.06 %), will eventually have an effect on students' achievement (90.63%), is applicable to their teaching practice (82.81%), and provided too much information but does not make them overwhelmed (59.38%). On the other hand, the majority of participants either disagrees or strongly disagree that PD during vacation has helped them to gain knowledge about EFL learners (87.5%), and provided too much information and makes them overwhelmed (59.38%).

Lastly, 35 teachers making up 36.08% of participants had experience of online PD. The majority of participants do not believe in the helpfulness of online PD. Most of the participants either disagree or strongly disagree that online PD has helped them to gain theoretical knowledge about EFL teaching (94.29 %), practical knowledge (91.43%), and knowledge about EFL learners (100%), has helped them to have greater self-confidence and higher efficacy (82.86%), will eventually have an effect on students' achievement (91.43%), is

applicable to their teaching practice (97.14 %), and provided too much information but does not make them overwhelmed (97.13 %).

Table 12: Helpfulness of PD with Different Schedule

Types of PD		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
W E E K D A Y S	has helped me to gain theoretical knowledge about EFL teaching.	44.23%	46.15%	9.61%	0%	1.65	0.65
	has helped me to gain practical knowledge about EFL teaching.	0%	17.30%	48.07%	34.61%	3.17	0.70
	has helped me to gain knowledge about EFL learners.	55.76%	42.30%	1.92%	0%	1.46	0.54
	has helped me to have greater self-confidence and higher self - efficacy.	3.84%	15.38%	48.07%	32.69%	3.07	0.79
	will eventually have an affect on student achievement.	0%	26.92%	69.23%	3.84%	2.77	0.50
	is applicable to my teaching practice.	0%	9.61%	75.0%	15.38%	3.06	0.50
	provided too much information but does not make me overwhelmed.	1.92%	69.23%	28.84%	0%	2.27	0.48
	provided too much information and makes me overwhelmed.	11.53%	67.30%	17.30%	3.84%	2.13	0.65

Table 12 (cont'd)

V A C A T I O N	has helped me to gain theoretical knowledge about EFL teaching.	6.25%	6.25%	71.87%	15.62%	2.97	0.68
	has helped me to gain practical knowledge about EFL teaching.	6.25%	21.87%	62.50%	9.37%	2.75	0.71
	has helped me to gain knowledge about EFL learners.	40.62%	46.87%	12.5%	0%	1.72	0.67
	has helped me to have greater self-confidence and higher self - efficacy.	0%	10.93%	45.31%	43.75%	3.33	0.66
	will eventually have an affect on student achievement.	0%	9.37%	73.43%	17.18%	3.08	0.51
	is applicable to my teaching practice.	0%	17.18%	82.81%	0%	2.83	0.38
	provided too much information but does not make me overwhelmed.	12.5%	28.12%	59.37%	0%	2.47	0.70
	provided too much information and makes me overwhelmed.	0%	59.37%	28.12%	12.5%	2.53	0.70

Table 12 (cont'd)

O N L I N E	has helped me to gain theoretical knowledge about EFL teaching.	20.0%	74.28%	5.71%	0%	1.86	0.48
	has helped me to gain practical knowledge about EFL teaching.	37.14%	54.28%	8.57%	0%	1.71	0.61
	has helped me to gain knowledge about EFL learners.	82.85%	17.14%	0%	0%	1.17	0.37
	has helped me to have greater self-confidence and higher self-efficacy.	14.28%	68.57%	14.28%	2.85%	2.06	0.63
	will eventually have an affect on student achievement.	20.0%	71.42%	5.71%	2.85%	1.91	0.60
	is applicable to my teaching practice.	20.0%	77.14%	0%	2.85%	1.86	0.54
	provided too much information but does not make me overwhelmed.	82.85%	14.28%	2.85%	0%	1.20	0.47
	provided too much information and makes me overwhelmed.	0%	2.85%	37.14%	60.00%	3.57	0.55

Looking at teachers' thoughts through the different schedules of PD, it is worth noting that the majority of teachers reported they did not gain knowledge about EFL students from any types of PD. Moreover, the majority of participants responded that both PD during weekdays and

during vacation have helped them to gain practical knowledge about EFL teaching, have greater self-confidence and higher self-efficacy, will eventually have an affect on student achievement, and is applicable to their teaching practice.

However, the majority of teachers neither reported gains of theoretical and practical knowledge about EFL teaching, gains of knowledge about EFL learners, have greater self-confidence and higher self-efficacy, nor believe that it will eventually have an effect on student achievement from online PD. Also, they believe that online PD provided too much information and makes them overwhelmed.

Also, when the survey asked participants to respond about the effectiveness of specific types of PD programs, there are few questions that show a significant factor such as location of the school, qualification, and teaching experience, from the participants who have experiences of PD during vacation and PD through online.

As Table 13 indicates, location is a significant factor ($p\text{-value}=0.018$) for the question asking if PD during vacation helped them to have greater self-confidence and higher self-efficacy, and all the participants from good urban school districts responded agree (48.4%) or strongly agree (51.6%). On the other hand, a majority of the participants from average urban school districts responded agree (43.8%) or strongly agree (43.7%), and a few participants disagree (12.5%) whereas participants from suburban schools responded disagree (29.4%), agree (41.2%), and strongly agree (29.4%).

Table 13: Significant Difference of Location on Teachers' Responses

PD during vacation has helped me to have greater self-confidence and higher self-efficacy.				
Responses Location	1	2	3	4
Urban (Good school district)	0.0%	0.0%	48.4%	51.6%
Urban (Average school district)	0.0%	12.5%	43.8%	43.7%
Suburban	0.0%	29.4%	41.2%	29.4%

Whereas all of the participants from good school districts and a majority of participants from average school districts in urban schools responded that PD during vacation helped them to have greater self-confidence and higher self-efficacy, some teachers from suburban schools responded that PD during vacation was not helpful to improve their self-confidence and self-efficacy. A possible explanation can be that self-confidence and self-efficacy is based on their relative performance compared to other teachers whom they meet at PD as was found through interview data. Therefore, urban teachers who meet suburban teachers who think that they are doing good job as a teacher will have higher confidence and self-efficacy, whereas suburban teachers who meet urban school teachers and think they are doing lesser than urban school teachers will have relatively lower self-confidence and self-efficacy. It is also consistent with urban school teachers that teachers from good district schools show a higher rate of agreement

with improvement in self-confidence and self-efficacy than teachers from average school districts.

Also, qualification is a significant factor ($p\text{-value} = 0.006$) when participants responded to the statement “PD during vacation will eventually have an affect on student achievement” as Table 14 indicates. 20.0% of regular teachers strongly agree with the statement “PD during vacation will eventually have an effect on student achievement”, and 80.0% of regular teachers agree, where as 13.8% of contract teachers strongly agree with the statement, 65.5% of contract teachers agree, and 20.7% of contract teachers disagree as presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Significant Difference of Qualification on Teachers’ Responses

PD during vacation will eventually have an affect on student achievement.				
Responses Qualification	1	2	3	4
regular	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
contracted	0.0%	20.7%	65.5%	13.8%

It was not found if there are distinctive differences in numbers of participants’ responses between PD during weekdays, PD during vacation, and PD through online for this particular question. Although it requires further investigation to find out why qualification is a significant factor for responses on effectiveness of PD during vacation in student achievement, a possible explanation for this result may be that contract teachers usually stay in the same school for 1 year for the maximum, so if they participate in PD during vacation, they may be at a different school

teaching a different grade with different curriculum the next semester. Therefore, they have fewer chances to practice information that they acquire from PD during vacation.

Also, qualification in combination with location of the school is a significant factor ($p\text{-value}=0.000$) when participants were asked to respond to the statement “PD during vacation is applicable to my teaching practice”. As Table 15 presents, responses for the most contract teachers and regular teachers from urban and suburban schools were concentrated in the agree category and there are less responses in the disagree category. However, one interesting result was found that a majority of contract teachers from suburban schools disagree (70.6%) with the statement “PD during vacation is applicable to my teaching practice” whereas 29.4% of the contract teachers agree.

Table 15: Significant Difference of Qualification on Teachers’ Responses

PD during vacation is applicable to my teaching practice.												
location Qualification	Urban (good school district)				Urban (average school district)				Suburban			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Regular	0.0	0.9	99.1	0.0	0.0	2.6	97.4	0.0	0.0	20.5	79.5	0.0
Contracted	0.0	7.5	92.5	0.0	0.0	20.2	79.8	0.0	0.0	70.6	29.4	0.0

It can also be explained with contract teachers’ short-term contracts. As indicated earlier, contract teachers often move to another school after one year of contracted work, but teachers from urban schools tend to stay in the same district and area where the level of the students and school curriculums are similar. However, contract teachers from suburban schools have less of a

chance to stay in the same district since there are not many vacant positions for EFL teachers. Therefore, they tend to move around a lot schools with very different environments in terms of level of students, school curriculums, grade of the students, and support from schools. Therefore, if contract teachers participate in PD targeting students in their current school during winter vacation, and their contract ends the next year before March, information from PD during vacation won't be applicable to their teaching practice.

Three out of 8 questions asked about the helpfulness of PD provided online were found to be significant. As presented in Table 16, responses of teachers with less teaching experience (1-25) were concentrated in strongly disagree or disagree about the statement “PD provided online has helped me to gain theoretical knowledge about EFL teaching” whereas a majority of teachers with more teaching experience (26-35) responded more toward agreeing with the statement and less participants responded they disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

Table 16: Significant of Teaching Experience on Teachers' responses

PD provided online has helped me to gain theoretical knowledge about EFL teaching.				
Responses Teaching experience	1	2	3	4
1-5yrs	25.5	74.5	0.0	0.0
6-10yrs	22.1	77.8	0.1	0.0
11-15yrs	18.9	80.4	0.7	0.0
16-20yrs	15.7	80.5	3.8	0.0
21-25yrs	11.4	70.5	18.1	0.0

Table 16 (cont'd)

26-30yrs	5.3	39.5	55.1	0.0
31-35yrs	1.3	11.5	87.2	0.0

Contrary to both researcher and popular expectation that teachers with less experience would benefit more from PD provided online since teachers with more experience could have problems working through software, however, teachers with 31-35 years of teaching experience reported that they benefited the most, and teachers with 26-30 years of teaching experience reported that they benefited the next highest degree. Numbers continue to decrease until almost none of the teachers with 1-15 years of teaching experience think PD provided online did not help them to gain theoretical knowledge. This is consistent with the previous explanation that teachers with less experience may have fresher memories about the theory.

Location was a significant factor ($p\text{-value}=0.025$) when participants answered the statement “PD provided online has helped me to have greater self-confidence and higher self-efficacy”. It was found that responses of all the participants from average urban school districts either strongly disagreed or disagreed where as a majority of participants from good urban school districts and suburban schools responded that they disagree (60.0%, 90.9%). Also 6.7% of participants from good urban school districts responded that they strongly disagree, 26.7% of participants agree, and 6.7% of participants strongly agree, whereas only 9.1% of participants from suburban schools agree as Table 17 presents.

Table 17: Significant of Location on Teachers' Responses

PD provided online has helped me to have greater self-confidence and higher self - efficacy.				
Responses Location	1	2	3	4
urban(good school district)	6.7%	60.0%	26.7%	6.7%
Urban(average school district)	44.4%	55.6%	0.0%	0.0%
suburban	0.0%	90.9%	9.1%	0.0%

Attention should be paid to this result because previous results, with support of interview data, on self-efficacy and self-confidence found that self -efficacy and self-confidence for teachers is in relation to the colleagues that they meet at the PD programs. Whether they have higher or lower self-efficacy and self –confidence is rather relative, which is affected through the comparison with how other teachers are doing. However, despite the fact that PD through online does not provide an opportunity to meet other teachers, location is still a significant factor of teacher responses. A possible explanation for this result would be that contents of PD (what teachers are learning from PD) still play an important role for teachers' self-efficacy and self-confidence. Therefore, some of the teachers from good urban school districts feel that PD provided online has helped them to gain greater self-confidence and higher self -efficacy since what they learn from PD provided online makes them feel confident and more effective. However, almost all participants from average school districts and suburban schools do not agree that PD provided online has helped them to gain greater self-confidence and higher self -

efficacy because either they did not learn much from online PD, or self-efficacy and self-confidence are not something that teachers gain from PD.

In addition, questions about teacher's preference about the PD with different intensity, duration, period, and types were asked. Teachers mostly prefer PD provided after school during weekdays for less than an hour (32.47%), PD provided during vacation for less than a week (26.28%) whereas PD provided during weekends for 6-8 hours (0%) and PD provided online for over an hour (1.03%) were the least preferred. It is consistent with the previous survey result of this study about the effectiveness of PD regarding different PD schedules (Table 12 on page 53). Teachers' responses show that PD during weekdays most positively affected their practical knowledge about EFL teaching, greater self-confidence and higher self-efficacy, student achievement, and applicability to their teaching practice in comparison to PD during vacation and PD provided online. PD during vacation and PD provided online were the least preferred by the participants of this study; as was mentioned earlier, none of the participants of this study have experience for PD during weekend. It turned out that participants of this study do not prefer PD during weekend. Moreover, participants were very skeptical about the effectiveness of PD provided online.

Also, teachers listed the following terms as qualities of effective PD: practical (63.33%), various resources (10.00%), authentic (10.00%), interactive (5.0%), consulting (3.33%), changes (3.33%), voluntary (1.66%), review (1.66%), and appropriate (1.66%). However, teachers list the following terms for qualities of ineffective PD; theoretical (50.84%), boring (15.25%), superficial (15.25%), cliché or repetitive (6.77%), mandatory (3.38%), result (3.38%), lecture (1.69%), workshop (1.69%), and networking (1.69%). Some of the listed qualities are somewhat overlapped with the findings reported earlier. It was found that teachers prefer practical

information rather than theoretical, think PD providing teaching resources is helpful, and prefer interactive PD such as PD providing discussion forum and PD providing language practice rather than lecture types. Moreover, even though these qualities are not explicitly or directly overlapped with results earlier reported, some of them are implied through their interview data, which will be reported later.

By looking at the survey results and multinomial logistics regression model, information about how teachers think about the effectiveness and helpfulness of PD and what factors have an effect on teachers' responses were examined. Interviews will provide more detailed information about teachers' thoughts about the effectiveness of PD.

Interview: Teachers' Explanations about the Effectiveness of PD

After the teachers completed surveys, eight focal teachers were interviewed to find out more details about teachers' thoughts on the effectiveness of PD. When I asked teachers about their thoughts on the effectiveness of PD, three teachers had a negative stance about PD for EFL teachers in general, three teachers had a positive stance about PD for EFL teachers, and two teachers had half positive half negative responses, depending on types of PD, context of PD, etc. Teachers' answers can be categorized thus: types of participation, PD quality, and types of PD. In addition, PD's effect on teachers' self-efficacy and self-confidence will be explained.

Types of participation. Teachers were asked about the effectiveness of PD according to types of participation. Roughly, these can be categorized as voluntary or mandatory. For voluntary, there are two ways to participate. One way is that teachers search for the PD programs they want to participate in, they submit the document to the school, and get approval from the principal and funding from the school if necessary. Another way is that the official document

with the list of PD programs from the Department of Education is delivered to the school principal and teachers can choose from programs on the list. In that case, teachers do not have to get the principal's approval or funding since all of the programs are pre-approved and funded by the Department of Education. By contrast, mandatory PD programs work differently. When the official documents are announced and delivered to a school principal, teachers are drafted who are qualified for a particular PD, who are less experienced, or who are not homeroom teachers, to participate and to fill in the number of teacher participants requirement. Since teachers are often drafted to participate, they may have less motivation, and they may tend to find PD less effective as well. In the teachers' episodes, I found that type of participation has an influence on the effectiveness of PD, as indicated by Lee and Son.

Well, I think it is all about the school requirement and government requirement. When the PD for EFL teacher is held by the ministry of the education, an official document is sent to the school principal with how many teachers are needed to fill the seats. Then, teachers are selected to go to participate... Teachers have to participate in PD even though they don't want to and that is the problem of ineffective PD and that does nothing good for teachers. [Lee]

Sometimes I participated in PD because of the requirement, but there's always something that I can learn even though I was dragged into that PD...I see the difference between a PD that I chose to go to and a PD that I was obligated to go to. [Son]

When Lee and Son explained about the effectiveness of PD, both of them used the compulsory term for types of participation such as 'fill the seats' 'don't want to', 'dragged', and 'obligated', which shows their perspectives about the forcibleness of PD participation. Since Lee has 10

years of teaching experience, she knows a great deal about how mandatory PD works and has a lot of experience with mandatory PD. She stated that mandatory PD participation does not have any positive effect on teachers.

... Let's say there are useful resources in certain PDs, but if I decided not to learn because I was there just for the requirement, it is huge waste of time, money, and energy.

[Son]

Son indicated that the types of participation hold an important key for the effectiveness of PD because if she is there just for the requirement, and not learning anything, this makes that PD ineffective no matter whether that particular PD has a high quality, or is effective for other participants.

Mandatory PD does not only make teachers feel forced to participate and 'fill the seats' but also, provides same information repeatedly, as Son stated.

... I was often pushed to participate in similar kinds of PD over and over, since there are only 3 EFL teachers in our school. So for the schools that have many EFL teachers, they can take turns participating in PD until all of them participate, but for the small schools like ours, all the EFL teachers have to go to every EFL PD requirement and take similar kinds of PD every year. For example, an EFL classroom management PD is held and each school is supposed to send two EFL teachers every year. We send Teacher A and Teacher B this year and Teacher B and C or Teacher A and C next year, which means one of the teachers is taking same PD two years in a row. Well, sometimes we pick up and learn something that we did not learn last year, but most of the time, we are just

sitting there paying no attention since there's nothing new, nothing interesting for us.

[Son]

Son also mentioned the problem of mandatory PD held by the government or ministry of education. It indicates the vulnerability of government ignoring teachers' needs and inconsideration of their circumstances. It is worth noting that both Son and Lee are from suburban schools. As compared to urban schools, there are fewer EFL teachers in suburban schools, so there is more pressure on mandatory PD participation for teachers from suburban schools as was stated in Son's interview. As was described earlier, Lee came back to school after a long break, and Son had just started her second year of teaching. Therefore, it is hard to consider the period of lassitude since both teachers were highly motivated and happy to be a teacher; it was just the types of participation in PD that they did not prefer.

Teachers' interview data about the effectiveness of PD when it deals with the types of participation indicated that teachers do not have a positive attitude toward the PDs they are forced to participate in. Lee thought that required PDs do not help teachers learn, since teachers are forced to participate regardless of their opinions or their situations. Son saw a difference in terms of effectiveness between PDs that have voluntary participation and PDs that have forced participation. Also, Son pointed out that mandatory PD has the weakness of assigning the same teachers every year for the school where there is small number of EFL teachers.

All these interviews are aligned with teachers' responses for the survey results reported earlier about the qualities of effective PD and ineffective PD. 'Mandatory' was listed as characteristics of ineffective PD whereas 'Voluntary' was listed as characteristics of effective PD.

Self-determination theory (e.g Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991; deCharms, 1968; Ryan, & Connell, 1989) previously explained the differences between self-determined behavior and controlled behavior. This study's results show that voluntary participation brings more effective outcomes in terms of effectiveness of PD and increasing motivation. Teachers who voluntarily participate in PD, learn better and are more motivated about what they are learning, which can be connected to the usage of information and improvement in teaching. Moreover, voluntary participation is closely connected with the teachers' interest and needs as well. When they are allowed to choose in what they participate, they make their decisions based on their interests, concerns, and previous experience, which allows them to have a meaningful experience and possibly more effective outcomes.

PD quality. Although PD quality can include plenty of things depending on the teachers' perspectives, this section only deals with organizations that provided PD, instructors' credibility, and continuity. In teachers' interviews, Kim and Yoon mentioned that whether PD is effective or not is closely related with who is the PD presenter.

There is a conflict between having an instructor who is a native speaker of English and does not have deep understanding or knowledge about EFL teaching, and an instructor who does not have fluent English skills but has greater knowledge and experience of EFL.[Kim]

Kim talked about difficulties of choosing a PD presenter between a person with English fluency and a person with greater knowledge about EFL. Since Kim is working in a good school district of Seoul where students' motivation is higher, parents' interest in children's learning is greater, and attitude toward teachers is better when compared to schools in the suburbs, she cannot ignore

the reputation of PD that she participated in. Since parents of good school districts are extremely passionate about their children's proficiency level, EFL teachers in good school districts are expected to have native like language proficiency, which a PD presenter with higher level of proficiency can provide in PD.

