

SEP 7 1993



**TEACHER USE OF STUDENTS' MOTHER TONGUE
IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM:
PERCEPTION AND PRACTICE**

by

Sachiko Isobe

A monograph submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education in
Education in Second Languages

Department of Education in Second Languages
McGill University, Montreal
June, 1992

AGIN 7058

ABSTRACT

This study investigated whether there are any discrepancies among teacher perceptions, student perceptions and observed practice concerning teacher use of students' L1 in the foreign language classroom. Four specific questions were examined: 1) When and how is the mother tongue of the student used by a teacher in a foreign language classroom?, 2) What is the teacher's opinion/perception about the use of the students' mother tongue?, 3) What are the student opinions/perceptions about the use of their mother tongue?, 4) Is there a discrepancy between student and teacher opinions/perceptions concerning the use of students' mother tongue in a foreign language classroom? Subjects in this study were three teachers of Japanese as a foreign language, and university students in 5 classes (total of 57 students). Data was collected from three sources: Classroom observations, Teacher Interviews and Student Questionnaires. The results from each data source were examined separately and in combination. The results indicate that there are some discrepancies among teacher opinions/perceptions, student opinions/perceptions, and observed practice concerning teacher use of the student's L1 in the foreign language classroom. There are also considerable differences among teachers in terms of the use of the students' mother tongue. These differences in practice are a reflection of the differences in their beliefs about the best way to learn a language. This study contributed to exploration of the role of students' L1 use in the foreign language classroom. It also raises further research questions

concerning the effect of students' L1 use on language acquisition.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette étude avait pour but de savoir s'il existe des divergences entre les perceptions des enseignants, celles des élèves et les pratiques observées au sujet de l'emploi par l'enseignant de la langue maternelle des étudiants dans une classe de langue étrangère. Quatre questions ont été analysées en particulier : 1) quand et de quelle façon la langue maternelle de l'étudiant est-elle employée par l'enseignant dans un cours de langue étrangère?; 2) quel est l'avis/perception de l'enseignant sur l'emploi de la langue maternelle des étudiants?; 3) quels sont les points de vue/perceptions des étudiants sur l'emploi de leur langue maternelle?; 4) y a-t-il des divergences entre les opinions/perceptions des étudiants et de l'enseignant au sujet de l'emploi de la langue maternelle des étudiants dans un cours de langue étrangère? Les sujets de cette étude étaient trois professeurs de japonais et les étudiants inscrits à cinq cours universitaires (au total 57). Les données ont été recueillies dans trois sources : les observations en classe, les entrevues des enseignants et les questionnaires des étudiants. Les résultats de chaque source de données ont été analysés séparément et collectivement. Les résultats révèlent qu'il existe certaines divergences dans les opinions/perceptions des étudiants et la pratique observée au sujet de l'emploi par l'enseignant de la langue maternelle des étudiants dans un cours de langue étrangère. On constate également des différences considérables parmi les enseignants en ce qui a trait à l'emploi de la langue maternelle des étudiants. Ces différences reflètent les différentes croyances sur la meilleure façon d'apprendre une langue. Cette étude a contribué à l'étude du rôle de l'emploi de la langue maternelle des étudiants dans un cours de langue étrangère. Elle soulève également d'autres questions de recherche sur l'effet que peut avoir l'emploi de la langue maternelle des étudiants sur l'acquisition d'une langue.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Carolyn Turner, my monograph supervisor, for her constant support. Her patience, encouragement, consideration and understanding as well as her professional suggestions made this study possible. I cannot express how grateful I am to her.

My appreciation goes to Dr. Nina Spada who helped me design this study. I admire her passion toward and her knowledge of research.

Special thanks to Hiroshi Ueda who helped with the word-processing of this monograph. Without him and his computer, this work would have been more time-consuming.

Special words of thanks to all the staff in NOVA HOUSE. Their emotional support enabled me to continue this monograph.

I am grateful to Paul Jarrett, my best friend. I appreciate his kindness and concern. Thank you very much, Paul!

Finally, I wish to express my appreciation to Leo Borrega, my husband, who encouraged me in his special way. Though we part from each other, I always wish him happiness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
General.....	1
Specific.....	3
 CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	 6
Percentage of teacher talk in L1.....	6
What influences teacher use of L1 in the classroom.....	8
Functional allocation of language choice.....	10
Effects of functional allocation of L1.....	11
Student opinion toward language learning in general.....	12
Students' opinion toward the use of L1 in the classroom..	13
Summary.....	13
 CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHOD.....	 14
Research question.....	14
Subjects.....	15
Teacher description.....	15
Class description.....	17
Data sources and instrument.....	18
Classroom observation.....	18
Teacher interviews.....	20
Student questionnaire.....	21
Procedure.....	23
Analysis of data.....	24

CHAPTER 4 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....	26
Results of Observation Data.....	26
General findings.....	26
Class 1.....	29
Class 2.....	30
Class 3.....	32
Class 4.....	33
Class 5.....	34
Comparison: Level comparison.....	36
Comparison: Teacher comparison.....	38
Results of Teacher Interview Data and discussion.....	40
General findings.....	40
Teacher A.....	41
Teaching methods.....	41
The use of English in the classroom.....	41
Teacher B.....	43
Teaching method.....	43
The use of English in the classroom.....	43
Teacher C.....	46
Teaching methods.....	46
The use of English in the classroom.....	46
Comparison among three teachers.....	48
Result of Questionnaire Data and discussion.....	50
General findings.....	50
Class 1.....	54
Class 2.....	55
Class 3.....	57
Class 4.....	57

Class 5.....	59
Comparison: Level comparison.....	60
Comparison: Teacher comparison.....	62
Comparison of different data.....	65
Comparison between Observation Data and Teacher Interview Data.....	65
Comparison between Student Questionnaire Data and Observation Data.....	66
Comparison between Teacher Interview Data and Student Questionnaire Data.....	67
 CHAPTER 5 IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.....	 69
 ENDNOTES.....	 74
REFERENCES.....	75
APPENDICES.....	77
APPENDIX A Modified COLT scheme.....	77
APPENDIX B Interview questions.....	79
APPENDIX C Questionnaire.....	81
APPENDIX D Results of Questionnaire Part I	85
APPENDIX E Results of Questionnaire Part II.....	91

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

General

When we talk about what facilitates language learning in a formal language context, there are many factors to be considered: teacher factors, student factors, and environmental factors.

