The Journal of Asia TEFL

Uses of First and Foreign Languages as Learning Resources in a Foreign Language Classroom

Tae-Hee Choi
Education University of Hong Kong

Constant Leung
King's College London

In South Korea, many senior high school English teachers consider Korean as a helpful medium of instruction for their subject, although many also feel that they need to develop students' practical command of spoken English, and, therefore, they also see the need to use English as a medium for teaching. This article provides an account of an exploratory study of how Korean, the students' first language (L1), and English, a foreign language (L2), are used as communication and pedagogic resources in English lessons taught by an experienced teacher. We will focus on the ways in which the two languages are used to manage classroom interactions and to facilitate teaching and learning activities. Drawing on concepts and analytic frameworks from the fields of formative assessment, code-switching/translanguaging and classroom discourse analysis, this paper aims at making a contribution to the renewed debate on the use of L1 in L2 learning and teaching.

Keywords: first language (L1), foreign language (L2), L1 in L2 classrooms, medium of instruction (MOI), codeswitching, formative assessment, English Language Teaching (ELT), South Korea

Background

This paper reports an exploratory study investigating teachers' use of Korean and English in facilitating student learning in a foreign language[1] classroom in South Korea. The medium of instruction (MOI) for English language teaching (ELT) in secondary schools in South Korea has been a contentious issue. Korean English teachers have long used the first language (L1), Korean, as the default MOI, as they believe that using the L1 is most effective in helping students prepare for the college entrance exam which mainly tests receptive language competencies and grammatical knowledge (Choi, 2008). On the other hand, the Ministry of Education has undertaken a series of initiatives to increase the use of English, a foreign language (L2), as the MOI for ELT: since 2009, in the annual teacher recruiting tests across the nation, candidates for the subject English Language have been assessed on their ability to conduct lessons

---

[1] The terms such as the first language (L1) and the foreign language (L2) have been problematized by many scholars. For instance, Cook (2010) suggests the terms 'own language' and 'new language' respectively to replace the terms above, pointing out the limited utility of these terms in reflecting the relationship between the languages and their users in this multilingual society. While agreeing with his arguments, for reasons of scope and wide use of the terms in the South Korean context, we will use L1 and L2 in this paper. Also see Dewey (2012) for a further discussion.

in English through micro teaching and English interviews (Hwang et al., 2012). The ministry also doubled up efforts to provide in-service English language teacher education to improve teachers' English proficiency and pedagogic skills to conduct lessons in English. Between 2009 and 2014, in-service teachers were encouraged to attend 600-hour courses (ibid); each regional educational office has certified in-service teachers who can conduct lessons in English since 2010 (Choi, 2015; Yi et al., 2011), although recently the pressure from the government on teachers to be certified has decreased. These initiatives have not had impact to the degree desired, partly due to the backwash from the college entrance exam, which mainly focuses on listening and reading skills and grammatical knowledge (Choi, 2017a), and partly due to some teachers' limited English proficiency and insufficient knowledge of pedagogy using English as the MOI (Ahn, 2015). Still, various survey results show that most teachers at least in part use English as the MOI: in teacher surveys on MOI for ELT, which included the item on the exclusive use of Korean, no one reported exclusively using Korean as the MOI (e.g., Hwang et al., 2012; Min, 2008).

Meanwhile, the use of students' L1 as an MOI in English lessons has been a hotly debated issue in contexts outside South Korea. Many education systems require the use of English as the MOI because they consider it to be an effective teaching approach to enable students to attain proficiency in English (Choi, 2016; Dearden, 2014; Hamid, Nguyen, & Baldauf Jr., 2013). The pedagogic issues involved have been investigated from different perspectives such as the use and roles of L1 in L2 classrooms, task-based language learning, and bilingual education (see Lin, 2013; Lin & Li, 2012 for a detailed discussion). Many studies consistently find that using L1 in L2 classrooms as a resource can benefit students in terms of both cognitive and emotional development (e.g., Anton & Dicamilla, 1999; Canagarajah, 2013; Choi, 2017b; Hall & Cook, 2012). A number of reasons for using students' L1 has been put forward. First, the use of L1 can facilitate learning of L2 in cognitive ways, as it helps students to engage with complex tasks at a deeper level and with more self-regulation of learning (Anton & Dicamilla, 1999), and it functions as a scaffold for understanding a lesson when students have only limited English proficiency (Hall & Cook, 2012). Second, it lowers the affective barriers of those who lack confidence in L2 use, and empowers learners if their mother tongue is marginalised in the wider social context outside of the classroom (Canagarajah, 2013) (see Choi, 2017b; Hall & Cook, 2012 for further discussion).

Classroom studies on codeswitching prove to be informative. In capturing teachers' use of L1 and L2, codeswitching refers to the alternate use of different languages or varieties of a language. Research on codeswitching has been concerned with its functional use, as well as meaning construction within the codeswitching process, that is, how the social and cultural contexts and the meanings of the codes within these contexts are utilised and negotiated by interactors (Levine, 2011). Of the latter studies, Auer's (1999) work is useful for this research: Auer divides codeswitching based on forms, insertional switching and alternational switching depending on where they occur, the former happening within a clause and the latter happening at the boundary of a clause. He also differentiates between participant-related and discourse-related codeswitching; the former concerns change of codes due to features of speakers such as language competences or preference, and the latter is related to the situation such as the shift of topic, footing or context.

Recently, the debate on classroom codeswitching has moved on to identifying principled use of L1 and L2, to maximise students' learning (e.g., Maboob & Lin, 2016; Zhao & Macaro, 2014). For instance, Maboob and Lin (2016) demand that the role of local languages be integrated into theorisation and practice of L2 teaching, and exemplifies such effort through a multimodalities cycle model where students learn about a new topic through both L1 and L2 and express their ideas using both languages before they switch to full L2 mode. Further relevant research is still required, however, as the MOI use is context-dependent: Ahn (2015), in a recent review of the past 50 years of research on ELT in Korea, identifies a research gap in the relationship between the MOI and students' learning in English classrooms, and calls for further research.