For a PD developer, the first type of instructor will make the PD look good and may have benefits of providing language practice, but teachers may not learn what they expect to learn. However, the latter type of instructor can present high quality information but PD participating teachers would have prejudice of being incompetent based upon instructor's communication skills. [Kim]

The dilemma Kim mentioned above can also be considered a gap between ideal and reality, since a person with both high English proficiency and great knowledge about EFL would be perfect, but it is not always available in reality. Even if a person with both qualities is available, a high budget for inviting presenters can be another problem. Therefore, PD organizations have to choose between a person with more teaching experience and a person with higher language fluency, however it was found that teachers prefer the person with more experience over the person with language proficiency.

Moreover, Yoon brought up another quality for the presenter. She stated that a person who is an expert of research is not helpful for effective PD.

I personally don't like...it is just not me though, teachers don't like...or don't give credit for those PD presented by the person who does not have teaching experience. Experts are maybe good for the research and writing, so when they are up there, they are busy presenting what they have done, and how successful they were with their research.

However, former or present teachers are the real experts of teaching, so we learn a lot from them. So I'd rather go to a PD where former teachers talk about their experience and what works and what does not for those reasons. I really learn from them. [Yoon]

Yoon explained that a PD presenter should be a person who has teaching experience in order to understand the EFL teaching in the Korean context. It can also be considered a gap between practice and theory, since the presenter who has a great research background may well know about the EFL theory and may not be knowledgeable about the practice in classroom where there are too many variables. Yoon has 12 years of teaching experience, and has a lot of experience with PD, which was offered by a presenter with various backgrounds and careers. She shared not only her thoughts about the PD presenter's qualification, but also represents other teachers by quoting, 'it is not just me' and used general term 'teachers usually'. It was confirmed from survey results, since teachers responded that PD providing a discussion forum with other EFL teachers is more helpful than PD providing a discussion forum with EFL experts. This means that teachers have higher credibility for teachers than EFL experts who do not have classroom teaching experience. Additionally, Yoon is not only a more experienced teacher but also, the only EFL teacher in her school, so practicality is the one of the most important issues for her for effective PD. Therefore, she prefers the PD presenter who talks about real world quoting, 'what works and what does not for those reasons'.

In addition to quality of PD regarding the presenter, Jeong and Lee mentioned the quality of the PD organization.

...Usually private organization that we research for it, pay for it, and enroll for the certain topic has higher quality than those provided for free from the government. Private

organizations tend to keep updating their topics according to EFL educational trends, and tend to get feedback from participants and use them to improve the quality of PD they are providing; otherwise, people are not going to pay for it. However, PD provided by government sometimes outdated and tend to repeat topics over and over due to budgets and other reasons. They also have kind of feedback, which they hand out evaluation forms at the end of the PD sessions, but I have not seen the much improvement since I have participated. [Jeong]

Jeong explained that usually PD provided by the government tends to be less effective than PD provided by a private organization since effectiveness is directly related to the profits private organizations make. Jeong discredited the PD provided by the government by saying it is ‘outdated’, ‘repeat[s] topics over and over’, and ‘have not seen the much improvement’. Since she is working in an urban school, there might be more chances of participating in PD that was held by different organizations, which makes her able to compare the qualities and effectiveness of different PD programs. However, Lee especially pointed out the lack of long-term plan for PD and PD being a one- time event.

It is always a problem that there is no long-term plan for PD for EFL teachers. There are so many mini workshops and short-term PD targeting one time slot. There are topics that are enough for one-time PD, but sometimes I wish all the PDs were connected as a series for long-term effect for specific purposes. In order to do that I guess PD organization should have long-term plan for providing PD for teachers in different stage. [Lee]

As Lee mentioned, teachers expected that PD would result in changes in their teaching practice, but sometimes one time PD is not powerful enough to change their teaching practice. Therefore,

Lee insisted that PD organization should have a long term plan to connect the PD as series, which will lead to long-term effect for teachers. It is worth noting that Lee has relatively more teaching experience of 10 years, which allows her to see the problem of PD being a one time event rather than promoting professional growth for teachers in the long term. It was a problem back then when she worked for the private school eight years ago, and has not improved after she came back from being laid-off.

Teachers' interviews tell us that the PD presenter and PD organization are the important elements that decide the quality of PD and teachers value PD presenters who have teaching experience more than people who have better language proficiency or greater knowledge about the research.

Types of PD. Teachers also mentioned types of PD are an important key to determine its effectiveness. Even though they were not asked to answer which types of PD are more effective in the interviews, teachers mentioned this while they talked about the effectiveness of PD. Comparison between different types of PD is not possible since teachers have not participated in all kinds of PD and have neither rubrics nor standards for reliable comparison. However, teachers' interviews tell us that teachers know what types of PD work effectively for them from their previous PD experience. Most of the teachers' episodes were consistent with survey data, but some used confusing language. For example, using a positive term but implying something else. Kim and Jeong talked about the advantages of lecture types of PD and online PD.

Sometimes I feel lecture-type PD is more comfortable and works better for me. Usually PD programs are really interactive and so intensive, which makes me really exhausted.

So I sometimes need time to listen to the lecture. That is like a break for me. And I sometimes learn from the lecture as well. [Kim]

Teachers love online PD since it is effortless. We sometimes take online PD during class when students are doing in-class activity sheets or something. But I am not sure about the effectiveness of online PD though. It is very hard to say. Some people who are doing online PD because of his or her own needs and situation will find it effective, and those who are just choosing online PD to fulfill the requirement will not. I am more like the latter one, so I do not usually take advantage of online PD. [Jeong]

As was mentioned earlier, it is worth noting that some teachers seem to use positive language about certain types of PD, but the contents do not talk about the helpfulness or effectiveness but rather personal preference such as convenience. For example, excerpts from Kim and Jeong stated, “Comfortable and works for me,” and “Teachers love online PD,” which do not indicate they really think those are effective or helpful since preference and effectiveness are different matters. It is worth noting that both Kim and Jeong are fixed term teachers and have previous experience of taking the teaching placement test more than twice. Both of them mentioned that they chose to become fixed term teachers since they failed to pass the teaching placement test. The teaching placement test consists of theoretical materials, which is delivered mostly in the form of lectures. Therefore, when Kim mentions ‘lecture is more comfortable and works better,’ it may actually mean the opposite. The latter part of her quote tells us it may be easier and convenient for her but she ‘sometimes’ learns from lecture, which implies she does not learn from it for the most of time.

Unlike the first two quotes from participants which seem to be positive but are actually negative, Lee and Kwon straightforwardly stated that lecture type PD and online PD are not very helpful for effective learning regardless of its benefits.

Lecture-type PD is so boring. I put myself into students' shoes and realize how my students would feel about my lecture in the class. Teachers especially hate to sit and listen. They learn through hands-on activity. Even though we learn something from lecture-type PD, we easily forget unless we do activities related to that lecture. So I would say lecture-type PD is not really effective in that sense. [Lee]

Online PD is very over-rated in education I think. Of course, it has pros of being convenient for time, long-distance, and expenses. However, it sometimes is just good for fulfilling the time requirement for teachers. Some teachers are required to take or participate in 60 cumulative hours of PD each year. However, if we have online PD, we can actually make it shorter...Originally we were supposed to read and answer the questions and we just passed the reading materials without reading, and we cheat on the questions like students. If there is a teacher who took that online PD before, she or he has all the right answers for us. So it can take a shorter time for us. Online PD is convenient and helps us to fulfill the time requirement, but in terms of learning and outcomes, it is pointless and useless. [Kwon]

Although Lee and Kwon acknowledged the benefits of lecture type of PD and online PD, they both agreed that they not only prefer those types of PD by saying it is 'boring' and they 'hate to sit and listen,' but also those were not effective by using language such as 'forgot,' 'not really effective,' 'pointless,' and 'useless'. It is worth noting that both Lee and Kwon have relatively

more teaching experience than other teachers. Kwon works in an urban school as a head teacher of the English department, so she knows theoretically about the benefits of online PD being convenient for teachers in long distance and providing them opportunities to participate in same quality PD that urban school teachers are given. However, she may not experience these benefits since she is working in an urban school where there are more opportunities than for teachers in suburban schools. Also as she has more experience, she may have seen a lot of teachers not taking online PD seriously.

On the other hand, Cha, Son, and Park mentioned certain types of PD are effective for them. Park's interview was focused on the location where PD was held. It was not only about the convenience regarding the location, and it also implies familiarity of environment and able to use resources that are already there.

Once there was PD in our school site. Our principal invited an expert to our school to have kind of mentoring sessions and teaching demonstrations in our own classrooms. We found them very helpful since it happened in our own classrooms where we actually teach, so we could use the environment and resources that we are familiar with. Also, it happened during school days, so we were able to use learned activities the next day. It worked well. It has benefits of saving time and it is convenient for teachers. [Son]

Son particularly mentioned about this PD that was provided in her schools with her colleagues. Therefore, there is a high possibility that it was not open to the public nor officially held. However, she shows a positive attitude toward it since it has advantages of saving time, is convenient for teachers, and having available and familiar resources. As was described earlier, Son has the most unique background as she was a flight attendant for years and went to graduate

school for TESOL degree; she has the least teaching experience of all the interview participants. Also, she was very passionate about teaching and PD. When she talked about the most effective PD that occurs in her school site, she seems to be very excited talking about how good it was and worked. It is worth noting that this type of PD may only be possible because she works in a private school.

On the other hand, Cha and Park seemed to talk about the place of PD was held, but what they really focused on is the content of PD.

One of the most effective PD for my entire teaching experience was when I went to the U.S and observed the actual class there. It gave me an idea not only how activities are taught in the US but also how classes are organized. It was very interesting and I was able to see the difference and made me to think about the modification in my class. I saw many positive changes from my colleagues from that experience as well. [Cha]

Once, I participated in international PD, in which I went to countries using English, and visited the classroom and schools. I observed the classes, looked around the classroom environments, and had conversations with teachers. It was very helpful and gave me a lot of ideas of teaching EFL students. Also, it fulfilled the language practice at the same time. Sometimes, looking is much better than hearing. [Park]

It was not found that both of them participated in the same types of PD, but it was confirmed that teachers with certain qualifications are given the opportunities to go abroad for experience of schools in other countries. And it was also confirmed that almost of all international PD has the same format such as classroom observation, school tour, and conversation with teachers, and sometimes language practice. Since all the participants of this study are EFL teachers, they have

a higher interest about how other teachers in English-speaking countries practice their teaching. Especially, Cha has earned her TESOL degree in the USA, and is familiar with the educational environment in the USA, which may make her positive about the experience of abroad PD. Also, participating in abroad PD may become a reminder of her field experience in the USA and provide language practices because it has been eight years since she graduated from school. Moreover, this type of PD will provide a language practice for her since she is working in a good district school that pressures her to show excellent English proficiency. Also, participation in international PD would give Park inspiration to try new things that are implemented in another country and gives her a lot of ideas about English activities since she is passionate to motivate her students.

As teachers' answers show a mixed picture, it can be considered that their thoughts on the effectiveness of PD is more related to their individual preferences. Depending on their situation, characters, locations, and other factors, teachers have different opinions about the effectiveness of PD depending on its type. These interview results go with survey results as teachers' responses for the survey show online PD was not effective overall, PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL is not helpful, PD providing hands-on activities is helpful, and PD providing English language practice experience is helpful.

Self-efficacy and self-esteem. Teachers' responses showed a mixed picture when they were asked how PD affects their self- efficacy and self-esteem as a teacher. Some said PD helps them to have higher self-efficacy and some said it make them feel worse about themselves as a teachers. Kim and Lee said they gained higher self- efficacy and greater self -confidence after PD. Both of them received what they wanted from PD and good quality of PD content had a positive effect on their self-efficacy and self -confidence.

It definitely does. I am learning a lot from PD all the time, so I can't wait to use them in my classroom. And I am sharing information with other teachers in school and modify activities. All these procedures help me to grow up as a teacher and make me to become a better teacher, I believe. [Kim]

There are times when I got answers to the questions I had and everything made sense. I had that experience with the mentoring session provided by PD. After that I became confident as a teacher and realized that did not happen because of my mistakes or my poor classroom management skills. The mentoring session with EFL experts made me understand about EFL teaching and how to deal with different proficiency level students. [Lee]

Kim mentioned that she learned a lot from PD and gaining knowledge about the field she is in made her confident. Also, sharing gained knowledge with other teachers made her have higher efficacy. Lee mentioned that she got what she wanted from PD. She got answers and better understanding about the EFL teaching and also she got consolation from the mentors, which made her feel better about the situation she was having problems with. Lee admitted that she is confident to deal with different proficiency levels of students. Although Kim is from a good school district of Seoul and Lee is from a suburban school, both Kim and Lee have higher self-efficacy after PD participation because they believe PD has helped them to improve in many ways regardless of whom they meet in PD.

Unlike two teachers who became confident and had higher efficacy through PD programs, there are two teachers who were affected by other teachers they met in a PD program.

Jeong is the case of having lower self-confidence and lesser self-efficacy and Kwon is the case of having higher self-confidence and greater self-efficacy.

Whenever I go to PD, I feel like I am a horrible teacher. PD experts present so many things and urge us to try those. But when it is not possible to use or modify those, I feel like I am a bad teacher and feel sorry for the students. Also I lost my confidence about my English skills and teaching quality. [Jeong]

I feel good after I see many teachers at PD. I always think that I am not good enough for my students because they don't seem to be interested in English and I had a problem with my classroom management. But when I see a lot of teachers who are having the same kinds of problems, I feel I am not alone and not too bad as a teacher compare to others. Also, there are some teachers who don't even try. So I have my self-confidence that I am a teacher who tries hard to make my students learn. Even though it doesn't always work. [Kwon]

From teachers' interviews, it is worth noting that not only does PD itself play an important role in teachers' self-efficacy, but colleagues who participate in the same PD also play a critical role for determining level of self-efficacy. Teachers tend to make comparisons between themselves and other teachers in similar situations. So when they see teachers who are doing a better job, they feel they are bad teachers; whereas they feel good about themselves when they see teachers who are doing similar or lesser job than themselves. Therefore, it can be stated that PD also sometimes provides emotional comfort and discomfort for teachers' self-efficacy and self-esteem. It might not be the direct effect of PD, but PD provides it in terms of a social network for teachers so we might say it has an effect on teachers' self-efficacy and self-esteem.

It is worth noting that both Jeong and Kwon work in a school that is in average school district of Seoul. Differences in self-efficacy affected by other teachers may or may not be caused by their location of the school but may be from their different teacher qualifications. Jeong is a fixed-term teacher and Kwon is a regular teacher. The fact that Jeong has failed a teaching placement test twice and was planning to take the tests every year while working as a fixed term teacher shows how she has lower self-confidence due to two failures of tests without satisfaction of being a fixed-term teacher. On the other hand, Kwon is the most experienced and the oldest of all the interview participants, and she has a higher level of self-efficacy after PD. Kwon is considered to be a motivated teacher since she is still trying hard to make her students learn by participating in PD, even though she does not teach many classes due to her position in her school as the head of English department. Therefore, self –efficacy and self –confidence may not only be related with the qualifications of the teacher, but also related with motivation and personalities as well.

Summary and Discussion

In sum, Korean EFL teachers are well aware of the importance and effectiveness of PD for their teaching practice and their professional growth, however, they are not satisfied with the effectiveness and sufficiency of current EFL PD in Korea. They thought PD for most of the content is helpful except introducing new research findings and theories, in the form of lecture, and providing discussion forums. Also, different types of PD have a different level of effectiveness on gaining theoretical and practical knowledge about EFL teaching, gaining knowledge about EFL students, greater self-confidence and higher self-efficacy, effect on students' achievement, providing too much information which makes them either overwhelmed or not overwhelmed, and applicability to their teaching practice.

The majority of teacher participants did not gain knowledge about EFL students from any type of PD. On the other hand, the majority of participants responded that both PD during weekdays and during vacation have helped them to gain practical knowledge about EFL teaching, have greater self-confidence and higher self-efficacy, will eventually have an effect on student achievement, and is applicable to their teaching practice. However, the majority of teachers responded that online PD does not help them gain any of the knowledge listed above and provided too much information and makes them overwhelmed.

Moreover, the spectrum of teachers' thoughts about the effectiveness or helpfulness of PD includes various features such as circumstances, types of PD, and PD quality. Reasons behind the teachers' thoughts on PD being ineffective are either they are forced to participate, they are not interested in that topic, their workload is very high so they are tired and cannot concentrate, information from PD is not practical in terms of being too theoretical, too idealistic and too culture specific, or there are certain types of PD teachers prefer, or teachers don't believe PD presenters are qualified.

Also, teachers have concerns about the immediate use of information from PD. They mentioned that they don't usually acquire knowledge for potential use, but only look for immediate use. Therefore, they treat information from PD for potential use as ineffective. It seems like EFL is a very specific context, and EFL trends, policy, and instruction change very quickly which might have influenced teachers thought about the usefulness of information. Ever since the National English Curriculum Policy (NECP) came into effect there have been 7 revisions of NECP from 1954 to 2008 and the English Immersion Plan (EIP) was developed and implemented in 2008 to present (Ahn, 2013). Therefore, EFL teachers may feel that all the information teachers are looking for from PD should be up to date and ready for immediate use.

Constructivism can explain how teachers' knowledge and experience about PD is constructed by their experience when they actively engaged in PD. In that sense, their previous experience about certain types of PD creates information and makes connections among constructed knowledge in order to make decisions about effectiveness of PD and PD participation.

In the next chapter, I describe and discuss the teachers' motivation of participating in PD and the factors that influence teachers' PD participation.

Chapter 5: Teachers' Motivation and Other Influential Factors

The second research question of this study investigated EFL teachers' motivations for participating and their reasons for not participating in PD programs. In this chapter, I first report the survey results that show teachers' motivation for participating in PD and the factors they consider when they decide to participate. Then, I report the survey results that show teachers' motivations for not participating in PD.

Survey questions have a scale of 1 through 4, with 1 being weakest influence and 4 being strongest influence. The survey has 3 sets of questions. One set addressed their motivations of PD participation. The second set addressed the factors that have influence on their PD participation. The third set addressed the reasons for not participating in PD.

Survey Results: Motivations for PD Participation and Reasons for non-Participation

Motivations for PD participation. Table 18 presents the survey results of the teachers' motivations to participate in PD. The first set of questions for motivation of PD participation was asked to find the factors that have influence on PD participation and are more focused on whether it is voluntary or mandatory, and internal or external. Most of the questions obviously belong to one category, but there are some questions that can be both regarding their circumstances. For example, school or government requirement is mandatory and external motivation, but promotion can be mandatory or voluntary and external motivation for some teachers.

As Table 18 presents, 97 participants responded to questions for motivation to participate in PD. Through the chi-square test, it was found that responses for question 2) School or government requirement ($p\text{-value} = 0.13$) is not rejected which means that responses were almost

evenly distributed and a fair number of participants responded on each scale almost equally. Unlike responses for other survey questions, responses for this question are only consistent because this particular motivator is individualized for different participants. Requirements for each schools district are independent, so PD requirements are also different depending on each school district.

First of all, a majority of participants responded that acquiring practical information such as 6) practical and pedagogical knowledge development (78.35%), 9) acquiring teaching resources (91.75%), and 10) improvement of teaching in general (91.75%) as having some influence or strongest influence on PD participation. Secondly, a majority of participants tend to respond that external motivations such as 3) promotion (87.63%) and 4) salary raise (86.60%) have the weakest or least influence in participating in PD. Third, a majority of participants tend to respond that trends or educational movement such as 1) as an effort to stay current in EFL field (74.23%), or 8) getting information about a particular reform/educational policy/test (72.16%) as the weakest or less influence on PD participation. In addition, participants responded that 7) social network (69.07%) and 5) language proficiency development (52.58%) are the weakest influence or less influence in PD participation.

Table 18: Motivations for PD Participation

		Weakest influence	Less influence	Some influence	Strongest influence	Mean	SD
1	As an effort to stay current in EFL field	45.56%	28.87%	11.34%	14.43%	1.95	1.07

Table 18 (cont'd)

2	Requirement of school or government	26.80%	20.62%	34.02%	18.56%	2.44	1.07
3	Promotion	51.55%	36.08%	10.31%	2.06%	1.63	0.75
4	Salary raise	51.55%	35.05%	10.31%	3.09%	1.65	0.79
5	Language proficiency development	22.68%	29.90 %	34.02%	13.40%	2.38	0.98
6	Practical and pedagogical knowledge development	10.31%	11.34%	26.80%	51.55%	3.20	1.00
7	Social network	38.14%	30.93%	10.31%	20.62%	2.13	1.14
8	Getting information about a particular reform/ educational policy/ test	47.42%	24.74%	18.56%	9.28%	1.90	1.01
9	Acquiring teaching resources	2.06%	6.19%	43.40%	48.45%	3.38	0.70
10	Improvement of teaching in general	2.06%	6.19%	36.08%	55.67%	3.45	0.70

It is worth noting that participants tend to favor the improvement of teaching in general (mean=3.45), acquiring teaching resources (mean=3.38), and practical/ pedagogical knowledge development (mean=3.20) as the motivation for PD participation since it is the above the mean

of the responses. On the other hand, the following are less favorable influences on their motivation for PD participation: requirement of school or government (mean= 2.44), language proficiency (mean=2.38), social network (mean= 2.13), as an effort to stay in current EFL field (mean=1.95), getting information about a particular reform/ educational policy/ test (mean =1.90), salary raise (mean=1.65), and promotion (mean=1.63).

