Modern English Education, Vol. 18, No. 4, Winter 2017
http://dx.doi.org/10.18095/meeso.2017.18.4.06

Phraseological Items in Teacher Talk and Their Pedagogical Relevance: A Corpus-based Study

Sanghee Kang
Gwangmyeongbuk High School

Kang, Sanghee. (2017). Phraseological items in teacher talk and their pedagogical relevance: A corpus-based study. *Modern English Education*, *18*(4), 109-134.

Despite increasing attention on phraseological items in second language (L2) classrooms, there has been little effort to investigate phraseological aspects of native teacher talk in order to examine their pedagogical potential in L2 teacher education. To fill the gap in the literature, the present study explored recurring formulaic sequences identified in the spoken classroom discourse of MICASE (Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English). Phrase-frames (p-frames) and n-grams were selected as target phraseological types, which were identified based on two criteria: frequency and teachability of the phraseological items. Extracted n-grams and p-frames were processed at two levels of analysis: functional classification (Biber, Conrad, & Cortes, 2004) and teachers' verbal behavior classification (Bowers, 1980, as cited in Malamah-Thomas, 1987). The functional analysis was employed as a preliminary step for the second analysis, where phraseological items were coded to investigate their pedagogical functions within classroom discourse. The results revealed that linguistic functions of formulaic languages in native English teacher talk are expressing stance, organizing discourse, and indicating reference. The second analysis showed that the formulaic sequences are used for presenting, organizing, and getting students' attention in the classroom. Also, the pedagogical implications for non-native English language teachers and learners are discussed.

**[phraseological items/teacher talk/spoken corpus/
정형화구/교사언어/구어 코퍼스]**

I. INTRODUCTION

In Korean educational contexts, English has not been the major medium of instruction in

English classes. Instead, Korean, a native language that is shared by both the body of learners and Korean English teachers, has been used to teach English. Recently, however, a new approach of Teaching English in English (TEE) has received spotlight from many administrative educators and English teachers in South Korea (E. J. Moon, 2010). This change has been promoted in two major ways: on the part of government (see U. Maeng, 2009) and on the part of Korean teachers of English. With the efforts made, an issue rose to the surface: many Korean English teachers are not confident and comfortable with using classroom English (M. K. Kang, 2010). This might be attributed to Korean English teachers' lack of experience in being taught English in the target language when they were learners, lack of proper teacher training geared toward TEE, lack of English proficiency that is enough to conduct a class in English, and lack of teaching materials based on authentic classroom English.

Considering the educational context, the concept of 'teacher talk' is believed to lie at the center of successful TEE in English classrooms in South Korea. To be more specific, phraseological phenomena observed in authentic teacher talk of classroom discourse might be able to shed light on the current issues of TEE by nonnative speaker English teachers. Therefore, with the primary motivation, this study aims to examine authentic native English teacher talk to look for phraseological patterns, analyze them, and apply them to pedagogy, especially for nonnative teacher training. The findings of the present study would attempt to suggest pedagogical implications to language teachers and learners so that they can prepare for English-medium classes.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Phraseology and Language Learning and Teaching

In the past decades, there has been an increasing interest in the investigation and teaching of phraseological items among researchers and teachers (Cortes, 2006; Römer, 2010; Schmitt, Dörnyei, Adolphs, & Durow, 2004). It has been agreed that language has both the nature creativity and that of formulaicity, which enable a speaker not only to produce infinite utterances but also to use prefabricated chunks instead of other possible grammatical constructions (Jones & Haywood, 2004; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Pawley & Syder, 1983; Wray, 2000; Wray & Perkins, 2000). The formulaic nature of language is corroborated by Erman and Warren (2000), which report that 58.6% of the spoken corpus analyzed in their study and 52.3% of the written corpus consist of a variety of multi-expressions. Wray (1999) points out that formulaic sequences facilitate both language comprehension and production since they are believed to be stored and retrieved

as prefabricated expressions. A good command of formulaic sequences plays an essential role in L2 learning (Cowie, 1992; Schmitt & Carter, 2004) and acquiring native-like fluency (Simpson, 2004). As a result, much attention has been paid to teaching formulaic sequences in L2 classrooms. (e.g., AlHassan & Wood, 2015; Jones & Haywood, 2004; Nguyen, 2014). Although previous studies focused on the pedagogical potential of formulaic sequences for L2 learners, Granger and Meunier (2008) claims that attention should be drawn to L2 teachers as well. They propose that the need for pre-and in-service teacher training is a challenge that Phraseology in language learning and teaching is facing and maintain this suggestion in terms of raising awareness of the phraseological view of language on the part of teachers.

2. Previous Research on Spoken Classroom Discourse

Spoken classroom discourse has been investigated from multiple perspectives in the past few decades (Csomay, 2004). Specifically, many studies have explored functions of linguistic items in academic lectures by taking a corpus-based approach. For instance, Simpson and Mendis (2003) take a corpus-based study approach to explore the patterns in the use of idioms and their functions in academic speech. The study draws on a specialized corpus of 1.7 million words of academic discourse, MICASE (the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English) (Simpson, Briggs, Ovens, & Swales, 2002). The findings indicate that the use of idioms appears to be related more to individual speakers' idiolects than any other linguistic or content-related factors. In addition, the important role of idioms has been identified in terms of functional discourse grammar of academic speech. Grant (2007) also examines recurrent figurative idioms in corpora. The study compares the idioms used in American English and British English based on MICASE and the BNC (British National Corpus). Csomay (2004) identifies intra-textual linguistic variation in university classroom speech and discusses differences in the discourse patterns from different disciplines and instructional levels. The findings demonstrate three identified dimensions: 1) contextual, directive orientation vs. conceptual, informative focus; 2) personalized framing vs. lack of personalized framing; and 3) interactive dialogue vs. teacher monologue. Also, the study reports that the three dimensions show three aspects of the linguistic variation in the topical discourse units of university classroom speech. Simpson (2004) analyzes highly frequent formulaic sequences identified in the spoken corpus, MICASE. Interestingly, this study conducts cross-corpus frequency comparisons of the formulaic sequences to find out whether high frequency formulaic expressions are also used in other spoken genres.