To respond to this call, the concept of formative assessment[2] (FA) will be appropriated in this

---

[2] For reasons of focus and scope, this paper will not provide a comprehensive review of the various conceptualisations of FA within language education and the diverse terms associated with FA practices such as

discussion, as FA is interested in how learning opportunities are created through classroom interactions. This pro-learning orientation is one of the reasons why FA has attracted the attention of teachers and policy makers internationally (e.g., Black & Wiliam, 1998; Cowie, 2012). But it should be noted that FA in this discussion is understood to be integrated into teaching and learning in everyday classroom interactions, reflecting its current understanding, rather than a discrete stand-alone assessment activity such as a quiz. Following Black and Wiliam's (2009, p. 9) conceptualisation, FA is thus understood as follows:

> Practice in a classroom is formative to the extent that evidence about student achievement is elicited, interpreted and used by teachers, learners, or their peers, to make decisions about the next steps in instruction that are likely to be better, or better founded, than the decisions they would have taken in the absence of the evidence that was elicited.

FA understood as such is conducted as part of classroom interaction and teacher-student dialogue. The purpose of any teacher-led FA is task- and context-dependent, that is, an act of FA may concurrently address various concerns such as student rate of progress and learning style as perceived by the teacher, as well as language and content learning objectives. In addition to factors such as cognition, language and personal preferences of the speakers that are inherent in interactions, external factors also add to its complexity. Cowie (2012), in a discussion on FA carried out by science teachers, identifies a number of factors that can have an impact on teachers' thinking and decision-making. These include the curriculum and educational culture, competing reform demands on teachers, and characteristics of students among others. These factors are also relevant to formative interactions within a language classroom.

The concept as discussed above is helpful in capturing teachers' attempts to create learning opportunities, as FA is concerned with identifying and addressing learning gaps, and, therefore, serves the needs of this paper that aims to understand the relationship between teachers' use of languages and students' learning. Furthermore, the concept is appropriate for this study, because the education authorities in South Korea have long promoted FA through the official, national curriculum. FA was first introduced into the official, national curriculum as early as 1973 (Kim & Lee, 2010), only 6 years after Scriven (1967) discussed the concept in the educational assessment research literature. The current national curriculum continues to promote FA. In the assessment section of the national curriculum for English Language education (MEST, 2011, pp. 77-78), for instance, one of the seven principles for assessment concerns FA; it encourages teachers to examine the appropriateness of the teaching content and methodology through FA and to utilise the results to improve their teaching. FA has been gaining additional attention recently in Korea, because it is considered to be an integral part of the new policy initiative of the Free Semester which has been fully implemented from 2016. During the Free Semester, students will be given opportunities to explore their potential and career opportunities through experiential learning, 'free' from concerns about maintaining good grades for college entrance, and its educational purpose will be supported by formative and other alternative assessments. Although no official assessment results will be included in student records, teachers are encouraged to use FA to ensure student learning (see Chi et al., 2014; Shin et al., 2014 for further details of the initiative).

In an attempt to make an empirical contribution to the debate on the optimal use of L1 and L2 in ELT, this paper investigates how an experienced English teacher uses L1 and L2 to assist student learning. Against this background, we aim to answer the following questions in this exploratory study:

1. Does teacher-led FA happen in the focal classroom? If so, in what forms?
2. What purposes does the teacher's bilingual use of Korean and English serve during FA?
3. What factors might have influenced the teacher's bilingual FA practice in the classroom?

In the next part of the paper, the research design, data and methodology used for this study are

---

Assessment for Learning and Learning Oriented Assessment.

discussed, which is followed by an account of the findings. The paper concludes with a discussion on how the participant teacher ensured student learning using languages as resources, while navigating through multiple demands on language use and ELT pedagogy, seen against the backdrop of the broader educational context in South Korea. In passing we would like to note that the use of L1 and L2 in our data may be construed as instances of translanguaging[3] (e.g., García & Wei, 2013). However, given that English (L2) is not used as a linguistic resource for communication in the school outside the English lessons and in South Korean society generally, and that the participant teacher self-monitored and reviewed her use of languages and aims at a native-like proficiency, code-switching, as a concept, seems to serve our purpose better.

Data and Research Methodology

The data discussed in this paper were collected from four extra-curricular English lessons with Year 12 students aged 16/17 at a senior high school, who are expected to maintain good grades while preparing for the national college entrance exam. The English level of these students is about average, in contrast to the national performance, considering their college entrance record in previous years; but, according to the teacher, they are not accustomed to English as the MOI. Thus, the teacher used Korean as one of the learning resources, although she regarded English as the official MOI of her lessons to provide students with English input whenever possible. At the time of data collection, replacing the English section of the annual national college entrance exam with the National English Ability Test (NEAT) – designed to assess speaking and writing abilities rather than structural knowledge of English – was a possibility and thus, the students were preparing for both the traditional college entrance exam and the NEAT test, though the plan for the latter was abandoned that very year.

Most senior high schools in Korea offer extra-curricular lessons in major subject areas such as Mathematics and English to help students prepare for the college entrance exam and most students attend these semi-mandatory classes. The participant teacher used part of the extra-curricular lessons to help students learn for the NEAT exam. In these lessons students engaged in specific writing tasks such as describing pictures and writing invitation letters. These tasks, however, prescribed using certain grammatical points or communicative functions. The writing sessions were held approximately every other week and conducted in both L1 and L2 (see Appendix A for the tasks and flow of the lessons).

The teacher, Ms. Park (pseudonym), is considered an expert ELT practitioner. She has over 15 years of teaching experience with senior high school students. She also holds a leadership role in ELT both in and out of her school. She was certified for her ability to conduct lessons in English a few years ago and was selected as a model teacher in the region where she works, as well as being an English panel head in her school. She values, and adopts when possible, a task-based approach. That is, she believes that students develop their language ability while they perform a task using the target language. The focal lessons also reflect this pedagogic approach.