Teacher factors include: experience in teaching and learning, skills, personality, philosophy, intelligence, motivation, training, etc. Student factors include: learning strategies, experience, motivation, abilities, knowledge, attitude, aptitude, age, personality. etc. Environmental factors include: school and community contexts, school curriculum, society needs and expectations, school and class size, textbook and materials, etc.

All of these factors are brought into the classroom. Their interaction produces the diversity of a learning context. The teacher background factors are reflected in teacher classroom behavior and student factors are reflected in student classroom behavior. Environmental factors influence both student and teacher behavior and interaction. And these behaviors and interaction affect the "product variable" --- student learning and acquisition of the language. Although not designed exclusively for L2 classrooms, a general model for the study of classroom teaching by Dunkin and Biddle (1974) is quite useful in explaining the interrelation of all the possible variables and factors. In addition, it can serve as an initial guide for the classification of variables and behaviors. There are four

categories in the model: presage variables, context variables, process variables and product variables. "Presage variables" are related to teachers. Here, teacher formative experiences such as social class and age affect teacher training experience. Teacher training experiences as well as personal traits such as intelligence, motivation, and personality affect teacher behavior in the classroom.

Student variables and environmental variables are classified as "context variables". Student formative experiences influence such characteristics as abilities, knowledge and attitudes. In return these student characteristics reflect student classroom behavior. As for environmental variables, school and community contexts such as climate, ethnic composition of community, and school size influence classroom contexts (e.g. class size, audiovisual aids, textbooks, homework). These classroom contexts also affect "process variables."

What actually happens in the classroom is categorized as "process variables." Mainly, these refer to teacher classroom behavior, student classroom behavior and their interaction. The interaction of their behavior creates changes in student behavior. When these changes occur, students are considered to have learned. This "learning" produces the fourth category "product variables." First this is seen as "immediate student growth." It will then be stored as long-term effects.

In the field of second language acquisition, much research has been done on the relationship of "process-product." The relationship between teacher-specific behavior in the classroom such as methods or techniques and student achievement on

particular tests was the research focus in the 1970's (See Spada, 1987, 1989). Later, the focus switched to more "process-oriented" research (Chaudron, 1988, Allwright 1988). Whether neglected, too obvious, or simply considered no different from other subject-matter learning, few have investigated the relationship of "context/presage-process" in teaching and learning second languages.

In this paper, my focus will be on the relationship of "presage-process," that is the relationship among student and teacher variables and classroom practice. I will explore how teacher background such as experience, philosophy and personality affect classroom practice. I will also look into the interaction (or conflict) between presage variables and context variables in the classroom. The influence this interaction has on product such as achievement of second language learning will be discussed.

Specific

As the communicative approach gained attention among theorists, researchers and teachers, the role of the target language in the classroom became a central discussion point in foreign language teaching. Krashen (1980) claimed the importance of "comprehensible input" and exposure to the target language. Contrary to this, little attention has been given to the role of native language use in the classroom. The communicative approach, according to Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983), accepts "judicious use" of the native language of students where feasible, while "more traditional" audiolingual methods inhibit it completely. However, what "judicious use" means, when and what kinds of

native language use can be justified as "judicious use" are not adequately mentioned.

Atkinson (1987) claims;

At present it would seem to be true, in general, that in teacher training very little attention is given to the use of the native language. The implication, one assumes, is often that it has no role to play. It is true that total prohibition of the students' native language is now unfashionable, but the potential of its use in the classroom clearly needs further exploration.(p. 241)

The effects of native language use in the classroom on language acquisition are not obvious. It appears that the use of native language is a neglected factor to be considered.

Where the students are homogeneous in terms of their mother tongue(L1), teachers have the choice of using it or not. L1 use might help students' learning in one case and it might hinder it in another case. In order to know what is meant by "judicious use" (Finocchiaro and Brumfit, 1983), investigation of when and how L1 is actually used, and how teachers and students feel about its use should be investigated. The present study looks into these issues by exploring the classroom process (i.e. practice) as well as teacher and student perceptions of this process. Chapter 2 is a review of the related literature on L1 use in the classroom and student and teacher perceptions. The remainder of the monograph reports a study in which the purpose and design of the study are discussed in Chapter 3. The results are presented

and discussed in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 provides implications and suggestions.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Little research has been done on the choice of language in a bilingual classroom where teachers and students use two languages alternately. Where a foreign or second language classroom is concerned, less is found in the literature. Moreover, subjects of classes studied are mostly preschoolers or elementary. Sometimes they are secondary students. In general, studies on college or university level students are not found in the literature. Therefore, when looking at the existing research, the above-mentioned information must be taken into consideration.

Within this context, the research done on the choice of language in the classroom is reviewed below.

Percentage of teacher talk in L1

Legarreta (1977) studied five Spanish-English bilingual kindergarten classes (L1 being Spanish and L2 being English) and found that teachers used L1 more than L2 (L2 use was 16%-47%). The goal of these programs was 50%-50% split use of the two languages. In comparison Wong-Fillmore (1980) found that only 8% was found in Chinese-English bilingual classes where Chinese was the L1. Since these classes were bilingual classes where students were supposed to be exposed to both languages, it is not directly related to the present study. These results, however, show that teachers do not choose each language equally in spite of the goal of the program.

Ramirez et al. (1986) studied 74 kindergarten and first grade English immersion classes and found that the L2, English, was used between 93-100% of class-time. They also observed 7 kindergarten late-exit transition classes and 11 grade 3 late-exit classes and found teachers used English for 34% and 49% of the class period, respectively. In immersion classes where the goal and circumstances were similar to foreign language classes, teachers used the L2 most of time. Chaudron (1988) also mentioned that the use of the target L2 was encouraged in foreign language and immersion classrooms and that in second language classrooms, with mixed L1 students, it was almost impossible to use the different first languages of the students. Similar results are found in studies by Frohlich et al. (1985). They found that 13 teachers in the four program types (grade 7 classrooms in core French, extended French with subject matter courses, French immersion, and ESL) used the students' L2 90% of the time. The results of Mitchell et al. (1981) do not coincide with those of the above. They observed 17 Scottish secondary school French as a foreign language (FFL) classes. Teachers in their study used the students' L1, English, more than 21% of the time. Mitchell and Johnstone (1984) also found an average of 30% of L1 use over 30 weeks by a teacher in a FFL class (range 13% - 48%).

