Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, **Vol 24, October 2024, pp. 1177-1196**
DOI: 10.15738/kjell.24..202410.1177

KOREAN JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

ISSN: 1598-1398 / e-ISSN 2586-7474

http://journal.kasell.or.kr

Translanguaging in Korean Middle School EFL Classrooms: A Conversation Analysis Using the SETT Framework

Gayoung Son · Sun-Young Oh (Seoul National University)

Received: September 2, 2024
Revised: October 23, 2024
Accepted: October 28, 2024

Son, Gayoung (first author)
Ph.D Student, Department of English Education
Seoul National University
1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu
Seoul, Korea
Tel: 02) 880-7670
Email:snownoble@snu.ac.kr

Oh, Sun-Young (corresponding author)
Professor, Department of English Education
Seoul National University
1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu
Seoul, Korea
Tel: 02) 880-7675
Email: sunoh@snu.ac.kr

ABSTRACT

Son, Gayoung and Sun-Young Oh. 2024. Translanguaging in Korean middle school EFL classrooms: A conversation analysis using the SETT framework. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 24, 1177-1196.

The purpose of this study is to explore the dynamics of translanguaging in the context of Korean middle school EFL classrooms. Through a conversation analysis of six natural classroom videos, this study examines how translanguaging manifests in various classroom modes of the SETT (Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk) framework, aligning with the pedagogical objectives of each mode and the unique characteristics of the EFL environment in Korea. In managerial modes, teachers use translanguaging as a tool to facilitate task understanding and learner engagement, clearly demonstrating the role of teacher's language as the medium of instruction. In the material mode, translanguaging serves as a means to create an environment where students can freely express their opinions. In the skills and systems mode, translanguaging enables students' metalinguistic awareness. Lastly, in the classroom context mode, translanguaging not only enables students to express their thoughts using their native language resources but also supports their English language development through scaffolding. This study highlights the significant role of translanguaging in the Korean EFL context, shedding light on its contributions to teaching and learning practices.

KEYWORDS

translanguaging, classroom interaction, teacher talk, conversation analysis, SETT framework

1. Introduction

Classroom interaction, defined as the communication between teachers and students or among students themselves, has long been a focal point in educational research due to its critical role in teaching and learning. Traditionally, research in this area focused on evaluating the effectiveness of these interactions. However, recent studies have highlighted the complexities inherent in classroom interactions (Rabbidge 2019, Wang and Lai 2023, Zhao 2013), leading scholars to shift their focus from merely assessing these interactions to describing them in detail to raise awareness about their intricate dynamics (Tsui 2003).

In English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, teaching practices are shaped by dominant ideologies, with the monolingual approach being especially influential. This approach promotes English-only instruction, assuming immersion as the most effective learning method and positioning native speakers from Inner Circle countries as the educational standard. As a result, English teachers are often expected to conduct their classes exclusively in English to maximize students' linguistic exposure and immersion (Auerbach 1993, Cummins 2000, Park 2009, Yang and Jang 2022).

Research shows that these expectations also extend to Expanding Circle countries, where policies encourage similar English-only teaching practices despite differences in local linguistic needs (Byrd Clark 2012, Kubota 2018). Around 2010, Korea reinforced its monolingual education policy by introducing the TEE (Teaching English in English) certificate to recognize teachers proficient in English-only instruction and inviting native speakers to co-teach through English Program in Korea (EPIK) (Foreman and Min 2010, Ministry of Education 1997, Park and Kim 2011). However, these policies have been gradually phased out due to changes in government, evolving educational approaches, and a mismatch with practical classroom realities.

Despite the emphasis on English-only instruction, many ESL/EFL teachers employ a practice known as "translanguaging", blending their native language with English. Recent studies underscore the value of translanguaging as a natural and effective pedagogical strategy that enhances language proficiency, supports task completion, and allows students greater expression (Ahn et al. 2020, Guo 2023, Jang 2021, Menken and Sánchez 2019, Rabbidge 2019, Yang and Jang 2022, Yeom 2021, Yuzlu and Dikilitas 2022, Zhang 2024, Zuo and Walsh 2023). It also improves classroom management and fosters a more inclusive learning environment (Rabbidge 2019, Xiong 2024, Zhang 2024).

Yang and Jang (2022) identified a significant gap in the literature on the effectiveness of integrating learners' native language (L1) into instructional strategies and the practical considerations involved. Research on translanguaging, particularly its pedagogical and practical effects in secondary EFL classrooms, remain limited, with a need to explore its subtle use across various contexts. To address these gaps, this study examines the role of translanguaging in Korean classrooms utilizing Walsh's (2006) Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) model, a Conversation Analysis (CA)-based framework for analyzing classroom interaction. This approach provides an in-depth view of the relationship between translanguaging, pedagogical goals, and classroom dynamics. Through a CA-based analysis of authentic classroom data, it aims to explore the role of translanguaging in classroom interaction and address the following research questions:

1) How do teachers employ translanguaging within the Korean EFL classroom, considering the contextual modes outlined in the SETT framework?
2) What is the influence of teachers' translanguaging on the teaching and learning of English in the Korean EFL classroom?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Multilingualism and Translanguaging

Translanguaging is a concept that has emerged from the shift away from monolingual ideologies towards embracing multilingualism. The recent movement known as the "multilingual turn" challenges the longstanding dominance of monolingualism in Applied Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition. Monolingualism promotes an idealized and isolated view of the target language, leading learners to set unrealistic goals of achieving native-like proficiency, akin to Inner Circle speakers. According to monolingual standards, learners are considered deficient speakers who continually strive but fail to attain native-like competence. However, critical voices have emerged in contexts where individuals with diverse multicultural backgrounds use English in a variety of sociolinguistic settings. With the advent of English as a Lingua Franca and the recognition of World Englishes, Cook (1992) argues that multilingual learners possess a distinct and qualitatively different competence known as "multicompetence" (p. 112). Their linguistic journeys markedly differ from those of monolingual speakers as learning an additional language involves adjusting and expanding their linguistic repertoire to accommodate a new language (Canagarajah 2018). Mauranen (2018) terms this phenomenon the "composite language resource" (p. 113), while Cenoz and Gorter (2014) stress the importance of considering all multilingual resources for effective language teaching, including linguistic, paralinguistic, semiotic, and experiential aspects. Full utilization of these resources enhances multilinguals' language learning.

Translanguaging has emerged as a concept that highlights dynamic, integrated, and multilingual language use. Rooted in Welsh bilingual education, it initially referred to the practice of alternating between Welsh and English for teaching and learning, fostering the growth of both languages. However, translanguaging has evolved beyond its initial role as a mere teaching strategy and has profoundly influenced our comprehension of language itself. Baker (2011), who introduced the term translanguaging, defined it as "the process of making meaning, shaping experience, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages" (p. 288). Canagarajah (2011) further elaborates, describing translanguaging as "the ability of multilingual speakers to fluidly move between languages, treating the diverse languages in their repertoire as an integrated system" (p. 401). This concept aligns with the idea of multicompetence, acknowledging that learners possess more than two languages, each accompanied by distinct learning experiences, all coexisting within their linguistic repertoire.

