



## The Effects of Translanguaging on Participation in EFL Classrooms

Michael Rabbidge

*Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, South Korea*

This study employed pedagogic discourse theory (Bernstein, 1990) to investigate whether student participation was affected by teachers' translanguaging practices. The study employed qualitative research methods, including classroom observations and semi-structured interviews, to gather data on teachers' classroom practices in regards to their translanguaging practices. The data was then analysed via pedagogic discourse theory to ascertain how power and control within the translanguaging practices influenced student participation. Results suggest that teachers' translanguaging practices may improve students' ability to participate in class by improving student understanding of teacher talk. However, when teachers translanguage within IRF sequences, student participation appears to be limited to responses within the IRF sequences, suggesting students may struggle to gain any sense of control over the learning environment in such situations. Results therefore infer that translanguaging may not always provide space for the creative or critical thinking that is often discussed in translanguaging literature.

**Keywords:** translanguaging, first language use, pedagogic discourse, EFL, IRF

### Introduction

Globalization's influence on the South Korean education system has reportedly seen the English language promoted as a tool that can improve the socioeconomic prospects of both the country and its citizens (Seth, 2002). This has led to calls for English to be granted status as an official language, creating much debate over the role of English in South Korea (Seth, 2002). While some researchers state the importance of English for South Korea's global competitiveness (Park, 2009; Yoo, 2005), lingering criticisms insinuate that English is merely a tool which maintains historically entrenched social hierarchies (Song, 2011). Studies that have looked at the extent of Korean-English bilingualism in South Korea (Baik, 1992; Shim, 1994) have been criticized as describing what amounts to impersonal bilingualism (Song, 1998, 2011), a superficial use of English within pop culture that is not evident in the daily life of most citizens. Other criticisms extend to the controversial and sometimes divisive rhetoric surrounding English's place in South Korea (Jeon & Lee, 2017). Such criticisms naturally lend themselves to supporting traditional notions of South Korea as a monolingual nation (Song, 2011). Nevertheless, more inclusive notions that redefine bi- or multilingualism as the use of at least two languages in everyday life (Grosjean, 2013) present arguments for South Korea to be reimagined as a nation with an emerging bilingual, if not multilingual, citizenry, and present an opportunity to redefine South Korea's relationship with the English language.

English becomes a compulsory subject from the third grade of elementary school, and, officially, there is a first language exclusion policy that prohibits use of the Korean language when teaching English (Kang, 2008). Unofficially, however, studies reveal that teacher's use their language repertoires as they

see fit (Choi & Leung, 2017; Kang, 2008, 2013; Liu, Ahn, Baek, & Han, 2004; Rabbidge & Chappell, 2014). This has led to interest in how South Korean English teachers conduct their classes. Most, if not all, studies have taken the traditional view of English and Korean languages as discrete linguistic systems operating within teachers or students, where changes between the systems are described as code switches (Kang, 2008, 2013; Lee & Macaro, 2013; Liu et al., 2004; Rabbidge & Chappell, 2014). However, studies employing this view of language can unintentionally position teachers and learners in terms of deficiency, and tend to undervalue the use of the first language (García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; García & Wei, 2014; MacSwan, 2017; Mahboob & Lin, 2016).

A counter view to that of code switching is translanguaging, which is defined as ‘the deployment of a speaker’s full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages’ (Otheguy, García, & Reid, 2015, p. 281). This definition allows for the use of Korean in English language teaching as an opportunity to create more equitable learning experiences that potentially improves student opportunity to participate in, and interact critically with, class content. The concept of translanguaging can be employed to view Korean EFL teachers as bilinguals, and Korean EFL students as emerging bilinguals, rather than as deficient, non-native speakers (Grosjean, 2013; Turnbull, 2016). However, such views have not been applied in research on Korean EFL teachers in South Korea. This study therefore addresses this gap by understanding the language practices of Korean EFL teachers as translanguaging. Taking this view of teachers’ language use as a starting point, the study examines if these translanguaging practices provide space for the transformative benefits often associated with translanguaging. It attempts this by employing a pedagogic discourse theory (Bernstein, 1990) that examines if translanguaging affects student participation. This project focuses on the role translanguaging plays in student participation in order to better understand how participation is affected by translanguaging in EFL contexts, as this is said to be a major tenet of translanguaging theory. Additionally, participation in the EFL classroom has been a source of constant concern for language educators and often a source of justification for the use of the first language in EFL contexts (Kang, 2008, 2013; Rabbidge, 2017).

## Literature Review

This review will start with a discussion on translanguaging, looking at its origins as a concept, its growing relevance to different language teaching contexts, and its relationship to participation in the classroom. Then, it will introduce the theoretical concept of Bernstein’s pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 1975, 1990, 2000) and how the constructs of this concept are used to understand participation in the classroom.

### Translanguaging

The concept of translanguaging originated in Wales (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012), describing the discursive practices of bilinguals. It has since evolved to encourage language users to employ their entire linguistic repertoire (García & Wei, 2014), where a repertoire is the myriad of ways people use language in diverse social contexts rather than a system of grammar (MacSwan, 2017). Translanguaging has been used to describe multilingual practices which previously may have been labelled code switching (Wei, 2011), and therefore the two concepts are distinguishable in a number of ways. Firstly, translanguaging recognizes named languages (such as Korean or English) as social fabrications (Makoni & Pennycook, 2006) that do not exist as separate entities within language users. Code switching, conversely, historically describes languages as existing separately as discrete items within bi- or multilingual users (Otheguy et al., 2015). Translanguaging describes the single, unified, language system within a user as an idiolect or linguistic repertoire to more accurately portray the unique characteristics of an individual’s language. Code switching relies on the names assigned to languages by society, which are largely generalizations of

language use (Makoni & Pennycook, 2006). These differences in terminology are important as they influence how interactions are analyzed and described (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; MacSwan, 2017). Consequently, translanguaging also differs from code switching in that it does not adhere to monolingual biases which have traditionally marginalized bilinguals speakers (García & Wei, 2014). Overall, translanguaging is said to provide a more inclusive, non-deficit account of language use compared to the traditional literature on code switching (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; García & Wei, 2014).