Other studies such as Csomay and Cortes (2009) and Biber, Conrad and Cortes (2004) investigate the functions of patterns identified in classroom discourses focusing on 'lexical bundles.' Csomay and Cortes (2009) examine how functions of lexical bundles relate to

discourse structure (i.e., class sessions: opening phase, instructional phase, and closing phase). The result indicates that functions of lexical bundles are related to the communicative functions in discourse structure. For example, stance bundles are identified as the most frequent bundles in the opening phase while the frequency of those stance bundles dropped sharply in the instructional phase. Biber et al. (2004) conduct a corpus-based study that includes not only classroom teaching but also textbooks, both of which are important university registers. They compare the use of lexical bundles in classroom teaching and textbooks and provide a functional classification based on a corpus-based analysis. The findings show that speakers in classroom teaching contexts use more stance and discourse organizing bundles than speakers engaged in conversations. Also, when compared to academic prose, classroom teaching uses more referential bundles.

Unlike studies that investigated recurring patterns in the spoken discourse, a line of research documented characteristics of lexis identified in spoken classroom discourse. For example, Thompson (2006) reports word frequency used in Economics lectures by analyzing the BASE (British Academic Spoken English) corpus. The study attempts to find out whether the results would contribute to expanding the knowledge of linguistic aspects of spoken English academic discourse.

Other studies report patterns of classroom discourse by considering both teachers and learners. For example, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) examine primary classroom communication and compile a list of speech acts based on the verbal behaviors of teachers and students. Csomay (2007) explores how teacher talk and student talk are different in a university setting by analyzing a spoken corpus. The corpus used in the study is 1.4 million words and consists of 196 transcriptions recorded at five different universities in the United States. The results reveal that students take more turns than teachers. However, findings also indicate that over 80 % of student turns are fewer than 30 words at a time. Another study investigates how classroom discourse affects language learned by learners. Cazden (1986) examines the relationship between the language used in a language classroom and the language learned by learners. However, results reveal that there is no direct relationship between the language used in a language classroom and the language learned by learners.

A body of research reports utterance types that language teachers produce in the classroom. For instance, Y. J. Choi and T. E. Kim (2016) attempt to explore the question types and discourse structure in Elementary English teachers' teacher talk. The results show that execution questioning and recognition questioning are the most frequently used question types. But types of question that can stimulate learners' thinking process are rarely used by the teachers. J. Shim (2006) analyzes patterns of two English teacher talk in terms of frequency and types of utterance in their teacher talk by taking a corpus approach. Data from two middle school teachers' classroom instruction and interactions were collected to

build a corpus. The study finding reveals that the two teachers prefer employing classroom language for explaining, requesting, and questioning.

Other aspects of classroom spoken discourse than linguistic functions were also examined. Thompson (2003) examines the roles of metadiscourse and intonation as a means of indicating a lecture organization in an academic setting and their pedagogical implications. The results suggest that both metadiscourse and intonation are used by lecturers to help students map the organization of a talk and understand how subsets are interconnected. Barbieri (2013) analyzes non-informational dimension of the university classroom discourse. The study focuses on the speaker's involvement in the classroom interaction in a corpus of American university spoken discourse. Specifically, the speaker's involvement is examined in terms of three situational factors: academic discipline, level of instruction, and class size. Findings indicate that although the effect of the three characteristics are not significantly influential, small courses and disciplines such as the Humanities and Social Sciences allow for involvement and interactivity in the classroom.

3. Importance of Teacher Talk in a Language Classroom

For decades, there have been substantial studies that claimed the importance of teacher talk in language learning and language classroom. According to Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), teachers talk for a considerable part of a lesson and teacher talk takes account of approximately two thirds of the lesson in teacher-led lessons. Forman (2012) also points out that teacher talk is a primary feature of much education and plays an essential role in EFL contexts where learners' exposure to L2 is limited outside classrooms. In addition, it is generally agreed that language input provided by teachers is vital for learners' language development in L2 classrooms (Ellis, 2005; Van Pattern, 2003). However, there have been concerns about teacher talk in the EFL classroom. According to Cullen (1998), there is a misconception that a good teacher talk meant little teacher talk as too much teacher talk time is considered to deprive students' opportunities to speak during a lesson. In the study, it is reported that teachers and educators start to pay more attention to the quality of teacher talk than the quantity of teacher talk by giving good reasons for putting emphasis on teacher talk quality: 1) teacher talk can be a potentially valuable source for comprehensible input and 2) teacher talk can affect the quantity and quality of student interaction in the lesson (Brock, 1986, as cited in Cullen, 1998). Meunier (2012) also makes the same point about the importance of the quality in teacher talk in a language classroom: "As learners have been shown to be sensitive to input frequency, the quantity and quality of the input that learners get in instructed SLA is thus of paramount importance" (p. 115). Another concern is whether nonnative English speaking teachers (NNESTs) can provide a high quality of input to learners in the classroom. Tang (2011) investigates the English language classrooms in China to see whether NNESTs can be a rich lexical source for L2 learners in terms of variety and

frequency. Results indicate that the language classroom cannot be an input-rich environment since the language that the teachers used is limited and consists of simple structures and vocabulary.

Furthermore, there has been a line of studies that explored differences in teacher talk of native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) and nonnative English-speaking teachers (NNESTs). For example, Y. E. Kwon (2012) compares characteristics of teacher talk between NNESTs and NESTs focusing on their use of formulaic sequences. The study reports that the frequency of formulaic sequences of NESTs is higher than that of NNESTs and that the variety of formulaic chunks that were used in NEST's classroom language is greater than that of NNESTs. The result reveals that NNESTs used a limited number of formulaic sequences repeatedly. In addition, S. Lee (2005) analyzes three English teachers' teacher talk in terms of syntactic structures and classroom interactions. Two Korean English teachers and one native English teacher participated in the study. The study found out that there is a significant difference among the three teachers depending on their proficiency. To illustrate, their classroom English differ in fluency (i.e., the amount of classroom English and the length of sentences), accuracy, and syntactic structures.