The data collected comprise audio and video recordings of four lessons, as well as three interviews and several email exchanges with her, and lesson plans and teaching material such as worksheets and PowerPoint slides. Ms. Park was asked to record her own lessons to assist with this research, and she chose these sessions for sharing. For logistical reasons, the first session was audio-recorded, and the other three were video-recorded. Unfortunately, the final parts of the recordings of the first and the third sessions were cut short toward the end of those sessions due to technical issues. The three interviews were semi-structured (see Appendix B for interview questions) and lasted 43 minutes in total. The first

---

[3] While the concept of codeswitching assumes the traditional boundaries between languages or language varieties and is often associated with pedagogy which encourages learners to aim at achieving a native-like proficiency in L2, the concept of translanguaging challenges the boundary, and considers legitimate a mixed use of the languages or varieties involved without being bound by the rules governing them, and encourage such practice as a counter argument against linguistic hierarchies or nativespeakerism (Canagarajah, 2013; García & Wei, 2013).

interview focused on her understanding of the context; the second, which was held after the lesson plans had been studied by one of the researchers, focussed on the reasons behind Ms. Park's pedagogical decision-making; and the third, which was conducted after class observation, explored the reasons underlying some of the teacher's formative actions. The recordings of the lessons and interviews were transcribed in the languages spoken: Korean and English. Data originally spoken in Korean were translated into English for presentation in this article. The translation tried to capture the original socio-cultural meanings as far as possible (e.g., Twinn, 1997; Xian, 2008).

Phases of Data Analysis

To answer the research questions, we focussed on teacher-led classroom activities and interactions that were oriented towards improving student learning, and identified instances of classroom interactions that we refer to as formative moments (FMs): when the teacher attempted to provide feedback and guidance to students to help them with their work. We then compared FMs and non-FMs, paying particular attention to the ways in which the teacher and the students interacted, and the purposes for which the Korean and English languages were used. Where the two researchers had divergent interpretations of the classroom interactions, the differences were discussed with a view to reach a shared understanding and come to an agreement, so that the differences were resolved.

Our data analysis comprised three stages. In the first stage, to understand the structure of the writing sessions and to pave the way to contextualising FA activities, each session was segmented into phases of activities, drawing on the terms and segmentation of the Language Arts classes used by Bloome, Beierle, Grigorenko, and Goldman (2009) and Nagy and Robertson (2009). In identifying the different lesson segments, and, later, interactional turns, the notion of contextualisation cues was employed, taking account of "pausing, stress patterns, intonation patterns, changes in volume and speed of delivery, [and] stylistic changes (e.g., a shift to another voice, such as often occurs during mocking or quoting someone else)" (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005, p. 19). For the video data, "nonverbal cues (kinetic and proxemic)" such as looking at a specific student or walking toward a group were useful in identifying the segments (Green & Wallat, 1983, p. 168).

In the second stage, FMs were identified. Drawing on Black and Wiliam's (2009) conceptualisation, a segment of interaction was considered formative if the teacher elicited students' responses, explicitly or implicitly gauged students' current knowledge and tried to work out the further guidance. Where there was a learning gap, the segment was considered FM if the teacher provided some guidance on how to improve their performance or learning (Alvarez et al., 2014; Davison & Leung, 2009).

Our data suggest that FA of a particular piece of learning can be enacted across several FMs. For instance, when the teacher wanted to teach expressions for argumentation she realised that the students did not understand the task at hand, so she sidetracked to make sure that students understood the task before she taught the language items. So FA which was focused on a particular learning issue can be interspersed over several points in a lesson. The identified FMs were then collated for analysis.

In the third and final stage, the use of the two languages was analysed. Only verbal codeswitching was included in the analysis for reasons of focus and scope. In the analysis, following Auer's (1999) categorisation, codeswitching is divided into different types according to their function and form. When noting insertional codeswitching, loan words as recorded in the Unabridged Korean Dictionary that is published by the National Institute of the Korean Language[4] were excluded from the analysis. If the codeswitching happens within a clause, although the inserted item is a fully formed grammatical unit i.e. not just a word, it was coded as insertional codeswitching.

The analysis was also concerned with the initiator (teacher vs. student), the direction (from L2 to L1 vs. from L1 to L2), as well as the purposes of codeswitching (e.g., meta-statement on the flow of the lesson). All occurrences of codeswitching, their types (e.g., insertional) and direction (e.g., from Korean to

---

[4] See http://stdweb2.korean.go.kr/main.jsp.

English), and the purposes they serve, were tallied. In our analysis, we took notice of and drew on the purposes for codeswitching identified in previous research, although we did not impose these purposes on our data. We found studies by Lin (2013) and Liu et al. (2004) particularly useful for initial analysis of codeswitching at the interactional level, and Boon (2013) and Cincotta-Segi (2012) for forming initial hypothesis about the respective roles of English and Korean.

Findings

Formative Moments: Occurrences and Means

The occurrence of FA varied across the four sessions. We identified 5 in the first session, 4 in the second, 10 in the third, and 6 in the fourth – in total 25. Each FA consisted of one through three FMs, the total FMs amounting to 32. As indicated earlier, FMs are part of the flow of the lesson, so it could occur any time during the lesson. Understandably, about half of them occurred while the teacher was setting up the task, as students' understanding of the task would impact on the success of the lesson. The shaded cells in Appendix A represent the instructional phases where FMs were observed.

The teacher used both talk and other semiotic means to assist student learning during FMs. The following twelve communicative moves were utilised by the participant teacher, often in combination:

- Describing
- Qualifying previous explanation (e.g., limiting the scope of the answers)
- Requesting information (e.g., examples)
- Repetition/rephrasing
- Questioning
- Expanding a previous turn or providing additional information
- Using utterance completion frame
- Explaining (e.g., sources of errors)
- Making prosodic changes (e.g., tone, volume)
- Codeswitching between English and Korean
- Using gestures
- Using realia (e.g., coloured paper, handouts)

For instance, in Excerpt 1, where Ms. Park was setting up an activity in which the students would be asked to describe people in famous paintings using the target grammatical item, i.e. the present progressive, she had to employ a series of communicative moves before students could correctly identify the target language item from the sample writing by themselves. Transcription keys for the excerpts are presented in Appendix C.