## **Translanguaging and Participation**

Translanguaging studies equate participation with students using their full linguistic repertoire to engage in learning tasks, and translanguaging is reported to afford learners opportunities to utilize their full linguistic repertoire, without sociopolitical rules of separation, in order to achieve greater overall academic success (Bartlett & García, 2011; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; García & Kleyn, 2016). This is because of the role translanguaging is said to have in enhancing student participation. Research reports how meaningful participation created by translanguaging may endow learners with positive identities (García & Wei, 2014) as well as possibly guarantee student participation (García, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017), which potentially leads to the development of weaker aspects of a learner's linguistic repertoire in relation to stronger ones (García & Wei, 2014). Research suggests translanguaging may promote better understanding of class content, create stronger home-school connections, and allow for better participation between weaker and stronger learners in mixed ability classes (Paulsrud, Rosen, Straszer, & Wedin, 2017). Research to date has also suggested translanguaging may provide learners with access to curricula content (García & Kano, 2014), may be used to understand the meaning of new vocabulary in another language (Creese & Blackledge, 2011), and may allow greater classroom participation (Allard, 2017). Accepting an answer, no matter the language spoken, has also been shown to progress student agency compared to contexts which limit access to linguistic resources (Arthur & Martin, 2006).

Translanguaging has been found to occur in organizational and non-school related matters as well as curricular activities and knowledge transfer (Jaspers, 2015; Rosiers, Van Lancker, & Delarue, 2017). Translanguaging potentially serves a socio-emotional purpose that allows students and teachers to demonstrate knowledge of social hierarchies within the classrooms as well as to mediate multilingual identities, which may improve student participation (García et al., 2017; Rosiers et al., 2017). Translanguaging has been described as a 'moral and political act that links the production of alternative meanings to transformative social action' (García & Wei, 2014, p. 37) which theoretically creates spaces (Wei, 2011) for learners to develop and modify their 'historical and present conditions critically and creatively' by understanding social norms that affect daily life (García & Wei, 2014, p. 67). The boundaries of such spaces are created by the interactions between speakers, and it is within these boundaries that creativity and criticality may allow for challenges to established norms to take place.

## **Translanguaging and Non-participation**

Nevertheless, translanguaging's influence on participation can be tempered by unsupportive educational ecologies (Allard, 2017). Educational environments with ambiguous language policies may influence teachers, who are guided by their own beliefs or other socio-historical factors, to privilege one language over another, unintentionally encumbering translanguaging spaces. This was a finding of significance by Martinez-Roldan (2015), where a lack of guidance resulted in some teachers favoring English over Spanish, impacting students willingness to use the language favored by the teachers. Furthermore, Jasper (2018) de-emphasizes the 'causal effects that are presupposed' (p. 7) of translanguaging by restressing the impact of socio-economic, political or historical factors that accompany all languages. Jaspers (2018) similarly states how negative attitudes towards students' home languages do not always result in student failure to learn a language (Rampton, 2006). Likewise, attempts to incorporate more of students' home language into the learning process may not be welcomed by

students (Sierens & Van Avermaet, 2014). Caution is therefore required when applying the translanguaging concept, as it is more than just employing linguistic repertoires. It is about accepting linguistic repertoires to enhance participation, improve language learning experiences, and inevitably build positive identities (García & Wei, 2014).

## **Pedagogic Discourse**

Translanguaging is said to create more equality in the classroom by employing individuals' full linguistic repertoire in the language learning process (García & Wei, 2014). Yet teacher authority is ubiquitous in teaching (Buzzelli & Johnston, 2001). Initiation Response Feedback sequences (IRF) (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), considered the unmarked norm of classroom discourse in EFL classrooms (Hicks, 1995; Wells, 1994), allow teachers to demonstrate authority by restricting students to routinized, teacher-led interactions, creating passive learning environments (Arthur & Martin, 2006). The use of the first language within IRF sequences is said to improve participation as well as promote more complex student contributions (Li, 2018; Littlewood & Yu, 2011)

To understand how authority affects participation in translanguaging practices, this study examines teachers' translanguaging practices using the theory of pedagogic discourse. This theory is defined as "a principle for appropriating other discourses and bringing them into a special relation with each other for the purposes of their selective transmission and acquisition" (Bernstein, 1990, p. 183). In other words, analysing pedagogic discourse reveals mechanisms of authority at operation within classrooms (McLean, Abbas, & Ashwin, 2013). Pedagogic discourse exposes the influence of language choices via classification and framing that deal with the location of power and control in the classroom respectively (Bernstein, 1990; Buzzelli & Johnston, 2001; Chappell, 2014). Classification describes the socially constructed boundaries in the classroom which create hierarchical relations between students and teachers. Strong classification is the result of teachers creating boundaries which limit the amount of outside knowledge students can use in the classroom. Weak classification is the result of teachers allowing outside knowledge into the classroom. Teachers' control of selection, pacing, and sequencing of learning activities, as well as what qualifies as knowledge to be learned, result in strong framing which potentially limits student input in the learning process. When students have more input or control over learning in the classroom, framing is said to weaken. Framing regulates the rules of social order and rules of discursive order. Rules of social order, such as teacher authority, are revealed in the regulative register. This register is how teachers control behaviour and represent moral orders of society. Rules of the discursive order (selection, sequence, pacing and criteria of knowledge) are revealed in the instructional register, and is how teachers control how an activity is taught (Chappell, 2014).

Framing weakens when learners gain control over the timing of their learning, which is possible when teachers embrace pedagogic principles that provide such opportunities to change practices (Bernstein, 2000; Morais, 2002). Weakened framing is accompanied by weakened classification, which allows learners to use non-academic discourses in academic contexts to improve access to the target knowledge (Bernstein, 2000; Chappell, 2014; Morais, 2002). Studies have shown that weaker framing and weaker classification increase learners' freedom to interact in class, ask questions and share ideas (Bernstein, 2000; Chappell, 2014; Morais, 2002).