As seen above, research on percentage of teacher use of students' L1 is not conclusive on language classes in general, let alone foreign language classes, specifically.

What influences teacher use of L1 in the classroom

Regarding the extent to which teachers use L1 in the classroom, the pertinent question appears to be what makes teachers decide to use the L1. What is the main factor which influences the use of L1 in the classroom? As was mentioned in Chapter 1, teacher behavior in the classroom is influenced by "presage variables." The question is what is the most influential variable here.

Bruck and Schultz (1977) studied two teachers' interactions with two bilingual Spanish - English (L1=Spanish) children in a grade 1 half - day bilingual class. The two teachers (one English native speaker, and one native Spanish speaker) used Spanish because they did not want to discourage the children from interacting with them. They also found that the native Spanish-speaking teacher used Spanish slightly more than the native English-speaking teacher. They concluded that the teacher's language dominance, philosophy, and perception toward the language ability of students influenced teacher use of L1.

Wong-Fillmore (1980) states that the amount of L1 use depends on the kind of classroom activity and the degree of individualization in teacher-student interaction. She found that teachers preferred to use English in one subject class and Chinese in another. For example, in a Chinese writing class, teachers spoke 100% Chinese, while in other classes they spoke it less. She also found that English was used more when the whole class was involved than when teachers talked to each student separately. Interaction with individuals in seat work was 28%

Chinese, whereas whole-class instruction involved the most English (92%).

Chesterfield et al. (1983) suggest that in preschool classes, the language preference of the children may be an important factor. He did a longitudinal ethnographic study of five bilingual (L1 Spanish, L2 English) preschool classes in two locations. While in the first location, teachers tended to use more English (53%-78%), in the second location, it ranged from 33% to 52%. They suggest that in the location where teachers use more English, the dominant language of the students is English. Teachers sense the language preference of the children and use that language more frequently.

Teacher experience in teaching and learning, and teacher philosophy may also influence the use of L1 in the classroom. Through observing seven classes and interviewing 5 teachers in Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) classes, Isobe (1988) found that L1 use was influenced by teachers' experience in teaching and learning and knowledge about second language learning/teaching research. Most of the teachers believed that the way they themselves acquired their second language was the best way. Teacher training, education and teaching practice also influence teacher opinion toward L1 use as well as other aspects of teaching. Thus teachers had personal opinions toward what the language class should be. These opinions are reflected in their L1 use in the classroom.

Functional allocation of language choice

If teachers use students' L1 in the classroom, do they use it systematically? According to Townsend and Zamora (1975), teachers seem to choose between the two languages depending on the function of the utterance. Fifty-six teachers in a bilingual preschool were observed over a two-year period. They used a modification of a Flanders-type interaction observation scheme. A greater percentage of questions, rejecting students' answer, and accepting students' answer were made in Spanish (i.e., the students' L1). English (i.e., the students' L2), on the other hand, was used for direction-giving, praising and reinforcing.

These results are similar to those of Legarreta (1977) in that both studies show that teachers allocate the language according to the function. Legarreta found that English (L2) was used more for correcting and disciplining (61%) and Spanish (L1) was used more for directing and positive functions (62% and 72% respectively)

Guthrie (1984) studied two teachers in grade 1 Cantonese-English bilingual classes. She found that Cantonese (L1) was used for translation, classification, checking understanding, procedure and direction. Wong-Fillmore (1980) suggests that managerial and instructional functions are produced in students' L1 while content matters and explanation of the subject are made in L2.

Milk (1982) also found uneven distribution of L2 versus L1 in a grade 12 English-Spanish bilingual class. The teacher used L2 for directives (92%) and metastatements (63%). Ramirez et al.

(1986) also found unequal use of two languages in bilingual classes for "modeling."

Isobe (1988) found that one in five teachers in her studies, used the students' L1 (L1 English, L2 Japanese) for functions, including information-giving, instruction, management, explanation, checking comprehension and social purposes. The second teacher used L1 the most for information giving and instruction. The third teacher sometimes used L1 when explanations of grammar were involved, and rarely used L1 for other purposes. The fourth and fifth teachers rarely used L1. When they did, however, they only used English words within a Japanese structure.

In general, there appears no agreement as to which functions are used with which language (i.e., L1 or L2). However, if teachers decide to use English in the classroom, content explanation is the first function they consider using it for. As for other functions, it seems to depend on teachers' personal preference.

Effects of functional allocation of L1

If teachers choose one language for certain functions according to their preference, does this affect students' language acquisition? Chaudron (1988) states, "An unbalanced differentiation of L1 or L2 use can limit the learners' exposure to the full range of L2 use" (p.124). When children acquire their first language, they are exposed to all functions. But in the context where students learn their second or foreign language and their exposure to the language is limited to the classroom,

limited exposure to certain functions may cause prohibition of acquiring certain parts of the language. Therefore, teacher choice of L1 may affect student L2 acquisition.

Student opinion toward language learning in general

Until now, teacher language use and preference have been considered. A mention of student opinion is presented below.

While teachers have their opinions concerning how the language class should be, students, too, have their opinions. They have expectations and ideals. It is important to take these into account. How students feel about the class may influence student motivation levels, attendance in the class, and efforts put into language learning. Though it is important to consider teacher personal opinions, it is as important to turn attention toward student opinions, since students are the learners.

Very little can be found in the literature concerning student opinion on language learning. Savignon (1981) wrote an article in the form of a letter to a Spanish teacher. From the eyes of a student, she expressed her disappointment and showed the differences between her opinion on learning a foreign language and how she was actually taught in the classroom. From this example, it can be seen that there is a possible difference between teacher and student opinions on the matter of language learning.

Students' opinion toward the use of L1 in the classroom

Research concerning student opinions toward the use of L1 in the classroom is lacking in the literature. For the purpose of this monograph study, it is predicted that there is some discrepancy among student opinion, teacher opinion and actual practice.

Summary

As seen above, research on the choice of language in the classroom (i.e., either L1 or L2) is either inconclusive or uninvestigated. Moreover, even the results from the studies done on this subject can only be used with caution, because they use either different settings (e.g., bilingual classes instead of foreign language situations) or different subjects (e.g., the subjects are usually kindergarten or elementary school students) than the study presented in this monograph. Considering the lack of existing research, it is evident that more attention to this subject is needed.

CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHOD

Research question

General: Are there discrepancies among teacher perceptions, student perceptions and observed practice concerning teacher use of students' L1 in the foreign language classroom?

Specific:

1. When and how is the mother tongue of the students used by a teacher in a foreign language classroom?
2. What is the teacher's opinion/perception about the use of the students' mother tongue? (i.e., why does the teacher decide to use or not to use the other tongue of students?)
3. What are student opinions/perceptions about the use of their mother tongue?
4. Is there a discrepancy between student and teacher opinions/perceptions, concerning the use of the students' mother tongue in a foreign language classroom?

Subjects

Teacher description

Background information was collected through the teacher interview. There were three teachers in this study (Teachers A, B, C). They were teaching at McGill University in Montreal in the Centre for East Asian Studies. Each teacher had a different background in terms of experiences and philosophy of teaching and learning.

Teacher A had been teaching Japanese for 13 years at several universities. Though she was a native speaker of English, it was difficult to trace any accent in her Japanese. Her Japanese ability was equivalent to that of a native speaker of Japanese. She learned Japanese and French at school and used both languages fluently. She held a Ph.D in Japanese and in French, and had completed her master's degree in Japanese at a Japanese university. She had lived and studied in Japan for 5 years. In spite of her education, she had never gone through a specific teacher training program.

Through the interview period, she emphasized the importance of grammar. She seemed to believe that grammar should be the primary concern of teachers. She mentioned that understanding grammar was essential and that students had to learn grammar before speaking. She thought that other practices or drills could wait until full understanding of grammar was confirmed.

Teacher B was an inexperienced young teacher who started teaching Japanese 2 years previous to this study. She was a native speaker of Japanese who had been living in Canada for 3

years. She learned English in Japan at school and recently had begun French lessons at school. She received a B.A. in English and a certificate for teaching English in a secondary school from a Japanese university. She spoke English without any apparent difficulty.

Since she had had English language training in Japan recently, she was familiar with several approaches and methods. She seemed to favour the 'Communicative Approach' which had become popular recently in Japan. Though she did not deny the necessity of grammar explanation, she did not think understanding grammar was as important as listening and using Japanese.

Teacher C was a native speaker of Japanese who spoke English and French with ease. She had been teaching Japanese at the university level for 8 years. She acquired a B.A. in Japanese and a M.A. in Linguistics at a French university. Her teacher training was 21 years prior to this study. she learned French in Paris, where only French was spoken. She did not take any French courses there, but instead learned French by listening to what people said on the street. Later she studied French in Montreal. She also learned English both in Japan and in Montreal.

She thought understanding grammar was important, but not the most important element of language learning. Though she had had teacher training a long time ago, she tried to keep up with recent trends in second language teaching by attending conferences, corresponding with other teachers in several universities and reading research papers.

Class description

Five Japanese classes were chosen at McGill university in the Centre for East Asian Studies. There are four levels in the Japanese language program. Level 1 is for beginners, Level 2 is for beginner-intermediate learners who have completed Level 1, Level 3 is for intermediate learners who have completed Level 2, and Level 4 is for advanced learners. Level 4 was excluded from this study for the reason that the nature of the class is different; classes are designed for students who have experience in studying or staying in Japan for at least 6 months. Students in this class have already been exposed to Japanese and speak it quite well.

There are three classes at Level 1, two classes at Level 2 and two classes at Level 3. Due to scheduling constraints five classes were selected for this study.

The classes and corresponding teachers are provided in Table 1.

Table 1 The classes and corresponding teachers

	Level	Teacher	No of students in Class
Class 1	1	A	14
Class 2	1	B	15
Class 3	2	A	10
Class 4	3	B	10
Class 5	3	C	8
Total			57

All classes were held in the same building of the university. The same textbook was used for each level regardless of the teacher. The classes met one hour a day, five days a week, with total hours being 130 hours for the academic year. The majority of

students had never visited in Japan. A minority of the students had been to Japan for a short period to visit. The students' native language was English, with the exception of seven native speakers of French and three of Chinese. These students, however, were highly proficient in English.

Data sources and instrument

Data were collected from three sources: 1) Classroom observations 2) Interviews with teachers, and 3) Student questionnaires.

Classroom observation

In order to identify what actually happens in the classroom, classroom observation was carried out. In order to describe in a consistent and accurate manner, a scheme was used to record specific features. The COLT scheme (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) (Allen et al. 1984) was modified to suit the purposes of this study. The reasons why COLT was used are: 1) COLT was designed to serve in research while most other schemes are for teacher training, and 2) COLT is based on current theory and research in second language acquisition.

To adapt the COLT scheme, Part A and Part B were combined and features that were irrelevant to the present study were removed. (See Appendix A for the actual scheme used and for summary notes.) Each category was scored in terms of minutes spent on the category. Features included in this scheme are:

1. Activity type: This is an open category. Each activity (exercises, explanation, drills, practice, games, etc.) is listed

with a brief description. The time used for each activity is measured and written.

2. No talk: The original COLT used this feature to measure "no talk" on the part of both students and the teacher. In this study, however, only teacher talk was coded. Therefore, this feature refers to the period when teachers are talking no longer than one minute. This does not necessarily mean "complete silence."

3. Language: There are two subcategories under Language.

a. Choice of language: This category measures the choice of language use on the part of teachers (English or Japanese). L1, refers to the students' first language (i.e., English), and L2 means the target language (i.e., Japanese). The number of minutes the teacher uses each language in each activity is scored. If the teacher switches languages in a sentence, the language most used in the sentence will be recorded. In case of doubt it is scored as 0.5 minutes for both.

b. Sustained speech; This category measures how many minutes of teacher talk are ultraminimal speech, minimal, or sustained. Ultraminimal speech is a speech unit smaller than clause level. Minimal speech is a speech unit smaller than sentence level. Sustained speech is a speech unit larger than sentence level.

4. Content: This category has 3 subcategories---management, language and other.

a. Management has 2 sections. If time is spent on such things as collecting homework, announcements from the department, or giving information, it is considered classroom procedure.

