



2003 NFLRC SUMMER INSTITUTE:

Corpus Linguistics for Korean Language Teaching and Learning

June 30–July 11, 2003

EVALUATION

©2003 Robert Bley-Vroman & Hyun Sook Ko

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

CONTENTS

Background, goals, and overall design.....	3
Facilitators	5
Participants	7
Summary schedule	7
Workshop evaluation	9
Appendix A: Summary of participant responses to the evaluation instrument	12
Appendix B: Compilation of all participant responses to the evaluation instrument	16

BACKGROUND, GOALS, AND OVERALL DESIGN

Corpus linguistics studies takes advantage of the existence of large collections of language production (written or spoken language) in order to investigate a language. It bases its descriptions on the empirical characteristics of language production, in the first instance (rather than chiefly on theory, or speaker intuition).

The past decade, and especially the past several years have seen an explosion in corpus linguistic studies. This is due to several causes: First, personal computers have now the speed and storage capacity to process huge corpora (often involving tens or hundreds of millions of words — the equivalent hundreds or thousands of thousand-page books) in a few seconds. If one wants to find out how a word is used, for example, one can pull up hundreds of examples, in context, in a matter of seconds in a convenient display using readily available and inexpensive tools. Second, there now exist easily accessible and scientifically prepared collections of language — large and well-structured corpora — which the individual can easily use on a personal computer. Third, the world-wide web itself now contains an enormous amount of language, again readily accessible to the individual user. The web has also made the distribution of scientific corpora and corpus tools easy and convenient, as well as provided a forum for corpus linguists to interact — thus driving the field forward. Fourth, the field of natural language processing by computer (and artificial intelligence in general) has been exploring the ways in which probabilistic models can improve processing: These probabilistic models require tools that investigate the statistical structure of language output, and this of course involves corpus studies.

Foreign language pedagogy is now beginning to see new possibilities for recent advances in corpus linguistics to improve language teaching and learning. To be sure, the results of older “classic” corpus-based studies of the have long been of interest to language teaching, especially with regard to word frequency studies as informing decisions about materials development, grading of materials, and assessment. These early studies, from the period before the mid-1990’s were produced by specialists working with mainframe computers at major universities and research institutes. Certainly, corpus linguistics was nothing that an ordinary classroom teacher or learner could possibly do.

What we are seeing now is something quite different and potentially revolutionary. Readily available corpora and easy-to-use tools now can be used on the spot in a language teaching context, by teachers and learners without extensive training in computational linguistics, and studies of linguistic features can be tailored to specific pedagogic context and learning requirements. Thus corpus linguistics fits in with the current emphasis on authentic materials and on task-based language teaching — emphases of other Hawai‘i NFLRC projects.

The use of corpus linguistics for language teaching, up to now, been almost exclusively concentrated on English as a target, with a few rare small-scale examples in European languages. There has been little or no use of corpus linguistics for language pedagogy in less-commonly-taught languages, in particular those of Asia and the Pacific. For example, in most recent North American Conference on Corpus Linguistics and Language Teaching, there was not a single presentation that did not deal with English or a widely studied European language. Already, a range of books and articles deals with

the use of corpus linguistics for English teaching. There are now several book-length works dealing with corpus linguistics and language teaching; in none is there any significant treatment of any language but English, or very occasionally of a European language.

Corpus linguistics for Korean is now well-advanced. Initial difficulties involving the writing system have been solved. Tools and corpora for Korean now exist and can be made available to teachers. However, corpus linguistics has not been widely used in Korean language teaching, and Korean language teachers in are generally not acquainted with the tools and have had little opportunity to explore the possibilities of their use in pedagogical contexts.

The workshop on Corpus Linguistics for Korean Language Learners and Teaching, organized the National Foreign Language Center at the University of Hawai'i, was intended to help a small leadership group of Korean language teachers from around the U.S. become acquainted with the available resources and to begin to explore the possibilities for the classroom. The primary goal was to help the participants develop the skills of using corpus linguistic tools, to investigate possible conceptual frameworks for the use of corpus linguistics in language teaching, and to begin work on small concrete projects that could be continued in larger scope when they returned to their home institutions.