Translanguaging transcends the traditional view of languages as separate entities, recognizing the interconnected nature of languages within multilingual individuals. It emphasizes the holistic use of linguistic resources for meaning-making and knowledge construction, allowing multilingual speakers fluidly navigate between languages, drawing on their diverse linguistic repertoire to shape meaning and enhance comprehension. While translanguaging is sometimes likened to code-switching, which also involves strategic transitions between languages, significant differences exist between the two concepts. Code-switching typically assumes a separation between the target and native languages, prioritizing the target language while still acknowledging the value of the native one. In contrast, translanguaging views language use as dynamic and integrated, where speakers effectively and purposefully utilize all languages in their repertoire. García (2015) illustrated this distinction by comparing code-switching to language-switching on an iPhone and translanguaging to texting, where users employ a rich semiotic repertoire—including text, emoticons, photos, and sounds—to communicate effectively. Similarly, this study classifies the use of both Korean and English as translanguaging, reflecting the prevailing understanding of the concept. Translanguaging captures the fluid and flexible nature of language use, emphasizing the integration and interaction of languages rather than their rigid separation.

As interest in translanguaging grows, an increasing number of studies are exploring its application in both ESL (Akbar and Taqi 2020, Burton and Rajendram 2019, Carroll and Sambolín Morales 2016, Mukhopadhyay 2020, Ooi and Aziz 2021, Tabatabaei 2020) and EFL context (Guo 2023, Xiong 2024, Yeom 2021, Yuzlu and Dikilitas 2021, Zhang 2024, Zuo and Walsh 2023). The practice of translanguaging in ESL classrooms shares similar purposes with those in EFL contexts, such as for administrative reasons, classroom management, enhancing cognitive abilities, providing clear instructions, and allowing students the freedom to express their ideas. Notably, some studies in ESL contexts focus on the perceptions and attitudes of instructors towards translanguaging (Burton and Rajendram 2019, Tabatabaei 2020). These studies indicate that while translanguaging is not outright banned in ESL context, it is often discouraged. This is largely because many instructors believe that an English-only approach is a fairer and more effective way to improve language proficiency, which in turn influences students' perceptions. This trend may be attributed to the diverse cultural backgrounds of students in ESL settings, where the primary goal is often to enhance proficiency in the target language through English immersion (Burton and Rajendram 2019).

In contrast, research on translanguaging in EFL contexts often focuses on its pedagogical benefits, such as enhancing learning outcomes, addressing students' affective needs (Zhang 2024) and supporting classroom management strategies (Xiong 2024). For example, Zhang (2024) employed emotional curves as a translanguaging space for Chinese EFL students, thereby enhancing student engagement through emotional acknowledgment and scaffolding. Furthermore, Xiong's (2024) recent study illustrates that the spontaneous and unscripted nature of instruction requires teachers to dynamically orchestrate semiotic resources, including translanguaging, to optimize instructional effectiveness.

While translanguaging offers several pedagogical benefits, as mentioned earlier, Rabbidge (2019) also presents challenges in EFL contexts. In the Korean context, his study revealed that translanguaging was often limited to the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) pattern or when only teachers are permitted to use it, students may become disengaged or participate less actively. These findings highlight how translanguaging practices are influenced by power dynamics, control, and teachers' beliefs and prior experiences, posing challenges to its effective implementation.

Given the widespread use of translanguaging in both ESL and EFL contexts, it is essential to closely investigate how translanguaging is actually implemented in regular Korean secondary school classrooms. This includes exploring translanguaging practices across various dimensions of teaching and learning, assessing their alignment with pedagogical goals, and examining their effects on educational outcomes.

2.1 The SETT Framework

The Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) framework, developed by Walsh (2006), is a versatile and comprehensive approach used to examine and analyze classroom interaction. It offers a contextual perspective that considers the interplay between language use and pedagogical objectives. Walsh (2006) incorporates the concept of L2 lesson context as being "locally produced and transformable at any moment" (Drew and Heritage 1992 as cited in Walsh 2006, p.55). Context, as highlighted by Seedhouse (1996), serves as the "interface between pedagogy and interaction" (p. 118), where the teacher's instructional goals are manifested through their talk-in-interaction.

To better comprehend the diverse subvarieties of the L2 classroom context, Walsh (2006) proposes four distinct classroom modes: managerial, materials, skills and systems, and classroom context modes. In the managerial mode, teachers employ language to manage class activities and teaching procedures. The materials mode revolves around

language use related to instructional materials. The skills and systems mode focuses on language accuracy and correctness. Lastly, the classroom context mode emphasizes meaning-based communication and fluency. Each mode encompasses specific instructional objectives and distinct interactional features as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The SETT Framework (Walsh 2006, p. 94)

Mode	Pedagogic Goals	Interactional Features
Managerial	To transmit information To organize the physical learning environment To refer learners to materials To introduce or conclude an activity To change from one mode of learning to another	A single, extended teacher turn, the use of transitional markers and confirmation checks, an absence of learner contributions
Materials	To provide language practice around a piece of material To elicit responses in relation to the material To check and display answers To clarify when necessary To evaluate contributions	Predominance of IRF pattern, extensive use of display questions, form- focused feedback, corrective repair, the use of scaffolding
Skills and Systems	To enable learners to produce correct forms To enable learners to manipulate the target language To provide corrective feedback To provide learners with practice in sub- skills To display correct answers	The use of direct repair, scaffolding, extended teacher turns, display questions, teacher echo, clarification requests, form-focused feedback,
Classroom Context	To enable learners to express themselves clearly To establish a context To promote oral fluency	Extended learner turns, short teacher turns, minimal repair, content feedback, referential questions, scaffolding clarification requests

Walsh (2006) introduces various dynamic and divergent properties of classroom interactions, including concepts such as mode switch (rapid movement from one mode to another), mode side sequence (movements between main and secondary modes back and forth), mode convergence (when pedagogical goals and language use are aligned), and mode divergence (when pedagogical goals and language use are inconsistent). This study adopts these four modes and their associated interactional features as a framework to analyze the dialogic nature of a classroom discourse.

Multiple studies across different contexts have explored how the SETT framework facilitates and enhances learners' educational experiences through teacher talk within classroom settings. Specifically, the four classroom modes and 13 interactional features of the SETT model have been employed to assess how teacher talk mediates or assists students' learning. Prominent scholars have underscored the significance of incorporating Classroom Interactional Competence and teacher talk training in both in-service and pre-service teacher education programs (Huan and Wang 2011, Seedhouse 2008, Walsh 2006, 2011, 2013).

Studies on in-service teachers (Ghafarpour 2017, Jeanjaroonsri 2018, Shamsipour and Allami 2012, Zuo and Walsh 2023) have explored classroom interaction dynamics using the SETT framework. For instance, Jeanjaroonsri's study (2018) in Thailand and Shamsipour and Allami's study (2012) in Iran both identified positive and negative interactional dynamics. Ghafarpour's (2017) study on classroom interaction in a university General English Course, supported by a teacher's reflective diary, showed that interactional modes vary depending on the context. This study also found that critical reflective practice increased teachers' awareness of their talk, highlighting the effectiveness of combining the SETT framework with critical reflection in teacher training. Zuo and Walsh (2023) examined classroom interaction in a Chinese university, with a particular focus on the use of translation. Their study emphasizes the contextual sensitivity of teachers' translanguaging practices, which align

closely with the pedagogical objectives of the moment. This study illuminated the role of first language (L1) use within the EFL environment, offering valuable insights that have strongly influenced the current research.

