

*The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 2015–1, 34–51*

## The Use and Perception of Codeswitching among Teachers and Students

Hyun-Ju Kim<sup>1</sup>

---

### Abstract

This study involves a small-scale investigation of codeswitching in university classrooms. The perceptions of the use and the effectiveness of codeswitching were investigated from the perspectives of 23 instructors and 765 students in various fields at a Korean university. In addition, the actual use of codeswitching in the classroom by an instructor, teaching the theories of English Language Teaching, was investigated. These two data sources have served as the subsequent main study. The results show that both instructors and students perceive the use of codeswitching is effective in learning English skills overall, but the instructors consider it more effective in reading while students perceive it more effective in listening. This study also explored the functions of codeswitching in the classroom. The findings suggest that codeswitching is employed to accommodate the participants' language preference or competence.

**Keywords:** Codeswitching, University classrooms, Perceptions, Functions, English skills

© Association of Gazi Foreign Language Teaching. All rights reserved

---

### 1. Introduction

Codeswitching (henceforth, CS) is an alternate use of two or more languages in one sentence or in other sentences. It is one of the distinctive features of bilingual behaviors. However, in many educational contexts, it is believed that it negatively affects language learning and academic achievements (Dewaele, Housen, & Wei, 2003). Several researchers (Martin, 2005; Moodley, 2007; Probyn, 2009) have pointed out that CS in an educational setting interferes with children's acquisition of English and is a deficit of interactional skills. However, other researchers have argued that CS is helpful for L2 acquisition (Gumperz, 1982; Romaine, 1995; Sridhar, 1996). Although there have been different perceptions on CS, it is assumed that there are at least certain functions and reasons of switching between the native language and the foreign language. As a result, this paper will discuss how CS works in the L2 learning process in a Korean educational setting based on previous CS research. Evan and Lee's (2012) study explains that CS is used for the purpose of comprehension, monitoring, and producing aesthetic and affective responses when

---

<sup>1</sup> Dankook University, Republic of Korea. Email: [hyunjuk@gmail.com](mailto:hyunjuk@gmail.com)

bilingual readers make written recalls and comments on books. They assume that meaning emerges in a relationship between a reader and a text, and that past experience, background knowledge, and expectations play a major role in the interpretation of texts. More recent research has made it clear that the L1 is available to support the implementation of higher cognitive strategies when learning a second language.

Extensive research shows various reasons why foreign language teachers use CS in the language classrooms (Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009; Chowdhury, 2012; Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2009; Edstrom, 2006; Macaro, 2001; Tian & Macaro, 2012). Nevertheless, most of them focus on the use of the target language by language teachers or learners in the classroom. There is a lack of research conducted on the perceptions of CS from the actual users and its functions in teaching/learning academic subject matters. Today, English is widely used as a communication medium in many classrooms with the idea that the students should be exposed to as much authentic language input as possible to develop language skills (Ellis, 1984; Polio & Duff, 1994). Moreover, the input should be comprehensible to learners (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In addition, such input might be modified or enhanced by means of repetition, paraphrasing, highlighting certain features (Duff & Polio, 1990) or using the students’ first language.

In this paper, the CS data from the university-level classes are analyzed and compared with previous research. A few studies on CS within written language are also compared with the current study on CS in spoken language. This paper presents the policy of using English only as a teaching medium in an entire curriculum for higher education in Korea in order to discuss the CS situation in Korea. I also present the survey results from the instructors at my workplace who have taught majors in English as well as survey data from their students. The main goal of the survey was to examine the amounts of L2 and L1 use in class. In addition, I sought to better understand teachers’ and students’ perspectives on the use of CS. That is, I examined how Korean instructors and their students perceive CS in teaching/learning content areas as well as English as a target language at universities. Although the findings in this study are limited in terms of generalizability because the use of CS was examined in just one setting and is also limited in terms of empirical research data, I suggest changes in further research practices which could enhance the future accumulations of knowledge about the functions of CS in the classroom.

## **2. English-only Policy for Higher Education**

English was first introduced in Korea in 1883 when the Joseon Dynasty opened an English institute to train interpreters. At that time English pedagogy mainly focused on grammar and translation in the way that European students learned Latin and Greek. English Language Teaching was subsequently expanded and developed by the Korean government during and after the Korean War. More recently, it has been widely recognized in Korea that English is the most powerful tool to achieve upward social mobility and status. Along these same lines, English is deemed vital to the economic development of the entire Korean nation.

There are a myriad of ramifications of this focus on learning the English language in Korea. For instance, in order to get a job many people are required to demonstrate proof of their competence in English by achieving high scores in tests such as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), and the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview by Computer (OPIc). Following a restructuring of the nationwide system of English Language Teaching in 2009, teaching in the public sector now heavily emphasizes teaching spoken as well as written language. Naturally, such trends lead to some stress among English language teachers in schools, many of whom feel that they are not ready for teaching oral communication since they lack adequate training in it. As English has become more

important in Korea, the number of private, as well as public, institutions providing English instruction has grown rapidly. Now most children in Korea are exposed to learning English from their kindergarten years. After kindergarten, Korean children now receive more than ten years of learning English in schools, both those run by the state and in Hagwon (after-school classes). Some educators and researchers go so far as to suggest that the best way to learn English is by the exclusive use of the target language (Park, 2007; Park, 2009).