Public school teacher's pedagogic discourse moves students into teachers' ideal pedagogic subject positions (Singh, 2010), which is when students do what the teacher wants (Chappell, 2014; Christie, 1995, 2002; Singh, 2010). Ideal pedagogic subject positions are contingent upon a number of socio-historical, cultural and institutionally based experiences which act through teacher beliefs and actions. The regulative and instructional registers are responsible for moving the learner into the ideal pedagogic subject position and hence ready to learn (Bernstein, 1990).

Singh's study of Samoan students within the Australian public school system showed how 'contradictory and conflicting subject positions' can result from a teacher's pedagogic discourse (2010, p. 255). Alienation was said to occur when learners did not understand, and therefore rejected, the regulative

and instructional registers of the classroom. Detachment was said to occur when learners accepted the instructional registers but rejected classroom regulative registers. Deferment was observed in students who put on hold their commitment to the registers of the classroom (Singh, 2010). Another position not observed but theorized included estrangement, which refers to learners who may struggle with the instructional register but still accept the regulative register. These learners either align themselves with teacher's ideal subject position or move into a position of alienation (Bernstein, 1975).

As established earlier, translanguaging potentially improves student participation in the classroom (Garcia et al., 2017; García & Wei, 2014). Therefore, this study employs the theory of pedagogic discourse to the teachers' translanguaging practices to see if translanguaging influences student participation and is guided by question:

RQ: How do the translanguaging practices of South Korean English teachers shape student participation?

## Methods and Materials

### Participants

The study employed case study methodology from the qualitative paradigm to investigate the classroom practices and beliefs of five Korean English teachers who worked in different elementary schools within the same city in South Korea. In line with translanguaging, these teachers are viewed as English and Korean bilinguals rather than NNESTs who are deficient in English. I knew all participants from my time as an instructor on a government funded in-service teacher trainer program within South Korea. The participants were chosen due their stated beliefs about needing to use their L1 when teaching English. The participants themselves were not aware of the concept of translanguaging per se, but described their classrooms as places where they believed it to be inappropriate to limit student or teacher linguistic choices. Their stated beliefs about their teaching practices during informal discussions with the researcher fell in line with more recent and inclusive definitions of both bilingualism (Grosjean, 2013) and translanguaging (Bartlett & García, 2011; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; García & Kleyn, 2016) in that it appeared the teachers believed linguistic freedom to be necessary when teaching English. One of the constants in these informal talks was how using both the L1 and English ensured greater student participation, which according to translanguaging should also provide more equitable learning situations. It is therefore from these discussions that this research project developed. The method of purposeful sampling used here has been successfully employed in similar studies (Carless, 2004; Kang, 2008, 2013; Tsui, 2003), and therefore was deemed appropriate for the current study.

All participants displayed adequate knowledge of the South Korean English teaching context at the elementary school level, sufficient expressiveness of language, as well as suitable approachability and availability, making them appropriate candidates for the research project (Wolcott, 1988). The number of participants also (five) fell within the range of participants considered necessary to reach a saturation of data (Boyd, 2001). Three teachers are discussed here as they adequately represent the findings of the study while meeting writing constraints. Biographical information is provided in the table below. All names are pseudonyms.

TABLE 1  
*Participant Information*

	Years Teaching English	Gender	Age group	Grade of class	Level of education	Current Teacher type
Keum me	12 years	Female	30-35	5th grade	M.Ed.	Subject teacher
Myung hyun	10 years	Female	30-35	5th grade	M.Ed.	Subject teacher
Myung jin	10 years	Female	30-35	4th grade	B.Ed.	Subject teacher

## Procedure

A comparative case study approach (Stake, 1995, 2005) allowed an examination of the translanguaging practices of the participants. Beliefs about translanguaging were also examined via interviews to provide further background to their actions. Each case had a single participant who was interviewed twice. The first semi-structured interview collected participants' recollections of their own language learning experiences and experiences learning to teach. A second interview focused on their current beliefs about how they teach and use language in class. Each participant was observed teaching two 40-minute lessons to the grades mentioned in the table above, and each observation was video recorded.

## Classroom Analysis

An initial analysis of the classroom transcripts revealed a high prevalence of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequences (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), which was not a surprise as IRF sequences tend to dominate teacher-centered classrooms worldwide (Cazden, 2001) and are associated with safe and routinized English classroom interactions. Arthur and Martin's (2006) use of IRF analysis revealed how teachers controlled students' use of language and limited participation to that deemed appropriate by the teachers. Being that IRF sequences are central to Bernstein's (1975) framing of transmitted knowledge, the IRF sequences in the current study were analyzed to investigate how the IRF sequences influenced power and control in the classrooms.

The system of negotiation (Martin & Rose, 2007) identifies the movement of information and action during lessons. The basic parameters of negotiation are:

- what is being negotiated (information or goods and services);
- whether it is being given or demanded (statement-information /offer-goods, or question); and
- whether a move initiates or responds to the exchange (Martin & Rose, 2007)

Four basic speech functions dominate exchanges: statements, questions, commands, and offers. Within these speech functions, the following grammatical moods are labeled and classified in both congruent forms and metaphorical forms,

- declarative
- interrogative
- imperative (Martin & Rose, 2007)

This system of negotiation and identification of speech functions (Martin & Rose, 2007) was used in the analysis to reveal who was delivering information during exchanges, and who was receiving it and how, which assisted in the identification of power and control. This then revealed certain inequalities in the exchanges which led to further discussion about the different uses of the teachers and students' linguistic repertoires.

## Results

This section will present the data and analysis as collected for each case in the study. The interviews revealed that all teachers believe that translanguaging ensures they can control the students and improve student participation in classroom activities effectively. However, analysis of the classroom interactions suggests that translanguaging within the IRF sequences may have limited student participation to responding to the teachers' initiations.