When time is spent for disciplining students, it is scored under discipline

b. Language has four sections. If the teacher focuses on form (e.g. focus on grammar, language structure), time spent for this activity is scored as focus on form. If activity focuses on function (e.g. apology, greeting, demands), it is scored as focus on function. An activity spent on discourse such as explaining how the conversation progresses, is scored as focus on discourse. Time spent for explaining or practicing sociolinguistical aspects of the language is considered as a focus on socio-linguistics (For more detail see Allen et al, 1984, and Frohlich et al, 1985).

c. If the activity cannot be categorized in either classroom management or language, it is classified as other.

Teacher interviews

Interviews with teachers were conducted to gather data on teacher opinions/perceptions of L1 use in the classroom. According to Guba and Lincoln (1981), interviewing is the most appropriate tool to "tap into the experience of others...while utilizing their value and belief frameworks" (p.155). They also state, "Since the experience and beliefs of teachers are to be investigated, it is impossible without face-to-face and verbal interaction with them to get enough information" (p.155). Since teacher opinion is investigated in this study, interviewing was considered the best way to fulfill this purpose.

Questions to be asked were prepared before the actual interview. The areas discussed were divided into three sections:

1) Teacher background, 2) Teacher methods, and 3) The use of English (students' L1) in the classroom (See Appendix B).

The first section focuses on background information concerning teaching and learning experience, education, and teacher training. The second section asks questions on the teaching approach, methods, and techniques the teacher believed in and used in the classroom. Aspects and language skills emphasized in the classroom were also included. Three points were included in the questions of the third section which focus on the use of English in class. First, questions were aimed at looking at the consistency between what teachers think they do and what they actually do (i.e., whether the teachers think they use English in class or are conscious of doing so). Second, questions were aimed at revealing teacher opinion toward the use of English in the classroom (i.e., whether the use of English is desirable; if so, when and how English should be used; what are the effects of using English on student language acquisition). Third, questions were aimed at finding out the basis of teacher opinion (i.e., whether the basis was teacher experience in teaching or learning and/or research findings/theory).

Student questionnaire

With regard to student opinions/perceptions, it would have been desirable to interview all the students. Due to the large number of students and time limitations, a written questionnaire was used instead in order to obtain the desired data. Questions are sequenced in random order. The questionnaire had two main parts. Part 1 consisted of 22 statements and students were asked

the extent to which they agree according to a point scale. (See Appendix C). This was designed to document student perceptions and opinions toward the use of English in the classroom in general. In order to avoid confusion, each statement is called "Question 1," "Question 2...."

The questions were constructed to correspond to the questions in the third section of the Teacher Interview (See P.20)

1) Student perception as opposed to teacher perceptions. Question 1 examined whether students feel English is actually overused or not.

2) Opinion about using English in the classroom:

a. Desirability of the use of English.

Questions 2, 3, 5, 9, 15, 17, 18, 21 were designed to show whether students think the use of English is desirable.

b. The occasion and the way English should be used.

Questions 6, 7, 12, 14, 22 examined when and where the students think English should be used or is preferable.

c. The relationship between the use to English and language acquisition.

Questions 3, 5, 8, 18, 21 explore opinions about the consequences of the use of English on language acquisition.

d. Comfortability/Preference

Questions 10, 11, 19, 20 examined whether they feel comfortable having English used in the classroom.

Question 9 examined whether they want Japanese used all the time.

3) Others (Questions 4, 13, 15, 16)

These questions were included in the questionnaire in order to see what students want as opposed to what they think is best.

Part II of the questionnaire examined student opinion concerning the used of L1 in the classroom for specific language functions. There were 6 functions---information, instruction, management, explanation, comprehension check and social function (based on the literature mentioned in Chapter 2: Functional Allocation of Language Choice, p. 10)

Procedure

Observation data were collected for 1-hour periods for each class. Originally, only the observation scheme was to be used. In the end, however, classes were also audiotape-recorded in order to confirm information at a later time. The author of this monograph (i.e., researcher) served as the examiner during these class observations. All observation data were collected near the end of the course in the last week of February. Observation preceded the Teacher Interviews in order to avoid giving teachers preconceived ideas concerning the research questions.

Each teacher was interviewed for 30 minutes in her office. These teachers knew the interviewer, (i.e., researcher) already, so the atmosphere was open and informal, even though the interview format was structured. Interviews were carried out at the end of February. The Student Questionnaires were administered on the last day of the course. Students were allotted as much time as necessary. Instructions were explained in the L1 and time for questions was provided. Students took from 10 to 25 minutes to answer all questions. All questionnaires were collected in class.

Analysis of data

Once the data were collected, each source was analyzed separately. Then data from the different sources were compared.

The minutes in each category of the observation scheme were totalled and the percentages of each category over total time were calculated. Teacher interview data were sorted out according to sections mentioned in Teacher Interview (p.20). Student answers to each question in the Student Questionnaire data were sorted into three categories according to their choice of answer: 1) answers "strongly agree" and "agree" were labelled as "agree," 2) answers "disagree," and "strongly disagree" were labelled as "disagree," and 3) answers "don't know" were "don't know." Percentages of each category were calculated. Later when necessary, the answers "don't know" were excluded from the total number of responses, and percentages of "agree" (answers 1 and 2) and "disagree" (answers 3 and 4) were calculated. Once each set of data had been analyzed and compared across levels and

teachers, different sources were compared to see if there were any discrepancies. First, observation data and Teacher Interview data were compared to find out if teachers actually did in class what they perceived they did. Second, Teacher Interview data and Student Questionnaire data were compared to see whether student and teacher opinions/perceptions matched (i.e., were similar or different).

CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Results of Observation Data

General findings

Each class produced a different profile in terms of the proportion of L1/L2 language use and in terms of the choice of one language over another for a particular function. Some patterns were observed, however, in classes where the same teacher teaches irrelevant of the level.

Besides the differences, the data from the observation scheme showed three points which were common across all classes (see Tables 2-5) Total time of observation for each class was 200 minutes.

First, most of the teacher talk focused on form-related activities in all classes (see Table 3).

A second point that was commonly observed across all classes was closely related to the above-mentioned point. Due to the time spent on form-related and some function-related activities, there was no time spent on discourse or sociolinguistic related activities. Also, there was no time spent on discipline.