In the study of pre-service EFL teachers, Aşık and Gönen (2016) implemented the SETT model with 23 pre-service educators in Turkey. These teachers analyzed the interplay between language usage and pedagogic objectives, engaged in discussions with peers, and maintained reflective diaries. The results evidenced an enhanced awareness of classroom interaction among the participants.

The research gap can be identified in two key areas: methodological and contextual. Methodologically, the SETT framework, grounded in CA, is well-suited to uncover the subtle nuances of translanguaging across diverse pedagogical contexts. However, many existing studies in classroom settings have not thoroughly examined its role within the sequential organization of classroom interactions, often focusing instead on merely identifying or quantifying interactional features that have been observed (Jeanjaroonsri 2018, Shamsipour and Allami 2012). Specifically, there is a significant gap in understanding how translanguaging emerges and develops within the turn-by-turn structure of conversation – a primary focus of CA. Furthermore, the limited attention to micro-contexts, such as specific turns, actions, and sequences where translanguaging is employed, has left gaps in our understanding of the intricate functions it serves.

Contextually, there has been no prior research on translanguaging within Korean secondary school classrooms, making this study particularly valuable. By exploring the practical application and effects of translanguaging in a setting with a large student population, this research can provide critical insights. These insights can enhance teachers' awareness and strategic use of translanguaging within the typical Korean EFL context, ultimately contributing to more effective language instruction.

3. Methodology

3.1 Data Collection

Data were collected from six teaching sessions conducted in Korean EFL classrooms at a middle school located in Gyeonggi Province, South Korea. Out of the six recorded sessions, three were taught by one of the authors and the remaining three by her colleague. Both teachers possessed M.A. degrees and had more than 10 years of teaching experience. The video recordings were made during regular classroom instruction throughout the year to facilitate self and peer evaluation. These recordings captured a variety of activities, including speaking, listening, writing, and reading, targeting students in grades 7 to 9. Students had been exposed to teachers' translanguaging, as it was a common practice for the teacher researchers to alternate between Korean and English. Table 2 provides an overview of the recorded data, which amounts to a total duration of 4 hours and 30 minutes.

Table 2. Video Recordings of 6 Classroom Lessons

Session	Teacher	Nature of lesson	Theme	Grade	Duration
1	Teacher 2	Speaking	Present continuous	7th	45 mins
2	Teacher 2	Speaking & listening	Preposition	7th	45 mins
3	Teacher 1	Reading & writing	Music for change	8th	45 mins
4	Teacher 1	Reading & writing	Heroes are all around us	8th	45 mins
5	Teacher 1	Reading & writing	Inner beauty	9th	45 mins
6	Teacher 2	Reading & writing	News article	9th	45 mins

3.2 Data Analysis

As previously stated, this study utilizes the SETT framework to examine the effects of translanguaging in the Korean EFL classroom. The SETT framework aids in pinpointing the micro-context of the classroom within teacher discourse, shedding light on the structure of translanguaging within this study's context. This research aims to provide insights into translanguaging and its impacts on learning within the context of Korean EFL. Learning in this study refers to engagement, meaningful participation and supportive interaction, rather than measurable outcomes, as highlighted in many previous studies.

Data analysis follows Walsh's "SETT procedures" (2006, p. 166). Initially, repeated viewings of the recorded material were conducted to identify meaningful scenes, meticulously scrutinizing instances of significant transitions from English to Korean. These moments were then analyzed using the SETT framework to determine the modes and interactional features at play. Subsequently, conversation analysis was adopted to examine the teacher's use of Korean in talk-in-interaction from an emic, participant perspective. This approach aims to gain a deeper understanding of the sequential patterns in translanguaging. By analyzing turn-taking, sequence organization, and repair, this study seeks to uncover the dynamics of translanguaging in the Korean EFL context. The SETT model serves as a benchmark to assess how translanguaging sequences affect the progressivity of interaction in relation to the pedagogical goals identified from the SETT modes and how these sequences influence students' learning experiences.

To ensure the reliability of the analysis, both the mode identification and the CA-based analysis were meticulously double-checked. In cases of disagreement, the researchers held in-depth discussions to reconcile differences between interaction and pedagogical orientation, thereby enhancing the reliability of the findings.

For transcription, this study employed an adapted version of Gail Jefferson's (2004) transcription system. In the extracts, Korean data are first presented in Romanized form (e.g., thullin kulimi isstanun keci), followed by an English translation (*There are wrong pictures*).

4. Findings and Discussion

This chapter presents findings from two distinct perspectives. First, it elucidates how translanguaging manifests within classroom interactions across each mode of the SETT framework. Second, it explores the impact of translanguaging on the teaching and learning dynamics within the context of Korean EFL.

4.1 Translanguaging in Managerial Mode: Facilitating Task Understanding and Engagement

The managerial mode, as proposed by Walsh (2006), aims to effectively organize the physical learning environment through the implementation of specific tasks. This mode is characterized by an extended teacher turn, the use of transition markers, and minimal learner contributions. In Extract 1, the teacher introduces the 'listen and mark' activity, where students listen to directional cues and mark the appropriate pictures corresponding to those directions. Before this activity, the teacher introduces specific items like a box and dictionaries to visually demonstrate the meanings of several prepositions, such as *in front of*, *in the middle of*, *in*, *out*, *inside*, *outside*. Extract 1 vividly illustrates the multimodal nature of classroom interaction. As evidenced in lines 3 to 15, the teacher adeptly employs visual aids, drawing pictures to offer clear instructions for the activity. Additionally, she preannounces the anticipated level of difficulty (line 18), thereby ensuring the students' attentive engagement during the upcoming activity.

<Extract 1>

1		T2	And now (0.5) from now, I will (.) play (.) a direction. you can listen to a direction.
2	→	T2	and I will give you this paper. Okay ↑
3		T2	There is some picture (.) and MARK the right pictures while you are listening to the direction
4		T2	for example (0.8) uh (.)
5		T2	there is (0.5) what is it? ((T draws a box on the black board))
6			(1.0)
7		SS	Ciksakakhyeng=
			retangle
8		T2	=yeah, a box, a box. uh (.) ((T draws two apples on the black board))
9		SS	apple
10		T2	yes, apple. okay, very nice.
11		T2	and there is a direction, like this, draw an apple (.) in front of the box.
12		T2	then what apple should we mark? where? this one? this one?
13		SS	Il pen ((Ss point to an apple drawn first))
			Number one
14		T2	yes, you should mark here. understand ↑
15		T2	and I'll give you pictures, listen to the direction and mark.
			((T hands out worksheets))
16		T2	okay, please write down you your name first.
17		T2	please write down your name. ((Ss get the worksheet))
18		T2	It is a little bit difficult.
19		T2	Please listen carefully. ((T prepares listening material))
20		T2	Are you ready to listen? (0.2) Are you ready?
21			(1.5) ((T plays listening material and observes the students' performance))
22	→	S1	Kokosing
			Let's get started
			((As the listening activity begins, T notices that students are confused))
23	→	T2	NO NO, look at this [paper]
24		S2	[Han pen] te halkeyeyyo?
			Are we going to do it one more time?
25	→	T2	=no, MARK. Ca, cal tule. yekiey cikum yelekaci kulimi issci.
			Well, listen carefully. there are many different pictures here.
26		S2	ney
			Yes
27	→	T2	Kulimeyse tullintaylo kulin kesey phyosilul hamyen toynun keya.
			You can mark the same picture as described in listening.
28		S3	[ah::]
29		S4	[um::]
30	→	S5	Ney?
			What?
31	→	T2	i salami malhan kutaylo marklul hamyen tway. matnun kulimey
			You can mark the same picture as described in listening.
32		S4	*=Ah!*
33	→	T2	Thullin kulimi isstanun keci. There are wrong pictures, (0.4) okay?
			There are wrong pictures.
34		S5	A:: yes, yes, yes=
35		T2	=okay ((laughs)) once [again]
36		S3	[go,go,go,go] ((T turns on the recording))

In Extract 1, the introduction of the managerial mode by T2 is indicated by the transition marker *now (And now, from now)* in line 1, signaling a shift from the previous activity to the commencement of the 'listen and mark' task. The use of such discourse markers (e.g., *well, so, all right*) is significant as they help learners effectively navigate classroom discourse (Breen 1998). These markers serve multiple functions in teacher talk, including capturing students' attention and indicating a shift in pedagogical objectives (Walsh 2006).