The classroom extract analyses included in this section are understood as possible instances of translanguaging, as they are situations in the lessons when teachers and/or students were observed to rely on their full linguistic repertoire rather than adhering to ideologies that call for the restriction of the L1 in TL teaching suggesting there was possibly little regard for socially or politically constructed boundaries of named languages, (Otheguy et al., 2015) with the goal of improving participation in observed lessons.

### From Keum me's Classes

The following exchange from the interview sums up Keum me's beliefs about her use of language repertoires in her classes

R: How much English do you think should be used to teach English?

K: I think unless students are naughty as much as possible so... I think 100% is good because if they can understand ... well because it is English class so as much as possible

R: Is this a personal feeling or something you have learned from someone?

K: Mixed yeah personally I think English lesson should be taught in English and when I think of my past experiences that learned English it made me feel more fun or motivated

R: How about disadvantages of only using English?

K: I can't be sure that every student understands my instructions

R: What do you do when you feel like that?

K: I try to ask that student some questions about my instructions in Korean still they don't look like they understand I try to say it in Korean again also students easily get distracted because when the students do not like to hear English, they just ask other students what is the teacher saying? They don't even try to listen

R: Why do you think that they don't try to listen?

K: I think it is because of the big difference of student level

R: So, the lower level students can't or don't want to?

K: Both

R: Any other disadvantages?

K: And when students are naughty and give some bad behavior, I feel really uncomfortable because even though I try to discipline in English I think like it is no use it is not useful they can't understand or don't feel it is serious.

As can be seen, Keum me's preference was to use English as much as possible in her classes, even to the extent of total omission of Korean if students behave appropriately. Her reference to using Korean as a means of controlling 'naughty' students, as well as ensuring all students could participate in the class, however, reveals contextual constraints on her ability to enact this preference. Other contextual constraints include student competency in English, something which she seemed to suggest varies from student to student in her classes. Keum me's use of Korean as a disciplinary measure has other consequences for the way she understands her classes as well. In particular, she claimed that her use of Korean tended to be viewed negatively by the students due to her reliance on Korean for discipline or explaining more difficult concepts in class. Her beliefs were such that she felt the students were more

relaxed during class when she was using English and more wary when she employed her Korean repertoire.

K: It's a kind of personal idea but when I use English, ... I ... students feel more comfortable so when I speak in Korean, they just look at me as a real teacher, or an adult. How can I say, kind of dominated?

This led me to ask where she felt these ideas originated from, to which she replied

K: From my past experience, so when I learned English and when I went to the academy and there was a teacher who only used English a foreign teacher maybe it's because he was a foreigner, I'm not sure but yeah using English itself makes the atmosphere better

In addition to this, she stated she felt her use of English language made her class unique in comparison to other subjects studied in school, and this seemed to be a significant influence in her preference for English. From her interviews, she suggested that her full linguistic repertoire for disciplining students and making explicit the requirements of participation for activities generally ensures students participate appropriately in class activities.

The following extracts analyses via the constructs of framing and classification show occasions when Keum me actively translanguaged in her classes to improve classroom participation, either via ensuring discipline or safeguarding against a lack of student understanding of activity requirements. These analyses reveal the effects that translanguaging had on participation in these occasions.

### Extract one

- 1 (I) T: So like this, it was team five's bandit so you have to circle the right picture and circle team five, like this, so you have to find five bandits, how many bandits?
- 2 (R) Ss: Five
- 3 (F) T: Five bandits, 왜 다섯 개죠? 여섯 모듬인데? (Why five? There are six groups (of students))
- 4 (R) S: 우리 꺼 빼고요. (We don't include our own)
- 5 (F) T: 그렇죠. 자기 거 빼고 몇 개 모듬을 찾으시면 돼요? (That's right, if you don't include your own how many do you find?)
- 6 (R) Ss: 다섯 (five)
- 7 (F) T: 다섯 모듬 것 찾으시면 되겠습니다. (You can find five)
- 8 (I) T: 제일 먼저 누가 움직인다 구요? (Which student moves first?)
- 9 (R) Ss: 1 번 (number 1)
- 10 (F) T: 1 번 (number 1)
- 11 (I) T: 5 번이 없으면 다시? (Who goes again if there is no number 5?)
- 12 (R) Ss: 1 번 (number 1)
- 13 (I) T: 한사람이 여기로 갔다가 그 다음 사람이 저기로 갔다가 하면 될까요? (If one student goes here can the next student go here?)
- 14 (R) Ss: no

In this extract, Keum me's translanguaging while giving instructions (lines 3, 5, 7, 8) weakened classification, ensuring students understood how to complete the activity. It also strengthened framing, via interrogative (lines 3, 5) and declarative (lines 5, 7) mood choices, which gave her control of activity pacing and sequencing. The IRF routines resulted in Keum me initiating each exchange, which restricted students to responses. However, this was important as it ensured that students were better prepared to

complete the activity. This example of translanguaging within IRF routines may have limited student participation during the giving of instructions, but resulted in improved student participation during the learning activity.