The importance attached to the learning of English by the Korean government has been reinforced by strident opinions frequently expressed in the mass media. It has also led policy-makers in Korean higher education to increasingly focus on English communication skills. Such attention to the pervasive use of English has resulted in strong demands to teach content subjects at universities through the medium of English. The 'English-only' policy was started to encourage learners to use English as the sole mean of interaction with teachers and peers with the belief that the exposure to the target language will maximize language learning (Eldridge, 1996). Thus, one of the most prestigious universities in Korea, the Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST), initiated an institutional policy in 2007 that required the exclusive use of English as the medium of instruction across the entire curriculum. Similar policies have since been adopted by an increasing number of other universities, in large part, due to the fact that English competence has now become one of the most important evaluation criteria in colleges and universities in Korea. As such, the English competence of instructors and emphasis on English in the curriculum can dramatically affect institutional status in the decisive higher education ranking system found in Korea.

Many university instructors are proficient in English, but both they and their students often have a hard time communicating issues raised in content subjects entirely in English. An unfortunate and yet quite common effect of this communication dilemma is the dilution of course content to what is comprehensible rather than what is essential. Eventually, strict adherence to an English-only policy can cause emotional and psychological stress on the instructors and the students (Hsieh & Kang, 2010). There are even reports of suicides by several university students that are attributed to the exclusive use of English as the medium of instruction (Choi, 2011; Jee, 2012). Consequently, there are increasing criticisms of such a policy (for example, Kang, 2012). At the present time, more attention is now being paid to the positive functions of using the first language (Korean) rather than, or as well as, English in delivering content knowledge through English. Therefore, the question arises as to what the optimal balance is between L2 and the L1 in content-based classes taught by Korean university instructors.

### 3. Functions of Codeswitching

Research indicates that CS serves various functions (Carless, 2007; Cook, 2001; Gort, 2012; Sampson, 2012). Specifically, it expresses meaning, identity, and humor (Carless, 2007); it is used as a daily practice to become competent L2 users (Cook, 2001); and for some, it functions as an episode of language equivalence, metalanguage, floor-holding, reiteration, socializing, and L2 avoidance (Sampson, 2012). 'Equivalence' CS is often used when attempting to paraphrase in L2. For example, bilinguals use the L1 equivalent for a certain L2 word, such as '*how do you say 경기 [kyunggi] (game)?*' Through using this type of CS, such a language learner can contrast L1 with L2 and understand the meaning of certain words or concepts more clearly.

'Metalanguage' is also commonly used by bilinguals when they perform a certain task. For example, they may say '*어떻게 시작하지? [Uhteokeshijakhagi] (How do we start)? Okay, let's begin with the issue of a classroom environment.*' They often articulate L1 to discuss tasks. Another function

of CS is reported as 'floor holding.' For example, bilinguals may say 'I like er.. 사과 [sagua (apples)], er.. apples.' Such an expression is different from the function of 'equivalence' in that it is used because of language users' desire to continue the conversation, not because of their lack of word knowledge.

Similar to some of the strategies already mentioned, 'reiteration' is often used to emphasize or clarify something. When using reiteration, a language learner will use L1 again right after the L2 words or sentences. In contrast, 'socializing' is used to develop a social relationship with communicators. Auerbach (1993) argues that L1 should be encouraged in the classroom since using L1 empowers the relationship and raises the interest in learners. Lastly, 'L2 avoidance' is like the language users' attempt to show divergence from a topic and they use the L1 on purpose. Therefore, it is somewhat similar to 'socializing' in that it is used purposely.

Especially for the functions of teachers' CS, Flymann-Mattsson and Burenhult (1999) report that it works as (1) a topic switch, (2) affective function, and (3) repetitive function. In other words, teachers use CS in order to transfer new contents in a clear way, create a supportive classroom environment for L2 learners, and help transfer the necessary knowledge for students to clarify meanings. It is also argued that teachers use CS to repair trouble or silence in the classroom (Ustunel, 2004), to adapt to students' proficiency and teaching goals (Yang, 2004) or to promote students' participation and understanding and to manage the classroom (Ustunel & Seedhouse, 2005). Azian, Raof, Ismail and Hamzah (2013) examined the teachers' communication strategies in teaching science in English and found that CS played multiple roles in the L2 science classroom. CS has long been recognized as a natural phenomenon occurred in bilingual or multilingual settings but it has not been clearly understood when and how it is used. This present research will help address this problem of a common understanding of CS.

## 4. Method

### 4.1. Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to understand instructors' and students' perceptions of CS in general, and their views on the role of CS in the development of content knowledge and English skills. Especially, this study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How do teachers and students perceive CS in their teaching and learning of content knowledge and English skills?
2. What are teachers' and students' views on the role of CS as a method of developing content knowledge and English skills?