The purpose of the workshop focused on corpus linguistics as part of the practical armamentarium of a language teacher; it did not focus on corpus linguistics as a tool for scientific linguistic investigations. This was a workshop on corpus linguistics for language learning and teaching, not a workshop on scientific corpus linguistics.

Because we find ourselves at the beginning of the use of corpus linguistics in Korean language pedagogy, the workshop could not, and did not pretend to provide participants with ready-made and tested lessons and materials. Rather, participants were led to explore cooperatively with each other and with the workshop facilitators, the many possibilities that suggest themselves. It was hoped that this open-ended and exploratory approach would be welcomed by participants and would in generate in a wide range of new ideas.

The workshop was intended to acquaint the participants with the basic concepts of the field, including corpus construction and annotation, concordancing, frequency counts and ranks, grammatical tagging, and related concepts. Participants learned how to access available Korean corpora and how to use the several available computer programs for analysis. The workshop outlined techniques that have been proposed for the teacher to use in materials preparation and curriculum design, and for the individual learner to use in exploring meaning, structure, and use in Korean. This first portion of the workshop was organized around lectures, practical presentations, and hands-on exercises to help the participants master the concepts and techniques.

In the second part of the workshop, participants engaged in individual projects chosen with their own learning goals in mind. They worked in teams and presented a project report to the group.

FACILITATORS

Robert Bley-Vroman, chair of the Department of Second Language Studies at the University of Hawai'i, received his M.A. in Germanics and his M.A. and Ph.D. in linguistics from the University of Washington. At UH, he served as director of the Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center and the founding director of the National Foreign Language Resource Center. Before joining the faculty at UH, he taught in Romania at Universitatea din Cluj (English and applied linguistics), the University of Texas at Austin (linguistics) and the University of Michigan, where he was director of courses for the English Language Institute. He also served as project manager at the interstate consortium SEARCH Group (Sacramento) for the national project on criminal justice terminology (Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration). His research is concentrated in applied linguistics, syntax, and second language acquisition theory, and corpus linguistics.

Dr. Bley-Vroman's recent theoretical work attempts to integrate current trends in linguistic theory with accounts of child/adult differences in language acquisition. His influential papers "The logical problem of foreign language learning" and "The comparative fallacy in interlanguage studies" are part of the required reading of graduate students in second language acquisition and applied linguistics at universities across the country. During 1986–1987 he worked as research computational linguist as part of the development team on the German-English machine translation project of Siemens AG (Project METAL), where he was responsible for the advanced augmented phrase structure grammar used by the German parser and for aspects of the design of the programming environment.

Hye-Ri Joo is an instructor in the Department of Second Language Studies at the University of Hawai'i as well as a doctoral student in Second Language Acquisition. She has taught several undergraduate courses, Second Language Learning, Second Language Teaching, Instructional Media, and Language Concepts for Second Language Learning and Teaching. She also has experience in teaching Korean and undergraduate SLS courses over the Internet. She completed her B.A. in Foreign Language Education in Korea and her M.A. in ESL at UH. She is experienced in language teaching and materials development. She is one of the authors of the Korean learning CD-ROM *Hangul-Ro Boja* series. As a doctoral student, her main area of research is second language learners' acquisition of Korean/English syntax and argument structures. She is also interested in computer assisted language learning (CALL) and corpus linguistics.

Han Saem Kim [guest presenter] is currently a researcher at the National Academy of the Korean Language. She received her B.A. in Korean and her M.A. and Ph.D. in Korean informatics at Yonsei University in Korea. From 1998 through 2002, she served as a researcher at the Institute of Language and Information Studies at Yonsei University. Among her research interests are corpus linguistics, corpus-based dictionary development, and Korean informatics. She has presented on her research and authored or co-authored a number of papers and book chapters on these topics.