Furthermore, there were interesting patterns of responses regarding participants' background factors. The multinomial logistics regression model is used to find out if there is significance between teachers' responses regarding participants' background information. The results show that participants' experience has an effect on 4 items of motivation (question 1, 3, 6, 9) (see Table 19 through 22), qualification has an effect on one item (question 5) (see Table 23), and location has an effect on one item (question 10) (see Table 24). These findings are discussed below.

Table 19 shows that as participants' experiences increase, their responses for motivation of "as an effort to stay current in EFL field" tend to lean more toward either some influence or strongest influence. Teachers with experience of 1-5 years hardly participate in PD in order to stay current in EFL field (3.5%). It slightly increases for participants with 6-10 years and 11-15 years of teaching experience. It rapidly increases after 16 or more years of teaching experience (71.8%). Then, when teaching experience reaches 21 or more years, a majority of participants respond either "as an effort to stay current in EFL field" as some influence or strong influence.

Table 19: Motivation for PD Participation: Effort to Stay Current in EFL Field

Responses Teaching experience	Weakest influence	Less influence	Some influence	Strongest influence

Table 19 (cont'd)

1-5yrs	65.0%	31.4%	1.5%	2.0%
6-10yrs	50.9%	35.6%	5.9%	7.7%
11-15yrs	30.3%	30.6%	17.1%	22%
16-20yrs	11.5%	16.7%	31.6%	40.2%
21-25yrs	3.0%	6.3%	40.3%	50.4%
26-30yrs	0.7%	2.0%	43.6%	53.7%
31-35yrs	0.1%	0.6%	44.8%	54.4%

From this model, it can be considered that as participants have longer teaching experience, they tend to search for current EFL trends and want to stay current in the EFL field by participating in PD. Since EFL education in Korea has been rapidly changing from time to time, it is important for teachers to keep up with current educational trends. Basically all teachers try to keep up with current educational trends but teachers with longer experience tend to look for updates on current educational trends especially from PD and it became one of the important reasons to PD participation. Possible supposition for this result can be because of accumulation of PD information and knowledge originating from PD experience. Teachers with longer experience may think that they have learned enough from their previous experience about knowledge and information about EFL except current EFL education trends, they seem to focus

on current educational trends from PD when it was compared to the teachers with less experience.

Table 20 shows that as participants' experience increases, participants tend to respond that promotion is a strong influence on PD participation. A majority of participants responded that promotion is weakest influence or less influence of PD participation until 16-20 years of teaching experience, and then the percentage between weakest influence or less influence and some influence or strongest influence is almost even for participants with 21-25 years of experiences. Then, responses for some influence or strongest influence increase for 26 or more years of teaching experiences.

Table 20: Motivation for PD Participation: Promotion

Responses Teaching experience	Weakest influence	Less influence	Some influence	Strongest influence
1-5yrs	60.1%	37.6%	2.1%	0.2%
6-10yrs	55.5%	38.8%	5.1%	0.7%
11-15yrs	48.6%	38.0%	11.5%	1.8%
16-20yrs	38.4%	33.6%	23.5%	4.5%
21-25yrs	25.5%	24.9%	40.4%	9.2%
26-30yrs	13.7%	15.0%	56.1%	15.3%
31-35yrs	6.2%	7.5%	65.1%	21.2%

The result was totally divergent from expectations since it was expected to find that the teachers with less experience would have higher motivation of being promoted by PD participation. However, it may be because of the educational system in Korea. Teachers with less experience have less opportunities of being promoted unless they have more education degrees or studying abroad experience. No matter how many times they participated in PD programs or how much quality the programs had, teachers with less experiences in Korea have very little or no chance of being promoted just with PD experiences. Teaching experience is very important in Korean education system to be in a higher position. However, teachers with more teaching experience have wider possibility to be promoted if they can prove that they have achieved all the requirements and extras. Therefore, having more PD would help them to be promoted as a vice-principal and finally as a principal. Considering this circumstance, teachers with less teaching experience tend to respond that promotion is the weakest influence or less influence for motivation to participate in PD whereas teachers with more experience tend to respond promotion as some or strongest influence.

Teaching experience was also a significant factor on teachers' responses of PD participation for getting practical and pedagogical knowledge development. As Table 21 presents, the responses of some influence or strongest influence were greater for teachers with less experience of 1-15years. Despite this, there is a slight decrease in the rate of responses for practical and pedagogical knowledge development as some or strongest influence within 5 year increments. Then the percentage between negative influence and positive influence became almost even for teachers with 16-20 years of experiences. Finally, teachers with experience of 26 or more years responded that getting practical and pedagogical knowledge development is the weakest or has less influence on PD participation.

Table 21: Motivation for PD Participation: Practical and Pedagogical Knowledge Development

Responses Teaching experience	Weakest influence	Less influence	Some influence	Strongest influence
1-5yrs	2.4%	3.7%	34.1%	59.8%
6-10yrs	5.9%	7.9%	29.2%	57.0%
11-15yrs	12.8%	15.2%	22.7%	49.3%
16-20yrs	23.8%	25.0%	15.0%	36.2%
21-25yrs	36.3%	33.7%	8.1%	21.9%
26-30yrs	46.8%	38.3%	3.7%	11.1%
31-35yrs	54.2%	39.1%	1.5%	5.1%

This study found that teachers with less experience have higher motivation to challenge themselves with the new practical and pedagogical knowledge by trying many different things. However, as teachers have more experiences, they either tend to settle for appropriate pedagogy for themselves, or they have different resources for their practical and pedagogical knowledge development other than PD participation.

Lastly, teaching experience significantly affects teachers' responses about their motivation to participate in PD in order to acquire teaching resources. As Table 22 presents, a majority of teachers with less experience tend to respond that 'acquiring teaching resources' has some or the strongest influence on PD participation. It almost has the same pattern for up to 25

years of teaching experience and then it became almost even between the rate of positive influence and negative influence for teachers with 26-30 years of teaching experience.

Table 22: Motivation for PD Participation: Acquiring Teaching resources

Responses Teaching experience	Weakest influence	Less influence	Some influence	Strongest influence
1-5yrs	0%	3.4%	46.5%	50.1%
6-10yrs	0%	5.1%	44.8%	50.0%
11-15yrs	0.2%	7.6%	42.8%	49.4%
16-20yrs	1.3%	11.0%	40.0%	47.7%
21-25yrs	7.0%	14.8%	35.0%	43.2%
26-30yrs	29.0%	15.9%	24.2%	30.9%
31-35yrs	68.3%	9.6%	9.5%	12.6%

From this model, it can be considered that teachers with more experience tend to have their own teaching resources through teacher networks and their teaching experiences. It is worth noting that the rate of positive response (some or strongest influence) for “as an effort to stay current in EFL field”, and “promotion” tend to increase as the participants’ teaching experience increases. However, unlike the first two items, the rate of positive influence (some or strongest influence) responses for practical/pedagogical knowledge development and acquiring teaching resources tend to decrease as the participants’ teaching experience increases.

In addition to teaching experience, qualification has a significant effect on participants' response for the question about language proficiency development. As Table 23 presents, fewer regular teachers responded that they participated in PD in order to have language proficiency development whereas more contract teachers responded that they participated in PD in order to have language proficiency development.

Table 23: Motivation for PD Participation: Language Proficiency Development

QUALIFICATION	Weakest influence	Less influence	Some influence	Strongest influence
Regular teachers	31.7%	26.7%	30.0%	11.7%
Contract teachers	8.1%	35.1%	40.5%	16.2%

From this model, it was found that contract teachers are in more need of, or they value more, language proficiency development than the regular teachers. Contract teachers' higher language proficiency has more advantages for them. It is easier to get a contract extension since there are higher numbers of applicants than job openings, whereas regular teachers' language proficiency has little or no external benefit except higher self-efficacy.

Location of the school plays an important role in participants' responses for improvement of teaching in general. As Table 24 presents, 90.7% of teachers from urban good districts responded that "improvement of teaching in general" has some or the strongest influence to participate in PD, whereas 76.9% of teachers from urban average school districts and 75% of

suburban teachers responded “improvement of teaching in general” has some or the strongest influence on PD participation.

Table 24: Motivation for PD Participation: Improvement of Teaching in General

Responses Location	Weakest influence	Less influence	Some influence	Strongest influence
Urban (Good school districts)	7.0%	2.3%	62.8%	27.9%
Urban (Average school district)	7.7%	15.4%	34.6%	42.3%
Suburban	10.7%	14.3%	25.0%	50.0%

Although there are slight differences between numbers of responses, the patterns of responses tells us teachers from all locations value improvement of teaching in general as a motivation for PD participation.

For 6 items, one factor of the participants’ background has a significant influence on their responses for motivation of PD participation. On the other hand, there are 2 items that more than one background factor has an influence on. Experience and location correlatively have an effect on the responses for requirement of school or government, and qualification and location have an effect on the responses for social networks. This means that either experience or location alone does not have significance on participants’ responses, however both of them together have significance on the participants’ responses.

As Table 25 presents, responses for teachers with 21 or more years of teaching experience from urban average school districts and teachers with 31 or more years of teaching experience from suburban schools did not have significant difference between location of the school/teaching experience and their motivation of PD participation as a requirement of school or government. Although it seems like there is a significant difference in response of teachers regarding their teaching experience and their location for the school, teachers with less teaching experience tend to respond that requirement of school or government is stronger motivation. That would mean either teachers with more experience have less requirement about PD participation or they care less about the requirement of school or government as their teaching experience increases.

Table 25: Motivation for PD Participation: Requirement of School or Government

Location Experience	Urban (Good school districts)				Urban (Average school districts)				Suburban			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1-5yrs	6.8	14.5	28.2	50.4	1.7	17.1	68.8	12.4	3.3	15.9	56.0	24.8
6-10yrs	26.7	23.6	22.6	27.1	6.9	28.9	57.2	7.0	13.5	26.6	46.1	13.8
11-15yrs	59.7	21.8	10.2	8.3	22.0	38.1	36.9	3.0	37.8	30.8	26.2	5.3
16-20yrs	83.0	12.5	2.9	1.6	48.1	34.5	16.4	6.9	66.8	22.5	9.4	1.3
21-25yrs	93.3	5.8	0.7	0.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	85.4	11.9	2.4	0.2
26-30yrs	97.3	2.5	0.1	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	94.0	5.4	0.5	0.0

Table 25 (cont'd)

31-35yrs	98.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

* 1= least influence, 2=less influence, 3=some influence, 4=strongest influence

However, taking a closer look at the teachers with 11-15 year of teaching experience, it was found that the response were varied based on location of the school. A greater number of teachers with 11-15 years of teaching experience from urban good district school tend to respond that requirement of school or government is less motivation to PD participation than teachers with 11-15 years of teaching experience from urban average school and suburban school. Moreover, distinctively fewer teachers with 16-20 years of teaching experience from urban good school districts responded that “requirement of school or government” is the weakest influence on PD participation when it is compared to teachers with 16-20 years of teaching experience from urban average school districts and suburban schools.

Also, qualification and location of the school have a significant effect on responses for ‘social network’ as a motivation for PD participation. As Table 26 presents, regular teachers and contract teachers from suburban schools responded that social network is less or the weakest motivator of PD participation. However, half of regular teachers and a majority of contract teachers from suburban schools responded that social network is some or the strongest influence of PD participation. Larger numbers of EFL teachers in urban areas have more of a chance to have some kind of social network for themselves, and they don’t have to seek one out by PD participation. Also, regular teachers from suburban schools have better chances of building social networks between teachers within the same district than contract teachers, since contract teachers don’t usually belong in the ministry of education but are on their own.

Table 26: Motivation for PD Participation: Social Networks

Location Qualification	Urban (Good school districts)				Urban (Average school districts)				Suburban			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Regular teachers	57.8	35.0	4.6	2.5	51.9	32.9	14.5	0.8	22.2	31.0	20.6	26.3
Contract teachers	33.6	34.6	4.7	27.1	35.3	37.9	17.1	9.7	3.7	8.7	5.9	81.7

* 1=weakest influence, 2=less influence, 3=some influence, 4=strongest influence

Also, it is worth noting that there is a difference between regular teachers and contract teachers from suburban schools. Responses from regular teachers of suburban schools are evenly distributed for each scale, but responses from contract teachers are distinctively inclined toward social network as the strongest influence in PD participation. It can be considered that contract teachers from suburban areas have less human resources to build a network and social networks can be an important motivation for PD participation.

Influential factors for PD participation. Along with the teachers' motivations, the survey asked about other factors that have an influence on teachers' decision on PD participation because they may be directly related to the motivation of PD participation. Since these factors have the potential to play important roles on teachers' PD participation, they can help us to understand what is behind the motivation. As Table 27 presents, 10 features that may have influence on teachers' PD participation were asked. It was found that more than half of participants responded that length (82.47%), intensity (89.70%), both school schedule (93.82%)

and personal schedule (61.86%), contents (98.96%), location (76.28%), other colleagues' recommendation (91.22%), and popularity (64.95%) have some or strongest influences when they make a decision to participate in PD. On the other hand, more than half of participants responded that cost/school budget (64.95%) and instructors (76.29%) are the weakest or have less influence on PD participation.

Table 27: Influential Factors for PD Participation

		Weakest influence	Less influence	Some influence	Strongest influence	Mean	SD
1	Length (duration)	8.25%	9.28%	44.33%	38.14%	3.12	0.89
2	Intensity	5.15%	5.15%	52.58%	37.12%	3.21	0.76
3	Schedule (school calendar)	1.03%	5.15%	42.27%	51.55%	3.44	0.64
4	Schedule (personal)	15.46%	22.68%	30.93%	30.93%	2.77	1.05
5	Content (specific topic)	0%	1.04%	49.48%	49.48%	3.48	0.52
6	Location (distance)	6.19%	17.53%	25.77%	50.51%	3.20	0.94
7	Cost/school budget	22.68%	42.27%	28.87%	6.18%	2.19	0.85
8	Other colleagues' recommendation, review	3.09%	6.18%	41.24%	49.48%	3.37	0.74
9	Instructors	29.90%	46.39%	19.59%	4.12%	1.98	0.81
10	Popularity	2.06%	32.99%	43.30%	21.65%	2.85	0.78

It is worth noting that participants tend to favor the contents (mean=3.48), school schedule (mean=3.44), other colleagues' recommendation, review (mean=3.37), intensity (mean=3.21), location (mean=3.20), length (mean=3.12), popularity (mean=2.85), and personal schedule (mean=2.77) as the influential factors of PD participation since it is the above the mean of the response scales. On the other hand, cost/budget of the school (mean=2.19), and instructor (mean=1.98) were less favorable factors when teachers consider their PD participation. Considering that 80 % of the means are higher than the average mean, it was found that teachers consider those features as important when they decide to participate in PD.

Through the chi-square test, it was found that the only response that was not rejected was 4) personal schedule (p-value= 0.0911), which means that responses were almost evenly distributed and a fair number of participants responded on each scale almost equally. Unlike responses for other survey questions, responses for this question are only consistent because this particular motivator is individualized for different participants. Personal schedule as a motivator of non-PD participation is more connected with individual difference, which cannot be explained with trends or tendency. There are teachers who value their professional life over their personal life or vice versa. Moreover, when teachers responded to this survey question and thought about their personal schedule, different levels of urgency came up in their thoughts such as casual get together with friends, family health issues, family event, leisure, and so on.

The multinomial logistics regression model was used to find out if there is significance between teachers' responses regarding participants' background information. The results show that participants' qualification, location, and teaching experience correlatively have an effect on their participation. These results are discussed below.

As Table 28 presents, location of the schools, qualification, and their teaching experiences significantly affect responses for the influential factor of personal schedules. None of the factors have a significant effect on contract teachers from urban good school districts with 11 or more years of teaching experiences, regular teachers from urban average schools districts with 21 or more years of teaching experience, contract teachers from urban average schools districts with 11 or more years of teaching experiences, regular teachers from suburban with 31-35 years of teaching experience, and contract teachers from suburban with 11 or more years of teaching experiences.

Table 28: Influential Factors of PD Participation: Personal Schedules

	Qualification	Experience Responses	1- 5yrs	6- 10yrs	11- 15yrs	16- 20yrs	21- 25yrs	26- 30yrs	31- 35yrs
Urban (Good school districts)	Regular teacher	Weakest influence	0.7	1.2	2.0	3.2	4.8	6.1	6.0
		Less influence	0.1	0.4	1.2	3.8	11.0	27.5	53.2
		Some influence	46.4	40.1	33.8	27.5	20.8	13.5	6.8
		Strongest influence	52.8	58.3	63.0	65.5	63.5	52.9	34.0
	Contract teacher	Weakest influence	14.9	13.4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Less influence	33.3	59.0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Some influence	22.5	29.3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Strongest influence	29.3	17.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table 28 (cont'd)

Urban (Good school districts)	Contract teacher	Less influence	33.3	59.0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Some influence	22.5	29.3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Strongest influence	29.3	17.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Urban (Average school districts)	Regular teacher	Weakest influence	0.7	1.4	2.4	3.7	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Less influence	0.4	1.5	5.0	15.5	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Some influence	77.4	71.7	63.7	51.1	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Strongest influence	21.5	25.5	28.9	29.7	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Contract teacher	Weakest influence	8.2	5.4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Less influence	65.5	85.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Some influence	20.0	6.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Strongest influence	6.3	2.7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
suburban	Regular teacher	Weakest influence	16.4	25.1	35.1	42.9	44.0	36.9	n/a
		Less influence	0.8	2.3	6.2	15.0	30.2	49.9	n/a
		Some influence	48.1	37.7	26.9	16.8	8.8	3.8	n/a
		Strongest influence	34.7	34.8	31.8	25.4	17.0	9.3	n/a
	Contract teacher	Weakest influence	55.7	41.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table 28 (cont'd)

suburban	Contract teacher	Less influence	37.2	55.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Some influence	23.9	1.5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Strongest influence	3.2	1.6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

It is worth noting that regular teachers from all locations tend to consider personal schedule as some or strongest influence as compared with contract teachers. There is a significant percentage difference between contract teachers and regular teachers who consider personal schedule when they choose PD participation. As it was mentioned earlier, contract teachers tend to value things that make their contract extend and career better. Also, both contract teachers and regular teachers' response for some or strongest influence of personal schedule decreases as their teaching experiences increases.

As Table 29 presents, there are different patterns across location of the school and their teaching experiences when teachers responded that location of the PD was an influential factor for PD participation. It was found that there are no significant differences in responding of PD location as important factor for teachers with 21 or more years of teaching experience from urban average school districts and teachers with 31 or more years of teaching experiences from suburban schools. However, there are significant differences in responding of PD location as important factor regarding their location of the school and their teaching experience for the rest of the teachers. First of all, a majority of teachers from urban schools with 1-15 years of teaching experience tend to respond that the location where PD is held is some or strongest influence

when they consider PD participation, whereas a majority of teachers from suburban schools with 1-15 years of teaching experience think the location where PD is held is less or weakest influence when they consider PD participation. Secondly, half of the teachers with 16-20 years of teaching experiences think PD location is some or strongest influence and half of them think it is less or weakest influence for PD participation. Interestingly, none of the teachers from urban schools thinks PD location is the weakest influential factor for PD participation. It could mean one of the following: more PD opportunities and other resources are provided in urban areas than for teachers from suburban areas so they don't have to choose PD that is held in a long-distance location, or EFL teachers in urban districts have more duties and school work so they are not able to participate in PD held in a long distance location, or individual preference not to take PD from long distance location for many reasons.

Table 29: Influential Factors of PD Participation: PD Location

Location Teaching experience	Urban (Good school district)				Urban (Average school district)				Suburban			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1-5yrs	0.0	0.2	36.6	63.1	0.0	0.0	37.0	63.0	46.4	38.2	13.1	2.3
6-10yrs	0.0	0.7	34.4	64.9	0.0	0.0	20.5	79.5	11.4	60.4	21.3	6.9
11-15yrs	0.0	1.9	32.0	66.2	0.0	0.0	10.2	89.8	1.8	62.1	22.5	13.6
16-20yrs	0.0	50.0	2.4	47.6	0.0	50.0	2.4	47.6	0.3	55.7	20.8	23.2

Table 29 (cont'd)

21-25yrs	0.0	13.6	24.8	61.6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0	45.9	17.6	36.5
26-30yrs	0.0	31.2	18.5	50.3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0	34.4	13.5	52.1
31-35yrs	0.0	56.5	10.9	32.5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

* 1=weakest influence, 2=less influence, 3=some influence, 4=strongest influence

Interestingly, the responses of teachers in urban good school districts reported PD location as the strongest influence, and these responses decreased as their experience increased, except for teachers with 16-20 years of teaching experience. However, the responses of suburban teachers in all stages for location as the strongest influence increased as their teaching experience increases.