### 4.2. Participants and Procedures

In early 2012, I conducted a study at a university located in Yongin near Seoul in order to explore the perceptions about CS among some of the instructors who taught subject matters in English. The participants consisted of two main groups: (1) instructors and (2) students. I circulated an anonymous questionnaire (see Appendix) to the participants which resulted in feedback from 23 instructors (21 males and 2 females) and 765 students (362 males and 403 females). While limited in scope, it provided a reasonable picture of their perceptions of CS. The instructors were from various majors, including foreign languages, statistics, architecture, business, education, and engineering, but were all teaching the subject matters in English. The students were all undergraduates also majoring in various subjects. The questionnaire, consisting

of a demographic section and a perception section with five scales measuring the use of CS and its effectiveness, was administered to participants in their regular class time. Though participation was voluntary, everyone agreed to answer the questionnaire. Their demographic characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Backgrounds of participants

		Students		Instructors	
		Number	Percent (%)	Number	Percent (%)
Gender	Male	362	47.3	21	91.3
	Female	403	52.7	2	8.7
Age	19-25	716	93.6	-	-
	26-30	49	6.4	-	-
	35-40	-	-	7	30.4
	41-45	-	-	7	30.4
	46-50	-	-	8	34.8
	Over 51	-	-	1	4.3
School Year	Freshman	297	38.8	5	21.7
	Sophomore	210	27.5	7	30.4
	Junior	166	21.7	7	30.4
	Senior	92	12.0	4	17.4
Major	Humanities	221	28.9	3	13.0
	Natural Science	69	9.0	4	17.4
	Social Science	88	11.5	2	8.7
	Business	128	16.7	4	17.4
	Engineering	110	14.4	3	13.0
	Education	42	5.5	5	21.7
	Art	53	6.9	2	8.7
	Others	54	7.1	0	0.0
Total		765	100	23	100

As shown in Table 1, 23 instructors from various fields participated in the present study. They were all non-native speakers of English and had more than one year of teaching experience in colleges in the United States or Korea (See Table 2). The students were also from various departments and had different levels of English proficiency (See Table 3). Most of students in this study who were taking English-medium classes were freshman (38.8%) and sophomores (27.5%). The instructors (60.8%) were mostly teaching sophomore and juniors.

#### 4.3. Data Sources and Analysis

Qualitative and quantitative data were collected using two data sources. The first was 10 two-hour lectures conducted by a professor of English Language Teaching and which were recorded using a video camera. Although I recorded verbal interaction in two classes, only the data from one class were used since English was used exclusively in the other recorded class. One

of the participants of the recordings was a non-native speaker of English, but she had lived in the US for more than five years. She had two years of teaching experience in US college settings and five years in Korean universities.

I transcribed the recorded video data, and the professor who had taught the recorded classes reviewed the transcripts for accuracy of representation. As indicated, the transcriptions of the recorded video comprised the first and the most substantial data source.

The questionnaire data served as the second source. In accordance with the research questions, the questionnaires were organized into two major sections: (a) the use of CS, and (b) the effectiveness of CS (see Appendix). The questionnaire consisted of 13 closed-ended and two open-ended questions. The instructors and students were asked to check how much they use CS and explain how they perceive the effectiveness of CS in their teaching and learning of content knowledge and English skills.

To achieve integration of the two data sources, this study was conducted in three phases. Phase I involved analyzing the responses of closed-ended questions in the questionnaire using SPSS software for Windows (version 21.0). Phase II was the process of coding the responses of open-ended questions in the questionnaire and discovering the themes. Lastly, Phase III involved transcribing the recorded lecture video of the professor, and incorporating the data from the video at various points in the discussion of the results.

## 5. Results and Discussion

### 5.1. Perceptions of Codeswitching

The first five questions elicited information about the participants and their classes as well as their estimate of the extent of their own use of CS in their classes (See Tables 2 and 3).

Table 2. Instructors' English-medium teaching experience

Years of Teaching majors in English	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1 year ~ less than 2 years	6	26.1
2 years ~ less than 3 years	8	34.8
3 years ~ less than 4 years	8	34.8
More than 4 years	1	4.3
Total	23	100

Table 3. Self-evaluated English proficiency: Students and instructors

Levels of English proficiency	Students		Instructors	
	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Superior	29	3.79	2	8.70
Advanced	136	17.78	11	47.83
Intermediate	283	36.99	6	26.09
Low Intermediate	224	29.28	3	13.04
Low	92	12.03	0	0.00
Total (Missing)	764(1)	99.87 (.13)	22 (1)	95.65(4.35)

Most of the instructors considered themselves proficient in English with an advanced level or higher (56.53%) while many of the students evaluated their levels as intermediate (36.99%) or low intermediate (29.28%). For the degree of comprehension, interestingly, a majority of the instructors (73.91%) believed that most of the students seemed not to understand the content of English-medium lectures very well, whereas the students responded that they (52.42%) could understand more than 70% of the English lecture. These results imply that the instructors might have used CS more often on purpose to help their students to understand their English-medium lectures. The range of their reported use of CS varied considerably: some instructors indicated that they used English almost exclusively, while others suggested that many of their classes were conducted in Korean (See Table 5).