The third point, common across all classes, pertained to teacher speech. The teacher speech was usually sustained speech and there was no ultraminimal speech. All of the teacher talk in Class 1 and Class 5 was sustained speech. Only 11 minutes in Class 2, 18 minutes in Class 3, and 5 minutes in Class 4 were in minimal speech mode (14%, 11%, 3% of class time observed, respectively). Reasons for this could be that much time was

spent on explanation and/or giving information and that the teachers initiated most of the conversation.

Observation data of each class is examined separately below. In order to discuss typical classroom procedure in each class, one of four observation periods is described. Though the content was different, the procedure was similar across the four periods of each class.

Results of Observation data

Table 2

Teacher talk: Total use of English/Japanese (minutes, percentage of teacher talk)

	Total	English	Japanese
Class 1	166	133 (80.1%)	33 (19.9%)
Class 2	81	22 (27.2%)	59 (72.8%)
Class 3	170	123 (72.4%)	47 (27.6%)
Class 4	154	18 (11.7%)	136 (88.3%)
Class 5	174	0 (0.0%)	174 (100.0%)

Table 3

Teacher talk: "focus on form" in either English or in Japanese (minutes, percentage of teacher talk)

	Total teacher talk	Focus on form
Class 1	166	137 (82.5%)
Class 2	81	53 (66.0%)
Class 3	170	135 (79.0%)
Class 4	154	17 (11.0%)
(function)		104 (67.5%)
Class 5	174	123 (71.0%)

* includes "focus on function"

focus on form =17 minutes

focus on function =104 minutes

Table 4

Teacher talk: "focus on form" in each language (minutes, percentage of time spent for "focus on form ")

	Total "focus on form"	English	Japanese
Class 1	137	104 (75.9%)	33 (24.1%)
Class 2	53	15 (28.3%)	38 (71.7%)
Class 3	135	104 (77.0%)	31 (23.0%)
Class 4	17	4 (23.5%)	13 (76.5%)
(function)	104	12 (11.5%)	92 (88.5%)
Class 5	123	0 (0.0%)	123 (100.0%)

*includes "focus on function"

focus on form =17 minutes

focus on function =104 minutes

Table 5

Teacher talk: Classroom procedure (minutes, percentage of time spent for classroom procedure)

	Total	English	Japanese
Class 1	29	29 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Class 2	21	7 (33.3%)	14 (66.7%)
Class 3	29	29 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Class 4	50	6 (12.0%)	44 (88.0%)
Class 5	35	0 (0.0%)	35 (100.0%)

Class 1

The typical classroom procedure went as follows. The teacher is Teacher A. Teacher A went to the classroom 10 minutes before the class started in order to prepare the class. She wrote on the board in English the main grammatical items the class was going to deal with during the period, in addition to information about a text scheduled for the next week. The students came into the classroom, saying "good morning" in English and started talking or asking questions in English to Teacher A. She replied in English. At the beginning of the class, Teacher A informed the students about announcements from the department and talked about the test in detail. She asked the students to hand in the assignment for the day. Only English was used up until this moment.

The presentation of the lesson was done by using tapes. Students heard the Japanese dialogue on tape which contained several grammatical features to be learned in the period. Explanations of grammatical items to be learned were given only in English, with reference to English structural and grammatical differences. After the explanation, the example sentences where the specific grammatical features were used were provided by Teacher A in Japanese. When all items were explained, Teacher A checked the comprehension of students. Comprehension was checked by asking students to translate sentences from Japanese to English or from English to Japanese. In the cases where students could not provide the correct translation, Teacher A provided model sentences and the students imitated and repeated them. "How do you say this in English (or in Japanese)?" or "Will you

translate the sentence into English?" were common questions used in her class to check the students' comprehension. Toward the end of the class, she gave the students homework explaining it in English.

Students heard Japanese only in the presentation of the lesson on tape, in several example sentences by Teacher A, and sometimes in other student responses. Teacher A used English during 80.1% of class time (See Table 2). When form-focused activities were done, they were done in English 75.9% of the time (see Table 4). During the remaining 24.1% of the time, when Japanese was used, most of the Japanese was not "real" but was directly from translation drills or example sentences.

Only English was used for classroom procedure, for example, in instructions such as "Michael, will you read the next paragraph?" or "Repeat the sentence." Teacher A also used English in management of the class, such as "Take one handout and pass them down." or "Open the window."

Class 2

The typical classroom procedure went as follows. This teacher was Teacher B. The first thing Teacher B did in the class was to give information. First, she gave the information in Japanese and then sometimes repeated it in English. Then she began a conversation on a topic such as movies, weather, or events in Japan. She only spoke Japanese throughout this conversation. Following this, she started explaining the structures and vocabulary that students would learn during the present period. She usually explained in Japanese. During the

observation period, however, the Japanese event "Setsubun" was finally explained in English after she had tried to explain it in Japanese (See Endnote1, p.74). During the interview, Teacher B explained that the concept of "Setsubun" was unique and a key topic word of the class period and everybody's understanding of the word was important and therefore explained in English. She thought that it was difficult to ensure the full understanding of this event by using only Japanese. This explained the 12-minute use of English at this time. After this, the students started practicing structures in pairs. They did pattern practices aiming to acquire the structure and vocabulary Teacher B had introduced. During this pair practice, both the observer (i.e., the researcher/author of this monograph) and tape-recorder could not record teacher-talk. This is the reason why the total amount of teacher talk in this class is small (See Table 2 and 3). She then asked several students to demonstrate what they did during the pair practice. She pointed out several errors the students had made and explained them in Japanese. If students did not seem to understand what she said, she explained in English. Lastly, she gave the homework instructions and mentioned what they were going to do next class. All instructions and explanations were given first in Japanese if necessary, and only when the students did not understand in Japanese, even after repetition several times, would she provide English translation.

She used English 27.2 % of her total amount of talk time (22 minutes). Out of this 22 minutes, 15 minutes was used for "focus on form" (see Tables 2 and 4) which means that 68.2 % of her English talk was used for grammar explanation (i.e., focus on

form). However, this was a total of just 15 minutes, and the main reason why this was done is explained above. 33.3% (7 minutes) of the classroom procedure was done in English, though Japanese always preceded English.