An intriguing characteristic of teacher talk within the managerial mode is the incorporation of phrases like *okay*? (line 2) or *understand*? (line 14) during explanations. These can be categorized as "try-markers" (Sacks and Schegloff 1979), devices originally used by the speaker to prompt recipient recognition of a reference. The concept of the try-marker has since been expanded to include recognitional tokens frequently employed by teachers in classroom settings, such as using *okay* with a rising intonation. These tokens are aimed at assessing students' understanding of the just-concluded instruction (Zuo 2019, Zuo and Walsh 2023).

As the listening activity begins, the teacher, positioned at the front of the classroom, observes the students' performance and notices that they appear confused (line 22). In response, the teacher initiates a repair sequence directed at the whole class in line 23, using an emphatic repair preface *NO, NO*. She reiterates the crucial word *MARK* in English, followed by the Korean transition marker *Ca* (line 25) to capture the students' attention. The teacher then switches to Korean to enhance students' understanding. It is evident that T2 carefully evaluates the alignment between the pedagogical goal and her language use. Although no explicit trouble source is evident within the interaction itself, the teacher keenly observes the students' struggles, exemplifying the sensitivity inherent in classroom interaction. Here, students' performance becomes the primary concern and subject of analysis, determining the progressiveness of the talk-in-interaction.

In response to the teacher's initial repair attempt to assist students who were confused (line 27), S5 signals a lack of understanding (line 30), prompting another repair sequence in lines 31 and 33. While addressing students' misunderstandings, T2 uses Korean, but this translanguaging practice diminishes as the majority of students show noticeable improvement in their understanding. In lines 34 and 36, there is a notable shift in the students' understanding, indicated by S5 and S3's expressing recognition with *yes, yes, yes* and *go, go, go, go*. The challenges and difficulties encountered by multiple students in the classroom lead to varying responses to the teacher's repair attempts, resulting in repair segments that span multiple sequences. Translanguaging proves to be a valuable tool in effectively addressing these issues. The transition to Korean in this extract is closely aligned with the pedagogical goal of the managerial mode, which focuses on task setup. The managerial mode serves as an essential initial step in "locating learning" (Walsh 2006, p. 69), facilitating the other three modes.

In summary, the teacher's use of Korean in the managerial mode serves specific purposes: to facilitate task comprehension and engagement in the learning context. As shown in Extract 1, the teacher introduces the activity in a step-by-step manner. She takes charge of the interaction and utilizes English (e.g., *now, well*) and Korean transition markers (*ca*) to capture students' attention. The inclusion of a try-marker at the end of her statements ensures that students recognize the teacher's instructions. When students remain silent or fail to respond, the teacher employs additional strategies such as demonstration and translation. This translanguaging practice is driven by the teacher's immediate judgment to alleviate learner anxiety and encourage student participation in upcoming activities. This exemplifies what Sacks et al. (1974) referred to as "recipient design" (p. 727), demonstrating an awareness of and adaptation to the participants' needs and the ongoing interaction. Overall, the use of translanguaging in the managerial mode serves the purpose of establishing the learning context and actively involving learners in the activity.

4.2 Translanguaging in Materials Mode: Creating a Translanguaging Space

Extract 2 is from a reading class where students are reading a text titled 'Heroes Are All Around Us'. The interaction in Extract 2 exclusively revolves around this reading text, representing the materials mode within the SETT framework. In this instance, T1 attempts to assess students' comprehension after they have read a text about a celebrity who utilized various media outlets to promote Dokdo as Korean territory to foreign countries. The teacher prompts learner responses specifically related to the reading text. Extract 2 demonstrates several characteristic interactional features of the materials mode, including the predominance of the IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) pattern, teacher-dominated turn-taking, and the use of display questions (Walsh 2006).

<Extract 2>

1		T1	Why did he advertise Dokdo in American newspaper and TV station? (0.2)
2		T1	Can you guess? Why?
3		S1	Il-pon (.) e:: ((Ss stutter))
			Japan (.) uh::
4		S2	Japan:: e::
			Japan:: uh::
5		S3	Wulinala:: e::
			Korea:: uh::
6	→	T1	E, hankukmallo haeto kwenchana
			Well, you can speak in Korean.
7		SS	((T1 and SS laugh)) Ilponi [wukyeseyo]
			Japan insists
8		SS	[caki ttangilako wukyeseyo]
			(Japan) claims that Dokdo is their land.
9		T1	right, So, we can say (.) he loves Korea.
10		T1	and why do you think he is respected?
11		SS	he donated money for poor people and (0.2)
12		SS	and advertise Dokdo.

An intriguing instance of Korean usage arises when students attempt to answer inferencing questions. Despite knowing the answers, they struggle to respond, likely due to their limited English proficiency. In response to the students' noticeable difficulty in speaking (as evident from lines 3 to 5), the teacher employed translanguaging to encourage the students to speak in Korean (line 6). This illustrates the teacher's use of elicitation as a corrective feedback technique. Students who faced difficulties in expressing their opinions in English were provided the opportunity to articulate their thoughts in their native language, Korean. This moment appears to grant them a sense of liberation, as indicated by the sudden laughter that fills the classroom (line 7), enabling them to move beyond the perception of being struggling learners.

This highlights the importance of creating a translanguaging space in second language classrooms for authentic dialogue. A "translanguaging space" can be defined as "a space created through translanguaging" (Wei 2011, p. 1222) where students are encouraged to use and integrate their entire linguistic repertoire including their first language alongside the target language of instruction. In this space, there is recognition and acceptance of multilingualism and the value of students' diverse language resources. Students have the freedom to draw on their linguistic knowledge and skills from various languages to express their thoughts, engage in discussions, and construct meaning, thereby enriching their learning experiences and fostering authentic dialogue.

Extract 2 effectively exemplifies Cenoz and Gorter's (2020) argument that a monolingual focus on the target language can hinder students from utilizing their own linguistic resources (p. 304). Canagarajah (2011) mentioned

that ESL or EFL learners are often considered "developmental" or "deficient" compared to native speakers who speak the perfect language (p. 15). Bley-Vroman (1983) has referred to this binary view as "comparative fallacy" (p. 2), where multilingual individuals are judged as nonnative and lacking proficiency in certain languages. Translanguaging challenges this binary view of language and acknowledges learners' linguistic resources as valuable tools for meaning-making. Canagarajah (2011) has pointed out that translanguaging can empower individuals and help them shape their identities positively. When students are given the freedom to utilize resources beyond English, a translanguaging space emerges, enabling them to express their opinions using the language they feel most comfortable with.