Also, teaching experience has an effect on the responses for 'cost and budget of the school' as an influential factor. A majority of participants with up to 15 years of teaching experience responded that 'cost and budget of the school' is weakest or least influence where a majority of teachers with 21-35 years of teaching experiences responded some or strongest influence.

Table 30: Influential Factors of PD Participation: Cost and Budget of the School

Responses Teaching experience	Weakest influence	Less influence	Some influence	Strongest influence
1-5yrs	29.3%	47.7%	22.0%	1.0%

Table 30 (cont'd)

6-10yrs	23.9%	45.1%	28.5%	2.5%
11-15yrs	18.5%	40.6%	35.1%	5.9%
16-20yrs	13.2%	33.9%	40.1%	12.8%
21-25yrs	8.5%	25.3%	41.0%	25.1%
26-30yrs	4.7%	16.4%	36.4%	42.5%
31-35yrs	2.2%	9.0%	27.4%	61.3%

From this model, as teachers' experience increases, there is more possibility for teachers to be in higher positions such as senior teachers, or chairperson of the department. Higher positions seem to make them care more about the cost and the budget of the school/ department since they are in charge.

Thus far, motivation of PD participation and influential factors of PD participation have been examined and analyzed regarding participants' background factors.

Reasons for non- participation in PD. In addition to motivation of PD and influencing factors, the reasons of non-participation were examined (see Table 31). Out of 12 reasons, a majority of participants responded that previous professional development was not effective (83.5%), PD was theoretical rather than practical (80.41%), school schedule was too busy (86.6%), no follow-up programs were provided (82.47%), not transferable to my classroom (81.44%), low quality of PD (77.32%), and lack of information about PD (69.41%). These factors have some or the strongest influence on non-participation. On the other hand, a majority of participants responded that they had too many professional development experiences (69.08%), gave them an overwhelmed feeling after PD because of too much information

(67.01%), low budget from the school (80.85%), school not supporting the participation (88.66%), and complicated process for submitting documents after PD (64.94%) as weakest or less influence on non-PD participation.

Table 31: Reasons for non-PD Participation

		Weakest influence	Less influence	Some influence	Strongest influence	Mean	SD
1	Too many professional development experiences	8.25%	60.83%	25.77%	5.15%	2.28	0.68
2	Previous professional development was not effective	6.19%	10.31%	36.08%	47.42%	3.25	0.87
3	Theoretical rather than practical	10.31%	9.28%	31.96%	48.45%	3.19	0.98
4	School schedule too busy	4.12%	9.28%	34.02%	52.58%	3.35	0.81
5	No follow-up programs (one time event)	4.12%	13.40%	26.80%	55.67%	3.34	0.86
6	Overwhelmed feeling after PD (too much information)	3.09%	63.92%	29.90%	3.09%	2.33	0.59
7	Not transferable to my classroom	6.19%	12.37%	34.02%	47.42%	3.23	0.89
8	Low budget from the school	8.25%	72.16%	15.46%	4.12%	2.15	0.62

Table 31 (cont'd)

9	School not supporting my participation	18.56%	70.10%	9.28%	2.06%	1.94	0.60
10	Complicated process for submitting documents after PD	15.46%	49.48%	27.84%	7.22%	2.27	0.80
11	Low quality of PD	7.22%	15.46%	49.48%	27.84%	2.98	0.85
12	Lack of information about PD	11.34%	18.56%	40.21%	29.90%	2.89	0.96

These reasons can be organized into 5 categories; personal historical reasons (had too many professional development experiences, previous professional development was not effective), practicality (theoretical rather than practical, not transferable to my classroom), effectiveness of PD program (no follow-up programs, low quality of PD, lack of information about PD), personal reason (school schedule busy, overwhelmed feeling after PD due to too much information), and school support (low budget from the school, school not supporting the participation, complicated process for submitting documents after PD). When the mean of each category is compared, it was found that practicality (mean=3.21), personal reason (mean=2.84), personal historical reason (mean=2.77), and effectiveness of PD program (mean=2.73) play important roles for non-PD participation since the mean of each category is above the mean of responses. However, only school support (mean=2.12) is below the mean of the average, which either means all the schools are supporting teachers' PD or teachers don't care about the school support.

Moreover, qualification and location are a significant factor for non-PD participation for teachers (Table 32). First of all, a majority of contract teachers responded that the strongest influence of non- participation is their ‘school schedule is too busy’, which hinders their PD participation and none of them responded it is the weakest influence. On the other hand, some of the regular teachers think it is some influence and some think it is the strongest influence. One possible reason more contract teachers responded that they don’t participate in PD because their school schedule is too busy is that contract teachers actually have more duties than regular teachers. Most of the contract teachers are homeroom teachers and in charge of other administrative work depending on school circumstance and their contract. Therefore, they have heavier workload that makes them busier with schoolwork and may influence whether they are able to participate in PD.

Table 32: Reasons of non-Participation of PD: Busy School Schedule

QUALIFICATION	Weakest influence	Less influence	Some influence	Strongest influence
Regular teachers	6.7%	6.7%	41.7%	45.0%
Contract teachers	0.0%	13.5%	21.6%	64.9%

This study expected to find out differences between regular teachers and contract teachers since contract teachers do more work than regular teachers. Also, school schedule is closely related to the teaching experience, so it was expected that teachers with less experience have more workload. However, teaching experience did not have a significant effect on the responses for busy schedule for school; that means they are randomly distributed regardless of their background factors.

Interview Results: Motivation for Participation and Reasons for non-Participation

When teachers were interviewed, they discussed what makes them want to participate in PD and what impedes their PD participation. Teachers' interest and physical/psychological barriers play an important role in PD participation.

Teachers' interests. Interest has a direct relationship with teachers' motivation, because it is assumed that if teachers participate in PD that they are interested in, they have higher motivation, and therefore, they may learn from the PD and it may make teachers feel those particular PD programs are effective. However, if teachers participate in PD that they are not interested in, they may think the information is not helpful, which could affect their learning. In the teachers' interviews, different levels of interest were found. As has been reviewed by many studies, individual interest and situational interest are different levels in terms of arousal or curiosity. Individual interest usually involves arousal or curiosity since "it is mainly concerned with the subjectivity side of the person-object relationship" (p.25, Krapp, 1999). However, situational interest "may be tied to very specific contents and not only structural features, implying that it may last longer than simple arousal and may develop into a personal interest" (p.25, Krapp, 1999). These interests are very closely connected with types of participation. Both situational and individual interest can only exist with voluntary type of participation. However, it is difficult to categorize and distinguish between individual interest and situational interest. Sometimes teachers are not aware of the difference between the two levels of interest and use the term interchangeably as they talk about their preferences and experiences.

When Yoon explained teachers' interest, she used the term 'interest' for both individual interest and situational interest at first;

By looking at my teaching years, my interest changed every semester, every year, regarding my teaching experience, students' proficiency level, current educational trends, and educational philosophy of principal in school where I am teaching... I have chosen various topics and contents for PD from time to time. I think it is important to give teachers a chance to choose the PD regarding their interest, their situation and their needs at times...[Yoon]

However, when she gave an example at the end, she mostly referred to situational interest rather than individual interest.

...because sometimes you never had a chance to use information that you learn from PD in the classroom and then you feel that spending hours to participate in PD was useless and waste of time. For example, let's say you participated in PD of cooperative learning. But if your principal does not believe in cooperative learning or student centered learning, or your students' proficiency level is too low to work together or your class time is too short for some reason, you will never use them while you are in that school. Maybe it will be useful later in another school with other students, but after some time period, educational trends change, and it will be useless again. [Yoon]

Yoon thinks teachers' interests are continuously changing and letting teachers choose the PD regarding their interest is important for effective PD. Since situations they are in make teachers interested in a topic and move to different topics, being sensitive about what they want from PD at that time and providing what they need may be the key to an effective PD program. Since Yoon has 12 years of teaching experience, she has experienced her personal interests change depending on the school she works for and the students she teaches. She also has witnessed the

changing educational trends, which allows her to know a great deal about the role of teachers' interest in PD participation. Also, she did have a positive attitude toward the potential use of PD information; not only she is the only EFL teacher and did not have time for that, but also she knows educational trends change and information for potential use will be useless if she cannot use it right away.

On the other hand, Son's usage of the term 'interest' implies mostly individual interest. She gave an example of how her belief is reflected in her interest and is also connected to active learning.

Even though I am an EFL teacher, I am not interested in every single topic of EFL PD.

But there are times that I have to participate in PD because of some kind of situation.

Then I will neither be interested nor motivated, so I am not learning from that particular PD. It is so obvious. For example, if I participate in PD that teaches how to use phonics in classroom teaching, I will sit there and listen anyway, but I will remember nothing since I am not interested in phonics and not going to use it in my classroom anyway.

Because I don't believe that teaching phonics is going to improve EFL students' proficiency. Then I would evaluate that PD as ineffective unless it is extremely beneficial or interesting for some reason. [Son]

As was found in Son's interview, how one's belief affects his or her interest is closely related to one's evaluation of PD being effective or ineffective and which could affect one's motivation to participate in PD in the future. As was described earlier, she has one year of teaching experience at a private school in the suburbs and is passionate about her students' learning. She has her educational philosophy and her own beliefs about EFL education and tries to reflect it in her

teaching and PD participation as well. Therefore, personal interest, which is closely connected with personal belief and philosophy, plays an important role in motivation to PD participation in Son's case. A close relationship between teacher's interest and evaluation of PD was also found in the interview with Kim.

If I am not interested in the topics of the PD, it is very hard to evaluate the effectiveness of the PD. I got totally lost in there and do not know what is going on. So it is not reliable to evaluate the effectiveness of PD when I am not interested in the topic. [Kim]

It seems that Kim did not care if it was individual or situational interest. Kim said no matter the type of interest, it is not possible to evaluate the effectiveness of PD when the teacher does not have any interest. She has doubts about the reliability of PD being effective or ineffective when teachers are not interested in topic of the PD. In other words, a participant who is not interested in the particular PD may evaluate that PD as ineffective, whereas a participant who is interested in the particular PD may evaluate that PD as effective, which is in line with Son's example of phonics. These teachers' disinterest and their negative evaluation of PD are directly related to the motivation of PD participation, which is vicious circle of ineffectiveness in PD.

Psychological and physical barriers. Teachers have concerns about heavy workload as one of the difficulties in participating in PD effectively. Teachers stated that these psychological and physical barriers become one of the reasons of not participating in PD. Teachers' workloads can have negative effects, either psychologically or physically, on teachers' active and effective learning from PD. Insufficient time or being exhausted can be a physical barrier toward effective learning for teachers, since teachers are even more tired and busy when the PD is added to their

workload. No matter the type of PD, online or offline, teachers have to spend extra work time to participate in PD, which makes teachers' workload even heavier.

Psychological barriers could be a burden for class preparation and other work. When teachers treat PD as extra work, it is difficult to participate or learn from PD with passion or motivation. In teachers' interviews, three teachers mentioned that physical and psychological conditions result in PD being ineffective.

Teachers don't have enough time, since we already have so much to do related to teaching and other stuff at school, and forcing us to participate in PD means less time and more work. [Lee]

I sometimes bring schoolwork, such as grading, lesson plans, etc., to the PD site and do them during the PD session. There are too many things to do at the same time so we have to do whatever is hurried or whatever is more important. Most of the time schoolwork is more important and it is more hurried for me than PD. [Yoon]

Being a teacher is a job in which lifelong learning is required. In that sense, all teachers should keep learning and PD is where teachers can learn from experts, other teachers, and so on. However, when teachers have so many things to do already, PD is treated as additional work that teachers are pushed to do. Sometimes we enjoy our work, but sometimes we just do it because we are required to do it. PD is the same. [Kwon]

Lee, Yoon, and Kwon's interviews did not directly mention physical or psychological burden or barriers but Lee and Kwon used terms such as 'so much to do,' 'less time,' 'more work.' which implies a shortage of physical time. On the other hand, Yoon explicitly mentioned shortage of time by saying, 'too many things to do at the same time.' This is a direct indication of PD being

another type of work and becomes a burden for teachers as Kwon explicitly stated, “PD is treated as additional work.”

It should be pointed out that sometimes there are distinctive differences between physical and psychological barriers, but sometime it is blended and indistinguishable. For example, the terms ‘tired’ and ‘exhausted’ do not always mean physically tired or exhausted; sometimes people can be psychologically exhausted and tired. It is difficult to separate the two conditions since teachers seem to use them interchangeable or don’t distinguish between two. Kim and Park stated that teachers’ physical/psychological limitations influenced the effectiveness of PD.

The PD requirement is heavier on junior teachers, including novice teachers, than senior teachers since they have less power in school. However, junior teachers already have so much work in school other than teaching, such as administrative work, summer camp, PTA, and so on. That is the problem of PD being ineffective. Teachers are already exhausted with their load in school, so even if they go to PDs that are helpful and teachers are interested, they can’t really focus or concentrate. That is so ridiculous. [Kim]

Once I participated in PD after school on weekdays. I was already tired with lots of activities in the classroom. The PD was very interesting and activities seemed to be helpful for my classroom, but I could not remember anything after I was done. When I don’t remember anything from PD, and if it does not affect my teaching at all, I consider it as ineffective, right? [Park]

Both of them agreed and indicated that ‘being exhausted’ and ‘tired’ prevented them from being able to ‘focus or concentrate’ or ‘remember anything,’ resulting in no impact or changes on their

teaching practice, which is the ultimate purpose of PD. Unlike Kim and Park, Son more clearly indicated psychological barriers.

... Sometimes PDs are held when we are really busy. For example, there was PD during summer vacation, but the week after was English camp and I was in charge of organizing it. So I was participating in that PD, which was interesting, by the way, but there was tons of work waiting for me at the school, and it was hanging over my head all the time.

Moreover, I had to communicate with other teachers about the English camp over the phone so I was not able to concentrate and take valuable information from the PD. [Son]

Son indicated that psychological conditions, and preoccupation with other school- related work , hinder the PD being effective in the first level by saying ‘tons of work waiting for me’ and ‘hanging over my head all the time.’ And that eventually caused her to work on other tasks that made her ‘not being able to concentrate and take valuable information from PD’.

It is worth noting that no matter the teaching qualifications, the location of the school, teaching experience, and responsibilities as a homeroom teacher or a subject teacher, psychological or physical reasons certainly become barriers to PD participation. Six out of eight interview participants expressed their concerns of physical and psychological reasons regardless of their background.

Summary and Discussion

In sum, participants’ motivation for PD participation, influential factors of PD participating decisions, and reasons of non-participation were examined. First of all, it was found that a majority of participants pointed out practical information acquisition for PD participation, such as practical and pedagogical knowledge, teaching resources, and improvement of teaching

in general for PD participation are some or strongest motivation for PD participation. However, a majority of participants did not select external motivations (such as promotion and salary raise), and trends/educational movement (effort to stay current in EFL field, information about a particular reform/educational policy/test) as influential factors for PD participation. Moreover, participants responded that social network, and language proficiency development were not strong motivations for PD participation. This does not mean that the above factors are less valuable to teachers, it is just simply that these are not the features teachers seek to gain through PD.

Secondly, it was found that participants tend to consider format (contents, intensity, location, length), others' opinions (popularity, other colleagues' recommendation, review), and time availability (personal and school schedule) as influential factors of PD participation. On the other hand, cost/budget of the school, and PD instructor were less influential factors when teachers consider their PD participation.

Third, it was found that a majority of participants responded that the following have some or strongest influence on non-participation: previous professional development was not effective, the PD was theoretical rather than practical, school schedule was too busy, no follow-up programs, it was not transferable to my classroom, PD was low quality, and lack of information about PD. These reasons can be categorized as the following: personal historical reasons (too many professional development experiences, previous professional development was not effective), practicality (theoretical rather than practical, not transferable to my classroom), effectiveness of the PD program (no follow-up programs, low quality of PD, lack of information about PD), personal reason (school schedule busy, overwhelmed feeling after PD due to too much information), and school support (low budget from the school, school not supporting the

participation, complicated process for submitting documents after PD). It is worth noting that by comparing the mean of each category, it was found that practicality, personal reasons, personal historical reasons, and effectiveness of PD program play important roles for non-PD participation. However, only school support is below the mean of the average. That can be interpreted as either all the schools are supporting teachers' PD or teachers do not care about the school support.

Moreover, the multinomial logistics regression allows us to find several patterns that teaching experiences, location of the school, and teacher qualification have a significant effect on teachers' responses for motivation, influential factors, and reasons of non-participation. First of all, as participants' experiences increase, their responses for motivation "as an effort to stay current in EFL field" increase for stronger influence. As participants have longer teaching experience, they tend to search for current EFL trends and want to stay current in the EFL field by participating in PD. As participants' experience increases, participants tend to respond that promotion is a strong influence on PD participation. Also, as teaching experiences increase, teachers' responses for motivation of pedagogical and practical resources development has decreased.

Secondly, qualification also has a significant effect on language development as a motivation for PD participation. Contract teachers have higher motivation for language proficiency development since it gives them more benefits than for regular teachers. Location of the school has a significant effect on improvement of teaching in general. Responses from teachers for motivation in regards to requirement of school or government tend to decrease as their teaching experience increases, except teachers with 21 or more years of teaching experience

from urban average school districts and teachers with 31 or more years of teaching experience from suburban schools.

Third, location and qualification have a significant effect on social network. The rate of teachers from urban schools responding that social networks are weakest or have less influence on PD participation is much lower than teachers from suburban schools overall. Suburban teachers may have less opportunities of having strong network due to less EFL teachers within school district and distances between schools than teachers from urban district. Therefore, it is obvious they may look for social network from PD since it gives an opportunity for teachers get together from all areas. Then, there is a difference between regular teachers and contract teachers from suburban schools. Responses from regular teachers of suburban schools are evenly distributed for each scale, but responses from contract teachers distinctively inclined toward social network as the strongest influence in PD participation. Contract teachers are not belong in the school or any types of associations, so contract teachers are relatively have less sense of belonging, so they may look for one from PD.

Also, location of the schools, qualification, and teaching experiences significantly affect responses for the influential factor of personal schedules. Regular teachers from all locations tend to consider personal schedule as some or strongest influence as compared with contract teachers. Both contract teachers and regular teachers' response for some or strongest influence of personal schedule decreases as their teaching experiences increases. PD location is also a significant influential factor when participants decide to participate in PD. Teachers from urban areas tend to think location of PD is a stronger influence than teachers from suburban areas. Also, teachers with more experience tend to think location of PD has less influence for their PD participation.

Moreover, as teaching experience increases, participants tend to care more about cost and school budget for PD. It can be interpreted either as one of following; 1) there are more possibilities for teachers with more experience to be in a higher positions, or important positions, such as who is in charge of all the documentation of school budgets, or 2) teachers are willing to pay their own money for PD when they have less experience, but they are not as they gain more experience.

Lastly, participants' qualifications have a significant effect on busy school schedule for non-participation. Contract teachers' responses for strongest influence were higher than regular teachers because contract teachers have more duties in school.

Since motivation, influential factors, and reasons of non-participation are the important factors to understand teachers' PD participation, survey results and multinomial regressions model of this chapter provided insights for the nature of teachers' PD participation. Location of the school is important in this study because Korea has a unique circumstance for centralization of good school districts for elementary schools. Unlike other countries, all of the good elementary school districts are located in the southern part of Seoul, and their curriculum, passion for education, especially passion for English education, has been widely and generally known to be much greater than any other school districts. According to the Seoul Newspaper (Song, Lee, & You, 2015), children for English immersion preschool take test every week for reading and writing. English immersion preschool in southern part of the Seoul costs from \$1500.00~\$1800.00 per month and they even get English private tutor before they go to elementary school.

In addition to the survey results, interviews found out teachers' interest and psychological/physical barriers play important roles in motivation of PD participation and reasons of non-PD participation. Teachers explained that if they are not interested in topics of PD, this seems to be connected with the effectiveness of PD, resulting in non-PD participation. Moreover, teachers explained how psychological/ physical situations hinder teachers to participate in PD. Due to the heavy workload and being exhausted from busy schedules, neither teachers are able to participate in PD nor do they learn from PD effectively.

Social capital theory has informed us that the social network of teachers has a critical effect on teachers' learning and PD participation. Moreover, it further explains how teachers bring their social capital into their PD experience. Teachers also acquire new and additional social capital through PD as they construct social networking which becomes one of the highest motivations for PD participation.