Hyun Sook Ko is a student in the Ph.D. program in Second Language Acquisition at the University of Hawai'i. She received her graduate degree from Seoul National University in Korea and worked in middle school as an English teacher before coming to UH in 2002. Her research interests include interlanguage grammar and discourse development of second / foreign language learners and curriculum development for them. She has been currently involved in the Corpus Linguistics for Language Teaching and Learning project as a graduate assistant at the NFLRC since Fall 2002.

Jinhwa Lee is a Ph.D. student in Second Language Acquisition as well as a teacher in Korean Flagship program at the University of Hawai'i. She completed her B.A. and M.A. in foreign language education in Seoul National University, Korea. As a doctoral student, her main area of research includes instructed SLA, child and adult L2 acquisition of syntax and argument structure, and L2 pedagogy. As a graduate assistant, she has participated in several research projects including the Task-based Korean Teaching project, the Corpus Linguistics for Korean Teaching and Learning project, and the Needs Analysis for Korean Community School project. She is one of the authors of *Task-based language teaching: A demonstrational module*. She has also taught an undergraduate course, Language Concepts for Second Language Learning and Teaching, and is currently teaching advanced Korean students in the Korean Flagship Program.

Siwon Park is a Ph.D. student in the Second Language Acquisition program at the University of Hawai'i. He served as an English teacher in Korea for two years, before coming to Hawai'i for his master's study. He received his master's degree in English as a Second Language at UH in 1999. He has been involved in the Corpus Linguistics for Korean Teaching and Learning project and the CBT/WBT project for less commonly taught languages as a graduate assistant at the NFLRC. His research interests are in second language acquisition, language testing, corpus linguistics, quantitative research methods, and computer-based testing.

Sang Kyu Seo [guest presenter] is a professor in the Department of Korean Language and Literature and the director of the Department of Teaching Korean Language as a Foreign Language, Graduate School of Education, Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea. He received his B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees in Korean Language and Literature from Yonsei University and also studied as a research student at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (TUFS) in Japan. Afterwards, he served as a lecturer at TUFS and at the University of Tsukuba for about eight years.

Dr. Seo's research interests include various aspects of Korean corpus linguistics, methods and practices in Korean language teaching for foreigners, Korean language data-basing, and Korean informatics. He has authored and coauthored numerous books, research papers, and dictionaries, and has been directing various projects involving corpus linguistics and other research areas in Korean.

Currently, Dr. Seo serves as the vice-director of the Center for Language Information Development and the director of the Department of Korean Language and Information in the Graduate School at Yonsei University.

PARTICIPANTS

From a total of twenty-one applications, sixteen participants were selected. Fourteen attended. Five of these were from Hawai'i; the rest from the United States mainland. All were associated with Korean programs at universities. They had an average of a bit over four years of experience teaching Korean. The group was a mixture of graduate assistants, lecturers, instructors, and professors. Four participants were directors of Korean language programs. Two participants had had some formal exposure to corpus linguistics before; they taken or audited a course which included the topic. The others had little or no previous experience with the area.

SUMMARY SCHEDULE

The workshop lasted two weeks, with an intervening weekend off. On most days, the workshop ran all day, from 8:30 in the morning till about 4:30 or 5:00 in the afternoon. Participants also sometimes worked in the evenings and on the weekend. In general, the morning was devoted to presentations of content, usually in the format of lecture-discussion-demonstration.

Afternoons focused on more hands-on activities and exercises, to develop skill in the use of the tools and to encourage exploration of new possibilities. The afternoon format generally had the participants doing tasks, individually or in groups, with feedback from the facilitators.

In addition to the academic sessions, the workshop organizers also planned cultural activities (lei making, optional excursions), and social events (an opening reception, a final dinner at the director's home). Continental breakfast was provided every day. For those who wished, lunches were brought in every day from local restaurants, with dishes chosen by participants from a menu given out every morning.