Furthermore, García and Otheguy (2020) emphasize the necessity of embracing translanguaging practices in the school environment as they facilitate learners' transformation from a state of inability to capability. Under a monolingual approach, students may be compelled to express their ideas solely in English. However, the experience of stuttering and the inability to effectively convey their thoughts using the target language may lead them to view themselves as deficient speakers. Conversely, the presence of a translanguaging space can have a positive impact on learners' self-perception.

4.3 Translanguaging in Mode Switch from Managerial to Skills and Systems Mode: Developing Metalinguistic Awareness

Extract 3 is taken from the latter part of a lesson on the present continuous tense, demonstrating a mode switch from the managerial mode to the skills and systems mode. In this instance, T2 employs an inductive approach to grammar instruction, guiding students to discover time expressions associated with both the present tense and the present progressive tense. These expressions include phrases like *every Sunday*, *always*, *usually*, *sometimes*, *on Sundays*, as well as present progressive indicators like *today* and *right now*. Initially, T2 establishes the task in the managerial mode, while the latter part of Extract 3 focuses specifically on achieving linguistic accuracy through the use of materials, rather than aiming to elicit learner responses or interactions from the materials themselves.

This extract incorporates elements of both the materials mode and the skills and systems mode. Zuo (2019) referred to this as "the materials-based skills and systems mode" (p. 152), where the primary emphasis of interaction stems from the materials, but the pedagogical focus lies in developing the accuracy of language practice and skills. Likewise, Extract 3 exemplifies a shift from the managerial mode to the materials-based skills and systems mode.

In the initial part of the extract, the teacher mixes English and Korean to introduce an activity where students must find time expressions used with each tense in the materials. Throughout this process, the teacher employs a blend of English and Korean, providing immediate translations of the Korean explanations. There are intermittent pauses during the teacher's discourse, as seen in lines 4 and 6. Additionally, the use of Korean in line 5 reiterates the previous instructions provided by the teacher in English (line 4). In line 6, the teacher scaffolds the students by providing additional examples to support their understanding. She elaborates on her question in lines 4 to 7 before posing it in line 8, which acts as a first-pair-part. Following this, she summarizes and repeats the question in Korean (line 9). However, the students were unable to provide an answer, as indicated by a significant pause in line 10, followed by hesitation in line 11. When the expected answer is not received, the teacher repeats the question in line 12, and only then does a second pair-part response emerge in line 13. The same process of identifying time expressions and adverbs is repeated in lines 17 to 26, which are omitted in Extract 3. In the later stage of the activity, the teacher provides a summary of the grammar rules learned during the activity in Korean (lines 27-28, 29 and 31).

<Extract 3>

1		T2	okay and this form is IS DOING or ARE DOING or AM DOING. this form.
2		T2	but this form is just: 'DOES' or 'DO'. ((T writes on the board))
3		T2	and (.) there is a very: IMPORTANT question (.)
4		T2	when we use thi this form (2.2) there is special word (0.5)
5	→	T2	ilen hyengthaylang kathi ssuinun thukcenghan tanetuli isse.
			There are certain expressions that go with these tenses.
6		T2	for example (0.8) EVERY DAY EVERY SUNDAY
7		T2	so, find it in your text (.) Find it in your text.
8		T2	can you tell me: another word? like this one?
9	→	T2	ca, ilen hyengthaylang kathi ssuinun thukcenghan tanetuli cikum theyksuthu aney issketun?
			Now, are there specific words in the text that are used with this form?
10			(1.2)
11		SS	Um::
			Well::
12		T2	Please tell me one.
13		SS	today
14		T2	today? In this part or this part? (0.8) today.
15		SS	A part
16		T2	Very good. Today (.) today is here
			((Lines 17 to 26 have been omitted, which discussed expressions commonly associated with the present tense such as *every Sunday*, *always*, *usually*, *sometimes*, and *on Sundays* and the present progressive tense including *today* and *right now*))
			((10 lines omitted))
27	→	T2	Pikyolul cikum haypoca. pikyolul hamyen (.)
			Let's compare now. If we compare (.)
28			ca. mayil, ilyoilmata hangsang, pothong, ttayttaylo, ilyoil ohwuey.
			well. every day, every Sunday, always, usually, usually, sometimes, on Sunday afternoon.
29	→	T2	ilen phyohyenkwa kathi ssuilttaynun waters, washes kathun phyohyenhakoman ssununkeyeyyo
			These expressions are specifically used in conjunction verb forms such as 'waters' and 'washes'
30		SS	yes
31	→	T2	haciman RIGHT NOW, TODAY ilen phyohyenkwa kathi ssul ttaynun (.) is feeding, are playing (.)
			However, expressions such as 'right now' and 'today' goes with verb forms such as 'is feeding' and 'are playing'
32		T2	Something like that. Okay I'll give you one question.

This incorporation of L1 in this specific context exemplifies the concept of pedagogic translanguaging, which involves instructional strategies that integrate two or more languages to develop metalinguistic and language awareness (Cenoz and Gorter 2021, Garcia and Wei 2014). Such pedagogic translanguaging carries significant benefits for student learning, granting them access to linguistic insights through both English materials and Korean explanations. This type of grammar rule presentation in Korean English classrooms is quite common. The teacher typically adopts an inductive teaching approach, placing significant emphasis on encouraging students' active participation in the learning process. However, as the lesson concludes, there tends to be a preference for clearly articulating the grammar rule in Korean, given its alignment with the students' familiarity and comprehension. This approach is also relevant to the assessment practices prevalent in Korea, which predominantly prioritize reading and grammar.

Despite being somewhat dated, several studies have examined the impact of grammar rule presentation within

the Korean EFL context. For instance, Shin's study (2003) revealed that explicit grammar presentation yielded benefits for students across various proficiency levels, leading to improved learning outcomes while also saving time and reducing confusion. Furthermore, in Kim's (2001) study, a group of high school students who received explicit rule presentation coupled with input enhancement showcased the most significant improvements in English grammar learning. The significance of the teacher's clarification of grammar rules should not be underestimated within the Korean EFL context.

4.4 Translanguaging in Classroom Context Mode: Conveying Semantic Nuances and Providing Language Input

Extracts 4 and 5 focus on a reading text with the theme of 'inner beauty.' Students are reading about the golden ratio of human faces and the qualities of attractive people, engaging in discussions with their teacher about the idea that true beauty is not defined by external standards, but rather by internal qualities. Both Extracts 4 and 5 exemplify the classroom context mode, which aims to foster dialogue and discussion about feelings, emotions, experiences and attitudes. The students and the teacher engage in conversations about celebrities and their positive qualities with the interaction primarily focusing on conveying the message rather than on the formal aspects of language. The teacher provides feedback on content and uses referential questions to encourage students to explore their thoughts more deeply.

<Extract 4>

1		T1	Is he handsome?
2		SS	No
3	→	T	No? But people call him as hwunnam, why do they call him hwunnam ?
			a handsome and warm-hearted guy
4	→	S1	toni manhayo=
			He has lots of money.
5	→	T1	=S1 says he has lots of money.
6	→	T1	why he has lots of money?
7	→	S2	Chwukkwulul cal hayyo
			he is good at playing soccer.
8	→	T1	Yes, he plays good soccer.
9	→	T1	why is he a good soccer player?
10	→	S4	Yensupul manhi hayseyo
			he practices a lot.
11	→	T1	Yes, he practiced a lot.
12		T1	Have you ever seen his foot?
13		SS	foot?
14	→	T1	ney, cingkulewul cengtolo (0.2) he practices a lot.
			Yes, they are extremely damaged
15	→	T1	We call this kind of people, hwunhwunhata, right?