### Extract two

- 1 (I) T: Open your textbooks. Where is Jiyeon?  
 2 (R) S1: 책을 얻고있다 (He is getting his book)  
 3 (R) S2: 괜찮아 (It's OK)  
 4 (F) T: 뭐 괜찮아? (What's OK?)  
*Silence as the class waits for the teacher.*  
 5 (I) T: Are you on the right page? Hello everyone  
 6 (R) Ss: Hello teacher  
 7 (I) T: How are you today?  
 8 (R) Ss: Fine, happy....  
 9 (F) T: Happy, tired, hot.  
 10 (I) T: Did you have P.E class?  
 11 (R) Ss: Yes  
 12 (I) T: So maybe you are happy?  
 13 (R) Ss: No  
 14 (F) T: No, you look so tired.  
 15 (I) T: What day is it today?  
 16 (R) Ss: Today is Tuesday  
 17 (F) T: Tuesday  
 18 (I) T: And how's the weather outside?  
 19 (R) Ss: It's sunny  
 20 (F) T: Sunny  
 21 (I) T: And what's the date today?  
 22 (R) Ss: Today is October 28th

This opening exchange was observed in most classes in the project. Teachers would stand at the front and ask the class simple questions, and students would answer as a whole class, leaving little room for individual answers. As Keum me was beginning the lesson, she noticed a student was missing (line 1). The mood choices, firstly imperative, then interrogative, strengthened classification of the lesson, and reinforced the hierarchical relationship between the teacher and the students. When students answered her question in Korean (weakening classification, line 2, 3) her stricter tone and use of Korean implied she was not happy that they had replied in Korean, as she wanted to start the class in English. This was reinforced when she continued again in English in line 5 and proceeded to lead a question-and-answer exchange, all in English. Despite the change in register, she maintained her dominance by controlling the selection of topics, the sequencing and pacing of the exchanges via IRF cycles, and the criteria of what constituted an appropriate answer. In this extract, her translanguaging restricted her students' full linguistic repertoires, and this coupled with the grammatical mood choices and IRF cycles left little room for students to participate independently of the teacher's dictates.

That being said, the students who had answered in Korean were observed to remain silent during the ensuing exchanges. Where other students answered questions as part of the class, these two students did not. Although consistent with what she stated in the interviews, her adherence to her beliefs about English exposure had caused these students to detach themselves from the learning process on this occasion as a possible reaction to the teacher's translanguaging in the regulative register, which stopped the students from using their full linguistic repertoire to answer the teacher's non-curricula question. This highlights

the negative impact that her use of Korean had on student participation on this occasion. Her reference to the perceived better learning atmosphere when she spoke English seems to suggest that students might not always appreciate her translanguaging practices.

### From Myung hyun's Classes

Myung hyun frequently spoke about speaking Korean when teaching. Reasons given included motivating students and improved control of student action, which were all related to her ability to make herself better understood by her students. In fact, she stated that excluding her Korean in class was virtually impossible because of these reasons, which, as seen in the extract below, may have resulted in the comparatively more inclusive atmosphere (compared to Keum me at least) in her class when speaking Korean.

M: If they cannot understand well then, they get some ... maybe some students lose interest, some students get angry and they ... (*trails off*)

R: Has that happened before?

M: Yeah frustrating even for 6th graders they care other people a lot but if they notice my partner understands very easy but I don't know what's going on they just pretend to understand what I'm saying or pretend I'm not interested in English

When asked about other occasions where she felt it necessary to employ her full linguistic repertoire, she mentioned instances of discipline as well as explaining activities, or linguistic aspects of English.

M: What if they don't understand what I'm saying, what's wrong? So, you have to do something and it's not about the class it's about their behavior so I have to use Korean

R: Anything else?

M: When I have to explain in Korean like grammar it's very difficult in English, like synonyms or opposite words or past present verbs... even I don't know that exactly so I think it's easier to teach in Korean

The following extract analysis reveals the impact that Myung hyun's translanguaging had on student participation during her classes.

### Extract 3

- 1 (I) T: 성준이 책이 없네? (You don't have your book?) 영어 책 준비하세요 (get your book ready please) OK, are you ready?
- 2 (R) Ss: Yes, I'm ready
- 3 (F) T: OK, 성준이 됐어요 이제? (Are you ready now?)
- 4 (I) T: Let's start, hello everyone
- 5 (R) Ss: Hello teacher
- 6 (I) T: How are you today?
- 7 (R) Ss: I'm fine/ hungry
- 8 (F) T: Hungry?
- 9 (I) T: 선생님도 빼빼 로 받았어요 (I received a pepero gift)
- 10 (R) *Students speaking in Korean about how today is a special day for giving chocolate*
- 11 (F) T: 조금 있다가 빼빼 로 얘기는 하구요 (Let's talk about pepero day a little later)

Her translanguaging during this non-curricula activity seems to have provided a more positive socio-emotional space than that of Keum me (extract 2). When Myung hyun noticed one student did not have

their book (line 1,3) she spoke Korean to reinforce the hierarchical relationship, but in a less threatening tone, that provided space for the student to participate in class. Her friendly tone during this exchange was inclusive and offered the student a chance to get their book. This exchange seems to have had a positive socio-emotional effect which resulted in the student moving into the desired pedagogic subject position rather than be alienated or detached from the lesson.

During the exchange, Myung hyun maintained control via initiating all the moves. The imperative, interrogative and declarative mood choices gave the exchange strong framing, allowing the teacher to establish the discursive order. The strengthened classification resulting from the mood choices, IRF sequences and the predominant use of English were occasionally weakened when she spoke Korean for classroom management as her Korean provided a space for all students to participate, by ensuring the students knew what was expected of them. Her reference to Pepero Day (line 9), although not curricula related, seemed to have improved the mood of her students despite the fact that it weakened framing and classification and led to a loss of control. However, this was then rectified by stating that they would talk about this topic after class (line 11), possibly due to my presence as an observer in the classroom. In general, while student participation was outwardly enhanced by translanguaging, in reality, this participation was often restricted to the response turn of IRF cycles throughout her lessons.

### From Myung jin's Classes

Much like Myung hyun, Myung jin stated that Korean was important for her teaching, as it ensured students could participate more effectively in class. This participation was related to her instructions for certain activities, as she relates here

R: When you are giving instructions for the games?

MJ: Yep, but it depends, sometimes I well last year sometimes I gave up explaining how to play games in English because it took too much time.

R: What kind of games took too much time?