S. Kim (2015) compares not only NESTs and NNESTs but also includes teachers' guide for classroom English. The research attempts to investigate whether the classroom English introduced in teachers' guide represents the real uses of English teachers in the classroom. Findings reveal that there is a gap between classroom language in the teachers' guide and classroom language that NEST used in the classroom. In other words, examples of classroom language suggested by the teacher's guidebook do not overlap authentic English of both NESTs and advanced NNESTs. Medgyes (1994) elicited English teachers' perceptions on differences in teaching behaviors between NESTs and NNESTs by using surveys. Findings indicate that teachers believe that NNESTs speak poorer English, use 'bookish' language, and use English less confidently. Similar findings are presented by Árva and Medgyes (2000). They conducted a qualitative research to examine the issues of NNESTs and NESTs by investigating a total of ten teachers, five NESTs and five NNESTs. They gathered data by recording the classroom instruction and interviewing the teachers. Findings demonstrate that although NNESTs are claimed to have a greater grammatical knowledge than NESTs, NNESTs are reported that they have a faulty command of English. Also, it is noted that classroom languages that NNESTs used lack authenticity and naturalness.

Problematizing teacher education programs for pre-service and in-service teachers, Sešek (2007) emphasizes a necessity to implement a specific training of classroom English for NNEST in an EFL environment. Y. E. Kwon (2012) also maintains that education on classroom language has been overlooked as it has been assumed that exposure to general English would lead to automatic acquisition of classroom English on the part of teachers. Motivated by this, this study attempts to suggest one of possible ways that can contribute to

resolving the current concerns by identifying phraseological items, investigating their pedagogical relevance, and incorporating them into English teacher education as resources. Even though there has been a growing body of phraseology research and an increasing attention to its pedagogic relevance, there have been few studies that attempted to examine phraseological aspects of native teacher talk in a language classroom with the purpose of incorporating them into pedagogical applications for nonnative language teachers and learners. Therefore, in an effort to address the gap in the literature, the current study was guided by the following research questions:

1) Are common phraseological aspects identified in native teacher talk from a spoken corpus?
2) What are the functions of recurrent phraseological items in native teacher talk?
3) What are the pedagogical implications of phraseological aspects found in native teacher talk?

III. METHOD

1. Corpus Used for the Study

The Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE) (Simpson et al., 2002) was used to investigate teacher talk produced by native speakers of English in the present study. In order to analyze data that are relevant to address the research questions, only subsets of MICASE were selected. More specifically, the present study attempted to examine the phraseological patterns in teacher talk, not student talk, within classroom discourse. Thus, this led to exclusive inclusion of highly monologic and mostly monologic contexts in the analysis. Also, lectures given by English native speaker teachers were exclusively extracted as the target data according to my research questions (Table 1). As a result, a total of 37 transcripts (total word count: 378,298) that meet the above criteria were extracted.

TABLE 1
Criteria to Extract the Relevant Subset of MICASE

Speaker Attributes	Transcript Attributes
Academic position/role	All (junior faculty, junior graduate student, junior undergraduate, post-doctoral fellow, researcher, senior faculty, senior graduate student, staff, senior undergraduate, and visitor/other)
Native speaker status	Native speaker (American English and other English)/near native
Speech event type	Lecture-large/lecture-small
Academic division & discipline	All (Biological and Health Sciences, Humanities and Arts, Physical Sciences and Engineering, and Social Sciences and Education)

2. Identification of Phraseological Items

In the present study, phrase-frames (p-frames) and n-grams are the measures in identifying phraseological items. Gries (2008) defines n-grams as "uninterrupted sequences of word forms; the upper limit of *n* is usually five" (p. 20). For instance, *on the other hand* is taken as an example of 4-grams. According to Römer (2010), "phrase-frames" are defined as "sets of n-grams which are identical except for one word, e.g. *at the end of, at the beginning of*, and *at the turn of* would all be part of the p-frame *at the * of*" (p.98). Additional examples will be *on the one hand* and *on the other hand* that can be categorized as the p-frame *on the * hand*. In this case, *on the one hand* and *on the other hand* are two instances of the p-frame *on the * hand*. In the current study, p-frames are operationalized based on the definition from Römer (2010): "n-grams with a variable slot in medial (not in initial or final) position (i.e., A*CD and AB*D for the 4-gram ABCD)" are considered as p-frames. To illustrate, 'I don't know *' cannot be considered as a 4 p-frame as the variable slot is located in the final position.

3. Data Analysis

In order to identify phraseological patterns in the corpus, KfNgram (Fletcher, 2002-2007) and AntConc (Anthony, 2014) were used. KfNgram served as an essential tool to create n-grams and p-frames. Also, this phraseological search engine helped to browse p-frames (e.g., frequency and variants). AntConc was used to see "concordance" and "file view" so that the contexts could be examined where phraseological items were used. The span for n-grams was set to the range from 3-grams to 6-grams; and based on them, p-frames ranging from 3 to 6 were generated. The floor (i.e., "the minimum or threshold frequency a wordgram must have to be included in the list," (Fletcher, 2002-2007) was set as 1 when extracting n-grams and 3 when extracting p-frames.

In terms of the selection of lexical phrases for analysis, two previous studies were taken into consideration: Sinclair (2004) and Granger (2011). Sinclair (2004) mentioned that criteria for selecting items should take the way of arranging initial frequency-based listings, which means frequency should be the first but other criteria should be considered as well. Granger (2011) argued that "frequency needs to be counter-balanced by at least three other factors: learner variables, learnability, and teachability" (p. 10). Thus, even though the analysis employed frequency criteria as the basis of analysis, this study did not include all of the most frequent lexical items. From a long list of n-grams and p-frames, the items that are teachable and meaningful to the target population and the teaching context were selected.

N-grams and p-frames (i.e., 3-6 grams and 3-6 p-frames) have been analyzed at two levels of analysis. Two steps of analysis were performed since the first analysis was conducted for the second analysis to be carried out with ease. The first linguistic analysis was done based on functional classification which was created by Biber et al. (2004). The classification was employed in this study since it was considered that the classification was comprehensive and was constructed based on a large corpus. Table 2 shows the main categories of the functional taxonomy. The purpose of the first level of analysis was to identify the functions of phraseological items by using the functional taxonomy developed by Biber et al. (2004).