There may be some debate regarding the classification of Extract 4 as classroom context mode since it does not exhibit the typical interactional features of this mode, such as extended learner turns and relatively short teacher turns. The data analysis in this research revealed limited instances of classroom context mode with extended learner turns and spontaneity. This suggests that when applying the SETT model, originally conceived in an ESL environment, to the context of a Korean classroom, it may manifest different characteristics. Notably, in this study, the disparities are most pronounced in the classroom context mode. Despite these distinctions, Extract 4 was coded

as classroom context mode due to its inclusion of referential questions and content feedback.

In this extract, both Korean and English are used by the students and the teacher, creating a translanguaging space. The teacher, in particular, incorporates Korean words into her English conversation when necessary. This practice is known as spontaneous translanguaging, which refers to "the reality of bilingual usage in naturally occurring contexts where boundaries between languages are fluid and constantly shifting" (Cenoz 2019, p. 77). For example, in Extract 4, the teacher uses Korean words like *hwunnam* (line 3), *cingkulewul cengtolo* (line 14), and *hwunhwunhata* (line 15). If the teacher did not use the term *hwunnam*, she might describe it as 'a man whose personality elicits feelings of warmth and pleasure in others'. However, this description may still fail to fully convey the subtle meaning understood by Koreans. This serves as a clear illustration that translanguaging extends beyond the mere use of two languages. Interlocutors bring their diverse experiences and cultural backgrounds into the classroom and ongoing interactions. The terms *hwunnam* and *hwunnye* were not translated as they carry shared perceptions within the Korean cultural context.

Moreover, the classroom context mode in Extract 4 reveals interesting patterns of questioning. In this setting, the teacher poses questions in English as the first-pair-part (lines 3, 6, 9), and the students respond in Korean as the second-pair-part (line 4, 7, 10). The teacher's sequence-closing third serves a dual role in providing feedback. Firstly, it acknowledges and accepts students' prior contributions through affirmations such as *yes* (lines 8 and 11). Secondly, it involves translating students' Korean responses into English (line 5, 8, 11), thereby exposing students to meaningful L2 input and enhancing the feedback process. This approach not only validates students' efforts but also facilitates their acquisition of L2 by consistently integrating it into the learning environment. This interactional pattern can be seen as a variation of the Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) patterns proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), which typically structure classroom interactions. The modified interaction pattern of Initiation-Response-Translation (IRT) in this scenario accommodates the language proficiency and communication needs of Korean learners, allowing them to effectively express their thoughts and receive feedback. The emergence of the IRT pattern in classroom context mode can be considered a specialized interaction feature tailored to the Korean context.

In the subsequent activity, students were instructed to define the qualities of *hwunnam* and *hwunnye* in English with their group members (e.g., *hwunnam is a considerate man*). In Extract 5, students, under the guidance of the teacher, share what they wrote about the positive attributes of *hwunnam* and *hwunnye* through group activities. Extract 5 differs from Extract 4 in that students share their ideas, but it is not spontaneous. This extract was also coded as classroom context mode since it focuses on sharing students' ideas and opinions. As shown in Extract 2, students face challenges expressing their opinions in English on the spot. To overcome this, they often engage in writing activities as a preliminary step to organize their thoughts before sharing them verbally. This may be considered as a characteristic of classroom context modes in the Korean SETT model.

Within Extract 5, interesting interactional features were discovered, particularly focusing on scaffolding. According to Walsh's (2006) framework, scaffolding involves strategies aimed at guiding learner discourse to elicit more comprehensive, precise, or contextually suitable responses. Walsh (2006) further categorizes scaffolding into three distinct subcategories: reformulation (rephrasing a learner's contribution), extension (extending a learner's contribution), and modeling (correcting a learner's contribution) (p. 44).

In Extract 5, the teacher begins with questions, and students respond using both English and Korean. The teacher carefully repeats the English responses, correcting any errors in pronunciation (line 4) and part of speech (line 11), which aligns with the modeling aspect of scaffolding. The teacher models the correct forms of the students' mistakes, hoping that they will notice and learn from their errors. Subsequently, the teacher redirects the question to the rest of the class, prompting them to provide the meanings of the words in Korean (lines 6, 12, 23).

<Extract 5>

1		T1	Ca, Is there any volunteer?
			Well
2		T1	Who will tell about hwunnam and hwunnye?
3		S1	Uh (.) touthful [tɔθfʊl]
4	→	T1	Uh?(.) Huh↓, they are thoughtful [θɔtfʊl] ((T writes down on the blackboard))
5		T1	Thoughtful
6	→	T1	What is THOUGHTFUL?
7		SS	Salyekiphun
			to be thoughtful
8	→	T1	uh, thoughtful. tto? Hoksi ikelang pisushan talun uykyeni issnun chinkwu??
			What else? Does anyone have another expression similar to 'thoughtful'?
9		T1	what else?
10		S2	modesty
11	→	T1	MO:DEST...
12	→	T1	What does it mean?= ((T writes down on the blackboard))
13		SS	= kyemsonhata
			to be humble
14		T1	e, kyemsonhan. ilen ttus ipnita.
			Right, it means 'humble'
15	→	T1	Hoksi ilen tanelul mollassten chinkwutulun meymohay twuseyyo.
			Please take a note if you didn't know this word.
16	→	T1	tto? Hoksi ikelang pisushan talun uykyeni issnun chinkwu?
			Has anyone used a different English expression with a similar meaning to this?
17			(0.6)
18	→	T1	They are thoughtful, modest, [and
19		S3	[Sense] of humor
20		T1	huh?
21		S3	Sense of humor
22	→	T1	Ah, they have sense of humor. ((T writes down on the blackboard))
23	→	T1	What is sense of humor?
24		SS	Yume kamkak ?
			sense of humor?
25	→	T1	e, ceki 6 coeyse pisushan iyakika issessten kes kathuntey (.) S4?
			Group 6 used a different English expression with a similar meaning
26		S4	They have wit=
27		T1	=e, They have wit. good.
28		T1	what else?
29		S5	good manner
30	→	T1	huh, they have good manners. ((T writes down on the blackboard))
31	→	T1	Hoksi good mannerlang pisushan tane ssusin pwun?
			Does anyone use an English expression with a similar meaning to 'good manners'?
32		T1	They have good manners.

Translanguaging serves as a vital tool in clarifying meaning between the teacher and the students, with the goal of helping students acquire a new vocabulary during the process of idea sharing. This practice not only facilitates the acquisition of English expressions from diverse sources but also enriches their vocabulary. A prime example of this is seen in the teacher's suggestion, made in Korean rather than English, to write down unknown words (line 15). The teacher also develops the words suggested by students into full sentences, which aligns with the 'extension' scaffolding strategy (lines 4, 18, 22, 30).