MJ: For example, like memory games or board games, casino, cause they already know how to play so I can speak in English, but something special like musical chair, something which they have never done before, then some students cannot understand, so sometimes I show the actions and say a little bit of Korean

In addition, certain new linguistic items that proved challenging often meant that she would translanguange to assist in what she believed was the continued participation of the students. An example of this is seen below

#### Extract 4

- 1 (I) T: Now last group, what group is left? Groups C, their name is?
- 2 Reptiles, reptiles, in Korean? 한국말로 뭐 까요? (What is this in Korean?)
- 3 파충류 (What is it in Korean? Reptiles)
- 4 (R) Ss: 파충류 (Reptiles)
- 5 (F) T: Right good, they have scales

Here, the students' lack of response to a new vocabulary item prompted Myung jin to translanguange to facilitate understanding (lines 2,3), and to evidently ensure that the students continued to participate in the exchange. Her Korean weakened classification which created space for students to understand the content and participate in the knowledge construction. Her use of translanguaging created boundaries that allowed students to use their knowledge within the response turn (line 4), and not feel alienated from the learning

process. Nevertheless, an analysis of the mood choices and IRF routine reveals a strong framing which still limited students to responses.

Despite her claims of welcoming full linguistic repertoire use in her classes, Myung jin did not always react to students' use of Korean favourably. In a similar moment of curricula focus, a student, seemingly mimicking his teacher, used Korean to show understanding of a new word without being prompted.

### Extract 5

- 1 (I) T: Do you know the name of any birds?  
 2 (R) S: Huh?  
 3 (F) T: Do you know any birds?  
 4 (R) Ss: Eagle (one student says 독수리 (eagle))  
 5 (F) T: Eagle right 친구야 지금 영어 센터 왔으니까 조금만 영어로 해줘 (friend, this is the English center please use English)  
*Teacher holds up a new card*  
 6 (I) T: Ch...  
 7 (R) Ss: Chicken  
 8 (F) T: And he said parrot. A parrot  
 9 (R) S: Penguin  
 10 (F) T: Penguin! Right good

The exchange was strongly framed as she controlled pacing as well as the content via the interrogative mood and IRF cycles. The instructional register was foregrounded as the focus was the content, and the teachers' continued use of interrogative and declarative moods, as well as English, also meant that there was a strong classification. Here, she held up a picture of a bird, and then elicited some descriptive language. During the exchange, while the rest of the class said eagle, one student said the Korean equivalent (line 4). This caused Myung jin to stop and let the student know that his use of Korean was not acceptable. Her use of Korean strengthened framing but weakened classification, which created boundaries for a space which did not accept students using Korean. This contradicted her beliefs about the importance of allowing students' access to their full linguistic repertoire and highlighted the negative consequences of a lack of guidance about how to react in such situations (Martínez-Roldán, 2015), as the student had still answered her question successfully, just not in the language desired by the teacher (who herself translanguaged when she saw fit). The student (from line 4) became detached from the exchange, and later was observed disrupting the lesson again. This suggests that Myung jin's translanguaging possibly has both a positive and negative impact on student participation, something not always reported in current literature on translanguaging.

## Discussion

The classroom and interview extracts are examples of how the teachers were using their full linguistic repertoires according to their own personal and contextual needs rather than those of education policy. As mentioned previously, the evolution of the term translanguaging to encourage language users to use their entire linguistic repertoire (García & Wei, 2014), as they need in diverse social contexts rather than a system of grammar (MacSwan, 2017) has many potential implications for foreign or second language teaching. This study suggests that while translanguaging can shape participation positively by allowing students to understand more of the lesson content, such positive effects may be tempered by issues of power and control in the classroom. Translanguaging posits that when linguistic repertoires are embraced, learners can participate more effectively (Allard, 2017; García & Wei, 2014). This is true on occasions where teachers' linguistic repertoires allow for pedagogical goals to be achieved, but not when it may lead to students losing interest in class activities. Teachers' full linguistic repertoires weakened the

classification of their classes, resulting in power being shared more equitably amongst teachers and students, giving students improved access to lesson content and improving participation within class activities.

However, the data in this study revealed that IRF routines mitigated student participation by strengthening the framing of the lessons. The extracts presented are indicative of the teachers' language observed in all lessons, where teachers initiated all exchanges, dictated grammatical mood choices, demanded information, and declared if the given information was correct or not. These teacher actions limited students to providing responses within the IRF routines observed. Although teacher translanguaging helped students to understand how they should respond, being limited to responses within IRFs appears not to have granted students the freedom to direct learning in a way that would seem conducive to the views of translanguaging (Bartlett & García, 2011; García-Mateus & Palmer, 2017; García & Kleyn, 2016). Arthur and Martin (2006) have previously stated that IRF routines allow teachers to accept or deny students access to their full linguistic repertoire, something which appears to have support in this study. It therefore may be hypothesized that translanguaging within such rigid exchanges potentially limits student participation to a type of teacher-directed participation.

This type of participation therefore implies little opportunity for students to take control of their learning situation, and leads to students becoming detached from, or losing interest in, the learning process, which as previously discussed, are major tenets for the translanguaging approach (Garcia et al., 2017). Examples of this were seen in Keum me's class, where the teacher weakened classification for classroom management, but students were reprimanded when they tried to do this, as well as Myoung jin's class, where the teacher employed her full linguistic repertoire to help with understanding linguistic items, but students were reproached for attempting to do likewise. Such observations imply that when teachers have access to their full linguistic repertoire but do not grant students similar access, students choose not to participate classroom activities or engage critically or meaningfully with class content, as reported elsewhere (Arthur, 1996; Arthur & Martin, 2006).

Language creates power for teachers by punctuating social spaces, and establishing 'legitimate relations of social order' (Singh, 2002, p. 578). Teacher monologues, triadic (IRF) dialogues and seat work activities (Singh, 2010) facilitate regulative and instructional registers which are not entirely utilitarian; these contain ideological elements which create and legitimize boundaries between teachers and students, and students themselves, based on their linguistic repertoires (Bernstein, 2000). Access to full linguistic repertoires can improve participation while allowing teachers control of the learning situation. However, the level of control seen in these classes suggests that the transformative social action of translanguaging, which creates spaces for learners to question historical or current realities (García & Wei, 2014) may be difficult to achieve. As Jaspers (2018) discusses, if teachers want to take advantage of the transformative nature said to be on offer by translanguaging, then they will need to not only create spaces for students to use their linguistic repertoires, but also create spaces where students can initiate exchanges instead of only providing responses. To do this, teachers need to be aware of how an overuse of imperative, interrogative and declarative mood choices, as well as an overreliance on IRF routines, limits opportunities for students to decide their learning paths.