TABLE 2
Functional Classification of Lexical Bundles (Biber et al., 2004)

Categories of the Functional Classification		Description
Stance expressions	Epistemic stance	To assess certainty of the information in the following proposition (e.g., *I don't know if*)
	Attitudinal/modality stance	To convey speaker's attitudes towards events presented in the following proposition (e.g., *if you want to*)
Discourse organizers	Topic introduction/focus	To introduce a topic (e.g., *if you look at*)
	Topic elaboration/clarification	To give details about the topic on focus or make a following position more comprehensible and less confusing (e.g., *has to do with*)
Referential expressions	Identification/focus	To give attention to the noun phrase following the lexical bundle (e.g., *that's one of the*)
	Impression	To make imprecise reference (e.g., *or something like that*)
	Specification of attributes	To single out particular attributes of the following noun (e.g., *there's a lot of*)
	Time/place/text/multifunctional reference	To make reference to specific places, times, or locations in the text (e.g., *at the same time*)

The second analysis was conducted to identify the functions of phraseological items that are specific to teacher talk in the classroom. The phraseological items from the first analysis were coded based on the teacher's verbal behavior classification developed by

Bowers (1980, as cited in Malamah-Thomas, 1987). As shown in Table 3, seven types of verbal behavior were suggested as behaviors observed in a classroom setting. Also, to determine the functions of identified items, contexts in which they were used were examined using AntConc. While analyzing the data, there was a need to modify the taxonomy from Bowers (1980, as cited in Malamah-Thomas, 1987) as there were lexical items that did not fit into their categories; and there were cases where no items were identified for the suggested category. This led to the adapted classification from the original one.

TABLE 3
Categories of Verbal Behavior in the Language Classroom
(Bowers, 1980, as cited in Malamah-Thomas, 1987, p. 25)

Verbal Behavior	Description
Responding	Any act already sought by the utterance of another speaker, such as answering a question
Sociating	Any act not contributing directly to the teaching/learning task, but rather to the establishment or maintenance of interpersonal relationships
Organizing	Any act which serves to structure the learning task or environment without contributing to the teaching/learning task itself
Directing	Any act encouraging non-verbal activity as an integral part of the teaching/learning task
Presenting	Any act presenting information of direct relevance to the learning task
Evaluating	Any act which rates another verbal act positively or negatively
Eliciting	Any act designed to produce a verbal response from another person

IV. ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL ITEMS IN TEACHER TALK: FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

Formulaic items identified from 37 transcripts by KfNgram and AntConc were categorized based on the functional classification (Biber et al., 2004). It was revealed that the most frequent phraseological items in the present study are similar to the results of the data analysis in Biber et al. (2004). The findings from the first analysis were used as the basis for the second level of analysis.

Table 4 shows quantitative data results from the first analysis in terms of sub-categories in linguistic functions. There are the largest counts of formulaic sequences in referential expressions. Regarding the proportion of the formulaic sequences, referential expressions

account for the largest proportion; discourse organizers and stance expressions take up 30 % and 25%, respectively. To provide more details of the data, a small portion of the result from the first analysis is presented in Appendix 1.

TABLE 4
Frequency and Proportion of Phraseological Items According to Functional Classification

Categories of the Functional Classification		P-frames	Instances of P-frames	Tokens of N-grams	Proportion (P-frames & N-grams)
Stance expressions	Epistemic stance	1	6	7	25%
	Attitudinal/modality stance	12	32	20	
	Sub-total	13	38	27	
Discourse organizers	Topic introduction/ focus	7	22	26	30%
	Topic elaboration/ clarification	2	4	13	
	Sub-total	9	26	39	
Referential expressions	Identification/ focus/imprecision	4	15	19	45%
	Specification of attributes	12	47	18	
	Time/place/text/ multifunctional reference	7	17	6	
	Other semantic categories (purpose/reference)	3	7	3	
	Sub-total	26	86	46	
	Total	48	150	112	100%

V. ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL ITEMS IN TEACHER TALK: VERBAL BEHAVIOR CLASSIFICATION

Table 5 shows the results from the second level of analysis using Bowers' Categories of Verbal Behavior in the Language Classroom (adapted from Bowers, 1980, as cited in Malamah-Thomas, 1987) (see Appendix 2 for details). To illustrate, 'topic introduction' includes three types of p-frames, *and * going to, if * look at,* and *I * talk about,* which have eight instances of p-frames (i.e., *and * going to (and i'm going to, and you're going to, and we're going to); if * you look at (if you look at, if we look at, if i look at); i * talk about (i*

wanna talk about, i will talk about)). Only relevant formulaic items were selected based on two criteria: frequency and teachability (i.e., whether they are useful for nonnative English teachers' teacher talk). In addition, the second analysis included the investigation of contexts in which formulaic sequences were used to determine the functions of the phraseological items.

TABLE 5
Frequency and Proportion of Phraseological Items According to Verbal Behavior Classification

Verbal Behaviors		P-frames	Instances of P-frames	Tokens of N-grams	Proportion (P-frames & N-grams)
Presenting	Topic introduction	3	8	32	85%
	Topic elaboration	16	63	32	
	Sub-total	19	71	64	
Organizing/giving instructions		6	17	3	10%
Getting students' attention		1	3	3	5%
Total		26	91	70	100%

Interestingly, in verbal behavior classification, the phraseological sequences identified in the first step were categorized into mainly two functions: presenting and organizing. It was assumed that this was due to how transcripts were extracted from the corpus (i.e., speech event type: lecture and interactive rating: highly monologic and mostly monologic). To be specific, as the lecture transcripts are highly monologic and mostly monologic in terms of interactive aspect, the data did not include phraseological items which can occur during interaction. For example, formulaic items that correspond with the teachers' verbal behavior of "sociating" (i.e., establishing and maintaining classroom rapport) or "evaluating" (i.e., correcting) were not identified as their functional nature is fundamentally interactive. Thus, based on this observation, only two categories were chosen for the second level of analysis and one more category (i.e., getting students involved) was added. Also, the function of giving instructions was combined with organizing as both functions are not directly related to teaching or learning itself. Lastly, subcategories were created to give a more detailed insight on the functions that identified items have in teacher talk.