Table 4. Comprehension of the English-medium lecture

Degree of comprehension (reported)	Students		Instructors	
	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Over 91%	130	16.99	1	4.35
71-90%	271	35.42	4	17.39
51-70%	242	31.63	6	26.09
31-50%	83	10.85	7	30.43
Less than 30%	35	4.58	4	17.39
Total (Missing)	761 (4)	99.48 (.52)	22 (1)	95.65 (4.35)

Table 5. Use of L1 and L2

L1 and L2 Use (reported)	Students		Instructors	
	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
100% L2	127	16.60	6	26.1
Over 70% of L2	214	27.97	5	21.7
Over 50% of L2	211	27.58	5	21.7
Less than 50% of L2	111	14.51	4	17.4
Less than 30% of L2	98	12.81	3	13.0
Total (Missing)	761 (4)	99.48 (.52)	23 (0)	100.0 (0.0)

With regard to item 6 on the questionnaire, there was great variability among instructors regarding their views about the optimal proportion of L1 and L2 use. However, generally the instructors felt comfortable using L2 when explaining content compared to other areas such as expressing opinions rather than presenting facts. Nevertheless, they also indicated that they needed to switch from English to Korean to facilitate the students' understanding. They claimed that their use of CS was affected by factors such as their personal beliefs, the instructional materials they used, and their students' proficiency levels. The perception of the use of L1 and L2 among students was also fairly similar to that of the instructors. Almost one third of the students (27.32%) indicated that they often noticed the use of L1 by teachers in the classroom and some of them considered that it was very helpful for them to understand the content, while others wanted 100% English in the classroom (See the excerpts in Table 8).

The rest of the items sought the instructors' and students' views on the effectiveness of CS in terms of the effect on teaching and learning new skills in both content areas and language development. Some instructors (21.7%) believed that CS was very beneficial when teaching difficult issues in content areas, but others (26.0%) also indicated that the first language should not

be used too much in the classroom. While they considered that it might be helpful for students to understand concepts, they did not think it served to improve students' English in general. Many instructors (77.2%) felt it would be somewhat or very helpful to improve English reading skills since students could understand the meaning of L2 words and contents by referring to their equivalents in L1 (See Table 6). Many students (73.0%) believed that CS is somewhat or very helpful in understanding difficult concepts and in developing listening skills. In summary, the effectiveness of CS is somewhat differently perceived by the two groups: instructors considered it more effective in reading and the students believed it was more effective in listening in English-medium classes.

Table 6. Effectiveness of codeswitching on language skills

Effectiveness	Frequency (Percentage %)									
	General		Listening		Speaking		Reading		Writing	
	S	I	S	I	S	I	S	I	S	I
Negatively	47 (6.1)	3 (13.0)	41 (5.6)	6 (26.2)	108 (14.1)	4 (17.3)	37 (4.8)	2 (8.7)	74 (9.6)	3 (13.0)
No effect at all	180 (23.5)	3 (13.0)	164 (21.4)	4 (17.3)	264 (34.5)	7 (30.4)	267 (34.9)	3 (13.0)	306 (40.0)	5 (21.7)
Somewhat positively	429 (56.2)	12 (52.2)	388 (50.7)	10 (43.4)	300 (39.2)	10 (43.5)	359 (47.0)	10 (43.5)	326 (42.6)	10 (43.5)
Very positively	109 (14.2)	5 (21.7)	171 (22.3)	3 (13.1)	92 (12.1)	2 (8.8)	101 (13.2)	8 (34.7)	58 (7.5)	5 (21.7)
Total	765 (100)	23 (100)	764 (99.87)	23 (100)	764 (99.87)	23 (100)	764 (99.87)	23 (100)	764 (99.87)	23 (100)

<Note>S refers to Students and I refer to Instructors.

With regard to affective aspects, 78.26% of the instructors and 73.07% of the students agreed that CS would help the development of students' confidence in English. In addition, 65.21% of the instructors and 79.21% of the students indicated that CS would be beneficial to lower students' anxiety. In terms of interest, most of the respondents (instructors: 69.56%, students: 72.55%) considered that it would be also valuable to raise students' interest in studying English (See Table 7).

Table 7. Effectiveness of codeswitching on affective factors

Effectiveness	Frequency (Percentage %)					
	Confidence		Interest		Anxiety	
	S	I	S	I	S	I
Negatively	48 (6.27)	2 (8.70)	96 (12.55)	3 (13.04)	74 (9.67)	2 (8.70)
No effect at all	152 (19.87)	3 (13.04)	106 (13.86)	3 (13.04)	83 (10.85)	5 (21.74)
Somewhat positively	457 (59.74)	9 (39.13)	442 (57.78)	9 (39.13)	478 (62.48)	8 (34.78)
Very positively	102 (13.33)	9 (39.13)	113 (14.77)	7 (30.43)	128 (16.73)	7 (30.43)
Total	759 (99.22)	23 (100.0)	757 (98.95)	23 (100.0)	763 (99.74)	23(100.0)