Excerpt 1

Transcription	Translation
1 T: Do you know the repetitive pattern in this	
2 writing?	
3 S: What?	
4 T: 자. 한번 읽어보시고; 여기서	(Well, read through the example; there are
5 선생님이 주로 쓴 문장이있어요.	sentences that I used often.
6 문장의 비슷비슷한 구조.	Similarity across sentences.
7 문법적인 거.	Grammatical feature).
8 S: [They are] wounded man, the absent	
9 minded man. [It is] who.	
10 T: Wounded man? 또. 문장에서 동사로.	(Anything else, concerning verbs in the sentence).
11 S: 진행형, 진행형.	(Present progressive, present progressive).
12 T: 네 진행형. 어떻게 썼죠? 첫 문장?	(Yes, present progressive. How is it written? The first sentence?)
13 S: Is walking.	
14 T: Is walking. 두 번째?	(The second one?)
15 S: Is smoking.	
16 T: Mm-hmm, is smoking. 세 번째?	(The third one?)
17 S: Is screaming.	
18 T: Yes, is screaming. So you are going	
19 to use this pattern. 자, 어떻게 해서	(Well, how can we
20 진행형으로 만들어요?	make a progressive form?)
21 S: 현재. 현재시제.	(Present, present tense)
22 T: 현재진행형이니까, 주로, be 동사	(Since it is present progressive, mainly, out of *be*-verbs,
23 중에서 is 쓰겠죠? 그 다음에 동사에다	*is* is needed, isn't it? Then to the verb
24 뭐 붙이면 돼요?	what do we add?)
25 SS: I-n-g.	
26 T: 네, *i-n-g* 를 쓰시면 돼요.	(Yes, you need to write '*i-n-g*.')

In Excerpt 1, Ms. Park utilises the first six of the communicative moves. After a student expresses that he does not understand what "the repetitive pattern" means by saying "What?" Ms. Park *describes* it as "sentences used often or similarity across sentences" in lines 4-6. Perhaps realising that the description is rather vague, she immediately *qualifies* her message saying that it concerns "a grammatical feature" in line 7. At that point, a student provides an incorrect answer, and Ms. Park, in line 10, indirectly points out the error by *requesting* another answer and again qualifies her previous tip by narrowing the scope down to verbs, which elicits a correct answer. As only one student provides the answer, perhaps to make sure that other students also follow, in line 12, Ms. Park *repeats* the student's contribution as a positive confirmation. As the answer is given as the present progressive, in order to assess students' understanding of the form, she requests examples three times between lines 12-16. In lines 19-26, she also probes students' knowledge of the form of the focal tense through *questioning* and then *expanding* the contribution of one of the students who describes the present progressive as requiring present tense, indicating that it necessitates the use of the *be* verb with the 'ing' inflection. These are accompanied throughout with other semiotic means of descriptive and emphatic gestures, and referring to the text in handouts. Codeswitching is also used as formative means throughout the sessions, as will be discussed in detail below.

Uses of L1 and L2 during FMs

Codeswitching is a prominent feature of teacher talk: 41% of Ms. Park's turns across the four sessions involves codeswitching. English proves to be the main MOI, as 77% of the turns which do not involve codeswitching are spoken in English. Ms. Park code-switched far more during FMs: 61% of teacher's codeswitching occurred during FMs. As a result, most of FMs involved codeswitching, with 3 exceptions. In general, codeswitching was initiated by the teacher; however, about 10% was initiated by the students, as the teacher accepted the codeswitching made by the students when they were responding to teacher's invitation for a comment. During FMs, in terms of forms, both categories of Auer's (1999), that is, alternational and insertional switching are used. Insertional codeswitching accounted for about 40% of total codeswitching, in contrast to 30% during non-FMs. In terms of functions, both categories suggested by Auer (1999), that is, participant-related and discourse-related, were used. For instance, in terms of participant-related codeswitching, the teacher codeswitched to address students' failure to understand the instruction and their low learning motivation (as perceived by the teacher); or to adopt preferred or default code of interaction chosen by the students. Discourse-related codeswitching was also used when the teacher codeswitched to English for meta-statements and when she switched back to English after mending communication breakdown through using L1 (Korean), thus, indexing English as the official MOI of the session.

Ms. Park adopts codeswitching during FMs to serve different discursive purposes, as presented in Table 1. For some purposes, codeswitching in only one direction is (almost) exclusively used. For others, Ms. Park used codeswitching in both directions, that is, from Korean (L1) to English (L2) and vice versa. The purposes served by codeswitching of different directions are also presented in Table 1, and described and/or illustrated in the sections below.

TABLE 1
Teachers' Beliefs about Using the TL an

From L2 to L1 Teacher	From L1 to L2	Both ways
• Gloss a difficult word	• Read/quote the texts from the teaching materials whiling talking in L1	• Expand/qualify previous info
• Segment a stretched interaction in English	• Recycle labels & descriptors of the task which are always in L2	• Repeat previous info
• Assure students		• Accept students' choice of language
• Engage students	• Meta-talk about the flow of the lesson (e.g., introducing a new task)	• Return to the original code after switching

Codeswitching from L2 to L1

Some purposes are served exclusively through codeswitching in one direction. For instance, a switch to L1 by Ms. Park happens when she glosses difficult words, especially after unsuccessful attempts to convey the meaning in different ways including paraphrasing or resorting to realia. There are, however, other purposes served singularly by switching to L1. One such purpose is to segment a stretched interaction in English. For instance, she codeswitches to L1 in confirming students' answers by saying "Ye/Ne," counterpart of "Yeah/Yes" in English, in most cases when students answered strings of questions in English – perhaps to help students better notice the change of topics/questions by reducing the demand on students' cognition, as observed in other studies (e.g., Nagy & Robertson, 2009).