The primary language of the workshop was Korean. However, participants and facilitators often moved back and forth between Korean and English depending on what seemed most comfortable in the circumstances. Presentations by the workshop director, Robert Bley-Vroman, who does not speak Korean, were in Korean. Bley-Vroman was also present, every day, though not always for the entire time, even when all interaction was in Korean.

Participants received an extensive set of handouts in advance, in a 2-inch loose-leaf binder.

Day-by-day summary schedule

Day 1 (June 30, Monday)

Introduction to SI 2003 on Corpus linguistics for Korean Teaching and Learning

Introductory presentation by the workshop director

Corpus type and its uses

Introduction to Korean corpora and concordancing programs

Day 2 (July 1, Tuesday)

The use of Korean corpora and concordancing programs

Available Korean corpora concordancing programs

(Web-based programs): CETCONC (Korean University Program), KAIST, **글잡이**

Day 3 (July 2, Wednesday)

Korean vocabulary

Lexical analysis of corpora

Use of frequency profiles

Day 4 (July 3, Thursday)

Korean grammar and discourse

Grammatical analysis of corpora

Discourse analysis of corpora)

Day 5 (July 4, Friday)

Pedagogical issues in corpus linguistics

Corpus based language teaching in the context of SLA research

Pedagogical issues in corpus linguistics

Sample tasks

Day 6 (July 7, Monday)

Guest presentation by Dr. Sang Kyu Seo

Project proposal preparation by project teams

Presentation of project proposals

Day 7 (July 8, Tuesday)

Guest presentation by Dr. Han Saem Kim

Group projects work

Question and answers session

Day 8 (July 9, Wednesday)

Group projects work and question/answer sessions (cont.)

Group progress reports

Day 9 (July 10, Thursday)

Group projects work and question/answer sessions (cont.)

Day 10 (July 11, Friday)

Group project finalization of final reports

Reports on the final products (in English for non-Korean audience)

Final projects

Participants worked in groups to develop final projects. These were presented at the end of the workshop, and selected projects, perhaps refined after the participants return to their home institutions, may be collected into a report to be distributed by the NFLRC.

The projects of the workshop participants are as follows.

Analysis of Function of Sentence ending “거 든요,” “잖 아요” in Korean

A pronunciation teaching program: “Korean Pronunciation Clinic (KCP)”, focusing on consonants such as “ㄱ,” “ㅋ,” “ㄴ,” “ㅃ,” and “ㅇ”

Vocabulary teaching activities: Locative nouns “소/안” (meaning “inside”)

Teaching activities: Causal Connectives in Korean: “-느 라 고 (because of)” and “-는 바 람 에 (due to)”

Reading activities in Korean through Corpus data for Intermediate and Advanced learners:
Focusing on collocation of verb and object

Domain-specific corpus and learning activities: Focusing on the relationship between Korea and the United States

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Format of the evaluation instrument

On the final day of the workshop, participants were asked to complete an evaluation questionnaire. The evaluation was confidential. The format of the evaluation instrument was based on a model that has been used in several other NFLRC Summer Institutes and has been found to provide useful information to workshop organizers and to the NFLRC Advisory Board.

Part I includes four questions relating to the participants’ previous background. Part II includes 14 items relating to the specific content of components the workshop; Part III includes five items which dealt with more general matters of overall satisfaction and perceived future value. The items which appear in the instrument plus a summary of the participants’ responses are included in Appendix A. In the summary of responses, grey-shadowed text highlights the predominant responses. A compilation of all participant responses is given in Appendix B.

Discussion of evaluation results

Part I

The information in Part I is primarily useful in interpreting the responses to the questions in the other parts; it will not be discussed separately. While this discussion is organized by instrument parts,

the discussion of responses to items in one part will sometimes include mention of responses to items in the other part, and the same themes tend to recur in all parts.