Some of the responses from instructors and students to the final open-ended question about the functions of CS in the content-based classrooms are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Functions of codeswitching

	Instructors	Students
Linguistic aspects	<p><i>It's sometimes really helpful especially when I'm explaining major concepts. If they couldn't understand those concepts I couldn't go further. So I often switch English to Korean when I see students do not follow my explanation.</i></p> <p><i>It helps students to reduce errors in using English and help them to understand the meanings of English words. Since I'm using English textbooks, they know the words in English and if I switch them to Korean they naturally get the meanings of the English words.</i></p> <p><i>Sometimes using only English makes errors. For accuracy, I think it's good to use CS.</i></p>	<p><i>When I have difficulty understanding important concepts, it's better to have Korean translations. I want my professor to provide detailed explanation in Korean, especially for major concepts.</i></p> <p><i>Sometimes it's really hard to get the meanings of some sentences because the English words themselves are jargon. I think it's much better for us to understand the meaning of the specific words in Korean. I think the professor should switch the English words to Korean so we can easily get the ideas of the words.</i></p> <p><i>I think using English and Korean at the same time helpful to understand the concepts clearly.</i></p>
Affective aspects	<p><i>I use CS to arouse students' interest in my class. It's hard to make a joke in English and I just want my students to like my class.</i></p> <p><i>They became more familiar with speaking English when the use of CS was allowed. I noticed that. I'm sure that CS at some point could be good to develop language skills.</i></p> <p><i>I think using CS is a good way to raise students' motivation to use English. Students might be repulsed by using English-only policy. I think we could be flexible using English in the classroom for students.</i></p>	<p><i>It's always hard for me to follow the all English-medium class, but I like the way my professor starts the class. He always starts with some jokes in Korean, but related to that day's lecture. That really helps me to get the idea of the lecture.</i></p> <p><i>My professor encourages us to use English but she also says it's okay to use Korean when we do not know the English words. That makes huge difference, I think.</i></p> <p><i>Allowing Korean words in a sentence makes me comfortable to speak out in English.</i></p> <p><i>Switching English to Korean is interesting. It's fun, I think.</i></p> <p><i>I prefer to listen to as much English as possible in the classroom, but I think the use of CS can lessen our anxiety of using English.</i></p>
Others	<p><i>I'm not sure when and why I use CS. I think it's my unconscious behaviors.</i></p> <p><i>I try to use as much English as possible</i></p>	<p><i>I want to hear all English, not mixed languages. I think using CS might be good at some points like anxiety, but eventually we need all English, not mixed languages.</i></p>

<i>in the classroom since that's the purpose of the English-medium class, isn't it?</i>	<i>Personally I like to have a total English-medium lecture so I can improve my English.</i>
<i>I try not to use CS too much when I feel like my students follow my class well.</i>	<i>We are not allowed to use CS in the exam so I think we need to use only English.</i>

In summary, although it is hard to generalize with such a small number of participants in one setting, these instructors and students perceived that CS might assist the students in understanding the content of the classes and might reduce anxiety and raise motivation and would be beneficial for their students' language development at some point. However, it was also found that some students considered that the use of CS could become a language habit and should be banned in the classroom and wanted to listen to 100% English from the instructors in the classroom. They said that the exposure to perfect English would help them to develop their own English. All of their comments on the use of CS in the content-based classroom can be associated with their teaching/learning situations. Therefore, because it is hard to generalize the perceptions of the use of CS from instructors and students in this small-scaled study, more research with various settings is needed.

### 5.2. Use of codeswitching

I recorded verbal interaction in two classes in spring 2012 in which students did the micro-teaching of English. During this microteaching, the instructors gave them feedback. Because English was used exclusively in one of the recorded classes, I only analyzed the use of CS in one class from Prof. Kim. In order to do this, I transcribed all the occurrences of English used by the instructor and then coded them on the basis of the categories identified by Bernard and McLellan (2013).

Table 9. Length and functions of Codeswitching

	Tag	Inter-sentential	Intra-sentential	Long-turn
Evaluatory	v v v v v v v v v v v v	v	v	v v v
Eliciting		v v v v		
Information-giving	v v v v v v			
Socializing		v v	v	

From the short extracts of CS, most tags with some inter-sentential switches and a few intra-sentential switches were found like in Canh's (2011) study. Interestingly, it was also found that sometimes the entire utterance was in the L1 (examples 1, 2, 5, & 6), which is categorized into long-turn in this study. In addition, since the extracts were feedback on a student's micro-teaching, mostly the CS was evaluatory (examples 5 & 9) with some eliciting (example 2), information-giving (examples 3 & 4), and socializing (examples 1, 6, & 8). The results indicate that CS clearly serves important communicative and social functions in the classroom. The instructor used Korean frequently when the students appeared to have problems understanding concepts. As documented by Levine (2011), L2 was used more in general in many scripted contexts. Typical examples were:

- (1) \*그렇지요?  
*K-jo?*  
(right?)
  
- (2) \*몇 살 정도 생각한 거예요?  
*Myo sal jung-do sangkak-han kyo-ae-yo?*  
(What age did you think it would be good for?)
  