Class 3

The typical classroom procedure went as follows. The teacher was again Teacher A, who was also the teacher of Class 1. Class 3 started with a small quiz which usually took 5 minutes. This quiz usually involved translation of five sentences either from English to Japanese or Japanese to English. The instructions were provided in English. After Teacher A collected the quizzes, she started the dialogue in the textbook. She first read the part which covered the day's structure and vocabulary. Then she proceeded to give grammar explanations. Most of time she used English. Examples of each grammatical item were provided in Japanese. If students asked a question, she would always answer in English. After the grammar explanations, pattern practices in the textbook were introduced. Teacher A gave a model sentence and a key word. Students were then asked to make a sentence. She sometimes gave the English translation of each sentence. Lastly, she explained the homework for the next class in English. Teacher A spent a total amount of 123 minutes (72.4%) speaking in English. 47 minutes (27.6%) were spent in Japanese (Refer to Table 2). Most of the time spent talking Japanese, however, was devoted to giving examples of grammatical items, giving model sentences, or reading the text. Excluding these, Teacher A used English throughout the entire class period. Classroom procedure

was always provided in English, such as quiz instructions, homework, and routine information.

Class 4

The typical classroom procedure went as follows. The teacher was Teacher B, who was also the teacher of Class 2. Teacher B started the class by giving general information and announcements (e.g., test information, scholarship applications). Then she explained what they were going to cover during the present period. She explained in Japanese and translated in English, when necessary. She then read the model dialogue in the textbook and explained the situation (i.e., the function, when the expressions could be used). This was more likely to be functional than grammatical, since most of time, she provided the situation where the students could apply the expression, rather than her explaining the structure. She used Japanese and if students did not understand, she paraphrased, drew pictures, gave examples and repeated. If students still did not understand, she briefly explained in English. English appeared to be kept to a minimum use. Students were asked to do exercises in the textbook in pairs. These exercises were of the type of word substitution, sentence production, and fill-in-the-blank. Next, several students were called upon to answer the questions in the exercises. Teacher B corrected answers if students made mistakes. Most of the mistakes were corrected in Japanese. However, some were corrected in English. 76.5% of the correction was done in Japanese, and 23.5% in English (Refer to Table 4).

Lastly, Teacher B explained what the class would do next class and gave instructions for homework.

The majority of the time, Teacher B used Japanese. 88.3% of her talk was done in Japanese (Table 2). 88.0% of classroom procedure was provided in Japanese (Table 5). She used English only after she tried Japanese in several ways (e.g., repetition paraphrasing, giving examples, etc.). This class was slightly different in that it was more function-oriented as opposed to other classes that were more form-oriented. She used Japanese as opposed to English 88.5% of the time when discussing "focus on function". When discussing "focus on form" she used Japanese as opposed to English 76.5% of the time (See Table 4). Thus the content of the class was conducted mostly in Japanese. The use of English was more complementary.

Class 5

The typical classroom procedure when as follows. The teacher was Teacher C. Teacher C went to class 10 minutes before the students arrived in order to prepare the class. She checked the cassette-tape recorder, drew pictures on the blackboard and wrote information on the blackboard. Everything on the blackboard was written in Japanese. As each student arrived, she said "Ohayo-gozaimasu" (good morning), instead of addressing them in English. Then she talked to them about the weather, a TV program or "small talk" in Japanese. When the students could not understand, she paraphrased, repeated slowly and clearly, used gestures and facial expression, and if necessary, used the blackboard.

Class began by giving information concerning tests, announcements from the department, etc. She collected assignments. She only spoke Japanese in all cases. When a student asked a question about the information, she repeated and pointed out the information written on the blackboard, using gestures. The presentation of the lesson was done by listening to the audio-tape, which focused on specific structures to be learned in the period. The teacher saved several examples and wrote each example on the blackboard. She explained the grammar, using pictures and modeling with physical questions. After the grammar explanation, exercises were done. Teacher C read the questions and the students answered them. She sometimes started small talk, if time remained. Lastly, homework was explained in Japanese. After class, several students came to her to ask about the final test. First, she explained in Japanese, and when noticing that students did not understand what she said, she wrote the actual format of the test and sample questions and answers in Japanese on the blackboard.

As we can see from Table 2, she only used Japanese in class. She used Japanese for classroom procedure and content grammar explanation and drills.

Comparison: Level comparison

Teacher A taught Level 1 (Class 1) and Level 2 (Class 3), and Teacher B taught Level 1 (Class 2) and Level 3 (Class 4). The question is: Did these teachers use the student's L1 in different proportions depending on the student's proficiency level? Did they use English for different purposes or in a different way?

Teacher A used English more in Class 1 than in Class 2, although in both classes English was dominant. If only the percentage of time is considered, she seemed to adjust the amount of English use to the student's proficiency level (i.e., more L1 use for lower proficiency class). However, the difference in the percentage did not seem to be due to her conscious attempt. The main part of the class, which was form-related activities, was conducted mainly in English in both classes. In reality, she used more English in Class 3, where student proficiency level was higher (focus on form: Class 1 is 75.9%, Class 3 is 77.0%, Refer to Table 4). However the difference is very small (1.1%). Her Pattern of using English was quite similar in both classes. She used English most of the time except when she gave the example sentences for grammatical items. Thus she did not appear to make different decisions in terms of language choice between the two classes at different levels.

On the other hand, Teacher B seemed to deal with her two classes differently. The amount of her use of English in Class 4 (Level 3) was less than half of that in Class 2 (Level 1), that is, 11.7% and 27.2% respectively (Refer to Table 2). This is because she used less English in Class 4 for instructions. While

in Class 2, 33.3% of classroom procedure was given in English, only 12% was given in English in Class 4 (Table 5). This could be because students in Level 3 understood Japanese better, so she did not translate for them as often as for those in Level 1. As for "focus on form", not much difference was observed. As can be seen, Teacher B's use of English was different between her two classes in general in both classroom procedure and content. Whether or not this is her conscious choice is questionable. It is more likely her reaction to the students' proficiency level. Since students in Level 3 most probably understood Japanese more than those in Level 1, they understood her explanations, instructions and conversation without need of English translation. Consequently, she did not have to use English as much in Class 4 as in Class 2. Also she did not have to repeat translations in English.