1. Presenting

A category of presenting provides a frame for p-frames and n-grams employed for the purposes of introducing a new topic, presenting new content, or further explaining already proposed topics. Under this category, two subcategories were included: topic introduction and topic elaboration from the taxonomy of Biber et al. (2004).

1) Topic Introduction

Phraseological items with the function of topic introduction provide signals to the students that a new topic will be presented. Their specific functions are demonstrating a lecturer's intention that he/she will start to talk about a new topic. The linguistic function of 'intention' is well demonstrated in the variant that fills the slot * in p-frames. For example, the two variants that fill the slot(*) in the p-frame *i * talk about, wanna* or *will*, are semantically related to intention. Excerpt (1) from MICASE is an example where items serve the function of topic introduction:

(1) Now we'll turn the lights back on and talk about loops. okay. so this is what *i wanna talk about* today. loops. (Intro Engineering Lecture)

As Biber et al. (2004) maintained in their study, phraseological items for topic introduction that were identified in the present study also tend to contain personal pronouns. As shown in Appendix 2, most of the p-frames and n-grams have first person pronouns (e.g., *and I'm going to, we're gonna talk about*) or second person pronouns (e.g., *if you look at, you can see*).

2) Topic Elaboration

Topic Elaboration is the second category that falls in presenting functions. A wide range of sub-functions are included in this umbrella category (e.g., explaining, rephrasing, exemplifying, specifying quantity, and contrasting). Excerpt (2) shows how the 4-gram *an example of a* is used to exemplify a topic.

(2) Here's a citation for uh, Lefkovitch's discussion of plant uh population growth, grouping organisms by stages. here's *an example of a* stage-based model for an insect population […]. (Graduate Population Ecology Lecture)

The p-frame *a * amount of* shows specific attributes of a word that follows it. For example, in Excerpt (3), *a certain amount of* specifies the quantity of energy. The variants that fill in the * slot in *a * amount of* are semantically associated with each other. More specifically, the core meaning of the whole phrases (i.e., specifying quantities) comes from the slot variants (i.e., certain, tremendous, small, and huge) (see Appendix 2 for more details).

(3) well, um, you'll recall, that, *a certain amount of* energy is required, for an enzyme to bind with its substrate and thereby …. (Biology and Ecology of Fishes Lecture)

The 4-grams *on the other hand* and *as a result of* are used for contrasting two different facts and indicating the relationship of cause and effect, respectively, in Excerpts (4) and (5).

(4) we have the reality of the physical world. and *on the other hand*, we have the symbolic reality of the written out recipes. (Fantasy in Literature Lecture)
(5) what it is is the idea that, evolution doesn't occur, simply, *as a result of* gradual processes, but that it actually occurs, because of speciations. (Race and Human Evolution Lecture)

Even though not many 5 p-frames were identified in the current study, there was one frequently used 5 p-frame, *has * to do with* as shown Excerpt (6). Similarly, with this p-frame, the core meaning of the whole phrases seems to be determined by the slot filler (i.e., something and nothing):

(6) uh, linguists have talked about changes that are more natural than others. uh that's a statistical term and *has nothing to do with* human physiology or natural or unnatural speech acts. (Historical Linguistics Lecture)

The 5-gram, *one of the things that* was used to give more details on the topic which was already introduced (Biber et al, 2004). Excerpt (7) demonstrates its function of providing details.

(7) Stephen J Gould […] wrote a great book (i think) his very best book is called Ontogeny and Phylogeny, which discusses the history of some of these ideas. And he characterizes humans as neotonous. because one of the things that does characterize humans, is our decreased growth rate it takes us a long time to reach maturity. (Race and Human Evolution Lecture)

Excerpt (8) demonstrates one of the subsections from the topic elaboration function: referring. The 4-grams *we already talked about* is used to refer to the topic that was discussed prior to the point when the speech was made or that was being discussed.

(8) but this is just to remind you, about serotonergic systems which *we already talked about*, just to, to jog memories. (Drugs of Abuse Lecture)

2. Organizing/Giving Instructions

This functional category describes any teacher's behavior that is serving to structure the learning environment or task but is not directly related to the teaching or a learning task itself (Bowers, 1980, as cited in Malamah-Thomas, 1987). In the present study, this function is expanded to include the function of giving instruction which is not directly associated with teaching. Excerpt (9) demonstrates that the instructor used the 4-grams *let me show you* to set up the environment for a pedagogical activity, watching a movie as part of a lesson.

(9) this is related to an environmental feature and in this case the environmental feature has do to with, […] industrial pollution. *let me show you* this little movie, i don't think the sound on this works very well […]. (Intro to Evolution Lecture)

In Excerpt (10), an instructor is giving instructions to students on what they need to do with the exam using the 4-gram *i want you to*.

(10) but right now *i want you to* read the exam, each question at least twice. okay. the exam we are suggesting a length of six pages do not go over six-and-a-half pages. (History of the American Family Lecture)

Phraseological items in this category tend to contain personal pronouns and have directive characteristics, as indicated in Biber et al. (2004). Thus, the items serve the function of directing the students to perform actions that the instructor wants completed. Many of the lexical items that have the function of topic introduction were also used for this category (Biber et al., 2004). Excerpt (11) is a part of an Inorganic Chemistry lecture where a lecturer is giving directions using *you're going to*.

(11) once you're assigned to a group of cations *you're going to* fill in this first column, with the cations you're assigned. so let's say let's say these are the cations you're assigned, you do that at the last minute […]. (Inorganic Chemistry Lecture)

3. Getting Students Involved

This function has a feature of classroom management rather than content-related characteristics. P-frame and n-grams in this category are used by an instructor to get

students' additional attention or to put more focus on the word following the phraseological items. In Excerpt (12), the p-frame *if you * at* is used with the function of getting students involved.

(12) okay so *if you look at* question number one, uh in your handout we have that reaction, and we are, going to repeat it when we perform a reference blank test. (Inorganic Chemistry Lecture)

The 4-gram *those of you who* in Excerpt (13) was used to identify the group of students who were related to the topic in the discussion and to get their attention (Biber et al., 2004).