- (3) \*그런데 lesson plan 과 micro-teaching 과 맞지 않는 process 가 진행되었다는 거예요.  
*Keorundae lesson plan-gua micro-teaching-gua maagi ahn-nun process-ka jinhang-dae-ao-da-nun-kyo-ae-yo.*  
(But, the process of your micro-teaching didn't match well with your lesson plan.)
  
- (4) \*지금 lesson plan 에 있는 lesson objectives 에 맞지 않는 teaching 과정이 이루어진다는 거죠.  
*Jikum lesson plan-ae ik-nun lesson objectives-ae mah-ji aun-nun teaching-kwajung-i iruaeo-jinda-nun-kyo-jo.*  
(Now, the teaching process doesn't follow the lesson objectives in your lesson plan.)
  
- (5) \*Good, very good! 굉장히 잘 했어요.  
*Good, very good! Kangjanghee jal haes-uh-yo*  
(Good, very good! You did a great job.)
  
- (6) \*Understand? 무슨 말인지 알겠죠?  
*Understand? Moo-soon mal-in-ji al-kae-jio?*  
(Understand? You know what that means?)
  
- (7) \*자, Again the second discussion topic.  
*Ja, Again the second discussion topic.*  
(Let's see, again the second discussion topic.)
  
- (8) \* You should review what you have learned today. 그렇죠?  
*You should review what you have learned today. Gyu-ruh-jo?*  
(You should review what you have learned today. Right?)
  
- (9) \*무슨 말이냐면 lesson plan 을 보면 지금 너무 잘 만들었거든요.  
*Moosoon mal-yi-nya-meon lesson plan-eol bo-meon jikum neo-moo jal man-dl-eok-keo-dyun-yo.*  
(What I mean was you made an excellent lesson plan.)

In fact, the instructor that I recorded used CS frequently in the classroom and it seemed to assist the delivery of the content knowledge to students. However, these results in the content-based classroom can be different from the data results discovered in language classrooms. In addition, by analyzing the usage of CS by the instructor, I was able to observe her perceptions of CS. In fact, it was possible to count all the CS words or sentences used by the instructor, which implies that the instructor mostly used English, considering her English is an important and

valuable input for the students even in the content-based classroom. Therefore, when schools make policies for using English in the content-based classrooms, they should be aware that teacher CS is helpful tool to increase students' English proficiency.

## **6. Conclusions**

What was particularly interesting was the 'free choice' of language use by the instructor in her class. This decision ensured that both instructors and students were free to use their L1 or L2 according to their own needs and desires. The results of this study suggest that CS is not as directly related to the target language proficiency as some might expect. Rather, the employment of CS has motivational underpinnings. In other words, teachers and students in this study perceived that CS is a type of teaching and learning strategy that positively affects the learning of content knowledge as well as the target language.

Too often, English language teachers in Korea, and elsewhere, feel obliged to insist upon the use of the target language both orally and in writing. In such cases, it is difficult to identify individual target language users' depth of comprehension and intention of response when they have to express these in the target language. Significantly, there was scant evidence of CS at the inter-sentential level. More often, the English tags that were introduced were mainly key words taken from the text, rather than embedded in the users' own lexicon. This finding adds weight to the conclusion that the English texts were first mentally deconstructed and then reconstructed in Korean.

One of the important unanswered questions is whether instructors use CS for different purposes in different domains with different people. It is necessary to investigate the actual uses of CS with different people in various situations. They might use CS more often at ease with certain people in certain situations, not just in the classroom. In other words, it might be context-specific. Furthermore, instructors may display clear language preference for certain topics with a certain emotional status. This study suggests future research on the use of CS in ways that are not commonly recognized in various contexts.

In addition, in order to obtain a fuller picture, the CS patterns detected in such data need to be related not only to specific theories of cognition and language choice, but to important sociocultural factors that play a major role in language choice. Therefore, further exploration into the issue of language choice, whether in written or spoken production, might benefit from a more nuanced theoretical framework. Such a framework or perspective would make better connections between the various cognitive and sociocultural categories and how they address fundamental questions about CS. Guiding factors might include the perceived status of certain language choices, an investigation into certain reader/writer identities, or more general socially relevant perceptions about English and Korean use. This implies that investigations into the beliefs, values, and practices of teachers and language learners, as suggested by Borg (2006), might stimulate broader, deeper, and longitudinal studies in a range of other contexts. Further research could add depth to current theoretical understandings of the benefits as well as potential difficulties of L1 use in content language learning.

## **7. Limitations and Implications of the Study**

The limitation of this study is that the process of CS was treated as a more-or-less transparent process. In other words, little attention was paid to the manner of actually reporting this process. The use of CS was expressed in a transparent representation of the mental processes. Therefore, the claim that I have explored the use of CS and the users' perceptions of CS, while still valid, is

somewhat limited, as any dialogic or social components in the process were intentionally overlooked.