A more notable purpose for switching to L1 is to address students' affective needs, as noted by other researchers (e.g., Walsh 2006). For instance, across the four sessions, the teacher often says "아시겠어요?" (Do you understand?) or "하실 수 있겠어요?" (Can you do this?). The fact that the level of students' English proficiency does not require for her to translate these expressions to Korean and that these expressions are used after extended FMs, which might have been frustrating to students, indicates that codeswitching was employed to serve affective purposes. Furthermore, when students were

not motivated, Ms. Park would adopt an informal register and signal solidarity and in-groupness[5], in addition to using L1, to motivate students. For instance, after several attempts to bring students to the front, as to be shown later in Excerpt 4, the teacher switches to L1 and adopts an informal register, at which point all groups responded, confirming the teacher's judgement on the source of students' unresponsiveness as lack of commitment to active participation rather than failure to understand her instruction. The segment where the teacher adopts the informal register is presented in Excerpt 2:

Excerpt 2

Transcription	Translation
T: ((Playfully)) 아니 왜 이래 왜 이래? 왜 이래 왜 이래? 여기 어떻게 된 거야?	(Oh, what is it, what is it? What is it, what is it? What happened to this group?)

Codeswitching from L1 to L2

There are purposes which are expressed exclusively or almost exclusively by switching to L2 during FMs. The most prominent purposes are to read and recycle the vocabulary and phrases used in the PowerPoint slides or handouts to explain and set up the main tasks and to refer back to them even when the students are not looking at the teaching materials. For instance, Ms. Park described the task of the third session as expressing one's "opinion" on an abstract painting. She first introduced the term "opinion" in turn 3, then she recycled this term 9 times. Even in the turns spoken in Korean, she would codeswitch to English to use the term, as illustrated in Excerpt 3.

Excerpt 3

Transcription	Translation
T: 네, 해석이 더 중요하죠. 이 해석이 바로 여러분의 opinion 이에요. 그래서 이걸 영어로 표현하는 걸 배우려고 해요	(Your own interpretation is more important [when appreciating an abstract painting]. This interpretation is your *opinion*. So we're trying to express this [your opinion] in English.)

For the purpose of recycling common labels and reference points, the most prevalent form is insertional codeswitching (90%), partly explaining the higher proportion of insertional codeswitching during FMs.

Another noteworthy observation is that codeswitching to L2 during FMs is used to show the structure of the lessons, or signal a change of the tasks at various levels and when the teacher is distributing the speech turns, confirming Milk's observation (1981, as cited in Martin-Jones 2000, p. 93) that directives and metastatements are provided in the L2, when the official MOI is the L2. After all, most codeswitching to L2 reflects the fact that the official language of Ms. Park's lesson is English: all her teaching materials such as handouts and PowerPoint slides are written in English to index this status, and thus labels of activities are all in English, and as an official code, L2 is used for official functions such as managing and structuring lesson activities as observed in other studies (e.g., Cincotta-Segi, 2012; Lin, 2013).

Codeswitching Both Ways (From Korean to English and English to Korean)

Some of the teacher's codeswitching was fluid in terms of directions – from Korean to English, or from English to Korean, when the FMs involved expansion/qualification or repetition of previous ideas, when accepting students' choice of code, or when returning to the original code after switching, so that she could show the fact that the same idea is being discussed. In Excerpt 4, for instance, the teacher code switched back and forth between the two languages, when she was using expansion and repetition to help

---

[5] In Korean, a deferential form is usually adopted in teacher talk, but an informal form typically shows the speaker's intention to narrow the social distance between the interlocutors (Byon, 2003).

students understand her instruction on the procedure of a group activity in which students needed to select, and describe, a painting in English. Students were confused as the teacher used the term "the leader" to mean two different things: one as the leader of the project, and the other as the person chosen by the group members who was to describe the title of the abstract painting. In the Excerpt 4, the teacher used the term to mean the latter.

Excerpt 4

Transcription	Translation
T: 그럼 일단 각 조에서 *리더*를 한 명씩 뽑아 주세요. Leaders, come forward. ((The teacher takes out pictures)). T: Please come to the front. Please. ((The teacher spreads out paintings.))	(Then first, each group, please select your *leader*).
T: 자, Leaders please. 나오세요 빨리 나오실수록 자기가 원하는 그림 뽑으실 수 있어요. ((Walks to a group))	(Well), (Please come forward. First comers will have more choices.)
T: 자 이쪽 leader 누구세요? 누구세요? 나오세요. ((The teacher moves to the front)). T: Choose one painting. Okay, then please raise your hand. Student 1, the leader. The leader? Or student 1 ((Only two out of six groups respond)).	(Well, who is the *leader* for this group? Who is it? Come forward).

In Excerpt 4, Ms. Park asked "leaders" to come to the front in English first, and repeated it in English again. Then, she codeswitched to Korean with an additional question to identify the leaders. She repeated the message 'to come forward' once again in Korean. And in the final turn, she codeswitched back to English. Ms. Park might have felt that repetition itself, rather than the code in which the information is given, will be helpful for drawing students' attention to the instruction, and thus elicit students' responses.

Regarding codeswitching of both direction, it would be useful to note that when students initiated codeswitching, Ms. Park appeared to be comfortable with following and using the code choice made by the students. In other words, we could see that Ms. Park, on these occasions, oriented toward the student participant codeswitching. The dominant direction of student-initiated codeswitching was from L1 to L2 (over 70%). In South Korea, many teachers, across different levels of education, believe that students are not ready for English as the MOI due to their limited English proficiency (see Macaro & Lee, 2013; Liu et al., 2004 for a related discussion). The fact that the dominant direction of students' codeswitching in the data is towards English may be a reflection of the fact that students are more willing to accept English as the MOI than is often perceived by teachers if it is agreed as the official code of the lessons – although the length of students' contribution was not extensive and consisted mostly of recycling the phrases used in the teaching materials, as illustrated in Excerpt 5:

Excerpt 5

Transcription	Translation
T: 자, invitation letter 를 쓰려면 뭐를 써야 할까요?	(Well, to write an *invitation letter*, what should you write?)
S: ((Looking at the slides)) Time and place.	