(13) if you take a look at that detail in the middle of the Mexican flag, you'll see *those of you who*'ve been to Mexico City will certainly recognize this. (Fantasy in Literature Lecture)

As the nature of p-frame demonstrates (i.e., "Looking at p-frames and the type and token frequencies of their variants can provide insights into the variability of formulaic sequences" (O'Donnell, Römer, & Ellis, 2013, p. 90)), lexical items that fill the slot within the p-frame tend to be semantically related.

VI. PEDAGOGICAL RELEVANCE OF THE PHRASEOLOGICAL ITEMS

Pedagogical implications are discussed in terms of educating nonnative teachers and getting nonnative learners ready for English-medium lectures. First, the finding from the study can be included in a teacher education curriculum, syllabus, and teacher training materials. Especially, one thing to be noted is that the number of p-frames were significantly smaller than that of variations of the p-frames. This result indicates that a p-frame can be an appropriate type of phraseological item as pedagogical resources for classroom language since a p-frame can be presented as a representative form of many variations. Also, introducing a handful of p-frames with a commonality among instances that fill the slot of the p-frames would be more accessible to teacher trainees rather than providing them with a long list of formulaic sequences unsystematically. As previous studies conducted in EFL contexts, NNESTs were reported as lacking authenticity and using limited types of utterances in their teacher talk. Thus, the expected benefit would be helping nonnative teachers to stay away from awkward classroom language production and to gain native-like classroom English. This would lead to authentic English input for

learners. In addition, the findings of the current study can be incorporated in teaching materials for classroom English. Considering a gap between classroom English in teachers' guide and the real use of English by NESTs (S. Kim, 2015) and the significance of teacher talk as valuable input for L2 learners, more authentic classroom language such as the current findings will play a facilitative role in teacher training. As Meunier (2012) points out, "if using native-like formulaic language constitutes a major challenge for learners, it is also the case for many of their nonnative speaker teachers" (p. 79), it is necessary for nonnative English teachers to receive appropriate training in classroom teacher talk as it is not the same as casual conversation, due to its distinctive characteristics.

When it comes to implications for nonnative English learners, teaching patterns of teacher talk to the learners will be beneficial as it will help them prepare for lessons conducted in English. In other words, understanding and having higher awareness of phraseologism in lectures on the part of learners can be good listening strategies for facing English-medium lectures. One of the related teaching methodologies that take this concept as its basis would be Aston's (2015) proposal. The study suggests that phraseological items can be taught along with their suprasegmentals. Also, including authentic classroom English data in teaching and learning materials will be beneficial as Meunier (2012) puts emphasis on the significance of the authenticity in teaching materials and teacher talk. In Meunier's (2012) study, it is claimed that the lack of authentic language in pedagogical resources would have detrimental influence on the teacher talk of nonnative English teachers.

One possible pedagogical application of the findings would be incorporating them into an EFL Teacher Training Program such as Grade I certification training for in-service English teachers. The current study would like to suggest an EFL teacher training curriculum as an example. The target population for the training curriculum can be both in-service or pre-service teachers. The program would be designed in terms of classroom discourse structure (i.e., opening phase, instructional phase, and closing phase) and corresponding phraseological items for each stage would be presented. In the final session, trainees will have a short practicum session where they demonstrate their microteaching. The purpose of implementing a practicum session is for teacher-trainees to be able to have hands-on experience of using the natural classroom English that they have learned in the previous instructional sessions by preparing their own lesson. As phraseological items that were found in the study would not be able to cover all classroom English (e.g., greetings or sociating), other supplementary materials will be necessary to complement teaching materials for the proposed teacher training program.

VII. CONCLUSION

The present study examined formulaic sequences (i.e., p-frames and n-grams) that were specifically used in teacher talk discourse by taking a corpus-based study approach and further investigated the pedagogical relevance of the findings in Korean EFL contexts. The research questions that this study attempted to address were as follows: 1) Are common phraseological aspects identified in native teacher talk from a spoken corpus? 2) What are the functions of recurrent phraseological items in native teacher talk? 3) What are the pedagogical implications of phraseological aspects found in native teacher talk?

The first and the second questions were answered by the first linguistic analysis of data extracted from MICASE based on functional classification from Biber et al. (2004) and by the second level of analysis based on Bowers' Categories of Verbal Behavior in the Language Classroom (Bowers, 1980, as cited in Malamah-Thomas, 1987). There were recurring phraseological items in native English speaking teachers' teacher talk and the results from the first linguistic analysis were partially in line with the findings from Biber et al. (2004). It was revealed that formulaic sequences identified in the first analysis also have the functions associated with teachers' verbal behaviors. The findings imply that there is a possibility that the recurring formulaic sequences in native teacher talk are teachable. Thus, this potential led to the attempt to examine pedagogical implications of the formulaic languages and outline a teacher training program.

However, the limitations of the current study should be acknowledged as many of them would have implications for future research. First, as the transcripts which were used in this study were extracted to examine exclusively teacher talk, they were either highly monologic or mostly monologic. This extraction criteria prevented the study from capturing interactive aspects of classroom talk, which do occur between a teacher and students in the classroom. Another limitation would come from the corpus that was constructed based on university settings and across multiple disciplines. Despite the common aspects shared in the university settings and primary/secondary education contexts (e.g., topic introduction, topic elaboration), future studies might benefit from constructing a corpus exclusively from language classrooms such as intensive English programs or EFL classrooms so that they can better investigate not only the interactive nature of the language classroom but also language teachers' teacher talk in depth. Last but not least, this study could not report interreliability on classifying functions of formulaic sequences as the author analyzed all data. Considering the shared awareness of difficulty to decide the functional classification of formulaic sequences (Ädel & Erman, 2012), there should be at least two raters to guarantee interreliability of data analysis in future studies. It is believed that phraseologism found in native teachers' teacher talk should be able to contribute to resolving the current issues that nonnative speaking

English teachers face. Also, it is suggested that there should be more research to be carried out to make a bridge between phraseology and pedagogy.

REFERENCES

Ädel, A., & Erman, B. (2012). Recurrent word combinations in academic writing by native and non-native speakers of English: A lexical bundles approach. *English for Specific Purposes*, *31*(2), 81-92.

AlHassan, L., & Wood, D. (2015). The effectiveness of focused instruction of formulaic sequences in augmenting L2 learners' academic writing skills: A quantitative research study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 17,* 51-62.