The translanguaging spaces are said to be influenced by the histories, experiences, beliefs and actions of the teachers (García & Wei, 2014; Wei, 2011). The teachers in this study all mentioned the regimental nature of their own language learning experiences. These were described as with strict teachers who used little English when teaching English. It may be speculated that the effects of these experiences affected the teachers own practices; possibly seen in the overreliance on IRF sequences and less than inclusive grammatical mood choices.

## Conclusion

Sociological understandings of language teachers' instructional practices serve to highlight the importance of embracing translanguaging views. The teachers in this study were acting independently of government policy, and while this benefitted students at times, often it did not. Allowing students to translanguage at moments marginal to the central curricula may have helped some students avoid becoming detached (i.e., stop responding to teacher initiations) from the learning process. This was witnessed on occasions when teachers did not allow their students full access to their own linguistic repertoires. The same can be said for when teachers reprimanded students who attempted to translanguage like their teachers. When teachers felt their control threatened, they prohibited student access to their full linguistic repertoire, which in turn, was observed to discourage students from participating in class activities.

This study highlights how a lack of knowledge can affect teachers' best teaching intentions. Interviews seemed to suggest that teachers were open to the full use of linguistic repertoires in their classrooms. What the observations revealed, however, was that for some teachers this was in reference to their own language use, and not their students. Additionally, while it can be said that these teachers were translanguaging in an attempt to improve student participation, a deeper investigation reveals that the influence of IRF routines possibly limited student voice limited participation to responses rather than initiation. There needs to be more exploration of actual linguistic repertoire uses in order to ascertain sociological effects of translanguaging, and Bernstein's theory of pedagogic discourse has proven a useful tool to achieve this.

English language classes in South Korea have the characteristics described by more modern and inclusive descriptions of bilingualism (Grosjean, 2013). Previously described notions of impersonal bilingualism, as mentioned by Song (2011), do not fit with what is occurring in these classrooms, where, due to larger socio-economic factors, the status of English is legitimized as an essential element of the immediate context. Categorizing the students in these classes as emerging bilinguals, and the teachers as bilingual teachers, highlights that South Korea is not simply a monolingual nation with a single named-language (Makoni & Pennycook, 2006). The language repertoires of South Koreans are emerging, reacting and evolving to be more than the socio-political constructs of bygone eras. Translanguaging has the potential to transform the English educational ecology of South Korea further, but only if students are granted more equality in the classroom. Weakening classification and framing by limiting the use IRF exchanges in combination with accepting full linguistic repertoires can potentially provide space for this transformation.

Although the findings of this study support the idea that there is more to translanguaging than just using full linguistic repertoires, such as the influence of interaction patterns like IRFs, future research needs to consider using a larger number of participants, possibly across a larger series of teaching contexts, to see if these findings remain true. Additionally, further research is needed to investigate how academic or classroom registers affect translanguaging and participation in order to truly understand how to realize the potential that translanguaging is said to offer.

## Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Department of English Education in Hankuk University of Foreign Studies.

## The Author

*Michael Rabbidge* is an assistant professor in the Department English Education of Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, South Korea. His current research interests cover translanguaging, bilingualism, and the development of language identities in EFL contexts.