Since teachers' thoughts about the effectiveness of PD and their motivation of PD participation were examined, it is important to investigate whether they use the information and knowledge that they learn from PD. Therefore, the next chapter will be about the application of PD knowledge. This includes whether they use the information and knowledge including activities they learn from PD, and how the experience of implementation goes. Additionally findings from teacher surveys and interviews will explain reasons of poor implementation or non-trial of implementation.

Chapter 6: Usage, modification, and non-usage of Knowledge from Professional Development

In chapters 4 and 5, teachers' thoughts about the effectiveness of PD and their motivations to participate in PD were investigated. Through surveys and interviews, how teachers think about the effectiveness of PD in general, regarding its content, approaches, and different schedules as well as what their motivations of PD participation are looked at and explained. Now we know what makes effective PD and what makes teachers want to participate or not participate in PD. If thoughts and motivation about PD occur before teachers participate in PD during the Pre-PD stage, applying what they learn from PD to their teaching practice is something that occurs after PD participation during the post-PD stage. According to the intentions of those who offer the PD, teachers' knowledge, philosophy, resources, pedagogy, instruction, etc. should be affected by the information they acquired from PD if they participate in effective PD properly. However, they have their choice to use, modify, or discard the knowledge that they learn from PD. Therefore, this study aims to find out how many teacher participants say they try to use the information from PD. We will also look at how it went, and what are the reasons if it didn't go well or if they did not try to use the information from PD.

Unlike the first two research questions, this section only has a few survey questions listed for participants, which asked if they have ever tried to use the information they obtained from PD, and if so, how the activities, lesson, and class went. If they answered either it went perfectly or well, they were not further prompted. However, those who answered that they have never tried to use the information obtained from PD and those who answered the activities, lesson, and class using information obtained from PD went not well or poorly were directed to list the reasons for not trying the information or having an unsuccessful experience.

Therefore, I first report the survey results that show how many participants have tried to use the knowledge and information obtained from PD with the list of reasons for not using knowledge or not being successful. Then I analyzed the interview data about teachers' episodes of successful and unsuccessful activities, lessons, and class in depth.

Survey Results: Usage of PD Information

First of all, the results of the survey question asking if participants have tried to use the information including ideas of activities, instruction, resources, etc. learned from PD will be displayed and explained. Then, as was in the previous chapter, if there are significant factors regarding background information such as qualification, experience, or location of the school they will be looked at and explained.

As Table 33 presents, 53% of participants have tried to use the information acquired from PD and 47% have not tried to use the information acquired from PD.

Table 33: Implementation of PD Information

Have you tried to implement the knowledge, research result, pedagogy, or activities that you learned about or acquired in your classroom?	YES	NO	Mean	SD
	53%	47%	1.47	0.50

Through the chi-square test ($p\text{-value}=0.968$), this result was not rejected with 5% significant level, which means that responses were almost evenly distributed and a fair number of participants responded on each scale almost equally. Therefore, half of the participants have tried to use information acquired from PD and half of them have not tried.

And for those who have tried to implement information acquired from PD, a majority of participants responded that the activity, lesson, and class went well (78.43%) or perfectly (5.88%) whereas only a few participants responded it went not well or poorly. Considering the mean (mean=2.86) of this question, the interpretation can be made that most of the participants said they had a positive experience with an implementation of information acquired from PD.

Table 34: Self-reflect of Implementation of PD Information

If you have tried to implement the knowledge, research result, pedagogy, or activities that you learned about or acquired in your classroom, how did it go?	Poorly	Not Good	Good	Perfectly	Mean	SD
	3.92%	11.76%	78.43%	5.88%	2.86	0.56

Those who have not tried to use the information from PD (n=46) and who reported that the activities, lesson, and class went not well or poorly (n=8) were asked to mark all the possible reasons for the implementation not working well. Since participants were allowed to make multiple selections, the number reported does not reflect the percentage of the total number. The reasons that more than half of the participants gave as to why they felt it did not work were “I just did not know how to implement in my classroom” (n= 34), “Acquired information that did not seem to be relevant or interesting for my students” (n=31), “Acquired information that was not developmentally appropriate for the students in my class”(n=31), “Acquired information that was aimed for very specific students and didn’t seem to work in my classroom”(n=29), and “My school does not have enough resources for me to implement the new ideas in my class”(n=27). The reasons selected by less than half of the participants were, “ Acquired information that was not consistent with my class objectives (n=19), “PD about certain topics was effective but it happened a long time ago” (n= 8),“Acquired information that was not up-to-date or current (n=4)

, and “Acquired information (about research, pedagogy, or activities) that was too broad and didn’t seem to work in my classroom” (n=0). Moreover, a few participants wrote in for the field for “etc. (please be specify)” that activities were not culturally specific, and activities were not easy to prepare, which also happened to appear during teachers’ interview.

Through the multinomial logistics regression model, it was found that none of the background factors have significance on these questions. Whether they have tried to use the information from PD or not was only attributed to individual differences.

Interview Result: Teachers’ Episodes of the Usage of Information Obtained from PD

Out of 8 interviewees, only 3 teachers have tried to implement information from PD. It is not feasible to conclude whether they had positive, successful experiences or not since 1) implementation of information from PD has too many variables, 2) teachers have various experiences with different types of activities, lessons, and class with the information, and 3) their definition of being successful is rather relative. Also, survey responses are inherently self-report. Follow up classroom observations are needed in order to know for sure. However, this study provides a good picture of what hinders their implementation of PD and what helps them to implement the PD information. Teachers interviews will be analyzed excerpt by excerpt with the interpretation of how they said their implementation experience went without evaluating if their whole experience of implementation was successful or not.

When it comes to categorizing teachers’ usage of information, it is usually divided into three categories; usage, modification, and non-usage. However, this study did not use these categories because it is ambiguous to distinguish between what has been used and what has been modified with the level of detail reported in the interviews. Additionally the focus of this study is

more on why teachers use the information from PD and why they don't use it. Ambiguity of distinction between usage and modification is mostly due to the variability of teaching (level of students, school environment, styles of teachers and so on) and usage always requires some level of modification. This study did not focus on whether teachers use, modify, and discard information from PD; rather this research explores the reasons of usage and non-usage of information.

Therefore, data presented in this study will be categorized by the priority of teachers when they consider implementation of PD information; ready to use, practicality, and possibility of modification. Not distinguishing the categories of usage and non-usage, allows for data presented in this chapter to identify clearly which types of information can be used in the classroom and which cannot be used through teachers' perceptions of it.

Ready to use. It is clear that one of the important features of information obtained from PD is whether the information is ready to use or not. The most frequently selected reason of not trying or having an unsuccessful experience of using information from PD was "not knowing how to implement in my classroom" and also a few teachers brought up "not easy to prepare". Teachers in interviews on the reasons of not using information from PD mentioned repeatedly their lack of time and overwhelming work situation, these concerns also arose in interviews on motivation. Kwon and Lee shared their experience of using ready to use worksheets from PD and how it is feasible for preparation, without a lot of effort and time.

I have used some of the activity sheets that I got from a PD session. It was not only easy and convenient, but also it was really interesting for my students. These kinds of resources from PD are really helpful and make us want to use them in the class.

Because teachers are overwhelmed with what they have to do already, so if there are any materials out there that are right for the students, we are going to use it. [Kwon]

Sometimes there are too many things that teachers have to prepare for the class. We don't actually have enough time to prepare for the classes, so we tend to discard the activities that require a lot of preparation time even if it is a really good activity. [Lee]

The experience of Kim and Kwon tells us that teachers prefer materials and resources that are ready to use since not only do they have not enough time to prepare for the material, but also it is not effective to put a lot of efforts and time for the short activities when there are resources available that students are interested in. It is worth noting that Kwon spends more time on administrative work and teaches fewer classes, so she must have a lot of things to take care of and did not have much time on class preparation. Therefore, it makes sense that she prefers the materials that are ready to use right away without extra preparation time. Kwon added more on the effectiveness of ready to use materials.

Sometimes it works better than an activity sheet that I created myself. Whenever that happens, I always realize that being original in terms of creating class material is not always the best choice I can make in order to motivate students and have better outcomes. Instead of that, I can have time for myself [Kwon]

In comparison between original materials of her own and ready to use material, she explained that ready to use material actually works better since it is created by educational experts through multiple trials and revisions. Also, Kwon's previous remark about self-efficacy revealed that she has difficulties in classroom management and she prefers materials that are ready to use in her class since students in her class are motivated by the materials that are already designed to use.

In contrast, Kim shared her experience with PD materials that take too long time to prepare.

Once, there was an activity I learned from PD that was suitable for my classes. That seems interesting and I thought my students would love it. But preparation for the activity was just not possible. I had to cut colored paper for an hour for 15 minutes of activity, I neither had a time for it nor was I going to do it. If I am teaching five classes, that means I have to cut colored papers for five hours. It is just not realistic. [Kim]

Kim's experience tells us that sometime materials from PD require a lot of preparation time and teachers' don't want to spend much time on the preparation. As many teachers appeal that they have little time and have so many tasks, preparation for materials and activities whether it is from PD or original is a burden for them. As was described earlier, Kim has a heavier workload since she is a homeroom teacher who works in a school in a good urban district. Also, in her previous quote about the physical or psychological barriers, she expressed how much work junior teachers have besides the teaching. Therefore, Kim tends to discard the materials that require long preparation time due to constraints of physical and psychological reasons. Lee mentioned ideal ready to use materials for teachers.

Sometimes we have different textbooks every year (especially if you are a fixed-term teacher and move around the school each academic year), and it took so much time to get adjusted with the new textbook and curriculum. So sometimes it feels like we are teaching materials we are not familiar with. So we spend most of preparation on textbook material and cannot think of additional activities which students love by the way. So if there is PD providing multiple additional activities, for each chapter, for different

textbook and teachers can choose among the activities to teach, it will save us a lot of time and allow us to focus on students' learning. [Lee]

Lee's interview tells us that getting adjusted with the new textbook and new curriculum is already so much work and demands much time for teachers. So even though teachers are willing to prepare for the additional activities for students, it is not possible. According to Lee's background, she already spent so much time adjusting to the new environmental changes as she came back to work after eight years of lay-off. That can explain to us why she prefers materials that are ready to use.

As we can see from teachers interviews, implementation of PD can occur more easily when ready to use materials, or at least easy to prepare materials, are provided for teachers. Therefore, readiness of information and ease of preparation are the keys to teachers' usage of information obtained from PD.

Practicality. Teachers pointed out one of the characteristics of effective PD as “practical” in an earlier chapter of this study, and a practicality issue of PD implementation also came up from teachers in interview. When teachers pick practicality as a reason of usage or non-usage of information obtained from PD, it becomes clear that there are different levels of practicality. The first level is between theory and practice. For example, teachers think that practice is not always a reflection of theory, so theory is sometimes not very useful and practical for teaching practice. Teachers think PD that only focuses on theory does not consider variability of practice. The second level is ideal and reality. For example, instruction and activities that work in an ideal environment sometimes might not work in a real classroom. The last level is

between different cultures. For example, characteristics of students, objectives of class, and teachers' role in different cultures cause very different direction for instruction.

Theory and practice. The first three excerpts are from teachers' interviews are about practicality of theory and practice. Teachers' interviews tell us that there is a premise that practice and theory are both important, and only good practice can be built upon good theory. However, sometimes they feel PD only focuses on theory and does not consider variability of practice. Kwon shared her experience that EFL teachers have different positions and authority for the class so the method they are using for classroom management is different from homeroom teachers, but theory doesn't treat them separately.

As much as theory is important, we see a lot of cases that practice is another world from us. So what we are dealing with now are more practical issues, and not the theoretical issues. For example, if we, EFL teachers are dealing with classroom management, it is different from homeroom teacher's classroom management skill, since subject teachers don't have authority like homeroom teachers. Therefore, we don't have much time to focus on theoretical backgrounds and pedagogy for classroom management skills; we need skills that work right away and move onto the lesson for the day. Theory is only good for teachers to understand why a certain situation is happening but not really resolve the problem that we are having. [Kwon]

Kwon says theory can explain why a certain thing happens and possibly provide theoretical solutions, but it does not work right away since theory does not consider the variability of real classroom situations. As Kwon teaches fewer classes as a subject teacher and has difficulties of classroom management, she mostly focuses on what really works in the class. As the most

experienced teacher who has the highest position of all the interview participants, she must have enough theoretical backgrounds, which does not work right away in real classroom. Also, Jeong mentioned that no matter how theory is valuable, there is a no chance to use them in her teaching practice.

Most of the PDs are repetitions of what I already know and have heard hundreds of times: theory and research that I am well aware of already, but never have a chance to use in my teaching practice. I agree that practice can be stronger on the foundation of theory, but if we never use them what a waste of time. [Jeong]

Jeong also pointed out theory gets wearisome because it is too much repetition and a pointless of waste of time if it never gets to be used in the classroom. As Jeong not only has the longest length of education background, but also took the teaching placement tests twice, she must have studied educational theories more than enough time. This can explain that Jeong feels that there is a gap between theory and practice regardless of the importance of theory. Cha also mentioned theory being old and over-generalizing.

I am ok with the PD refreshing my memories about a certain theory. However, some of the theories are really old and don't seem to work anymore, since educational situations are changing constantly. Also, theory always has a weakness of being an over-generalization, so I have my doubts when I think about the theory. Because when you become more experienced, it is your previous experience that you most rely on not the theory. [Cha]

Cha pointed out that since the educational environments are changing rapidly, theory that is not up to date does not support practice these days. Also, because of the weakness of theory being

over-generalized, it is not applicable for every situation teachers face. It is worth noting that Cha is in a school where students have high levels of English proficiency since most of the students graduated from English immersion preschool and some of the students have lived in English speaking countries. This can explain that Cha feels most of the educational theory came from several decades ago, which does not apply in the modern classrooms that consist of newer types of students.

Teachers' interviews of thoughts about theory and practice tells us that they don't believe theory is useful for their teaching practice. They tend to think theory does not resolve the problem they are having, it is old, repetitive, and over-generalizing. It became clear that theoretical information they obtained from PD tended to be discarded when teachers thought about implementation. Therefore, information obtained from PD being theoretical or practical is the key to whether teachers use it or not in their teaching practice.

Ideality and reality. Many teachers mentioned a second level, the gap between ideal and reality. As Adey et al. (2004) stated, "...in-class of from 15 to 90 students with one teacher can never be adequately replicated by a teaching machine, a computer, interactive video, or hypermedia text....no machine can get near to managing the billions of subtle interactions which occur amongst even 30 students and between them and their teacher" (p.3). Teachers suggested that there are so many variables in classrooms that activities and lessons presented in PDs are sometimes too idealistic for real life classroom situations. Kwon, Son, Yoon, Lee, and Jeong mentioned school environmental differences such as size of the class, location of the classroom, and limited school resources. For example, Kwon shared,

Sometimes there are lessons only good for small groups. However, we have a lot of students in one class, so we don't even consider trying those activities since we know they are not going to work from our previous experience... There aren't very many activities targeting large groups like we have in classes in Korea. [Kwon]

Kwon claimed activities provided in PD were designed to work with small groups, which is not realistic in classrooms in Korea since the classroom size of Korean EFL class is usually large. So from her previous experience of PD information not working due to class size differences, she no longer attempts to implement activities that would only work for small groups. Son and Yoon talked about the classroom settings and difficulties and impossibilities they experienced, while they implemented the activity obtained from PD.

Once, there was an interesting activity that I learned from PD using overhead projector. Using overhead projector, vocabularies appeared in ceiling, sidewall, and the floor in the classroom and students were supposed to jump and run to touch to connect the vocabularies with their meanings. I knew my students would love this activity, but in order to have this activity in the classroom, all the desks and chairs should be removed, but there isn't enough space to put all the desks and chairs. So we have removed some chairs and desks in the hall way and still remaining desks and chairs were in the classroom. So we have line them up along the sidewalls, but it was not really fun as much as it would be if all the desks and chairs would have been removed. [Son]

There is a dance activity with English songs that I want to use from PD. Students are supposed to jump around and express the alphabet with their bodies, and it might be possible for some classrooms that are far from other classrooms. But for some schools,

the English classroom is right next to regular classrooms, so we can't do anything noisy.

It will bother other classes. [Yoon]

Son and Yoon mentioned the constraint of the school environment, more specifically classroom settings in their school. It was classroom settings that hindered the implementation of activity obtained from PD even though Son tried anyway, but Yoon did not.

It is interesting that both of the activities that were difficult to implement were physical activities that require movements. In discussion of physical environment constraints, Lee and Jeong talked about their experience of lack of resources and school support.

Also there are PD instructors who do not know the real classroom situation. They may have been in a preschool lab where they have observed and experimented some kind of activities with a lot of resources, but most of the school teachers who are participating in that PD are working in public school where there aren't enough resources and dealing with a different level of students. [Lee]

Once I participated in a PD introducing how to use smart boards with an EFL class.

Everything was interesting and I thought we could make a good use of it. However, teachers submitted official documents to get a smart board for the EFL class, and it was rejected because of budget reasons. [Jeong]

Lee stated there is a difference in support of resources between school lab (including private schools) and public schools. She indicated these are the difficulties of implementing information provided from PD. Jeong discussed her experience of requesting a resource for the class, which she was introduced from PD, and it was declined because of her school budget. Moreover, Cha and Jeong mentioned expectation and unexpected outcome.

There is another thing regarding students' interest. Teachers always consider if students are going to be interested in these activities because motivation is the key for learning. However, sometimes our expectations about students' interests are totally wrong. Even though activities PD introduces were proven to get students' attention and make students interested in certain contexts, it is not always the case. It depends on the day, students' moods, weather, school schedule and everything. So sometimes activities from PD may seem to work and be interesting but does not work and is really boring in reality. [Cha]

Cha talked about activities from PD sometimes does not get students attention as expected. It can be explained with variability of teaching. Everything Cha mentioned and more things that construct a class can be a variable and it can either work along or work against the lesson. Therefore, teachers don't even know what is going to work or not until they experiment. More specifically, it is related with the students' level of English proficiency in Cha's case. Since Cha works in a school where most of the students' English proficiency is high, if students are introduced with the activities that seems to be easy, they won't be challenged or motivated to participate. Jeong also claimed the uncertainty of activities from PD as well.

Sometimes, students do not learn what they are supposed to learn from certain activities. For instance, PD introduced a card game to teach vocabulary, which was proven to work great in school with kids who are motivated and eager to learn English for some reason. However, students in some schools, such as mine, may only focus on pictures in the cards and do not care about the vocabulary. All they want to do is get more cards. In that case, I got students' attention, but failed to teach English vocabulary with the cards. [Jeong]

Jeong shared her experience of implementation of activities from PD and how it did not achieve the original objectives of the activity. The reason of could be level of the students, types of class students had before, the way activity was presented, and so on. Anything can be a variable of the class that day. What Cha and Jeong shared were outcomes that are never anticipated until it is experimented. Therefore, it is not actually a reason of non-usage but it is more a reason why implementation of information from PD did not work well.

As it was presented in teachers' interviews, reality constraints (whether it is a classroom environment, resources, or unexpected outcomes due to variability) are one of the factors for PD information is not used, or used but failed. Participants have experienced these gaps between reality and ideality.

Cultural gap. There are teachers who mentioned cultural differences between activities/class in Western countries and activities/class in Korea. Cultural differences also appear as environmental differences in the classroom, which is one of the considerations about the activities and lessons for the teachers. One activity or lesson that works perfectly in one culture or ethnic group may not work in another culture or ethnic group. Lee mentioned cultural differences in students' participation in the class.

There are activities that will only work for students who are actively participating in class and expressing their opinions. That will only work for students who speak their opinions. If we use those kinds of activities in our classroom, no one is going to speak out and there will be silence for an hour. Korean students are usually shy and trained to be quiet until teacher picks them to speak out even though they know the answer. Also, they are afraid of being incorrect. So until they are picked by teachers to answer, they almost never

voluntarily participate...Once, we were preparing group work, and I told students to choose the group leader, presenter, etc. The object of doing this was to teach them how to negotiate and share the roles in the group through interaction. It took forever, and no one from the group wanted to be a group leader, they didn't interact with each other and we never even started the main activities. So from then on, I randomly pick the group leader, presenter; that is against the purpose of cooperative group work, but class should go on.

[Lee]

Lee shared her experience of failure of implementation of cooperative work that might work in a culture where students share their opinion freely and not being afraid of speaking out. Therefore it was a common reaction of Korean students being afraid of volunteering because students in Korea are educated not to stick out and being ordinary is considered as a virtue. On the other hand, Park mentioned PD presenters from different cultures.