Part II

Responses on this part of the instrument are in the form of responses on a scale of “strongly agree”, “agree”, “neutral”, and “disagree.” All items are positive statements, so that responses toward the “strongly agree” end of the scale represent positive evaluations of workshop components, and responses on the “disagree” end of the scale represent negative evaluations.

Nearly all responses were either “strongly agree” or “agree” for all items. We interpret this as an indication of strong overall satisfaction.

Especially notable are the very high ratings given to the helpfulness of the staff (item 7), where all participants marked either “strongly agree” or “agree.” One participant commented that “the close coordination among the staff was impressive.” Similarly, comments in response to item 12 made mention of the valuable contributions of individual UH facilitators, with each of the four facilitators being individually named. Responses to items of Part III, discussed below, also speak of the high quality of the UH staff.

The guest speakers’ contributions were evaluated somewhat less positively overall (item 14), although it must be noted that even here, 9 of the 14 responses are “strongly agree” or “agree.” It appears that a few participants felt that the guest presenters’ presentations needed to be more closely integrated with the rest of the workshop. On the other hand, in comments to Part III, item 19, which asks about “most valuable learning experience,” the guest speakers were singled out by six participants, more than any other particular aspect of the workshop.

Although the evaluation was generally highly positive, some suggestions were made for improvements. In several cases, it was noted that there could have been more “hands-on” work, and that direct applicability to the classroom was unclear. These same themes reappear in some responses to Part III.

Part III

In this section of the instrument, participants are given the opportunity to comment freely. The section generally confirms the ratings and comments of Part II. In particular, participants note the high quality of the presentations by UH facilitators and by guest speakers (item 19). Several participants mentioned the value of networking and interaction among the participants and with the facilitators.

When asked what effect the participants expect the workshop to have on their own professional development (item 20), participants notably mentioned materials development.

When asked how they expect to share what they have learned with colleagues (item 21), many participants mention informal presentations. Three participants expect that their work will result in research presentations.

Among the areas mentioned as things that “could have been done better” (item 22), one notes some of the same themes that came out in Part II of the questionnaire. A few participants felt that

improvements could have been made with the guest speakers. More hands-on and classroom-oriented work was also suggested (as was implicit also in some of the replies to Part II).

When asked what we did particularly well, participants reiterated the same themes — excellent well-prepared staff, friendly, helpful staff, good organization. One mentioned that Robert Bley-Vroman attended regularly even though he didn't understand Korean. Jim Yoshioka received special mention. And, the food was praised.

Summary

In general, participants were enthusiastic about the workshop. They found

- the workshop was well-organized,
- staff was excellent,
- the substance of the workshop was useful,
- material was well-presented, and
- participants expect that what they learned will be useful in language teaching.

There seemed to be no aspects which were generally found inadequate. A few participants felt that the guest presentations needed more integration with the rest of the workshop. On the other hand, some felt that these were a particularly valuable part. Several mentioned that more hands-on work and more work with clear classroom application would be valuable.

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT RESPONSES TO THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Part I: Participants' backgrounds

Participants' institutional affiliation	
college/university	14 (100%)
1. Participants' position/title	
graduate student	1 (7.14%)
GA/RA	2 (14.29%)
instructor/lecturer	6 (42.86%)
coordinator	1 (7.14%)
acting director	1 (7.14%)
head/director of the Korean program	2 (14.29%)
assistant professor	1 (7.14%)
2. Years of experience in Korean language instruction	
1 year	2 (14.29%)
2 years*	6 (42.86%)
4 years	1 (7.14%)
5 years	3 (21.43%)
10 years	1 (7.14%)
15 years	1 (7.14%)
3. Previous experience with corpus linguistics	
none	6 (42.86%)
almost nothing	1 (7.14%)
reading books and journals	2 (14.29%)
did research with one's own corpus data without concordancing	1 (7.14%)
searching frequency in the COBUILD corpus	1 (7.14%)
audited a corpus seminar	1 (7.14%)
took a course	1 (7.14%)
no response	1 (7.14%)
4. How did you find out about the 2003 NFLRC Summer Institute?	
e-mail / WWW	11 (78.57%)
colleague	3 (21.43%)

* Grey-shadowed text highlights the predominant responses.