In some cases student-initiated codeswitching is to Korean, which is due to students' lack of vocabulary (e.g., *swindlers*), as is often assumed. But in most cases, the switch is triggered by the teacher asking for the Korean translation of words she says in English, to check the students' understanding of the discussion or the vocabulary used, as shown in Excerpt 6.

Excerpt 6

Transcription	Translation
T: Do you see 'abstract painting'? ((pointing at the slides))	
What is it? ((Writing "abstract painting" on board))	
S: 추상화.	(Abstract painting.)

Complexity in Language Use during FMs

In addition to addressing an observed or potential learning gap, the teacher at times seems to have other purposes in mind when offering formative advice, which complexifies the use of language or the attempt to scaffold students' learning. For instance, she addresses the immediate need of the students, that is, preparing for the current college entrance exam, by adding language foci. An addition of language foci to the "NEAT" tasks reflects her intimate knowledge of the context: despite the official aim of the NEAT test being the development of students' ability to use English spontaneously, the teacher designed the tasks so that students use a particular linguistic item in all of the writing tasks during the NEAT sessions. For instance, in Excerpt 1, to describe the picture, Ms. Park chooses the present progressive as the focal language item. When asked to explain this pedagogic decision, she says that if and when the NEAT replacing the current college entrance exam, due to strong emphasis on reliability, the NEAT items would be limited to measuring the ability to use patterned expressions. She says:

> Perhaps if the NEAT is adopted, perhaps [the focus] will become completing tasks using a certain pattern, for instance, "use these kinds of expressions for this, and others for that." Don't you agree the lessons will become a pattern practice? I feel [the NEAT-focused lessons] will end up being drills.

Despite the original intention of adopting the NEAT exam to promote the communicative use of English, she thinks, perhaps not without reasonable grounds, that teachers would end up training students to come up with automatized answers, as the samples provided by the government often prescribe which language items to use.

The fact that the substantive content of learning, the English language, is itself also used as the medium of learning added further complexity. As Excerpt 4 illustrated, students were confused and failed to respond to as simple an instruction as raising their hands when the teacher used the word "leaders" to refer to two different roles. In this case, her ambiguous use of an L2 term in her otherwise L1 turn might have caused the breakdown of communication. Such language related complexity can be amplified in an L2 classroom.

Discussion and Conclusions

There are some limitations to this study. First, the study analysing the practice of one teacher, a follow-up study is needed to examine whether the insights from this paper are also relevant to practice of other teachers. Second, our focus and scope precluded an examination of written language use and any switching between language and other semiotic representations such as realia. To capture the complexity of the classroom language use, codes other than spoken languages can be integrated into the analysis in future research.

We investigated how L1 and L2 were used to scaffold student learning, for which purpose the concept of FA was appropriated. The teacher conducted FA, or diagnosed and ensured students' learning, throughout the lessons, but mostly when introducing the target language items/tasks and setting up the tasks, when successful communication was essential for the success of the entire lesson. FA was realised through various communicative moves such as questioning and giving examples. Languages themselves

played integral roles in FA: code choice and the very act of code switching was used to scaffold students' learning. In addition to addressing an observed or potential learning gap, the teacher's adoption of codes reflects varied other wishes and considerations, including her own pedagogic beliefs, understanding of students' needs, and knowledge of the context, as well as traditional pedagogical practice. The findings confirm the observation in previous research that contextual factors affect individual pedagogic practice including FA; at the same time, teachers make instructional decisions reflecting their own contextual knowledge and pedagogic beliefs (Cowie, 2012; Liu et al., 2004).

We believe that the findings reported here will contribute to a more informed understanding of classroom language practices. Most of the previous studies argued for the allowance of L1 into L2 classrooms to ensure students' deeper cognitive engagement with learning activities and emotional support (e.g., Anton & Dicamilla, 1999; Canagarajah, 2013; Choi, 2017b; Hall & Cook, 2012). However, the overdue discussion of the optimal use of them, when and where and how, is only starting (e.g., Maboob & Lin, 2016; Zhao & Macaro, 2014). The paper, by presenting the description of the codeswitching practice by a veteran teacher when she tries to diagnose and scaffold students' learning, provides much needed, further empirical insights in exploring the language alternation practice to maximise student learning. It has often been assumed that whenever a teacher encounters a learning gap when using L2 as the MOI, the teacher will resort to the L1, as they can make themselves clearer in L1. However, this assumption has been shown to be questionable in this study, that is, the teacher did not always resort to L1 to deal with a learning gap. Rather, the teacher judiciously used both L1 and L2. When, of course, the teacher perceived that the students did need translation from L2 to L1 to understand the teaching point and to narrow a learning gap, she would switch to L1. In addition, when she needed to encourage or reassure students' participation after trying to build collective understanding of a complex concept or task procedure, she would also resort to L1, the language of rapport and affect (Walsh, 2006). However, in some instances, she seemed to consider that L2 was a better language to switch to/stay in, for instance, to maintain consistency and coherence throughout the interaction which was crucial for students' understanding and performing the task of the day (Excerpt 3). This allowed her to refer back to the labels and phrases she used for introducing and setting up a task. In some instances, rather than the code itself through which the act of mending the learning gap was performed, it was the acts of repetition, expansion, and qualification that helped, and for these cases, she would often continuously switch back and forth between the two codes (Excerpt 4). Finally, interestingly, most of the student-led codeswitching was from L1 to L2 perhaps showing that students were more ready to adopt L2 as the MOI – in contrast to many teachers' perceptions that students are not ready (e.g., Liu et al., 2004). Some of our findings are relevant to classroom-based studies of uses of L1 and L2. Although L2 (English) was set as the official MOI of the classroom, the participants were not always bound by this, but used the languages in a more contingent way to facilitate learning. For instance, the very act of codeswitching, irrespective of the direction (from L2 to L1 or vice versa), indexed teachers' noticing of a learning gap and efforts to mend the gap, and this, in turn, alerted students to the need to self-examine their learning and to register the importance of the message delivered, drawing out relevant responses. Our findings add to the growing understanding that we should encourage the full use of all language resources in the classroom for pedagogic purposes.