PD organizer and ministry of education loves to hire professionals who are foreigners since it will make their PD program look good, high quality, professional and attractive. But, there are times when I just want to say, "You don't know anything about EFL classrooms in Korea". Unless they teach class in Korea, they do not know what will work or not. They have to learn that what works for one culture and country does not apply to another culture and country. [Park]

Park criticizes the PD presenter from a different culture who does not know actual conditions of EFL classes in Korea. If the presenter seems not to know about the actual conditions of EFL class in Korea, teachers don't view the information from PD presenters as credible. And it is not

possible to expect teachers to use information obtained from PD. Son also realized the cultural differences while she was trying to make a good use of information obtained from PD.

Once I participated in PD, which informs EFL teachers to ask for parents' participation and cooperation with their children's English learning. PD has some useful insights for me. I have learned to ask parents to guide students' English homework and how parents can help increase students' motivation. As I try to have parents to be involved in education, I realized that most of the parents don't have time to help their children. They sometimes don't even have time to come to the PTA meeting. I think a PD presenter who does not understand these specific cultural situations can often misguide and do not know how to modify for the appropriate situation. [Son]

As Son shared, there is a cultural differences not only in different cultures and countries, but also within same ethnic groups. As a matter fact, cultural differences exist within the same ethnic groups due to the differences in generation, location, and economic status. Therefore, if the PD instructor does not understand these features and provides information that is not related with the circumstance teachers are in, there is no possibility that teachers are even going to try to use the information obtained from PD.

Teachers' interviews tell us that gaps between practice and theory, ideal and reality, and between cultures hinder the implementation of information obtained from PD. Teachers who have experienced PDs with these gaps begin to have lower expectations about PD and there is less usage of information from PD. It is worth noting that issues of differences between reality and the ideal were brought up the most from the practicalities category. Considering six teachers shared their experiences with reality constraints from their practice, it can be assumed that PD

information deals with the ideal situation and targets the ideal situation in the classroom. Park supports this as she stated, “Teachers hate presenters bragging about their successful implementation stories because there are too many variables and success is not always guaranteed in real classroom because we have different students, resources, and so on. Therefore, we learn more from the failure stories with possible reasons and alternatives” [Park]

Possibilities of modification. When teachers talk about usage of information obtained from PD, modification was an important issue. As many teachers (n=31) responded in the survey the reason they do not try to use information, or used it but failed, was, “Acquired information was not developmentally appropriate for the students in my class”. Whether teachers imply ‘developmentally appropriate’ as proficiency level or age appropriate, modification would resolve the concerns teachers have. Jeong mentioned the differences in proficiency level between classes and students.

Within same grade, each class has different proficiency level. So when I use information PD that is too easy, higher proficiency level students gets bored whereas intermediate and beginner students get bored if I use advanced activities. So it is always my concern how to satisfy both of them without providing totally different activity, which causes too much work for me. [Jeong]

Activities that are too rigid to one level of proficiency are difficult for teachers to implement in the classroom as Jeong’s comment since it is not feasible for teachers to provide too many different activities. Providing activities that can be easily modified for different proficiency levels would benefit teachers. Son also claimed that teachers spend much time on planning activities.

It is the creating activities that we spend most of our time for the preparation. Since we are teaching different grade each year, it feels like activities from last year are useless for this year. However, we came up with the idea that with the same topic and same activity, we can change the level such as changing vocabularies and contents. It will save us much time and since we know which types of activities work in previous year, it will lower the risk of failing. [Son]

Son pointed out the benefits of modification of activities such as saving time and the lower risk of failing.

Kwon supported the benefits of modification of activities by valuing the possibility of modification for information obtained from PD.

When I learn new ideas and activities from PD, the first thing I can ask myself or to the instructor if I am not sure is “Is there a flexibility in this activity?” “Can I expand/downscale/ divide this activity?” From my teaching experience I have learn there are very few activity from PD we can directly use because we have different environment, different level of students, and different resources. [Kwon]

As it was brought up with the issue of the gap between the ideal and reality earlier in this chapter, variability of teaching requires some kind of modification depending on the situation of school. Kwon is well aware of this and a possibility of modification is one of the aspects that prove whether information from PD is valuable or not for Kwon. Unlike other teachers’ interview on the possibility of modification for PD information, Kim shared her experience on modification from her own teaching experience.

I feel sorry to the class that I try new activities from PD for the first time because something always goes wrong for the first time. Then it gets better second time because I change little bit that cause flaw in the previous class. But if it does not go well for the second or third class, usually I think of that activity as not working properly so I discard it. [Kim]

As was mentioned in her interview, Kim modifies and adjusts activities as she implements class after class. It was not the immediate modification from information obtained from PD, but she found the way to work with the information acquired from PD and make a good use of it. However, if the modification does not work, information from PD is discarded. Lee shared an insightful opinion regarding modification.

The most interesting PD experience so far was PD demonstrating how to modify worksheet regarding the students' proficiency level. It did not provide materials for immediate use but it provides the general rules and instruction of how to modify any types of worksheet. Therefore, it works well for long-term use, and I became confident since I can modify and transform activities for my students in different proficiency level, and grade. [Lee]

From other teachers' interview, modification of information seems to be in teachers' discretion and capacity. However, Lee has experienced PD providing fundamental and practical information for teachers in any stage.

As was identified in the teachers' interview, the possibility of modification is one of the important features influencing whether teachers use or do not use the information from PD.

Summary and Discussion

In sum, half of the participants have tried to use the information from PD and most of them responded that the activity/lesson/class went well. However, those who have not tried or have tried but the class did not go well have selected the reasons of non-usage or failure of implementation as 1) I just did not know how to implement in my classroom (n= 34), 2) Acquired information that did not seem to be relevant or interesting for my students (n=31), 3) Acquired information that was not developmentally appropriate for the students in my class (n=31), 4) Acquired information that was aimed for very specific students and didn't seem to work in my classroom(n=29), 5) My school does not have enough resources for me to implement the new ideas in my class (n=27), 6) Acquired information that was not consistent with my class objectives (n=19), 7) PD about certain topics was effective but it happened a long time ago (n= 8), and 8) Acquired information that was not up-to-date or current (n=4).

Survey results tell us that teachers who have tried to use information have positive experiences with implementation. However, the reasons of non-usage, which were selected by more than half of participants, were related and supported by the interview data. These reasons included: 1) Not knowing about implementation is related with readiness to use, 2) information being irrelevant or uninteresting for my students and 5) not enough resources is related with the relationship between the ideal and reality, and practicality, 3) information being developmentally inappropriate for the students, and 4) information aimed for very specific students are related with modification of activities for different levels of students' proficiency.

Moreover, interview data tells us that teachers value information that is ready to use, practical, and possible to modify. Also, practicality has three levels: theory and practice, the ideal

and reality, and cultural gaps. Teachers have shared their experience with these aspects, which promote or hinder usage of information.

Since implementation of PD information is one of the important outcomes of PD, the reasons of usage/non-usage of information obtained from PD provided insights for requirements of implementation. Understanding these features will help us to think about the nature of successful implementation and how information provided in PD should be. The next chapter will be about the conclusion of this study. The research findings, the limitations and the implications of the study, and the future study directions will be presented.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

In this chapter, the research findings will be presented, the limitations and the implications of this study will be addressed, and the future study directions will be suggested. Through the surveys of 97 elementary EFL teachers in Korea and the interviews of 8 participants who have completed the survey, four major findings contribute to the previous research.

First of all, it was found that Korean EFL teachers consider the social nature of PD as an important aspect, and social interaction plays an important role in PD participation. Secondly, teachers' thoughts about effectiveness, motivation of PD participation, and reasons of non-usage of PD information differ, depending on various variables such as the contents of the PD, approaches to PD, different types of PD, and participants' teaching experience, and qualifications. The location of the schools also plays an important role on their perspectives about PD. Third, since the ultimate goal of PD is improvement of teaching practice, it is important to note that information and ideas of PD are more likely to be implemented if the resources provided are for immediate use with directions for modification provided. Finally, there are so many competing variables for teachers to balance when the PD participation is in consideration. Therefore, teachers consider all these competing demands and try to balance them in order to get the best outcomes of PD. These broad themes will be discussed more fully below.

Social Nature of PD

Previous research such as Giavrimis, Giossi, and Papastamatis (2011) found that the majority of teachers were motivated to participate in the PD program to communicate with, become acquainted with, and develop closer relationships with other colleagues. Current study tells us that especially teachers from suburban schools have stronger motivation to participate in PD for social network than teachers from urban schools. Due to the existence of more number of

EFL teachers within school, district, and other closer location, teachers in urban district seems to have better social network building than suburban school district. Therefore, social network is not as stronger motivation for urban teachers as suburban teachers strive for more information and resources. It was not investigated in this study whether suburban teachers seek for social network with teachers who are sharing similar demographical characteristics such as teacher colleagues within the same school and district which is categorized as ‘bonding’ or with teachers who do not share many of same characteristics, have a more or less equal social standing in horizontal nature such as a more experienced teacher which is categorized as ‘bridging’ in social capital theory (Grootaert et al, 2004). Because depending on the types of social network they are seeking, their needs for social network become clearer whether they need to have resources and information sharing from teachers in other area or they need counsel and mentors from more experienced teachers.

It was also implied from the Son’s interview that her suburban school has a smaller number of EFL teachers in school to share information and resources. As was found in the survey of this study, teachers prefer PD where they can work with other EFL teachers (PD providing discussion forums with other EFL teachers, PD in the form of formal mentoring with EFL teachers) rather than EFL experts. As previous research supported (e.g. Hollins et al., 2004; Hord, 1997; Killion, 1999, 2002a, 2002b, Loucks-Horsley et al., 2003), teachers value sharing their concerns, teaching ideas, lesson plans, engaging in discussions to solve problems, supporting each other in individual learning, evaluating one another, and giving feedback with others. However, despite the benefits of having a social network, teachers from suburban schools are having difficult times to establish social networks compared to teachers from urban schools where many EFL teachers work within schools and distances between schools are closer due to

the limitation of suburban schools (e.g. distance between schools are greater, number of EFL teachers within school are less).

Also, this study adds a new aspect of social interaction in self-efficacy and self-confidence. As was found in the interviews, self-efficacy and self –confidence of participants in this study seems to be a relative sense of superiority or inferiority of their performance in comparison with other teachers. Suburban teachers relatively feel they are doing worse than teachers from urban schools where resources and curriculums are well provided and shared by other teachers and vise versa. This is also supported by the survey results of this study that teachers from suburban schools have significantly lower self-efficacy and self- confidence, especially for PD during vacation, whereas teachers from urban schools have a higher self-efficacy and self- confidence when it is compared to PD during weekdays and PD through online. Interpretation for this phenomenon- relationship between self-efficacy and PD schedule- might be that PD during vacation solely provides the opportunities for suburban and urban teachers to meet together which allows urban teachers to have higher self-efficacy and suburban teachers to have lower self-efficacy. Relatively, there was not much polarization regarding the school location for PD during weekends and online PD.

In addition to that, this study found that social interaction plays an important role when considering PD participation. For example, colleagues' opinions were considered as influential factors of PD participation. This study found that teachers care about popularity of the program, other colleagues' recommendation, and review. Social capital theory supports this finding by explaining how teachers' perspectives and motivations about PD are influenced by other teachers who are in their close network (Bourdieu,1985; Loury,1977; Coleman,1988; Baker, 1990)

since the others' opinion category such as popularity, other colleagues' recommendation, and review play an important role as influential factors in PD participation.

Finally, it was found that teachers preferred having on-site PD in their school and receive additional benefit of having their colleague EFL teachers as a team, which was proved to improve curriculums and overall performance of the school. Previous research emphasized the importance of improving human resource continuously, and many researchers insisted that teachers working together in professional development as a community has a stronger impact on improvement of teaching practice. (e.g. Crow, 2009; Danaher, Price, & Kluth, 2009; Drago-Severson & Pinto, 2006; Engstrom & Danielson, 2006; Fullan, 2000; Lauer & Matthews, 2007; Lowden, 2006; Nelson & Slavit, 2008; Richardson, 2003; Saunders, Goldenberg, & Gallimore, 2009; Tienken & Stonaker, 2007). Also Killion (1999) supported this professional development as a team idea, by looking at the 27 successful staff development programs and found that teachers become a powerful team when they participate in a professional development program along with peer teachers from their school because this allows them to work together to deal with issues related to content and instructional processes. Moreover, many researchers also have shown that collaborative professional development has a greater effect on school change, providing a coherent educational environment for students and a way for teachers to support each other in improving their teaching practices (Hord, 1997; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996; Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001; Newman & Wehlage, 1997; Perez et al., 2007).

One Size Does Not Fit All

According to the previous literature about teachers' motivation to participate in PD, teachers' motivation seems to be simplified either one way or the other. Even though some researchers such as Giavrimis et. al.(2011) and Mestry et al. (2009) found specific motivation to

participate in PD, it can simply be categorized motivation as internal or external. It was not surprising to see teachers have various yet different thoughts and needs for PD depending on their geographic, demographic, and individual characteristics such as teaching experience, qualification, and location of the school in this study. As Knowles (1980) explains in adult learning theory, teachers' complex set of needs and presentation requirements must be filled in order for learning to occur. Teachers who participated in in this study have different needs depending on their situation as Knowles (1980) called "real-life tasks or problems" (p. 44), which motivates teachers ready to learn.

Therefore, this study assures that PD designed for one particular group might not work for another group. And their reaction to existing PD might be different depending on their situation. For example, teachers with more teaching experience tended to think EFL PD in Korea is not effective. This may or may not be about the quality of PD offered in Korea since there are some positive responses for the effectiveness of PD from teachers with less teaching experience. It may only mean that PD offered in Korea does not have influence on teachers with more teaching experience. Questions may be raised if teachers with more teaching experience had been offered a different kind of PD, then they might have valued it. However, this study also investigated the effectiveness of different kinds of PD, and a significant difference regarding participants' teaching experience was only found in gaining theoretical knowledge from online PD. It was found that as participants' teaching experience increases, they are more likely to respond that online PD helped them to gain theoretical knowledge. The above two results seem to be contradictory, however, previous questions only asked their overall thoughts about general experience of PD and later questions asked more detailed information about the effectiveness of PD regarding different types of PD so participants can compare these aspects according to types

of PD. Moreover, multinomial logistics regression only provides the relative value and limited information for the selected responses since a relatively fewer number of teachers with more teaching experience participated in this study. For example, teachers with 1-15 years of teaching experience include 82% of the participants whereas teachers with 16-35 only include 17% of the participants. Therefore, further investigation could be useful in order to find out more detailed information about different needs regarding teaching experience with larger samples.

Moreover, the negative responses about the effectiveness of PD in Korea may have influence on the responses of teachers with more teaching experience who tend to think PD is only for novice teachers. Possible suppositions for teachers with more experience are that teachers may tend to think that PD is only for novice teachers. In addition, that may think 1) teachers with more experience feel there is nothing new to learn since PDs are repetitive, 2) they have learned enough PD experience, 3) their teaching practice is fossilized due to long teaching experience so they either don't want to change or they want to change but they can't, 4) PD was not done well enough to help them to learn, or 5) PD programs are mostly targeted for novice teachers. Regardless of reasons among the above, the responses about the statement "PD is only for novice teachers" reflects teachers' beliefs that PD has no effects for them as their teaching experience increases. This is somewhat similar to the findings from Torff and Session (2008) that PD manifested significant changes in teaching practices and teachers' beliefs within the first 10 years of teaching, but no significant effect thereafter. As teaching experience increased, participants of this study may have experienced that there were no effects or changes on their teaching practice.

Even though teachers with more experience tend to think PD is only for novice teachers and PD is not effective for them, teachers with more teaching experiences are still required to

participate in PD. Considering the fact that teachers with more teaching experience think they already have enough PD experience, this study found that they tend to participate in PD for the external and lighter motivations such as promotion and as an effort to stay current in EFL field, however pedagogical and practical resources development is not as important for their motivation to PD participation as teachers with less teaching experience. Given the fact that teachers with more teaching experience only qualify for a promotion, it was self-explanatory that teachers with more experience have stronger motivation for promotion than teachers with less experience.

Also, this study newly found the trends for Korean EFL teachers' perspectives of PD and the motivation, which is originated from a unique educational environment in Korea. Location of school and qualification of teachers have a significant influence on teachers' perspectives that may not be found in other contexts. Teachers from different locations have different needs, thoughts, and motivation for PD participation. Due to the environmental uniqueness, invisible dividing lines between school districts exist. Unlike other countries, there is one mega urban city in Korea among other smaller urban cities. Everything such as education, business, government work, and medical facilities are located around the mega city Seoul. This creates the uniqueness in educational circumstance in Korea, and differences in terms of placement test scores, reputation of the schools, level of curriculum, the level of teachers' education, and the number of teacher –student ratio, and these differences exist not only between suburban and urban schools, but also among schools within urban cities. School districts in urban cities can be divided as called “good school district” and the rest of them. Although the ministry of education does not officially admit this difference in order to prevent the further students concentration phenomenon, it has been avowedly existed as a unique environment. Therefore, there are visual

differences depending on the location of the school, which is originated from invisible dividing lines. For example, teachers from suburban schools feel that current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are not sufficient whereas teachers from urban schools feel the opposite. It may be due to the PD opportunities provided. Most of the PD opportunities are conveniently provided for the teachers in urban school. Therefore, teachers in suburban schools have difficult times of participating in PD. In addition to the PD opportunities, teachers from urban schools pointed out PD location as an important factor for PD participation whereas teachers from suburban schools did not. It may be also related with the PD opportunities since teachers from urban schools don't want to or have to participate in PD that is held in a long-distance location. On the other hand, PD location does not seem to be a factor for teachers from suburban schools in PD participation due to lack of PD opportunities in close location for teachers in suburban.

Also, regular teachers and contract teachers have different perspectives about PD as was reported in this study due to the unique phenomenon of an increase in contract teachers in Korea. It was found that contract teachers have higher motivation for language proficiency development than regular teachers. Also, a majority of contract teachers think the form of lecture PD is helpful whereas regular teachers tend to think PD in the form of a lecture is not helpful. Contract teachers are up for anything that might improve their qualification and CV to establish a good reputation in order to be re-contracted. Therefore, this may explain why contract teachers tend to have positive perspectives toward most of the types of PD. On the other hand, contract teachers responded that PD during vacation would not eventually have an effect on student achievement, whereas regular teachers think PD during vacation will eventually have an effect on student achievement. As was reported in the survey results, teachers' interviews also supported that

teachers, especially contract teachers, search for immediate use of information from PD since contract teachers tend to move to other schools after their contract, which is 1 year for the maximum. So moving to another school changes teaching circumstances such as level of students they are teaching, principals' educational philosophy, textbook, and etc., which means they may think the information they are acquiring during vacation won't be effective for later use when they change schools.

From these results, it can be considered that one type of PD will not fit all teachers' needs that are seeking PD more focused on certain contents such ideas about pedagogy, researches and theories, and resources or seeking PD in different kinds of forms such as mentoring, lecture, discussion forum and so on. Teaching experience has an effect on teachers' beliefs and perspectives, the location of the school has an effect on the opportunities of PD, and qualification of teachers has an effect on the preferred contents and types of PD.

Practicality of PD Information

Interestingly, practical has multiple meanings in this study. Practicality was a big issue in this study since the term "practical" was both explicitly and implicitly mentioned through participants' surveys and interviews. The majority of participants listed 'practical' as the main characteristic of high quality PD. Also, a majority of participants pointed out practical information acquisition as an important motivation for PD participation, such as for acquisition of practical and pedagogical knowledge, acquisition of teaching resources, and improvement of teaching in general. Generally, 'practical' is used in the opposite of 'theoretical' or 'abstract, however, it was found that teachers in this study tended to treat information or resources for immediate use as practical when teachers talked about the effectiveness of PD, PD quality, and implementation of PD whereas participants think potential use as not practical.

Therefore, ideas from PD are more likely to be implemented if the resources are for immediate use with directions for modification provided. The survey data from this study found that the main reasons of not using PD information were mostly related with the implementation process, not because of the quality of PD information. Teachers both who have tried to implement PD information or have not tried to implement the information expressed concerned that they did not know how to implement PD information in their classroom, provided information was not developmentally appropriate for their students, provided information aimed for very specific students and did not seem to work for their classroom, and their school does not have enough resources for implementation. It is worth noting that teachers benefit from PD that is specific, but when the information from PD is too specific, they don't know how to modify and implement in their classroom. Therefore, PD that fulfills teachers' specific needs should be provided with the possibilities of modification for effective implementation. Also, this study revealed that teachers valued resources from PD that are for immediate use. Seeking information for immediate use derived from the work environment in Korea. As was also found in the interviews, considering the lack of preparation time for the classes and rapidly changing EFL educational trends, resources for immediate use seems to be more useful than resources for potential use.