Part II: Overall satisfaction and perceived future value

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	comment
5. The information given before the workshop was adequate.	4 (28.57%)*	7 (50%)	2 (14.29%)	1 (7.14%)	
6. The workshop was well organized and well run.	8 (57.14%)	4 (28.57%)	2 (14.29%)	0	
7. The staff was helpful.	12 (85.71%)	2 (14.29%)	0	0	–Close coordination among the staff was impressive. (1) included.
8. The workshop facilities and technical support was adequate.	8 (57.14%)	5 (35.71%)	1 (7.14%)	0	
9. The length of the workshop was appropriate.	5 (35.71%)	6 (42.86%)	2 (14.29%)	1 (7.14%)	–One week would have been better. (2) included
10. I enjoyed the overall format (presentations, demos, hands-on practice, groupwork, etc.).	7 (50%)	4 (28.57%)	3 (21.43%)	0	–More hands-on practice would have been better (4) included.
11. The variety of perspectives presented was valuable.	5 (35.71%)	6 (42.86%)	2 (14.29%)	0	>>Response between “agree” and “neutral” (1) not included –It was a really good idea selecting the participants from different areas.(1) included. –Networking with participants was excellent. (1) included.
12. Lectures from facilitators were especially valuable.	6 (42.86%)	7 (50%)	1 (7.14%)	0	–Joo and Ko: Showing how to use corpus in the classroom was really good. (1) included. –Park and Lee: especially good. (1) included. –Little relevant to the teaching situation in an actual classroom. (1) included.
13. Hands-on activities were especially valuable.	8 (57.14%)	4 (28.57%)	2 (14.29%)	0	–Needs more hands-on activities through group projects. (1) included.

* Grey-shadowed text highlights the predominant responses.

14. Lectures from the guest speakers were especially valuable.	7 (50%)*	2 (14.29%)	5 (35.71%)	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Complement lectures from facilitators. (1) included. -Hansen's lecture was informative, but others' maybe did not know the goal of the workshop or the needs of the participants. (2) included. >>No response (1) not included. >>Response between "strongly agree" and "agree" (1) not included.
15. Materials (handbook, handouts, CD-ROMs, etc) were especially valuable.	7 (50%)	3 (21.43%)	2 (14.29%)	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -CD-ROMs and handouts couldn't be better. (1) included. -Korean corpus programs and hands-on activities extremely useful. (1) included.
16. The process of learning and discussing corpus linguistics and language teaching was useful and relevant.	9 (64.29%)	4 (28.57%)	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >>No response (1) not included -The weakness of the activities shown is the very little applicability in actual classroom teaching. (1) included.
17. I was satisfied with the facilitation of the workshop.	10 (71.43%)	2 (14.29%)	1 (7.14%)	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >>No response (1) not included. -better if the guest speakers know the participants needs. (1) included.
18. My expectations were met.	7 (50%)	6 (42.86%)	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> >Response between "agree" and "neutral" (1) not included. -The staff who are teaching Korean should participate in the workshop. TAs did a wonderful job, but they had their limitations in applying the materials to the actual classroom teaching. (1) included.

* Grey-shadowed text highlights the predominant responses.