Furthermore, the teacher strives to connect students' opinions with those of their classmates who hold similar

viewpoints. This intention becomes evident in lines 8, 16, 25, and 31, where the teacher inquires with students about instances of similar but different English expressions. The teacher's effort to expose students to a diverse range of expressions is particularly noticeable in line 25, where in Korean, the teacher connects "sense of humor", presented by one group, with a similar word "wit", which originated from another group. This is a form of reformulation, where instead of directly rephrasing the students' expressions, the teacher elicits the rephrasing from the students themselves. Through the strategic use of Korean, the teacher ensures that all students have a clear understanding of the meanings of the words discussed. The primary aim of translanguaging in Extract 5 is to enhance students' vocabulary. This illustrates how translanguaging can be a valuable tool in language learning for students.

This activity effectively integrates the lesson's theme of 'inner beauty.' It demonstrates the potential for creating translanguaging activities, recognizing that the use of multiple languages from learners' repertoires is a natural and common occurrence among EFL learners. Such a "multilingual lesson" can create an inclusive learning environment and empower learners to express their linguistic creativity by utilizing diverse language resources. Exploring a topic from various linguistic perspectives can greatly enhance the language learning experience. Moreover, students may find that certain concepts or ideas are easier to express in one language than in others. This linguistic flexibility empowers students to heighten their awareness when selecting appropriate words and phrases to convey their intended messages. Furthermore, they come to recognize that certain intricate topics or words infused with specific cultural nuances can foster comprehension and enrich the overall quality of communication.

Additionally, the classroom context mode in the EFL environment evolved into a space where students could enrich their vocabulary and expressions while articulating their ideas. The teacher's spontaneous scaffolding created an environment where classroom interactions allowed students to identify precise language use, transform their ideas into sentences, and encounter a diverse range of expressions used by their classmates. In the Korean EFL context explored in this study, it is evident that the classroom context mode exhibits a range of distinct communicative features. Specifically, IRT patterns and scaffolding emerged as more prominent aspects compared to extended student turns and brief teacher turns. This observation underscores the adaptable nature of the SETT model, which appears to be contingent on various contextual and learner-related factors.

5. Conclusion

This study addresses two key questions: how teachers use L1 (Korean) in EFL classrooms and how translanguaging contributes to teaching and learning. Teachers employ translanguaging flexibly across classroom modes – using Korean to clarify instructions, support comprehension, and bridge communication gaps when students struggle to express ideas in English, exemplifying IRT (Initiation-Response-Translation) patterns. These practices ensure students remain engaged and can participate meaningfully, even with limited English proficiency.

Translanguaging offers cognitive, sociolinguistic, and pedagogical benefits. From a cognitive perspective, pedagogic translanguaging helps students organize and deepen their L2 knowledge, fosters conceptual understanding, and aligns with Korea's assessment system. Sociolinguistically, it creates an inclusive learning environment that values students' linguistic resources, promoting emotional well-being and active participation. Lastly, from pedagogical standpoint, translanguaging is an effective and time-efficient tool for classroom management. In the managerial context, using Korean clarifies students' confusion about the task. Teachers adapt their use of translanguaging to varying responses of students, ensuring that even complex instructions are

accessible to students with lower proficiency levels. Incorporating Korean, language students are comfortable with, surely contributes to a supportive learning environment.

Against Korea's long-standing monolingual ideology, this study argues that there is a valid rationale and practical utility in incorporating students' first language in the Korean EFL classroom. This research demonstrates the pedagogical effects of translanguaging in various learning contexts and suggests that it is time for EFL teachers to embrace a translanguaging stance – a philosophical orientation that acknowledges the value of drawing on students' full linguistic repertoires in the classroom (Garcia et al. 2016).

In his seminal work, Walsh (2011) underscored the importance of high-quality teacher talk in establishing meaningful and learner-centered interactions. Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) refers to the extent to which a teacher's language usage aligns with both the specific mode of instruction and the unique needs of the learners (Walsh 2006). CIC involves various components, including the skillful use of multiple modes, learner-convergent language, the creation of a supportive interactional space, the promotion of active learner engagement, and the application of effective elicitation strategies. This study posits that the deliberate and strategic translanguaging is a key component of a teacher's CIC in the Korean EFL classrooms.

The SETT framework, designed to help teachers reflect on their own classroom language use, is a valuable tool for enhancing CIC. However, for this model to be effective in diverse EFL contexts, it requires adaptation to reflect the unique characteristics, cultural aspects, and proficiency levels of learners. The need to localize the SETT model is evident in this study's classroom context mode. The need for preparatory writing sessions has emerged as essential, supporting students' ability to express ideas. Translanguaging serves as a scaffolding strategy, providing accurate, rich input while connecting peers' ideas. Additionally, the IRT pattern – where teachers translate Korean responses into English – proves effective for student expression and input exposure, highlighting features unique to the Korean context. Given these unique classroom dynamics, localizing the SETT framework ensures its relevance and effectiveness in fostering language learning and communication.

This study is based on data exclusively from middle school classes within the Korean EFL context. Classroom interaction can vary significantly depending on factors such as school level, educational objectives, and learners' proficiency. Future research across diverse school levels and contexts could yield additional insights into translanguaging practices in Korea. Furthermore, as Rabbidge (2019, p. 1307) mentioned, translanguaging practices are intricately intertwined with factors such as teachers' pedagogical beliefs, prior teaching and learning experience, educational backgrounds, socio-historical contexts, assessment methods, and educational policies in Korea. Therefore, it is imperative to use multiple approaches, such as narrative studies, classroom observations, and various reflective activities, to thoroughly examine the translanguaging phenomenon from multiple perspectives.

This study underscores the advantages of translanguaging in the Korean EFL context. However, it is crucial to acknowledge the critical perspective on the unregulated and indiscriminate use of Korean in the classroom. Teachers should prioritize the impact of their linguistic choices on students' English language learning during classroom interactions. One teacher-researcher made a noteworthy observation in her reflection, stating, "When the teacher communicates in English, students make efforts to speak in English, regardless of how small those attempts may be." Consequently, alongside the effective implementation of translanguaging, the strategic use of English by teachers can serve as a catalyst for motivating and fostering English communication. It is imperative that this insight remains a focal point in future research and teacher education.

References

Ahn, S., M. Kim and J. Lee. 2020. Beyond the NS/NNS dichotomy: Exploring the potential of translanguaging in CPP practice by Korean EFL teachers. *Journal of Asia TEFL* 17(2), 540-561.

Akbar, R. S. S. and H. A. Taqi. 2020. Translanguaging as an ESL learning strategy: A case study in Kuwait. *International Journal of Higher Education* 9(6), 54-63.

Allwright, D. and K. M. Bailey. 1991. *Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers.* Cambridge University Press.

Aşık, A. and S. Kuru Gönen. 2016. Pre-service EFL teachers' reported perceptions of their development through SETT experience. *Classroom Discourse* 7(2), 164-183.

Auerbach, E. 1993. Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 27(1), 9-32.

Baker, C**.** 2011. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. 2001. Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics. In K. Rose and G. Kasper, eds., *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*, 13-32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bley-Vroman, R. 1983. The comparative fallacy in interlanguage studies: The case of systematicity. *Language Learning* 33(1), 1-17.

Breen, M. P**.** 1998. Navigating the discourse: On what is learned in the language classroom. In W. A. Renandya and G. M. Jacobs, eds., *Learners and Language Learning*, 19-44. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Burton, J. and S. Rajendram. 2019. Translanguaging-as-resource: University ESL instructors' language orientations and attitudes toward translanguaging. *TESL Canada Journal* 36(1), 21-47.