Given this limitation, the claim that participants “used L1 when there was more difficulty” is somewhat speculative and does not consider numerous factors that could have played into language choice. Such factors might include the perceived status of certain language choices, an investment into certain speaker/listener identities, or more general socially relevant perceptions about English and Korean use. The research, in effect, hinged on the ‘free choice’ of language use by the participants. In fact, I went to great lengths to ensure that all participants were free to use their L1 or L2 according to their own needs and desires although the class is supposed to be conducted only in English. This process, however, tended to overlook social factors that very likely played a significant role in their language choice. In addition, one cannot simply assume that the patterns detected here are related to a general theory of cognition and language choice any more than we can assume that the choice of language occurs in a bubble. Consequently, these might be understood as limitations of this research.

However, this study has some important implications for the field of second language acquisition and pedagogy. Most notably, the continuing popularity of English immersion in the Korean education system has resulted in a perceived reduction in the value of L1 use. The concept such as ‘unconscious acquisition’ has had a meaningful impact on second language teaching for many years. Though research has consistently challenged the validity and universal effectiveness of unconscious acquisition theories, it continues to have a significant pedagogical and political impact in second language teaching in Korea and elsewhere. This research provides further confirmation that the instructors in content-based classrooms actively use CS as a facilitating tool for students with difficulty in understanding content knowledge so that the students can engage and create meaning in using the second language. As a result, the L1 is a crucial component in facilitating this learning process. For future research, CS data from a large number of participants at a variety of educational or social settings could be analyzed in terms of CS patterns in participant writing and speech production.

## References

- Ahmad, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers’ code-switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching* 2 (2), 49-55.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 27 (1), 9-32.
- Azian, A. A., Raof, A. B. A., Ismail, F., & Hamzah, M. (2013). Communication strategies of non-native speaker novice science teachers in second language science classrooms. *System* 41 (2), 283-297.
- Bernard, R., & McLellan, J. (2013). *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum.
- Canh, L.V. (2011). *Form-focused instruction: A case study of Vietnamese teachers’ beliefs and practices*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Waikato, New Zealand.
- Carless, D. (2007). Students’ use of the mother tongue in the task-based classroom. *ELT Journal* 62 (4), 331-338.
- Choi, M. (2011, April 21). Feature: KAIST’s student suicide crisis. *KAIST Herald* 21. Retrieved from <http://herald.kaist.ac.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=156>.
- Chowdhury, N. (2012). Classroom code switching of English language teachers at tertiary level: A Bangladeshi perspective. *Stamford Journal of English* 7, 40-61.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57, 402-423.
- Dailey-O’Cain, J., & Liebscher, G. (2009). Teacher and student use of the first language classroom interaction: Functions and applications. In Turnbull, M. & Dailey-O’Cain, J. (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 131-144). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dewaele, J.-M., Housen, A., & Wei, L. (2003). *Bilingualism: Beyond basic principles*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Duff, P., & Polio, C. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *Modern Language Journal* 74, 154-166.
- Edstrom, A. (2006). L1 use in the L2 classroom: One teacher's self-evaluation. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 63 (2), 275-292.
- Eldridge, J. (1996). Codeswitching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal* 50 (4), 303-311.
- Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Evan, M. S., & Lee, H. (2013). Codeswitching by Korean students in New Zealand. In Barnard, R., & McLellan, J. (Eds.), *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives* (pp. 186-200). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Flymann-Mattsson, A., & Burenhult, N. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of French. *Lund University Department of Linguistics Working Papers* 47, 59-72.
- Gort, M. (2012). Code-switching patterns in the writing-related talk of young emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Literacy Research* 44 (1), 45-75.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hsieh, P., & Kang, H. (2010). Attribution and self-efficacy and their interrelationship in the Korean EFL context. *Language Learning* 60 (3), 606-627.
- Jee, M. (2012, April 18). Another suicide hits Korea's top sci-tech university KAIST. *The Dong-A Ilbo* 18. Retrieved from <http://english.donga.com/srv/service.php3?bicode=040000&biid=2012041849518>.
- Kang, H-S. (2012). English-only instruction at Korean universities: Help or hindrance to higher learning? *English Today* 28 (1), 29-34.
- Levine, G. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom*. Bristol, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal* 85 (4), 531-548.
- Martin, P. W. (2005). 'Safe' language practices in two rural schools in Malaysia: Tensions between policy and practice. In Lin, A. M. Y., & Martin, W. (Eds.), *Decolonization, and globalization: Language in education policy and practice* (pp. 74-97). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Moodley, V. (2007). Codeswitching in the multilingual English first language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism* 10 (6), 707-722.
- Park, C-S. (2007). Fast increasing cost in private education. *The Hankyoreh* February 5, A3.
- Park, J. K. (2009). 'English fever' in South Korea: Its history and symptoms. *English Today* 25 (1), 50-57.
- Polio, C. G., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal* 78, 313-326.
- Probyn, M. (2009). Smuggling the vernacular into the classroom: Conflicts and tensions in classroom codeswitching in township/rural schools in South Africa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12, 123-136.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Sampson, A. (2012). Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT Journal* 66 (3), 293-303.
- Sridhar, K. K. (1996). Societal multilingualism. In McKay, S. L., & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 47-70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tian, L., & Macaro, E. (2012). Comparing the effect of teacher codeswitching with English-only explanations on the vocabulary acquisition of Chinese university students: A Lexical focus-on-form study. *Language Teaching Research* 16 (3), 367-391.
- Ustunel, E. (2004). Preference organization in learners' language choice following teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching in Turkish EFL classrooms. *ARECLS E-Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.ecls.ncl.ac.uk/publish/Volume1/Eda/EdaUstunel.htm>
- Ustunel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 15 (3), 302-32
- Yang, M. (2004). A study of code-switching in Chinese EFL classrooms: A pragmatic approach. *Sino-US English Teaching* 1 (10), 43-49.