Anthony, L. (2014). AntConc (Version 3.4.3) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from the World Wide Web: http://www.laurenceanthony.net/

Árva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System, 28*(3), 355-372.

Aston, G. (2015). Learning phraseology from speech corpora. In A. Lenko-Szymanska & A. Boulton (Eds.), *Multiple affordances of language corpora for data-driven learning* (pp. 56-84). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Barbieri, F. (2013). Involvement in university classroom discourse: Register variation and interactivity. *Applied Linguistics, 36*(2), 151-173.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Cortes, V. (2004). If you look at …: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks. *Applied Linguistics*, *25*(3)*,* 371-405.

Cazden, C. B. (1986). Language in the classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *7*, 18-33.

Choi, Yu-Jung, & Kim, Tae-Eun. (2016). An analysis of question types and discourse structure elementary English teachers use on the TEE-A teaching practice test. *Modern English Education, 17*(3), 219-244.

Cortes, V. (2006). Teaching lexical bundles in the disciplines: An example from a writing intensive history class. *Linguistics and Education*, *17*(4), 391-406.

Cowie, A. P. (1992). Multiword lexical units and communicative language teaching. In P. J. L. Arnaud & H. Bejoint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and applied linguistics* (pp. 1-12). Basingstoke UK: Macmillan.

Csomay, E. (2004). Linguistic variation within university classroom talk: A corpus-based perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, *15*(3), 243-274.

Csomay, E. (2007). A corpus-based look at linguistic variation in classroom interaction: Teacher talk versus student talk in American university classes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *6*(4), 336-355.

Csomay, E., & Cortes, V. (2009). Lexical bundle distribution in university classroom talk. *Language and Computers*, *71*(1), 153-168.

Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and the classroom context. *ELT journal*, *52*(3), 179-187.

Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *System*, *33*(2), 209-224.

Erman, B., & Warren, B. (2000). The idiom principle and the open-choice principle. *Text, 20*(1), 29-62.

Fletcher, W. H. (2002-2007). KfNgram. Annapolis, MD: USNA. Available from the World Wide Web: http://www.kwicfinder.com/kfNgram/kfNgramHelp.html

Forman, R. (2012). Six functions of bilingual EFL teacher talk: Animating, translating, explaining, creating, prompting and dialoguing. *RELC Journal*, *43*(2), 239-253.

Granger, S. (2011). From phraseology to pedagogy: Challenges and prospects. In T. Herbst, S. Faulhaber, & P. Uhrig (Eds.), *The phraseological view of language* (pp. 123-146). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Granger, S., & Meunier, F. (2008). Phraseology in language learning and teaching: Where to from here? In F. Meunier & S. Granger (Eds.), *Phraseology in foreign language learning and teaching* (pp. 247-252). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Grant, L. E. (2007). In a manner of speaking: Assessing frequent spoken figurative idioms to assist ESL/EFL teachers. *System*, *35*(2), 169-181.

Gries, S. T. (2008). Phraseology and linguistic theory: A brief survey. In S. Granger & F. Meunier (Eds.), *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 3-25). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jones, M., & Haywood, S. (2004). Facilitating the acquisition of formulaic sequences. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *Formulaic sequences* (pp. 269-300). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kang, Mun Koo. (2010). Developing a guidebook for teaching English in English. *Studies in English Language & Literature, 36*(4), 187-201.

Kim, Seongshik. (2015). A study on the improvement of the teacher's guide classroom English through its comparison with real classes. *The Journal of Modern British & American Language & Literature. 33*(1), 267-292.

Kwon, Ye-Eun. (2012). Formulaic sequence use of non-native and native English teacher talks. *The Journal of Studies in Language. 28*(1), 1-27.

Lee, Seungbok. (2005). Comparison of teacher talks from three different primary school ESOL teachers. *English Teaching, 60*(2), 161-183.

Maeng, Unkyoung. (2009). Perception of primary teachers and students on an English education policy in Korea, TEE. *Modern English Education, 10*(1), 177-206.

Malamah-Thomas, A. (1987). *Classroom interaction*. London: Oxford University Press.

Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher.* London: Macmillan.

Meunier, F. (2012). Formulaic language and language teaching. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *32*, 111-129.

Moon, Eun-Joo. (2010). Pre-service teachers' English in the TEE classroom. T*he Journal of Modern British & American Language & Literature, 28*(1), 125-146.

Nattinger, J. R., & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. London: Oxford University Press.

Nguyen, H. T. H. (2014). *The acquisition of formulaic sequences in high-intermediate ESL learners.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

O'Donnell, M. B., Römer, U., & Ellis, N. C. (2013). The development of formulaic sequences in first and second language writing: Investigating effects of frequency, association, and native norm. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 18*(1)*,* 83-108.

Pawley, A., & Syder, F. H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 191-227). London: Longman.

Römer, U. (2010). Establishing the phraseological profile of a text type: The construction of meaning in academic book reviews. *English Text Construction, 3*(1), 95-119.

Schmitt, N., & Carter, R. (2004). Formulaic sequences in action: An introduction. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *Formulaic sequences* (pp. 1-22). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schmitt, N., Dornyei, Z., Adolphs, S., & Durow, V. (2004). Knowledge and acquisition of formulaic sequences. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *Formulaic sequences* (pp. 55-86). Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Sešek, U. (2007). English for teachers of EFL–Toward a holistic description. *English for Specific Purposes, 26*(4), 411-425.

Shim, Jaehwang. (2006). An analysis of corpus in EFL middle school English class. *Modern English Education, 7*(1), 53-72.

Simpson, R. (2004). Stylistic features of spoken academic discourse: The role of formulaic expressions. In U. Connor & T. Upton (Eds.), *Discourse in the professions: Perspectives from corpus linguistics* (pp. 37-64). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Simpson, R. C., Briggs, S. L., Ovens, J., & Swales, J. M. (2002). *The Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English*. Ann Arbor, MI: The Regents of the University of Michigan.

Simpson, R., & Mendis, D. (2003). A corpus-based study of idioms in academic speech. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(3), 419-441.

Sinclair, J. (2004). New evidence, new priorities, new attitudes. In J. Sinclair (Ed.), *How to use corpora in language teaching* (pp. 271-299). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.