Byrd Clark, J. 2012. Heterogeneity and a sociolinguistics of multilingualism: Reconfiguring French language pedagogy. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 6(1), 1-19.

Canagarajah, S. 2011. Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. In Li Wei, ed., *Applied Linguistics Review* 2, 1-27. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Canagarajah, S. 2018. Materializing 'competence': Perspectives from international STEM scholars. *The Modern Language Journal* 102, 1-24.

Carroll, K. S. and A. N. Sambolín Morales. 2016. Using university students' L1 as a resource: Translanguaging in a Puerto Rican ESL classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal* 39(3-4), 248-262.

Cenoz, J. and D. Gorter. 2014. Focus on multilingualism as an approach in educational contexts. In A. Blackledge and A. Creese, eds., *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*, 239-254. Dordrecht: Springer.

Cenoz, J. 2019. Translanguaging pedagogies and English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching* 52(1), 71-85.

Cenoz, J. and D. Gorter. 2020. Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes* 39(2), 300-311.

Cenoz, J. and D. Gorter. 2021. *Pedagogical Translanguaging.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. 1992. Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning* 42(4), 557-591.

Cummins, J. 2000. *Language, Power, and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Drew, P. and J. Heritage. eds., 1992. *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foreman, W. and C. K. Min. 2010. Attitudes of learners, NESTs, & Korean NNESTs toward teaching English in English (TEE) in Korea. *The English Teachers Association in Korea* 16(2), 25-44.

García, O. and R. Otheguy. 2020. Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 23(1), 17-35.

García, O. and L. Wei. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York: Palgrave Pivot.

García, O. and L. Wei. 2015. The translanguaging turn and its impact. In *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*, 19-44. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

García, O., S. Ibarra Johnson and K. Seltzer. 2016. *The Translanguaging Classroom: Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning.* Philadelphia: Caslon.

Ghafarpour, H. 2017. Classroom conversation analysis and critical reflective practice: Self-evaluation of teacher talk framework in focus. *RELC Journal* 48(2), 210-225.

Gorter, D. 2015. Multilingual interaction and minority languages: Proficiency and language practices in education and society. *Language Teaching* 48(1), 82-98.

Guo, T. 2007. *A Case Study of Teachers Codeswitching Behaviours in Mainland China's University EFL Classrooms and Student's Reactions to the Codeswitching.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

Guo, H. 2023. Chinese primary school students' translanguaging in EFL classrooms: What is it and why is it needed? *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher* 32(2), 211-226

Huan, F. and L. Wang. 2011. A self-evaluation of classroom language used when teaching grammar. *International Education Studies* 4(4), 270-272.

Jang, E. Y. 2021. Possibilities of translanguaging and plurilingualism for new language education in South Korea. *Journal of Multiculture and Education* 6(2), 1-18.

Jeanjaroonsri, R. 2018. A study of constructive or restrictive features of classroom discourse in an EFL adult classroom in Thai context. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network* 11(1), 125-139

Jefferson, G. 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner, ed., *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, 13-34. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kim, E. Y. 2001. *The Effects of Input Enhancement and Learners' Rule Awareness on English Grammar Learning of Korean High School Students.* Master's thesis, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea.

Kubota, R. 2018. Unpacking research and practice in world Englishes and Second Language Acquisition. *World Englishes* 37(1), 93-105.

Mauranen, A. K. 2018. Second Language Acquisition, world Englishes, and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). *World Englishes* 37(1), 106-119.

Menken, K. and M. T. Sánchez. 2019. Translanguaging in English-only schools: From pedagogy to stance in the disruption of monolingual policies and practices. *TESOL Quarterly* 53(3), 741-767.

Ministry of Education. 1997. *The 6th Revised Curriculum - Foreign Language (English).* Ministry of Education.

Mukhopadhyay, L. 2020. Translanguaging in primary level ESL classroom in India: An exploratory study. *International Journal of English Language Teaching* 7(2), 1-15.

Ooi, W. Z. and A. A. Aziz. 2021. Translanguaging pedagogy in the ESL classroom: A systematic review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development* 10(3), 676-709.

Park, H. and Y. K. Kim. 2011. Motivation and methods of secondary teachers implementing Teaching English in English (TEE). *English Language Teaching* 23(3), 103-126.

Park, J. S. Y. 2009. *The Local Construction of a Global Language: Ideologies of English in South Korea.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Rabbidge, M. 2019. The effects of translanguaging on participation in EFL classrooms. *Journal of Asia TEFL* 16(4), 1305-1322.

Sacks, H., E. A. Schegloff and G. Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50(4), 696-735.

Sacks, H. and E. A. Schegloff. 1979. Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In G. Psathas, ed., *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, 14-21. New York: Irington Publishers.

Seedhouse, P. 2008. Learning to talk the talk: Conversation analysis as a tool for induction of trainee teachers. In S. Garton and K. Richards, eds., *Professional Encounters in TESOL*, 42-57. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sinclair, J. and R. M. Coulthard. 1975. *Toward the Analysis of Second Language Classroom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shamsipour, A. and H. Allami. 2012. Teacher talk and learner involvement in EFL classroom: The case of Iranian setting, *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 2(11), 2262-2268.

Shin, I. H. 2003. *Effects of Input, Explicit Rule Presentation, and Output Works on Korean EFL Learners' Learning of Grammar*. Master's thesis, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea.

Tabatabaei, R. 2020. *Translanguaging in ESL Classrooms in Sweden: From the Students' Point of View*. Master's thesis. Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden.

Tsui, A. B. M. 2003. *Understanding Expertise in Teaching: Case Studies of Second Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walsh, S. 2006. *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. New York: Routledge

Walsh, S. 2011. *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action.* New York: Routledge.

Walsh, S. 2013. *Classroom Discourse and Teacher Development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wang, H. and P. C. Lai. 2023. Classroom interaction and second language acquisition in the metaverse world. In *Strategies and Opportunities for Technology in the Metaverse World,* 186-195. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Wei, L. 2011. Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(5), 1222-1235.

Xiong, Y. 2024. Teacher contingency in the Chinese immersion classroom of young learners: A translanguaging perspective. *Linguistics and Education* 80, 101292.

Yang, J. and I. Jang, 2022. The everyday politics of English-only policy in an EFL language school: Practices, ideologies, and identities of Korean bilingual teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 25(3), 1088-1100.

Yeom, E. Y. 2021. Korean middle school EFL emergent bilinguals' transactional meaning-making regarding multiculturalism through translanguaging in book club discussions. *The Korean Society for Teaching English Literature* 25(2), 213-244.

Yuzlu, M. Y. and K. Dikilitaş, 2022. Translanguaging in the development of EFL learners' foreign language skills in the Turkish context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 16(2), 176-190.

Zhang, H. 2024. Translanguaging space and classroom climate created by teacher's emotional scaffolding and students' emotional curves about EFL learning. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 21(1), 298-324.

Zhao, C. 2013. Classroom interaction and second language acquisition: The more interactions the better? *Studies in Literature and Language* 7(1), 22-26.

Zuo, M. 2019. *Code-Switching in EFL Teacher Talk at Chinese Universities: A Conversation Analytical Perspective.* Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK. Newcastle University.

Zuo, M. and S. Walsh. 2023. Translation in EFL teacher talk in Chinese universities: A translanguaging perspective. *Classroom* Discourse 14(2), 128-146.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Level: Secondary