Competing Balance Demands

Previous research has concentrated on the intensity, duration, and contents of the PD as important features of effective PD. However, this study found it is much more complex for teachers to consider PD as effective. The PD presenter, PD organization, types of PD participation, PD formats, location of PD and schedules are the critical factors and all these factors synthetically work in order to be effective PD. For example, teachers' interviews revealed

that teachers preferred onsite PD and abroad PD experience. Only by looking at the location of the PD, it seems like two totally different types of PD were selected which also means that teachers did not select on-site PD based on their convenience. In this case, where PD is offered is not solely an issue with this data because it is also related with the formats and contents regarding both on-site and abroad PD experience. However, onsite PD offers a new perspective of how it can benefit teachers to be in a circumstance where they are familiar and have easy access to the resources. It was not only easier access for teachers' physical PD participation that they don't have to go somewhere else other than their school, but also gives them a psychological comfort and give them authority of being active in learning by using resources that they are familiar with.

In addition to the above findings, this study also investigated teachers' preference of PD schedules and found that teachers mostly prefer PD provided after school during weekdays for less than an hour, or during vacation for less than a week, whereas PD provided during weekends for 6-8 hours or online PD for over an hour were least preferred. Their responses reflect that teachers not only consider convenience, but also consider the efficiency. If the convenience was the only considerable factor, teachers would not have chosen a longer period of PD, which more likely would be held in long distance location such as during vacation. Also, online PD is potentially the most convenient PD for teachers but least preferred. It can be assumed that the teachers think about so many variables competitively and try to find optimal balance among duration, immediate use of information, investment of hours, feasibility, efficiency, and want to avoid being overwhelmed when they consider PD preference.

As was resulted in their responses, PD during weekdays most positively affected teachers on practical knowledge about EFL teaching, greater self-confidence and higher self-efficacy,

student achievement, and applicability to their teaching practice in comparison to PD during vacation and online PD. Online PD and the PD during the weekend were the least preferred by the participants of this study; as was mentioned earlier, none of the participants of this study has experience for PD during weekend. It turned out that the participants of this study do not prefer PD during weekend. It can be assumed that the reason teachers do not prefer PD during the weekend may not be related to its effectiveness or weakness of the PD program itself, because they don't know these without experiencing it. But it may be more related with balancing factors such as personal or school schedules, capabilities, location of PD, or physiological needs of break from work. Moreover, participants were very skeptical about the effectiveness of online PD as was found that teachers were not benefitted from online PD but it only makes them to be overwhelmed. Teachers' interview also supported that some participants choose online PD mainly for convenience reason such as, in order to just fulfill the requirements hour of PD, doing it while they are on a different task, took shorter times, they can do it anywhere and etc. Therefore, teachers admit the limitations and weakness of online PD, but some teachers still choose online PD for convenience over effectiveness. These can influence teachers' future selection of PD participation since teachers construct new understandings using what they already know according to constructivism theory.

Moreover, motivation to PD participation was also found to create challenge for teachers to balance between intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. As was reviewed in literature, there were two types of motivation that are internal (intrinsic) or external (extrinsic) motivation. It was found that the majority of teachers participated in PD with various motivation both internal and external (Bradley, 1991; Craft, 2000; Sybouts & Wendel, 1994) and mostly for internal motivation (Giavrimis, Giossi, and Papastamatis, 2011; Mestry, Hendricks, and Bisschoff, 2009).

It seems like studies focus on the types of motivation usually consider a person's motivation simply fall into the one of the categories either internal or external. And most of the time internal motivation is treated as higher and better motivation that result higher outcomes and being professional whereas external motivation is treated as lower level of motivation. According to the self-determination theory, it cannot overlooked that the qualities of their experiential and behavioral components are different in terms of willingness, creativeness, and demonstration of conceptual or intuitive understanding (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991). However, it should be noting that teachers are struggle to balance both internal and external motivation and they are kind of cohered while they consider motivation to participation. For example, it was discovered that teachers who chose external motivation such as promotion, salary, requirement of the school, and etc. as a strong influence also chose internal motivation such as improvement in teaching, language development, and etc. It shows that motivation is not the matter of valuing one type of motivation over the other type, but teachers mostly have both types of motivation and try to balance meeting both of them.

As was looked at the factors that have an effect on PD participation, this study found that there are many factors when teachers consider PD participation. Therefore, it is actually the matter of balancing competing demands for teachers to combine and PD participation is much more complicated process for teachers depending on their conditions and values.

Previous literature investigated the effectiveness of PD for improvement of teachers in general that was too broad. For example, this literature described how teachers' curricular knowledge and understanding about subjects or certain topics have changed after the PD (Cherubini et al., 2002; Ermeling, 2010; Frey & Fisher, 2009; Kennedy, 1998; Levine & Marcus, 2010; Morais et al., 2005; Seymour & Osana, 2003), how PD has resulted in instructional

changes and increases in teachers' use of practice (Desimone et al., 2002; Garet et al., 2001; Hughes, 2005; Loucks-Horsley et al., 1998), and how PD has influence on teachers' attitude toward students' learning (Benton & Richardson, 1993; Day & Sachs, 2004; Lessing & De Witt, 2007). However, this literature did not investigate what specific knowledge and understandings were changed, what types of changes occur in teachers' instruction, and how the teachers' use of practice increased, and so on. However, this study found that the effectiveness of PD has many aspects depending on the types of PD, more specific knowledge, and additional aspects when teachers make decisions about the effectiveness of PD. By providing the result in improvement or acquisition of specific knowledge or information for each type of PD, it allows us to know, from the teacher's perspective, which types of PD are more effective on certain types of knowledge acquisition and teaching improvement.

Moreover, many researchers concluded that teachers' participation in a professional-development program improved their confidence and helped them to become more effective and efficient (Elmore, 2002; Farrel, Kerry, & Kerry, 1995; Pennell & Firestone, 1996; Guskey, 2000; Oldroyd, Elsner, & Poster, 1996), but did not discover that there is more complicated process involved in contributing to teachers' perceptions of their self-efficacy and self-esteem. This study added that social interaction plays an important role in self-efficacy and self-esteem and how it decreases or increases self-efficacy and self-esteem.

Then this study added more information to existing literature about the important features of PD. No single feature of PD is considered as the most important, but also teachers struggle to maintain their many competing demands while they participate in PD. Moreover, not only is content an important aspect as was found in the literature, but also formats of information delivery and types of participation are important.

Therefore, this study provides additional findings rather than confirmation or disconfirmation of the existing literature for better understanding about teachers' thoughts about the effectiveness of PD, motivations, and PD information use by adding new aspects of PD.

Limitations of the Study

Even though this study contributes to the better understanding about teachers' thoughts about the effectiveness of PD, motivation, and PD information use, the main concern with this study is that data is primarily from teachers' self-report. As it has been pointed out, teacher self-reports can be subject to bias, and there are possibilities that teachers are reporting socially desirable responses (Schwartz 1999; Schwartz and Oyserman 2001). In relation to that, the data from this study does not follow up with the observation in PD site and classroom. Longitudinal studies may allow researchers to observe and evaluate how teachers use, modify or non-use information from PD more in depth. Moreover, observation may provide the objective evaluation whether teachers use, modify, and discard the information from PD, but it is still difficult to investigate how teachers use, modify, and discard the information from PD since every classroom is unique and the process of implementation decision will be based on many variables in the classroom. So without extensive investigation of the decision making process of teachers, providing meaningful analysis and clear pictures for implementation of PD information are not guaranteed.

Second, this study deals with types of PD that were diverse in terms of schedule, duration, approaches, contents, formats, and other accommodations. That allows us to have a comprehensive view for Korean EFL teachers' thoughts and motivation about PD in general, yet it did not provide detailed information about specific types of PD. Studies focused more

specifically on the types of PD would provide more accurate and detailed information about teachers thoughts and motivation.

A third important limitation is that teachers have participated in a series of PD through their long career, so it was not feasible to recall all their PD experience and which information was useful or they have implemented. Therefore, providing equivalent PD evaluation forms ahead of the time and collecting these after PD would resolve this limitation.

Finally, this study only focused on teachers like many studies of PD, which leaves out the effect on student achievement. It was based on the assumption that improvement of teaching will eventually improve students' learning. However, it is difficult to prove the relationship between improvement of teaching and student achievement as was stated earlier.

Future Study

Despite the fact that this study has limitations, the results of this study have several implications for future research. A useful next step would be to study what kinds of help teachers need to use information from PD more effectively after PD participation. Since most of the reasons of non -usage of PD information were related to the modification, future studies could investigate what specific needs teachers seek for the PD information implementation.

Another useful direction would be to investigate if there are other factors that influence teachers' thoughts and so on about PD. Possible factors for more investigation would be the roles of the teachers (whether they are homeroom teacher or subject teachers), the positions of the teachers (head teacher of the English or grade), education backgrounds (studying abroad, having TESOL certificate, and so on).

In addition, as many teachers addressed in this study, teachers look for immediate use of information from PD rather than future use. It is clear that teachers look for instant use of PD information and one of the urgent motivations to participate in PD is to obtain worksheets and ‘good ideas’ for use in class the next day which is their definition of being practical (Anderson, 2008). However, more detailed and long- termed investigation on changes in teachers’ knowledge benefitted from PD should be made. In order to better understand teachers’ knowledge development through PD, we need to investigate the PD participation from a perspective of teacher development.

Finally, efforts to investigate the effect of PD on students should be made. Even though there were efforts to connect the impact of PD on student achievement, connection between impact of PD and students’ reflection should be examined. Because changes in teaching practice due to effective PD may not always guarantee students’ higher achievement since there are too many variables. However, whether students have positive or negative reaction to the changes in teaching practice due to PD experience can tell us whether it is effective or not.

APPENDICES

Appendix A : Background information

This survey is part of a Michigan State University research study on 100 English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers in Korea. As part of this study, we are surveying teachers about their experiences with professional development.

We want you to know that:

1. We are asking you these questions to better understand how teachers perceive professional development (PD), their motivations for participating in PD, and how they use information acquired through PD.
2. Your name, the name of your school, the name of your district, and your responses to the questions in this survey will be kept strictly confidential among members of the research team at Michigan State.
3. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer; however, we hope that you will answer as many questions as you can.

Please put your full name on this line:

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Yeoreum Lee or Dr. Jeff Bale, study director, at (517)353-0750 or jbale@msu.edu.

1. Gender:

Male		Female	
------	--	--------	--

2. Age:

20-25		26-30		31-35		36-40		41-45	
46-50		51-55		56-60		60-65			

3. Education:

Undergraduate		Master's		Ph. D	
---------------	--	----------	--	-------	--

4. Teaching Experience:

1-5		6-10		11-15		15-20		20-25	
26-30		31-35		36-40					

5. Teaching grade:

Elementary	
Middle	
High	

6. School location _____

7. List all the EFL professional development programs you participated

8. Teacher qualification

Full time teacher type A (Graduate college of education and pass teacher qualifying exam)		Short-term teacher type A Graduate college with completion of course for teacher training and pass teacher qualifying exam)	
Full time teacher type B (Graduate college with completion of course for teacher training and work in private school)		Short-term teacher type B (Graduate college and receive TESOL certificate)	

Appendix B: Survey

A-1. Please indicate the extent to which you believe that each of the following kinds of PD is helpful on a scale of 1-4 with 4 being very helpful.

	Not helpful at all			Very helpful
PD introducing new research findings or theories about EFL	1	2	3	4
PD introducing new ideas about pedagogy	1	2	3	4
PD introducing new teaching resources such as software programs, books, etc.	1	2	3	4
PD providing discussion forums with other EFL teachers	1	2	3	4
PD in the form of formal mentoring	1	2	3	4
PD in the form of lecture sessions from EFL experts	1	2	3	4
PD providing discussion forums with EFL experts	1	2	3	4
PD providing hands-on activities	1	2	3	4
PD providing English language practice experience	1	2	3	4

A-2. What types of PD do you prefer? Please rank up to 2 of the following that you prefer:

___PD provided after school for 1 hour or less

___PD provided after school for more than 1 hour

___PD provided over the weekend for half day or less (3-4 hours)

___PD provided over the weekend for 1 full day (6-8 hours)

___PD provided during summer/ winter vacation for 1 week or less

___PD provided during summer/ winter vacation for more than 1 week

___PD provided online for 1 hour or less

___PD provided online for more than 1 hour

A-3. Which of the following do you prefer? (Mark only one)

___ PD provided for a shorter period with higher intensity (eg., for 2 full days)

___ PD provided for a longer period with lower intensity (eg., 1-2 hours for 10 days or more)

A-4. Please indicate your agreement on a scale of 1-4 with 4 being strongly agree.

	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree
Professional development programs should be only for novice teachers.	1	2	3	4
All EFL teachers should make an effort to stay current in the EFL field by participating in PD.	1	2	3	4
EFL PD is important for effective teaching.	1	2	3	4
Current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are sufficient.	1	2	3	4
Current professional development programs for EFL teachers in Korea are effective.	1	2	3	4

A-5. If you have participated in **PD provided after school on weekdays**, please indicate your agreement on a scale of 1-4 with 4 being strongly agree. If you have not participated **PD provided after school on weekdays**, then please go to A-6.

PD provided **after school on weekdays**..

	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree
has helped me to gain theoretical knowledge about EFL teaching.	1	2	3	4
has helped me to gain practical knowledge about EFL teaching.	1	2	3	4
has helped me to gain knowledge about EFL learners.	1	2	3	4
has helped me to have greater self-confidence and higher self - efficacy.	1	2	3	4
will eventually have an affect on student achievement.	1	2	3	4
is applicable to my teaching practice.	1	2	3	4
provided too much information but does not make me overwhelmed.	1	2	3	4
provided too much information and makes me overwhelmed.	1	2	3	4

A-6. If you have participated in **PD provided over the weekend**, indicate your agreement on a scale of 1-4 with 4 being strongly agree. If you have not participated **PD provided over the weekend**, then go to A-7.

PD provided **over the weekend**..

	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree
has helped me to gain theoretical knowledge about EFL teaching.	1	2	3	4
has helped me to gain practical knowledge about EFL teaching.	1	2	3	4
has helped me to gain knowledge about EFL learners.	1	2	3	4

has helped me to have greater self-confidence and higher self - efficacy.	1	2	3	4
will eventually have an affect on student achievement.	1	2	3	4
is applicable to my teaching practice.	1	2	3	4
provided too much information but does not make me overwhelmed.	1	2	3	4
provided too much information and makes me overwhelmed.	1	2	3	4

A-7. If you have participated in **PD provided during summer/ winter vacation**, indicate your agreement on a scale of 1-4 with 4 being strongly agree. If you have not participated **PD provided during summer/ winter vacation**, then go to A-8.

PD provided **during summer/ winter vacation**.

	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree
has helped me to gain theoretical knowledge about EFL teaching.	1	2	3	4
has helped me to gain practical knowledge about EFL teaching.	1	2	3	4
has helped me to gain knowledge about EFL learners.	1	2	3	4
has helped me to have greater self-confidence and higher self - efficacy.	1	2	3	4
will eventually have an affect on student achievement.	1	2	3	4
is applicable to my teaching practice.	1	2	3	4
provided too much information but does not make me overwhelmed.	1	2	3	4
provided too much information and makes me overwhelmed.	1	2	3	4

A-8. If you have participated in **PD provided online**, please indicate your agreement on a scale of 1-4 with 4 being strongly agree. If you have not participated **PD provided online**, then go to A-9.

PD provided **PD provided online**.

	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree
has helped me to gain theoretical knowledge about EFL teaching.	1	2	3	4
has helped me to gain practical knowledge about EFL teaching.	1	2	3	4
has helped me to gain knowledge about EFL learners.	1	2	3	4
has helped me to have greater self-confidence and higher self - efficacy.	1	2	3	4
will eventually have an affect on student achievement.	1	2	3	4
is applicable to my teaching practice.	1	2	3	4
provided too much information but does not make me overwhelmed.	1	2	3	4
provided too much information and makes me overwhelmed.	1	2	3	4

A-9. What is one (1) word or phrase that describes the most effective professional development program?

A-10. What is one (1) word or phrase that describes the least effective professional development program?

B-1. On a scale of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest influence, please rate the following factors as to their likelihood of motivating you to participate in a professional development programs.

	Weakest influence			Strongest influence
As an effort to stay current in EFL field	1	2	3	4
Requirement of school or government	1	2	3	4
Promotion	1	2	3	4
Salary raise	1	2	3	4
Language proficiency development	1	2	3	4
Practical and pedagogical knowledge development	1	2	3	4

B-2. On a scale of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest influence, please rate the following factors as to their likelihood of motivating you to participate in a professional development program.

	Weakest influence			Strongest influence
Social network	1	2	3	4
Getting information about a particular reform/ educational policy/ test	1	2	3	4
Acquiring teaching resources	1	2	3	4
Improvement of teaching in general	1	2	3	4
Others (please specify) _____	1	2	3	4

B-3. On a scale of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest influence, please rate the following factors as to whether you consider them in deciding whether to participate in a professional development program

	Weakest influence			Strongest influence
Length (duration)	1	2	3	4
Intensity	1	2	3	4
Schedule (school calendar)	1	2	3	4
Schedule (personal)	1	2	3	4

Content (specific topic)	1	2	3	4
Location (distance)	1	2	3	4

B-4. On a scale of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest influence, please rate the following factors as to whether you consider them in deciding whether to participate in a professional development program.

	Weakest influence			Strongest influence
Cost/school budget	1	2	3	4
Other colleagues' recommendation, review	1	2	3	4
Instructors	1	2	3	4
Popularity	1	2	3	4
Others (please specify)_____	1	2	3	4

B-5. On a scale of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest influence, please rate the following factors as to whether you consider them in deciding whether to participate in a professional development program.

	Weakest influence			Strongest influence
Too many professional development experiences	1	2	3	4
Previous professional development was not effective	1	2	3	4
Theoretical rather than practical	1	2	3	4
School schedule too busy	1	2	3	4
No follow-up programs (one time event)	1	2	3	4

Overwhelmed feeling after PD (too much information)	1	2	3	4
Not transferable to my classroom	1	2	3	4

B-6. On a scale of 1-4 with 4 being the strongest influence, please rate the following factors as to whether you consider them in deciding whether to participate in a professional development program.

	Weakest influence			Strongest influence
Low budget from the school	1	2	3	4
School not supporting my participation	1	2	3	4
Complicated process for submitting documents after PD	1	2	3	4
Low quality of PD	1	2	3	4
Lack of information about PD	1	2	3	4
Other(please specify) _____	1	2	3	4

C. Try to recall your most recent EFL PD experiences. Think about the most helpful recent PD experience, and answer the following questions.

C-1. Have you tried to implement the knowledge, research result, pedagogy, or activities that you learned about or acquired in your classroom?

Yes _____ (if yes, please go to C-2)

No _____ (if no, please go to C-3)

C-2. If yes, how did it go?
perfect

Poor

1 2 3 4

C-3. If no, why not? (Please check all that apply)

___ Acquired information(about research, pedagogy, or activities) that was too broad and didn't seem to work in my classroom.

- ___ Acquired information that was aimed for very specific students and didn't seem to work in my classroom.
- ___ Acquired information that was not up-to-date or current.
- ___ My school does not have enough resources for me to implement the new ideas in my class.
- ___ PD about certain topics was effective but it happened a long time ago.
- ___ Acquired information that was not consistent with my class objectives.
- ___ Acquired information that was not developmentally appropriate for the students in my class.
- ___ Acquired information that did not seem to be relevant or interesting for my students.
- ___ I just did not know how to implement in my classroom

Appendix C: Interview Question

1. Do you believe that EFL professional development programs are helpful or useful for teachers overall?

1.1 (If you think they are useful,) in what ways are PD programs useful or helpful to your teaching?

1.2. (If you do not think they are useful,) why do you think so? What would make professional development more useful and helpful?

2. In what ways have the EFL PD programs influenced your teaching in terms of understandings about

2.1 EFL teaching,

2.2 teaching philosophy,

2.3 understanding about EFL students (attitudes about learning English, motivations of students and etc.)?

If No, Why?

3. Try to recall your EFL PD experience across the past 3 years.

3.1 Describe your best professional development experience.

3.2 Describe your worst professional development experience.

3.3 What are the qualities that determine best PD and worst PD experience?

- 3.4 What is the most useful information or activities you learned from the PD? and the least useful information or activities that you remember from the PD? And why?
4. In what ways has the PD you participated in help you improve your teaching?
- 4.1 Give me specific examples of how can professional development program helped you to overcome a weakness and develop your strength?
- 4.2 In what ways has the PD programs you participated in help you to increase your self-efficacy and confidence?
5. Have you tried to implement any knowledge, activities, resources, and pedagogies that you learned from professional development?
- 5.1 Can you tell me about lesson plan/activities you've designed recently that used something you learned in a PD program?
- 5.2 What did you learn from using an activity that you learned in a PD program?
- 5.3 Were there any difficulties in trying to implement ideas from the PD program?
- 5.4 If you haven't tried, why?
- 5.5 For better implementation of the professional development , what can be improved?
6. Have you ever modified—added /deleted/changed something acquired information from a PD program? Could you give me some examples?