Part III: Participants' responses to general questions**

19. Describe your most valuable learning experience at the workshop.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lectures from guest speakers (6)* -Hands-on activities (5) -Getting familiar to Korean corpora and corpus (concordance) program (5) -Crystal clear lectures from knowledgeable and helpful facilitators (4) -Interactions/discussions with other participants (2) -Networking among facilitators, and participants -Final project (2) -Snacks (1) -no comment (2)
20. What effect will the workshop have on your teaching/professional development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In teaching material development (8): Open-minded try to use authentic data and materials as well as the textbooks Practical ideas of developing teaching materials Realize the usefulness of corpus linguistics for teaching Motivated to new try -In designing students' assignments (1) -In teaching: raising students' grammatical awareness (1) - no comment (6)
21. How do you expect to share/disseminate what you have learned with colleagues at home institution?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Through a brief demo or formal/informal presentation (5) -Through research publication (3) -Through developing and sharing teaching materials (2) -Encourage colleagues to incorporate corpora to their curriculum (1) -Training TAs and graduate students for developing lesson plans (1) - no comment (4)
22. What could we have done better at the workshop?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -If the guest speakers had known better the participants' needs and focused on them,... (3) -If the specialists' lectures were designed earlier in the schedule,... -If you had reminded the participants of the research topics before they had extended periods of hands-on practices,... -If the lectures was followed by hands-on activities,... -If you had have empirical research performed at the classroom,... -If the staff who are teaching Korean participated as facilitators,... -Organization (content) - no comment (5)
23. What did we do particularly well?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -always-available, friendly, helpful assistance (3) -good preparation for teaching, and excellent lectures by well-informed facilitators (3) -materials (2) -food, Jim (2) -Bley-Vroman's attendance at the workshop (1) -good organization (1) -pushing and encouraging the participants (1) - no comment (4)

* Grey-shadowed text highlights the predominant responses.

** There are the cases in which a participant supplied more than one response per item. Grey-shadowed text highlights the predominant responses.

APPENDIX B: COMPILATION OF ALL PARTICIPANT RESPONSES TO THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Part I: Participants' backgrounds

partic- ipant	1. position	2. yrs. teaching experience	3. previous corpus ling. experience	4. how find out about the SI
1	instructor	2	self-study with books	e-mail from AATA mailing list
2	instructor	2	searching frequency of COBUILD corpus	colleague
3	lecturer	2	none	e-mail/www
4	lecturer	2	none	e-mail/ www
5	director of Korean program	4	none	e-mail/www
6	coordinator of Korean	15	audited one corpus linguistics seminar	e-mail/www
7	lecturer	5	almost nothing	e-mail/www
8	lecturer/ acting director	5	did a research with my own Korean corpus data without concordancing	e-mail/www
9	grad student	2	none	e-mail/www
10	RA	1		colleague
11	instructor	10	took a course	e-mail/www
12	assistant professor	5	none	e-mail/www
13	GA	2	books and journals	e-mail/www
14	head of Korean program	1	none	colleague

PART II, items 5–12: Overall satisfaction and perceived future value

particip- ant	5. advance information adequate	6. workshop well organized	7. staff helpful	8. facilities/ tech support adequate	9. length of workshop appropriate	10. enjoyed overall format	11. variety of perspectives valuable	12. facilitators' lectures valuable
1	++	++	++	++	0 (less than 2 weeks better)	++	++ (selecting participants from different parts was really a good idea)	++
2	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	+
3	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+
4	++	++	++	+	++	0 (better if more hands-on practice)	0	++ (Ko, Joo showed how to use in the actual classroom)
5	++	++	++ (impressive close coordination among the staff)	++	++	++ (better if more time given to practicing)	++ (perspectives seems irrelevant to the workshop)	++ (esp. Siwon and Jinhwa)
6	0	0	++	+	- (one week better)	0 (hands-on practice most helpful)	+/0 (networking with participants excellent)	0 (little connections with actual Korean classroom situations)
7	+	+	++	++ (updating to XP better)	+	++ (more hands-on practice better)	++	++
8	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
9	+	+	++	++	+	++	++	++
10	+	+	++	++	+	++	+	+
11	+	++	++	++	+	++	++	+
12	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
13	+	++	++	++	++	++	+	++
14	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

++ = strongly agree + = agree 0 = neutral - = disagree

continued...