Email address: mikemind@hotmail.com

## References

- Allard, E. C. (2017). Re-examining teacher translanguaging: An ecological perspective. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(2), 116-130. doi:10.1080/15235882.2017.1306597
- Arthur, J. (1996). Code switching and collusion: Classroom interaction in Botswana primary schools. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(1), 17-33. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(96)90004-2
- Arthur, J., & Martin, P. (2006). Accomplishing lessons in postcolonial classrooms: Comparative perspectives from Botswana and Brunei Darussalam. *Comparative Education*, 42(2), 177-202. doi:doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1080/03050060600628009
- Baik, M. J. (1992). Language shift and identity in Korea. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication (Multilingual Matters)*, 3(1), 15-31.
- Bartlett, L., & García, O. (2011). *Additive schooling in subtractive times: Bilingual education and Dominican immigrant youth in the Heights*. Nashville, Tenn: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). *Class, codes and control: Volume III, Towards a theory of educational transmission*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *Class, codes and control: The structuring of pedagogic discourse*. London, England: Routledge
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Boyd, C. O. (2001). Phenomenology the method. In P. L. Munhall (Ed.), *Nursing research: A qualitative perspective* (3rd ed., pp. 93-122). Sudbury, MA: Jones and Barnett.
- Buzzelli, C., & Johnston, B. (2001). Authority, power, and morality in classroom discourse. *Teaching and teacher education*, 17(8), 873-884. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00037-3
- Carless, D. R. (2004). A contextualised examination of target language use in the primary school foreign language classroom. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 104-119.
- Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*: Portsmouth, NH : Heinemann, [2001] Second edition.
- Chappell, P. (2014). *Group work in the English language curriculum: Sociocultural and ecological perspectives on second language classroom learning*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Choi, T.-H., & Leung, C. (2017). Uses of first and foreign languages as learning resources in a foreign language classroom. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 14(4), 587-604. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2017.14.4.1.587
- Christie, F. (1995). Pedagogic discourse in the primary school. *Linguistics and Education*, 7(3), 221-242. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0898-5898(95)90024-1
- Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom discourse analysis: A functional perspective*. London, England: Continuum.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Ideologies and interactions in multilingual education: What can an ecological approach tell us about bilingual education? In C. Helot & M. Laore (Eds.), *Language policy for the multilingual classroom: Pedagogy of the possible* (pp. 3-21). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 20-35. doi:10.1017/S0267190514000233
- García-Mateus, S., & Palmer, D. (2017). Translanguaging pedagogies for positive identities in two-way dual language bilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 245-255. doi:dx.doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1329016
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In J. Conteh & M. G (Eds.), *The multilingual turn in languages education: Benefits for individuals and societies* (pp. 258-277). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. New York, NY; London, England: Routledge.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grosjean, F. (2013). Bilingualism: A short introduction. In F. Grosjean & P. Li (Eds.), *The psycholinguistics of bilingualism* (pp. 5-25). Chichester, UK: Blackwell Publishing
- Hicks, D. (1995). Discourse, learning, and teaching. In M. W. Apple (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 21, pp. 49-95). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Jaspers, J. (2015). Modelling linguistic diversity at school: The excluding impact of inclusive multilingualism. *Language Policy*, 14(2), 109-129. doi:10.1007/s10993-014-9332-0
- Jaspers, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language & Communication*, 58, 1-10. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.12.001
- Jeon, J., & Lee, H. (2017). Secondary teachers' perception on English education policies in Korea. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 14(1), 47-63. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2017.14.1.4.47
- Kang, D.-M. (2008). The classroom language use of a Korean elementary school EFL teacher: Another look at TETE. *System*, 36(2), 214-226. doi:10.1016/j.system.2007.10.005
- Kang, D.-M. (2013). EFL teachers' language use for classroom discipline: A look at complex interplay of variables. *System*, 41(1), 149-163. doi:10.1016/j.system.2013.01.002
- Lee, J. H., & Macaro, E. (2013). Investigating age in the use of L1 or English-only instruction: Vocabulary acquisition by Korean EFL learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(4), 887-901. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12044.x
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655-670.
- Li, J. (2018). L1 in the IRF cycle: A case study of Chinese EFL classrooms. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 3(1). doi:10.1186/s40862-017-0042-y
- Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44(01), 64-77. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809990310
- Liu, D., Ahn, G.-S., Baek, K.-S., & Han, N.-O. (2004). South Korean high school english teachers' code switching: Questions and challenges in the drive for maximal use of English in teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), 605-638. doi:10.2307/3588282
- MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1), 167-201.
- Mahboob, A., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2016). Using local languages in English language classrooms. In H. Widodo & W. Renandya (Eds.), *English language teaching today: Building a closer link between theory and practice* (pp. 35-49). New York, NY: Springer International
- Makoni, S. B., & Pennycook, A. (2006). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. London, England: Continuum

- Martínez-Roldán, C. M. (2015). Translanguaging practices as mobilization of linguistic resources in a Spanish/English bilingual after-school program: An analysis of contradictions. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 43-58. doi:10.1080/19313152.2014.982442
- McLean, M., Abbas, A., & Ashwin, P. (2013). The use and value of Bernstein's work in studying (in)equalities in undergraduate social science education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 34(2), 262-280. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2012.710007
- Morais, A. (2002). Basil Bernstein at the micro level of the classroom. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*(4), 559.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6, 281-307. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014
- Park, J. S.-Y. (2009). *The local construction of a global language: Ideologies of English in South Korea*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Paulsrud, B., Rosen, J., Straszer, B., & Wedin, A. (2017). Perspectives on translanguaging in education. In B. Paulsrud, J. Rosen, B. Straszer, & A. Wedin (Eds.), *New perspectives on translanguaging in education* (pp. 10-19). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Rabbidge, M. (2017). Assumptions, attitudes and beliefs: Tracing the development of teacher beliefs about classroom L1/TL. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 14(2), 346-354. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2017.14.2.11.346
- Rabbidge, M., & Chappell, P. (2014). Exploring non-native speaker teachers' classroom language use in South Korean elementary schools. *TESL-EJ*, 17(4).
- Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in late modernity*. Cambridge, UK: CUP.
- Rosiers, K., Van Lancker, I., & Delarue, S. (2017). Beyond the traditional scope of translanguaging: Comparing translanguaging practices in Belgian multilingual and monolingual classroom contexts. *Language & Communication*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.11.003
- Seth, M. J. (2002). *English fever: Society, politics and the pursuit of schooling in South Korea*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Shim, R. J. Y. (1994). Englishized Korean: Structure, status and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 13(2), 225-244.
- Sierens, S., & Van Avermaet, P. (2014). Language diversity in education. In D. Little, C. Leung, & P. v. Avermaet (Eds.), *Managing diversity in education: Languages, policies, pedagogies* (pp. 2014-2222). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London, England: Oxford University Press.
- Singh, P. (2002). Pedagogising knowledge: Bernstein's theory of the pedagogic device. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(4), 571-582. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0142569022000038422
- Singh, P. (2010). Pedagogic discourse and student resistance in Australian secondary schools. In A. Morais, B. Davies, H. Daniels, & I. Neves (Eds.), *Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to research* (pp. 251-285). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Song, J. J. (1998). English in South Korea revisited via Martin Jonghak Baik. *World Englishes*, 17(2), 263-271.
- Song, J. J. (2011). English as an official language in South Korea: Global English or social malady? *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 35(1), 35-55. doi:10.1075/lplp.35.1.03son
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of the case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of second language teachers*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Turnbull, B. (2016). Reframing foreign language learning as bilingual education: Epistemological changes towards the emergent bilingual. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-8. doi:10.1080/13670050.2016.1238866
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1222-1235. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035
- Wells, G. (1994). The complementary contributions of Halliday and Vygotsky to a “language-based theory of learning”. *Linguistics and Education*, 6(1), 41-90. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0898-5898(94)90021-3
- Wolcott, H. F. (1988). Ethnographic research in education. In R. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education* (pp. 187-210). Washington, D.C.: American Education Research Association.
- Yoo, O. K. (2005). Discourse of English as an official language in a monolingual society: The case of South Korea. *Second Language Studies*, 23(2), 1-44.