7. Even if you can't implement information directly from PD, did you have any aspect of the PD useful? (if yes) How?

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Adelson, J. L., & McCoach, D. B. (2010). Measuring mathematical attitudes of elementary students: The effects of a 4-point or 5-point likert-type scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70, 796–807.
- Adey, P., with Hewitt, G., Hewitt, J. and Landau, N. (2004) *The professional development of teachers: Practice and Theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Ahn, H. (2013). English policy in South Korea: A role in attaining global competitiveness or a vehicle of social mobility? *Journal of English as an International Language*, 8(1),1-20.
- Applefield, J. M., Huber, R., & Moallem, M. (2000). Constructivism in theory and practice: Toward a better understanding. *The High School Journal*, 35-53.
- Anderson, J. (2008). Teachers' motivation to attend voluntary professional development in K-10 mathematics: *31st Annual Conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia (MERGA31)*. Brisbane, Australia: MERGA.
- Axinn, W. G., & Pearce, L. D. (2006). *Mixed method data collection strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, W.(1990). Market networks and corporate behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96, 589–625.
- Baker-Henningham, H., & Walker, S. (2009). A qualitative study of teacher's perceptions of an intervention to prevent conduct problems in Jamaican pre-schools. *Child Care Health and Development*, 35(5), 632-642.
- Ball, D. L. (1996). Teacher learning and the mathematics reforms: What do we think we know and what do we need to learn? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(7), 500- 508.
- Banilower, E. R. (2002). *Results of the 2001–2002 study of the impact of the local systemic change initiative on student achievement in science*. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research.
- Benton, G. J., & Richardson, G. D. (1993). *A professional development school's impact on student teachers' attitudes*. Washington, D.C : Eric Clearing House.
- Bobrowsky, W., Marx, R. W., & Fishman, B. (2001). *The empirical base for professional development in science education: Moving beyond volunteers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Research in Science Teaching, St. Louis, Missouri.

- Bonometti, R. J., & Tang, J. (2006). A dynamic technique for conducting online survey based research. *Competitiveness Review*, 16 (2), 97–105.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 3-15.
- Bradly, H. (1991). *Staff development*. London: Falmer Press.
- Bredeson, P. (2003). *Designs for learning: A new architecture for professional development in schools*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Brinkerhoff, J. (2006). Effects of a long-duration, professional development academy on technology skills, computer self-efficacy, and technology integration beliefs and practices. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 39(1), 22-43.
- Busch, M. (1993). Using Likert scales in L2 research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 733-736.
- Campbell, J.P., Dunnette, M.D., Lawler, E.E., & Weick, K.E. (1970). *Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Carpenter, T.P., Fennema, E., Peterson, P.L. & Cary, D.A. (1988). Teachers pedagogical content knowledge of student's problem solving in elementary arithmetic. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 19(4), 345-357.
- Chapelle, C., & Duff, P. (2003). Some guidelines for conducting quantitative and qualitative research in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 157-178.
- Charmaz, K. (1983). The grounded theory method: An explication and interpretation. In R. M. Emerson (Ed.), *Contemporary field Research: A Collection of Readings* (pp. 109-128). Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (2nd ed.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp.509-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cherubini, G.,Zambelli, F.,& Boscolo,P. (2002). Student motivation: An experience of in-service education as a context for professional development of teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(3), (2002), 273–288.
- Cohen, D.K. & Hill, H.C. (1998). *State policy and classroom performance: Mathematics reform in California*. CPRE Policy Briefs (RB 23,1-16).
- Cohen, D. K., & Hill, H. C. (2001). *Learning policy: When state education reform works*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American journal of sociology*, S95-S120.
- Corner, M. (2000). How adults learn. Retrieved from [http://www. learnativity.com /adultlearning.html](http://www.learnativity.com/adultlearning.html)
- Craft, A. (2000). *Continuing professional development*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crow, G. M. (2009). The development of school leaders' professional identities: Challenges and implications for interprofessional practice. In J. Forbes, & C. Watson (Eds.), *Research into professional identities: Theorizing social and institutional identities* (pp. 41-52). Aberdeen, Scotland :University of Aberdeen, School of Education.
- Danaher, S., Price, J., & Kluth, P. (2009). Come to the fair. *Educational Leadership*, 66(5). 70-72.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher learning that supports student learning. *Educational Leadership*, 55(5), 6-11.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1), 1–44.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional Learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*. Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council.
- Day, C., & Sachs, J. (2004). Professionalism, performativity and empowerment: Discourses in the politics, policies and purposes of continuing professional development. In C. Day, & J. Sachs (Eds). *International handbook on the continuing professional development of teachers* (pp. 3–32). Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Desimone, L., Porter, A. C., Garet, M., Yoon, K. S., & Birman, B. (2002). Does professional development change teachers' instruction? Results from a three-year study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(2), 81–112.
- Deci, E.L., Vallerand, R.J., Pelletier, L.G., & Ryan, R.M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *The Educational Psychologist*, 26, 325-346.
- de Charms, R. (1968). *Personal causation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Dewey, J.(1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dillman, A.D. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ : John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Drago-Severson, E., & Pinto, K. (2006). School leadership for reducing teacher isolation: Drawing from the well of human resources. *The International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 9(2), 129-155.
- Easton, L. (2008). From professional development to professional learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(10), 755-759.
- Edutopia Staff. (2008). Why is teacher development important?: Because students deserve the best. Retrieved from <http://www.edutopia.org/teacher-development-introduction>.
- Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Elmore, R. F. (2002). *Bridging the gap between standards and achievement: The imperative for professional development in education*. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.
- Elmore, R. F., & Burney, D. (1997). *Investing in teacher learning: Staff development and instructional improvement in community school district #2, New York City*. New York: National Commission on Teaching & America's Future & the Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Elliott, S.N., Kratochwill, T.R., Cook, J.L., & Travers, J.F. (2000). *Educational psychology: Effective teaching, effective learning* (3rd ed.). McGraw Hill: Boston.
- Engstrom, M., & Danielson, L. (2006). Teachers' perceptions of an on-site staff development model. *Clearing House*, 79(4), 170-173.
- Ermeling, B.A. (2010). Tracing the effects of teacher inquiry on classroom practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(3), 377-388.
- Farrel, M., Kerry, T., & Kerry, C. (1995). *The blackwell handbook of education*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fishman, B. J., Marx, R. W., Best, S., & Tal, R. T. (2003). Linking teacher and student learning to improve professional development in systemic reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 643-658.
- Frey, N., & Fisher, D. (2009). Using common formative assessments as a source of professional development in an urban American elementary school. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 674-680.
- Fullan, M. (2000). The return of large-scale reform. *Journal of Educational Change*, 1(1), 5-28.
- Fullan, M. (2007). Change the terms for teacher learning. *Journal of Staff Development*, 28(3), 35-36.
- Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction*.

White Plains, NY, England: Longman Publishing.

- Garland R (1991). The mid-point of a rating scale: Is it desirable? *Marketing Bulletin*, 2, 66-70.
- Gallitano, G.M., & Jackson, K. (2011). The content and format of a professional development program and its attitudinal effect on teachers of mathematics. *International journal of education and information technologies*. 3(5), 336-343.
- Gallucci, C. (2008). District wide instructional reform: Using sociocultural theory to link professional learning to organizational support. *American Journal of Education*, 114(4), 541-581.
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L. M., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 915-945.
- Gerring, J. (2004). What is a case study and what is it good for?. *American Political Science Review*, 98(02), 341-354.
- Giavrimis, P., Giossi, S., & Papastamatis, A. (2011). Teachers' attitudes towards training in ICT: A critical approach. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 19(3), 283-296.
- Gibson, S.E., & Brooks, C. (2012). Teachers' perspectives on the effectiveness of a locally planned professional development program for implementing new curriculum. *Teacher Development: An International Journal of Teachers' Professional Development*, 16(1), 1-23.
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Pr.
- Gore, J. M., & Gitlin, A. D. (2004). Visioning the academic-teacher divide: Power and knowledge in the educational community. *Teachers and Teaching*, 10(1), 35-58.
- Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3), 255-274.
- Grootaert, C., Narayan, D., Nyhan Jones, V., & Woolcock, M. (2004). *Measuring social capital : An integrated questionnaire*. Washington DC : The World Bank.
- Groth, R. E., & Bergner, J. A. (2007). Teachers' perspectives on mathematics education research reports. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 809-825.
- Guion, L. A., Diehl, D. C., & McDonald, D. (2011). *Triangulation: Establishing the validity of qualitative studies*. University of Florida: IFAS Extension.
- Guskey, T.R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Guskey, T. R., & Sparks, D. (1996). Exploring the relationship between staff development and improvements in student learning. *Journal of Staff Development*, 17(4), 34-38.
- Guskey, T. R., & Yoon, K. S. (2009). What works in professional development? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(7), 495-500.
- Howard, B. C., McGee, S., Schwartz, N., & Purcell, S. (2000). The experience of constructivism: Transforming teacher epistemology. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 32(4), 455-465.
- Higgins, J., & Parsons, R. (2009). A successful professional development model in mathematics: A system-wide New Zealand case. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60 (3), 231-242.
- Hollins, E.R., McIntyre, L.R., DeBose, C., Hollins, K.S., & Towner, A. (2004). Promoting a self-sustaining learning community: Investigating an internal model for teacher development. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 17(2), 247-264.
- Holt-Reynolds, D. (1992). Personal history-based beliefs as relevant prior knowledge in course work. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(2), 325-49
- Hord, S.M. (1997). Professional learning communities: What are they and why are they important? *Issues about Change*, 6(1). Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/change/issues/issues61.html>.
- Hughes, J. (2005). The role of teacher knowledge and learning experiences in forming technology-integrated pedagogy. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 13(2), 277-302.
- Hull, G. (1997). Research with words: Qualitative inquiry. *Focus on Basics*, 1(1), 13-16.
- Huse, E. F., & Bowditch, J. L. (1977). *Behavior in organizations*. Massachusetts: Addison Wesley.
- Johri, P. K. (2005). *Foundations of Education*. New Delhi: Armol Publications.
- Jones, M., & Eick, C. (2007). Providing bottom-up support to middle school science teachers' reform efforts in using inquiry-based kits. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 18, 913-934.
- Joram, E. (2007). Clashing epistemologies: aspiring teachers', practicing teachers', and professors' beliefs about knowledge and research in education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 123-135
- Joyce, B., & Calhoun, E. (1996). School renewal: An inquiry, not a prescription. In E. Calhoun & B. Joyce (Eds.), *Learning experiences in school renewal: An exploration of five successful programs* (pp. 175-190). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 65-90.
- Kang, N., & Hong, M. (2008). Achieving excellence in teacher workforce and equity in learning opportunities in South Korea. *Educational Researcher*, 37(4), 200-207.
- Kast, E.F., & Rogenzweig, E. J. (1979). *Organization and management : A systems and Contingency Approach*. Auckland: McGraw-Hill.
- Kennedy, M.M. (1998). *Form and substance in in-service teacher education*. Madison :National Institute for Science Education.
- Killion, J. (1999). *What works in the middle: Results-based staff development*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.
- Killion, J. (2002a). *Assessing impact: Evaluating staff development*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.
- Killion, J. (2002b). *What works in the elementary school: Results-based staff development*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.
- Kim, Y. (2008). The Effects of Integrated Language- Based Instruction in Elementary ESL Learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(3), 431-451.
- Knapp, M.S. (2003). Professional development as policy pathway. *Review of Research in Education*, 27(1), 109-157.
- Knowles, M., (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. New York: The Adult Education Company.
- Korman, M. (1974). National conference on levels and patterns of professional training in psychology: Major themes. *American Psychologist*, 29, 301-313.
- Krapp, A. (1999). Interest, motivation and learning: An educational-psychological perspective. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 14(1), 23-40.
- Kubitsky, B., & Fishman, B. (2007). A design for using long-term face-to-face workshops to support systemic reform. Retrieved from http://hi-ce.org/presentations/documents/Kubitskey_Fishman_AERA07.pdf
- Lauer, D., & Matthews, M. (2007). Teachers steer their own learning. *Journal of Professional Development*, 28(2), 36-41.
- Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., & Sablinski, C. J. (1999). Qualitative research in organizational and vocational psychology. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 55(2), 161-187.
- Lessing, A., & De Witt, M., (2007). The value of continuous professional development: teachers' perceptions. *South African Journal of Education*, 27 (1), 53-67.
- Levine, T.H., & Marcus, A.S. (2010). How the structure and focus of teachers'

- collaborative activities facilitate and constrain teacher learning, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(3), 389–398.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalist inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Loucks-Horsley, S., Hewson, P. W., Love, N., & Stiles, K. E. (1998). *Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Loucks-Horsely, S., Love, N., Stiles, K. E., Mundry, S. E., & Hewson, P. W. (2003). *Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Loucks- Horsley, S., & Matsumoto, C. (1999). Research on professional development for teachers of mathematics and science: The state of the scene. *School science and mathematics*, 99(5), 258-271.
- Louis, K. S., Kruse, S. D., & Marks, H. M. (1996). School wide professional development. In F. Newmann (Ed.). *Associates, Authentic Achievement: Restructuring Schools for Intellectual Quality* (pp.170–203). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Loury, Glenn C. 1977. “A Dynamic Theory of Racial Income Differences.” In Phyllis A. Wallace and Annette M. LaMond (Eds.). *Women, Minorities, and Employment Discrimination*. Lexington, MA and Toronto: Lexington Books.
- Lowden, C. (2006). Reality check. *Journal of Staff Development*, 27(1), 61-64.
- Marshall. G. (1998). Analytic induction. *A Dictionary of Sociology*. Retrieved from Encyclopedia.com:<http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1O88-analyticinduction.html>
- Martin, A. J., & Dowson, M. (2009). Interpersonal relationships, motivation, engagement, and achievement: Yields for theory, current issues, and educational practice. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 327-365.
- McLaughlin, M., & Oberman, I. (1996). *Teacher learning: New policies, new practices*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2001). *Professional communities and the work of high school teaching*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. Jossey-Bass Inc Pub.
- Mestry, R., Hendricks, I., & Bisschoff, T. (2009). Perceptions of teachers on the benefits of teacher development programmes in one province of South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*. 29(4), 475-490.
- Mikami, A., Gregory, A., Allen, J. P., Pianta, R. C. & Lun. J. (2011). Effects of a teacher professional development intervention on peer relationships in secondary classrooms. *School Psychology Review*. 40, 367-385.

- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (2002). *The qualitative researcher's companion*. Thousand Oaks.
- Mokhtari, K., Rosemary, C. A., & Edwards, P. A. (2007). Making instructional decisions based on data: What, how, and why. *Reading Teacher*, 61(4), 354-359.
- Morais, A.M., Neves, I.F, & Alfonso, M (2005). Teacher training processes and teachers' competence : A sociological study in the primary school, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(4), 415–437.
- Muijs, D., Day, C., Harris, A., & Lindsay, G. (2004). Evaluating CPD: An over- view. In C. Day & J. Sachs (Eds.), *International handbook on the continuing professional development of teachers* (pp. 291- 310). Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Nasser, F. M. (2001). Selecting an appropriate research design. *Research Pathways: Writing Professional Papers, theses, and dissertations in workforce education*, 91-106.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.(1989). *Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Nelson, T. H., & Slavit, D. (2008). Supported teacher collaborative inquiry. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35(1), 99–116.
- Newmann, F., & Wehlage, G. (1997). *Successful school restructuring: A report to the public and educators by the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools*. Madison, WI: Document Service, Wisconsin Center for Education Research.
- Nielsen, D. C., Barry, A. L., & Staab, P. T. (2008). Teachers reflections of professional change during a literacy-reform initiative. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 24(5), 1288-1303.
- Odden, A., & Archibald, S. (2009). *Doubling student performance: And finding the resources to do it*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Odden, A., Archibald, S., Fermanich, M., & Gallagher, H. A. (2002). A cost framework for professional development. *Journal of Education Finance*, 28(1), 51–74.
- Oldroyd, D., Elsner, D., & Poster, C. (1996). *Educational management today: A concise dictionary and guide*. London: P Chapman.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-333.
- Pennell, J. R., & Firestone, W. A. (1996). Changing classroom practices through teacher networks: Matching program features with teacher characteristics and circumstances. *Teachers College Record*, 98, 46-76.
- Perkins, G. H. (2004). Will libraries' web-based survey methods replace existing non-electronic survey methods?. *Information technology and libraries*, 23(3), 123.
- Piaget, J. (1973). *To understand is to invent*. Grossman Pubs..

- Pianta, R.C., Mashburn, A.J., Downer, J.T., Hamre, B.K., & Justice, L. (2008). Effects of web-mediated professional development resources on teacher-child interactions in pre-kindergarten classrooms. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 23, 431-451.
- Perez, M., Anand, P., Speroni, C., Parrish, T., Esra, P., Socias, M., & Gubbins, P. (2007). *Successful California schools in the context of educational adequacy*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Reese, S. (2010). Bring effective professional development to educator. *Online education and distance learning*, 6(3). 39-43.
- Reid, J. (1990). The dirty laundry of ESL survey research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 323-338.
- Richardson, V. (2003). The dilemmas of professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84 (5), 401-406.
- Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 749– 761.
- Saunders, W.M., Goldenberg, C.N. , & Gallimore, R.(2009) Increasing achievement by focusing grade level teams on improving classroom learning: a prospective, quasi-experimental study of Title 1 schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46 (4), 1006-1033.
- Saxe, G.B., Gearhart, M., & Nasir, N. (2001). Enhancing students' understanding of mathematics: A study of three contrasting approaches to professional support. *Journal for Research in Teacher Education*. 4, 55-79.
- Schmoker, M. (2002). The real causes of higher achievement. *SEDL Letter*, 14(2), 3–7.
- Schwarz, N. (1999). Self-reports: how the questions shape the answers. *American Psychologist*, 54(2), 93.
- Schwarz, N., & Oyserman, D. (2001). Asking questions about behavior: Cognition, communication, and questionnaire construction. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22(2), 127-160.
- Seymour, J.R., & Osana, H.P. (2003). Reciprocal teaching procedures and principles: Two teachers' developing understanding, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19(3), 325-344.
- Shulman, L., & Sparks, D. (1992). Merging content knowledge and pedagogy: An interview with Lee Shulman. *Journal of Staff Development*, 13(1), 14-16.
- Skelton, A. (2005). *Understanding teaching excellence in higher education towards a critical approach*. USA: Routledge.
- Song, S., Lee, D., & You, D.(2015). *Private education report*. Seoul Newspaper.

Retrieved from <http://www.seoul.co.kr/news/newsView.php?id=20150112003001>

- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. *Handbook of qualitative research*, 435-454.
- Stronge, J. H. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Suh, J. S. (1996). A study of the design of an in service teacher training program in Primary English education. *Elementary English Education*, Vol.2.
- Supovitz, J.A., Mayer, D.P., & Kahle, J.B. (2000). Promoting inquiry-based instructional practice: The longitudinal impact of professional development in the context of science teaching practices and classroom culture. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 37, 963-980.
- Supovitz, J. A., & Turner, H. M. (2000). The effects of professional development on science teaching practices and classroom culture. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 37(9), 963-980.
- Supovitz, J. A., & Zeif, S. G. (2000). Why they stay away. *Journal of Staff Development*, 21(4), 24-28.
- Sybouts, W., & Wendel, F. C. (1994). *The training and development of school principals: A handbook*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Thurmond, V. A. (2001). The point of triangulation. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 33(3), 253-258.
- Tienken, C. H., & Stonaker, L. (2007). When every day is professional development day. *Journal of Professional Development*, 28(2), 24-29.
- Torff, B., & Sessions, D. (2008). Factors associated with teachers' attitudes about professional development. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35(2), 123-133.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.
- Wenglinsky, H. (2002). How schools matter: The link between teacher classroom practices and student academic performance. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*. Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n12/>
- Wilson, M. S., Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (2001). *A case of successful teaching policy: Connecticut's long-term efforts to improve teaching and learning*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Wright, S.P., Horn, S.P., & Sanders, W.L. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 1(1), 57-67.

- Wu, H. (1999). Professional development of mathematics teachers. *Notices of the AMS*, 46(5), 535-542.
- Yin, R. K. (2006). Mixed methods research: Are the methods genuinely integrated or merely parallel. *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 41-47.
- Zetlin, A. G., MacLeod, E., & Michener, D., (1998). Professional development of teachers of language minority students through University-School Partnership. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 21(2), 109-120.