## Appendices

### A. Questionnaire for instructor participants

Please put a checkmark (✓) in the box (☐) that applies to you or specify the information about yourself in the other category.

1. Sex  
 Male  
 Female
  
2. Age  
 31 ~ 35  
 36 ~ 40  
 41 ~ 45  
 46 ~ 50  
 over 50
  
3. Years of Teaching Majors in English  
 less than 1 year  
 1 year ~ less than 2 years  
 2 year ~ less than 3 years  
 3 year ~ less than 4 years  
 more than 4 years
  
4. Levels of Your English  
 Superior  
 Advanced  
 Intermediate  
 Low Intermediate  
 Low
  
5. How much do you use L1 and L2 in your class?  
 Totally L2  
 Over 70% of L2  
 Over 50% of L2  
 Less than 50% of L2  
 Less than 30% of L2
  
6. Describe (1) when you mostly use L2 and (2) when you mostly use L1.  
(1) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_
  
7. How do you think of your code-switching for teaching content areas in general?  
 Helpful and should be used a lot  
 Helpful but shouldn't be used a lot  
 Not very helpful and shouldn't be used a lot  
 Not very helpful and shouldn't be used at all
  
8. Do you think your code-switching works for improving students' English listening skills?  
 Negatively  
 No effect at all  
 Somewhat positively  
 Very positively

9. Do you think your code-switching works for improving students' English speaking skills?
- Negatively
  - No effect at all
  - Somewhat positively
  - Very positively
10. Do you think your code-switching works for improving students' English reading skills?
- Negatively
  - No effect at all
  - Somewhat positively
  - Very positively
11. Do you think your code-switching works for improving students' English writing skills?
- Negatively
  - No effect at all
  - Somewhat positively
  - Very positively
12. Do you think your code-switching works for developing students' confidence in English?
- Negatively
  - No effect at all
  - Somewhat positively
  - Very positively
13. Do you think your code-switching works for developing students' interests in English?
- Negatively
  - No effect at all
  - Somewhat positively
  - Very positively
14. Do you think your code-switching works for lowering students' anxiety in English?
- Negatively
  - No effect at all
  - Somewhat positively
  - Very positively
15. Any comments on code-switching?

*B. Questionnaire for student participants*

Please put a checkmark (✓) in the box (☐) that applies to you or specify the information about yourself in the other category.

1. Sex                     Male  
                               Female

2. Age  19 ~ 25  
 26 ~ 30  
 31 ~ 35  
 36 ~ 40  
 Over 40
3. Years of Taking English-Medium Classes  no experience  
 1 semester  
 2 semesters  
 3 semesters  
 More than 4 semesters
4. Levels of Your English  Superior  
 Advanced  
 Intermediate  
 Low Intermediate  
 Low
5. How much do you think your instructor use L1 and L2 in your class?  
 Totally L2  
 Over 70% of L2  
 Over 50% of L2  
 Less than 50% of L2  
 Less than 30% of L2
6. Describe (1) when your instructor mostly uses L2 and (2) when he/she mostly use L1.  
(1) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_
7. How do you think of your instructor's code-switching for teaching content areas in general?  
 Helpful and should be used a lot  
 Helpful but shouldn't be used a lot  
 Not very helpful and shouldn't be used a lot  
 Not very helpful and shouldn't be used at all
8. Do you think the instructor's code-switching works for improving students' English listening skills?  
 Negatively  
 No effect at all  
 Somewhat positively  
 Very positively
9. Do you think the instructor's code-switching works for improving students' English speaking skills?  
 Negatively  
 No effect at all  
 Somewhat positively  
 Very positively

10. Do you think the instructor's code-switching works for improving students' English reading skills?
- Negatively
  - No effect at all
  - Somewhat positively
  - Very positively
11. Do you think the instructor's code-switching works for improving students' English writing skills?
- Negatively
  - No effect at all
  - Somewhat positively
  - Very positively
12. Do you think the instructor's code-switching works for developing students' confidence in English?
- Negatively
  - No effect at all
  - Somewhat positively
  - Very positively
13. Do you think the instructor's code-switching works for developing students' interests in English?
- Negatively
  - No effect at all
  - Somewhat positively
  - Very positively
14. Do you think the instructor's code-switching works for lowering students' anxiety in English?
- Negatively
  - No effect at all
  - Somewhat positively
  - Very positively
15. Any comments on code-switching?