PART II, items 13–18: Overall satisfaction and perceived future value (continued)

particip- ant	13. hands-on activities valuable	14. guests' lectures valuable	15. materials valuable	16. process useful & relevant	17. satisfied w/workshop facilitation	18. expectations met
1	++	++ (they complemented lectures from facilitators)	++	++	++	++
2	+	0	++	++	++	++
3	+	+	0	+	0	+
4	0 (need more hands-on activities through group projects)	0 (Hanssem's lecture informative. The guest speakers should have talked. how to use in class)	++	+	++	++
5	++	++	++ (CDs and handouts couldn't be better)	++	++	++
6	++	0 (Hanssem most helpful, but others maybe didn't know the goal of this workshop)	++/+ (Korean corpus programs and hands- on activities extremely useful)	++ (better if applicable activities)	+ (better if guest speakers know the participants' needs)	+/0 wonderful job by TAs, limitations in the class
7	0	0	+	+	++	+
8	++	++	++	++	++	++
9	++	++				++
10	+	++	0	++	++	+
11	++	++	++	++	++	++
12	++	+	+	++	++	+
13	++	++	++	++	++	+
14	+	0	+	+	+	+

++ = strongly agree + = agree 0 = neutral - = disagree

Part III, participants 1–9: Participants’ responses to general questions

particip- ant	19. most valuable experience	20. effect on teach’g/profl development	21. how to share at home institution	22. ideas for better workshop	23. what done particularly well
1	hands-on practice, lectures from knowledgeable and helpful facilitators and guest speakers	motivate me to read more and implement what I learned in class	use in my teaching and research, mini-presentation for my colleagues		food
2	workshop (getting familiar to Korean corpora, interactions /discussion with other participants)	realize the usefulness of corpus linguistics for teaching and learning	introduce various corpora as a teaching tool to other teachers	if the guest had known the participants’ needs and focus on our needs	preparations in the workshop packet and helps using computer programs
3					
4	final project (through it, learned a lot)		try the projects proposed here, present through teaching workshop	all perfect. (impressed by graduate assistants, Jim, and Dr. Bley- Vroman)	Dr. Bley-Vroman’s attendance
5	crystal clear lectures/ presentations, hands-on experience, help from the staff, snacks	look to more corpus data for my teaching and research	encourage colleagues to incorporate corpora into their curriculum	needed more remind of the participants’ research topics before having extended periods of hands-on practices	excellent lectures
6	programs (better if more time for hands-on activities)		training TAs for developing lesson plans and graduate students	empirical research in the classroom; clear orientation to the guest speakers; include Korean teaching staff as a facilitator	
7	helpful lectures	open-minded about using authentic data, explore materials outside textbooks	brief demo or making a shared folder	if the guest speakers more aware of the goal of the workshop	pushing and encouraging the participants, being always available to offer assistance and being well organized.
8	interactions and discussions with other participants	got practical ideas of developing teaching materials and tools for research	through research, publication, teaching materials, website		preparation for teaching
9	learning concordance program	can use authentic and empirically reliable data to my teaching	share materials	if specialists’s lectures were designed earlier in the schedule	food, materials, Jim

continued...

PART III, participants 10–14: Participants’ responses to general questions (continued)

particip- ant	19. most valuable experience	20. effect on teach’g/prof’l development	21. how to share at home institution	22. ideas for better workshop	23. what done particularly well
10					
11	hands-on activities	material development		if lectures followed by hands-on activities, more effective	always available, friendly, efficient, well-informed
12	network among facilitators, participants, guest speakers, learning about the topic, hands-on practice and project	using corpus on research and teaching materials, pedagogic implications (designing assignments, raising students’ pedagogical awareness)	present at the conference		well prepared by the facilitators
13	lectures by guest speakers, learning how to use various programs		using in my class, share the knowledge with colleagues		
14	concordance program			organization (content)	food