Tang, E. (2011). Non-native teacher talk as lexical input in the foreign language classroom. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(1), 45-54.

Thompson, S. E. (2003). Text-structuring metadiscourse, intonation and the signalling of organisation in academic lectures. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 2*(1), 5-20.

Thompson, P. (2006). A corpus perspective on the lexis of lectures, with a focus on economics lectures. In K. Hyland & M. Bondi (Eds.), *Academic discourse across disciplines* (pp. 253-270). Hamburg: Peter Lang.

VanPatten, B. (2003). *From input to output: A teacher's guide to second language acquisition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wray, A. (1999). Formulaic language in learners and native speakers. *Language Teaching*, *32*(4), 213-231.

Wray, A. (2000). Formulaic sequences in second language teaching: Principle and practice. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*(4), 463-489.

Wray, A., & M. Perkins. (2000). The functions of formulaic language: An integrated model. *Language and Communication, 20*(1), 1-28.

APPENDIX 1

Examples of Formulaic Sequences Based on Functional Classification

1. Stance Expressions

Sub-categories			P-frames		N-grams
Epistemic stance		Personal			i don't know if i don't know how
		Impersonal	the * that	the fact that the things that the idea that	
Attitudinal/ modality stance	Desire	Personal	i * to	i want to i have to i wanted to	so if you want
	Obligation/ directive	Personal	i * you to	i want you to i wanted you to i ask you to	you have to do you have to be you have to think
			if * look at	if you look at if we look at if i look at	
	Intention/ prediction	Personal	and * going to	and i'm going to and you're going to and we're going to	you're going to have

	Ability	Personal	you * to be able to	you need to be able to you have to be able to	to be able to should be able to
			you * be able to	you should be able to you gotta be able to	

2. Discourse Organizers

Sub-categories		P-frames	N-grams
Topic introduction/focus	i'll* you	i'll show you i'll give you i'll tell you	by the way let's look at we're gonna talk about i'm gonna talk about if you think about
	we're * about	we're talking about we're thinking about	
Topic elaboration/ clarification	on the * hand	on the other hand on the one hand	in other words so to speak as well as to begin with has to do with
	has * to do with	has nothing to do with has something to do	

3. Referential Expressions

Sub-categories			P-frames	N-grams
Identification/focus		and * of the	and one of the and some of the and most of the	one of the things one of the first one of the most
Imprecision				and so on and so forth or something like that
Specification of attributes	Quantity specification	a * of	a lot of a couple of a number of	there's a lot of for the rest of from the rest of
		from the * of	from the rest of	
Time/place/ text reference	Place	at the * of	at the top of at the university of	all the way up all over the world all over the body
		in the * of	in the back of in the front of	
		from the * of	from the bottom of	
	Time	at the * of	at the end of at the beginning of	all the time over and over
	Multi-functional	at the * of	at the end of at the beginning of	
Other	Purpose			in order to

semantic categories	Referring	what * talking about	what we're talking about what i'm talking about what they're talking about	when we talked about as i said
	Other	we * about the	we talked about the we talk about the	
		if * were to	if you were to if i were to	

APPENDIX 2

Results Based on Verbal Behavior Classification

Verbal Behaviors		P-frames		N-grams
Presenting	Topic introduction	and * going to	and i'm going to and you're going to and we're going to	you can see we're gonna do/look/see/start i'm gonna show/talk let me give/ask /show /talk/explain/tell i wanna talk/start what we're doing/talking so let's look/talk what I'm talking we're gonna talk about i'm gonna talk about if you think about if you think of i want to say a little bit of a little bit about a little bit more take a look at let's look at by the way to begin with
		if * look at	if you look at if we look at if i look at	
		i * talk about	i wanna talk about i will talk about	
	Topic elaboration (explaining/ emphasizing/ identifying/ rephrasing/ exemplifying/ describing	what you * is	what you get is what you find is what you see is what you do is	with respect to what's going on here an example of a that would be a/the i don't know if i don't know how i don't know what
		has * to do with	has nothing to do with has something to do with	
		from the * of	from the rest of from the bottom of	
		a whole * of	a whole bunch of	

processes & effects/ specifying quantity/ referring)		a whole lot of a whole series of a whole variety of a whole range of	so if you want one of the things one of the first one of the most one of the reasons one of the problems one of the main some of the things or something like that in terms of the/a all the way up all over the world all over the body all the time over and over over and over again and so on and so forth in other words so to speak in such a way that one of the things that to the extent that
	a * amount of	a certain amount of a tremendous amount of a small amount of a huge amount of	
	in the * of	in the history of in the middle of in the case of in the process of in the presence of in the course of in the state of in the context of in the sense of in the name of in the way of in the form of	
	as a * of	as a result of as a function of as a matter of as a way of as a kind of	
	on the * of	on the basis of on the side of on the surface of on the top of on the order of on the verge of on the part of	
	from the * of	from the point of from the perspective of	
	at the * of	at the top of at the end of at the beginning of at the time of at the point of	
	at the * time	at the same time at the right time	
	on the * hand	on the other hand on the one hand	
	the * that the	the probability that the the fact that the the idea that the	
	when we * about	when we talk about when we talked about when we think about	as i said
	what * talking about	what we're talking about what i'm talking about what they're talking about	
	we * about the	we talked about the we talk about the	

Organizing/giving instructions	i * you to	i want you to i wanted you to i ask you to	you need to you're going to should be able to
	let me * you	let me give let me remind let me show let me tell you let me ask you	
	i'm gonna * you	i'm gonna show you i'm gonna give you	
	you * have to	you don't have to you would have to you just have to	
	you * to do	you have to do you need to do	
	you don't * to	you don't have to you don't need to	
Getting students involved	if * look at	if you look at if we look at if i look at	those of you who for those of you who when you look at

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Elementary/Secondary/Tertiary

Sanghee Kang
Gwangmyeongbuk High School
127 Sicheong-ro, Gwangmyeong, Gyeonggi-do 14225
Tel: 02-2067-0604
Email: bsb218218@gmail.com

Received 19 September 2017
Revised 26 October 2017
Accepted 17 November 2017