The findings also support the current conceptualisation of FA that is embedded in the teaching and learning process in the classroom. Assessment of students' learning cannot be complete with one-off quizzes at the end of a lesson or a unit or a term, but should be conducted throughout the learning process weaved into daily interactions (e.g., Black & Wiliam, 2009). This act of FA does not solely deal with here-and-now concerns of the lesson, but incorporates the influences from a larger educational and social context outside of school (e.g., Davison & Leung, 2009), as well as beliefs, identities and volitions of all involved (e.g., Cowie, 2012). The study has made a contribution to the FA research by shedding light on how languages are used as tools for FA, and the complexity arising from this interrelatedness. It identifies the diverse communicative moves adopted in order to realise FA, and draws attention to the irony that languages, helpful tools for FA in general, can also become a source of confusion.

To conclude, this study investigated how an experienced teacher used different languages as learning

resources in a foreign language classroom. In addition to confirming the findings from previous studies on teachers' MOI – such as the respective roles of L1 and L2, positive contribution of L1 in L2 learning – the paper presents new insights into languages and the act of codeswitching itself as resources to scaffold students' learning in an L2 classroom, and challenges some assumptions about these resources. Notwithstanding the need for further study to explore the transferability of the findings, it is hoped that the study has contributed to advancing the current debate on the pedagogically effective use of L1 and L2 in foreign language classrooms, if by a small step.

Acknowledgement

The Authors

Tae-Hee Choi is an Assistant Professor at The Education University of Hong Kong and a Fellow of the UK Higher Education Academy. She is also a founding committee member of the Language Policy SIG of the British Association of Applied Linguistics and the President of the Comparative Education Society of Hong Kong. She has participated in policy development, teacher education, and/or English language teaching in South Korea, Hong Kong, the UK and the US, and has published over thirty English language learning and teaching resources. She has published in the areas of policy and reform process, language education and teacher development. More information about her research can be found at https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Tae_Hee_Choi

Department of Education Policy and Leadership,
Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong, China
10 Lo Ping Road, Tai Po, New Territories, Hong Kong, China
Email: choith@ied.edu.hk
Tel: +852 2948 8763
Fax: +852 2948 7619

Constant Leung is Professor at King's College London and an Academician of Social Sciences, UK. Before taking up teaching positions in higher education he taught in schools and worked as advisory teacher and manager in local government. He was the founding chair of the National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum (NALDIC). His research interests include classroom pedagogy, content and language-integrated curriculum development, language assessment, academic literacies and language policy. He serves as Editor of Research Issues of *TESOL Quarterly*, Joint Editor of *Language Assessment Quarterly*, and as a member of the Editorial Boards of several journals including *Language and Education*, and the *Modern Language Journal*.

Department of Education and Professional Studies,
King's College London, London, UK
Franklin-Wilkins Building, Waterloo Road, London SE1 9NH, UK
Email: constant.leung@kcl.ac.uk
Tel: +44 (0)20 7848 3713
Fax: +44 (0)20 7848 3182

References

Ahn, K. (2015). An analysis of articles on teacher education in English Teaching. *English Teaching, 70*(5), 161-192.

Alvarez, L, Ananda, S., Walqui, A., Sato, E., & Rabinowitz, S. (2014). *Focusing formative assessment on the needs of English language learners.* San Francisco: WestEd.

Anton, M., & Dicamilla, F. J. (1999). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 83*(2), 233-247.

Auer, P. (1999). From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *3*(4), 309-32.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, *5*(1), 7-73.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *21*(1), 5-31.

Bloome, D., Beierle, M., Grigorenko, M., & Goldman, S. (2009). Learning over time: Uses of intercontextuality, collective memories, and classroom chronotopes in the construction of learning opportunities in a ninth-grade language arts classroom. *Language and Education*, *23*(4), 313-34.

Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A microethnographic perspective*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Boon, D. (2013). Multilingual classroom talk in adult literacy education in Timor-Leste: Teachers and learners doing literacy and numeracy tasks. *Language and Education*, *27*(4), 356-73.

Byon, A. S. (2003). Language socialisation and Korean as a heritage language: A study of Hawaiian classrooms. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *16*(3), 269-83.

Cincotta-Segi, A. R. (2012). Signalling L2 centrality, maintaining L1 dominance: Teacher language choice in an ethnic minority primary classroom in the Lao PDR. *Language and Education*, *25*(1), 19-31.

Chi, E., Won, H. H., Min, K.-S., Sohn, W., & Kim, T. I. (2014). *A study on evaluation methods for middle school free semester system*. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute.

Choi, I.-C. (2008). The impact of EFL testing on EFL education in Korea. *Language Testing*, *25*(1), 39-62.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York: Routledge.

Choi, T.-H. (2015). The impact of the "Teaching English through English" policy on teachers and teaching in South Korea. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 16*(3), 201-220.

Choi, T.-H. (2016). Glocalization of English language education: Comparison of three contexts in East Asia. In C. M. Lam & J. Park (Eds.), *Sociological and philosophical perspectives on education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 147-164). Hong Kong: Springer.

Choi, T.-H. (2017a). Hidden transcripts of teacher resistance: A case from South Korea. *Journal of Education Policy, 32*(4), 480-502.

Choi, T.-H. (2017b). Identity, transnationalism, and bilingual education. In O. García, M. Y. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 175-189). Sham: Springer International Publishing.

Cincotta-Segi, A. R. (2012). Signalling L2 centrality, maintaining L1 dominance: Teacher language choice in an ethnic minority primary classroom in the Lao PDR. *Language and Education*, *25*(1), 19-31.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(3), 402-23.

Cowie, B. (2012). Focusing on the classroom: Assessment for learning. In B. J. Fraser, K. G. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), *Second international handbook of science education* (pp. 679-690). Netherlands: Springer.

Davison, C. & Leung, C. (2009). Current issues in English language teacher-based assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, *43*(3), 393-415.

Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction: A growing global phenomenon*. London: British Council. Retrieved from http://www.education.ox.ac.uk/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/EMI-a-Growing-Global-Phenomenon-new-cover.pdf

Dewey, M. (2012). Beyond labels and categories in English language teaching: Critical reflections on popular conceptualisations. In C. Leung & B. V. Street (Eds.), *English: A changing medium for education* (pp. 129-149). Bristol: Multilingual Matter.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2013). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Green, J. L., & Wallat, C. (1983). Mapping instructional conversations: A sociallinguistic ethnography. In J. L. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (2nd ed.) (pp. 161-205). Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching, 45*(3), 271-308.

Hamid, M. O., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Baldauf Jr., R. B. (2013). Medium of instruction in Asia: Context, processes and outcomes. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *14*(1), 1-15.

Hwang, J.-B., Shin, S.-G., Kim, T.-Y., Kim, K. S., Kim, H.-S., & Wu, E. J. (2012). *Analysis of current English language education at primary and secondary levels*. Retrieved from http://www.prism.go.kr/homepage/researchCommon/retrieveResearchDetailPopup.do;jsessionid=0A58A9C5908CA5FFD87126AE9792883A.node02?research_id=1341000-200800595

Kim, J. K., & Lee, B. H. (2010). Educational administration system and supporting strategies of formative assessment policies in Korea. *Gyoyukmunhwayeonggu [Research on Educational Culture]*, *16*(3), 93-114.

Levine, G. S. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lin, A. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *4*(1), 195-218.

Lin, A., & Li, D. C. S. (2012). Code-switching In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 470-481). London: Routledge.

Liu, D., Ahn, G.-S., Beak, 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), 605-38.

Mahboob, A., & Lin, A. (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. 25-40). New York: Springer International.

Macaro, E., & Lee, J. (2013). Teacher language background, codeswitching, and English-only instruction: Does age make a difference to learners' attitudes? *TESOL Quarterly*, *47*(4), 717-42.

Martin-Jones, M. (2000). Bilingual classroom interaction: A review of recent research. *Language teaching*, *33*(1), 1-9.

Min, C. K. (2008). A survey of the English teachers' perception on teaching English in English (TEE). *English Language Teaching, 20*(2), 167-190.

Ministry of Education Science and Technology (2011). *English curriculum*. Seoul: Ministry of Education Science and Technology.

Nagy, K., & Robertson, D. (2009). Target language use in English classes in Hungarian primary schools. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 66-86). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Scriven, M. (1967).*The methodology of evaluation [AERA monograph series on curriculum evaluation, No. 1]*. New York*:* Rand Mc Nally.

Shin, C.-K., Hwang, E.-H., Kim, E.-Y., Song, K.-O., & Park, M.-J. (2014). *Settlement measures for*

middle school Free-semester program in Korea. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute.

Twinn, S. (1997). An exploratory study examining the influence of translation on the validity and reliability of qualitative data in nursing research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *26*(2), 418-23.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. New York: Routledge.

Xian, H. (2008). Lost in translation? Language, culture and the roles of translator in cross-cultural management research. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 3*(3), 231-245.

Yi, B. M., Yoon, Y. J., Lee, H. S., Kim, N. Y., Kim, J. Y., & Yu, S. E. (2011). *Analysis of policies to reinforce the public education in Seoul and implications: Focusing on effective human resourcing.* Seoul: Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education.

Zhao, T., & Macaro, E. (2014). What works better for the learning of concrete and abstract words: teachers' L1 use or L2-only explanations? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 26*(1), 75-98.

Appendix A. Phases of Sessions and Occurrence of Formative Assessment

	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5	Phase 6	Phase 7	Phase 8	Phase 9	Phase 10
Session 1	Greeting	Task introduction	Topic introduction	Language items introduction	Setting the task	Writing (Recording stops here)				
	Task: Creating an imaginative dialogue between the people in paintings									
Session 2	Greeting	Topic introduction	Task introduction	Language items introduction	Setting the task 1	Writing	Setting the task2 (For evaluation)	Evaluation	Sharing	Reviewing &Closure
	Task: Describing one's favourite teacher using a metaphor									
Session 3	Greeting	Topic & task introduction	Setting the task 1 (non-linguistic preparation for the main task)	Language items1 & Setting the task 2 (for writing)	Writing	Setting the task 3 (For evaluation)	Evaluation 1 (Within group)	Sharing	Evaluation 2 (Whole class) (Recording stops here)	
	Task: Writing an invitation letter as an object									
Session 4	Greeting	Topic & task introduction	Setting the task 1 (for writing)	Language items	Setting the task 2 (for writing)	Writing	Setting the task 3 (For evaluation	Evaluation	Sharing	Reviewing & closure
	Task: Presenting opinions and justifying them while describing an abstract painting									

* The shaded slots include formative moments

Appendix B. Themes for Semi-structured Interviews

Interview 1. Initial Interview (Participant's Understanding of the Context)

1. Can you briefly describe your school and your students?
2. What is your view of good English language teaching?
3. Currently, there is the discussion of introducing the National English Ability Test (NEAT). How does the NEAT compare with the current exam? How will you teach in preparation for the NEAT?

Interview 2 & email exchanges. After Reading the Lesson Plans

1. What were the objectives of your lessons as a whole?
2. The titles of the lesson plan refer to NEAT item types. Where do these types come from?
3. What were your rationales for choosing those particular activities for the lessons?
4. In the lesson plan, I see the word "creativity" often. What do you mean by that?
5. What is the relationship between your lessons and the educational innovations in the context, if there is any?

Interview 3 & email exchanges. After Viewing the Recorded Lessons

1. How did the students respond to the lessons in general?
2. Could you explain what you meant by YY?
3. Could you explain why you did ZZ?

Appendix C. Transcription and Translation Keys

Regular	Words originally spoken in English in a regular font.
Italic	Words originally spoken in English in an otherwise Korean segment are Italicised
[ ]	Words inserted (e.g., the subject of a sentence, which is often omitted in Korean)
(())	Kinetic and paralinguistic details (e.g., gestures and movement of the participants)
()	Translation from Korean to English; provided on the right column
	In translation, words originally spoken by the teacher in English in a comment otherwise Korean
(*Italics*)	are Italicized