From the above results, we cannot conclude if the teachers use students' L1 differently according to student proficiency level. Teacher A did not seem to make a distinction. Teacher B, however, seemed to use English in different proportion according to Level. This needs to be said with caution, since there was only one Level difference between Teacher A's two classes, and two between Teacher B's classes. Had Teacher A taught Level 1 and Level 3, the result might have been different. However, from the present result, it is most likely that the key factor which decided the teacher's use of L1 depended more on each teacher's individual pattern rather than the level taught. Even though Teacher B differed in her two classes, she still used Japanese more than 33.3% of the time in both classes. Her way of using

English was quite similar in both classes, as well. Thus, both of these teachers maintained their individual patterns of using English irrespective of student proficiency level.

Comparison: Teacher comparison

Level 1 was taught by two teachers---Teacher A and Teacher B (Class 1 and Class 2), Level 3 was also taught by two teachers---Teacher B and Teacher C (Class 4 and Class 5). The comparison of students' L1 use with classes at the same Level but by different teachers is discussed below.

It is quite interesting to compare between Class 1 and Class 2 in that there are quite a few contrasts. While 80.1% of the teacher's talk in Class 1 consisted of English, 72.8% of the teacher talk in Class 2 consisted of Japanese. As for the percentage of teacher use of English for the purpose of "focus on form," the same thing can be said. In Class 1, 75.9% of the time English was spoken, and in Class 2 about 71.7% of the time, Japanese was spoken. These two teacher's language choices were quite opposite. In Class 1, English was dominant and the "working language," which meant that English was the primary language and English was only complementary. Japanese which was spoken by Teacher A in Class 1 did not convey meaning. It was used for examples for grammatical items. In Class 2, however, instructions were spoken in Japanese, and explanations and information were given in Japanese. In this sense, in Class 2, Japanese was "authentic." Thus, in terms of language choice, Class 1 and Class 2 were different in terms of language use purpose.

Class 5 is worth discussing separately, since all observed teacher talk in this class was Japanese. Ellis (1985) states that in a foreign language classroom, L2 is "unlikely to be used for classroom management or for genuine social purposes." This is not necessarily the case. Teacher C not only used Japanese for classroom management and social communication, but also used it for all purposes.

Class 4 and Class 5 were observed to be more similar than Class 1 and Class 2. Although 11.7% of Teacher B's speech in Class 4 was English, in both classes, Japanese was dominant and used for genuine purposes as well as for grammar explanation and classroom procedure. Both Teacher B and Teacher C tried to use Japanese as much as possible and made every effort for this purpose. They both used paraphrasing, slow repetition, and drawing. Class 4 could be said to be the weak version of Class 5 in terms of "using Japanese as much as possible."

Although these two classes were quite similar, there were still differences. In Class 4, if students did not seem to understand, after Teacher B's every effort, Teacher B gave an English translation. In Class 5, however, Teacher C never gave a translation. The question remains: Did students in Class 5 really understand what the teacher said? One possible speculation is that the students may not fully understand what the teacher said especially when the explanations of grammar rules were complex. One example of misunderstanding can be cited in Class 5. When the instructions of a listening comprehension test were explained in Japanese for over 10 minutes, many students still misunderstood the instructions.

If we consider a continuum whose two ends are "only English" and "only Japanese," Teacher A would be toward the end of English and Teacher B would be toward the end of Japanese, both having equal distance between them and the extreme ends. Teacher C would be at the extreme end of "only Japanese." There is a similarity between Class 4 and Class 5 (i.e., Teacher B and Teacher C). Class 1 and Class 2 (i.e., Teacher A and Teacher B) are quite different despite being at the same level. From the present data, it appears likely that the language choice is due to each teacher's personal rationale/philosophy rather than due to student proficiency level.

Results of Teacher Interview Data and discussion

General findings

All three teachers had different opinions about the use of English in the classroom. Their opinions seemed to stem from their belief about language acquisition. The use of the student's mother tongue could not be discussed without mentioning their philosophy about language teaching in general. In spite of the differences in opinion among three teachers, they were all enthusiastic and confident about teaching Japanese. They seemed to know what they were doing and why they were doing it. All three teachers based their opinion on their personal experience in learning a foreign language, though interestingly, each experience led them to form different opinions.

Below, interview data from each teacher is examined separately and then compared across teachers.

Teacher A

Teaching methods:

Teacher A believed that grammar must be taught and student comprehension of grammar should be the primary concern of the teacher. She thought that before practicing any skills of the language, students must internalize the grammar of the language. In order to achieve this, grammar must be explained without any delay and any misunderstanding. Though she did not deny the importance of practicing communication skills in the language, at the beginner level, she felt that the student must concentrate on learning grammar. She seemed to believe that once grammar is learned, other skills will follow quickly and smoothly.

The use of English in the classroom

Teacher A said that she consciously used English for all classroom functions.

She did not think that in general teachers should use the students' mother tongue in the classroom, but that its use could facilitate student comprehension of the grammar when necessary. Since students have limited proficiency in Japanese, English could be used as a facilitator. She mentioned that teaching grammar only in Japanese took time to make students understand and caused unnecessary confusion and misunderstanding. Therefore, when the amount of time was limited, she felt the use of the mother tongue could be more efficient in order to save time. Though it is possible to teach Japanese grammar without using English at the beginners level, she said, it needs time and it lacks efficiency. At the Level she teaches (Level 1 and Level

2), students have to build grammar, without error. She felt that the teacher's primary concern must be teaching grammar, not speaking or listening practices. These skills would be acquired once grammar was internalized. Failure to acquire the grammar in the early stage of acquisition would lead students to fossilization. The proficiency level would stop, regardless if students practice or were exposed to the language.

Her opinions were based on her experience of learning Japanese and her experience of teaching Japanese. She learned grammar at school and then went to Japan. Since she learned grammar before going to Japan, she felt she had learned Japanese properly and efficiently, while other people spoke broken Japanese because they "picked it up on the street." Seeing people struggle to improve their ability to speak "good Japanese," convinced her that comprehension of grammar was essential before actual exposure to the language. She also discussed her students who went to Japan. She said that students who learned enough grammar could start speaking Japanese amazingly well and quickly once they were exposed to Japanese, while those who did not learn grammar properly would learn to speak Japanese well enough in the beginning, but would stop improving due to the lack of a proper grammar base.

As seen above, Teacher A's opinions about using English were the consequence of her belief in grammar explanation. Since she thought that students should understand grammar fully and without any delay, she used English as a means to achieve this purpose in her classes. She thought using English did not affect acquisition directly, but facilitated student comprehension of

grammar which actually enhanced acquisition. It is interesting to note that even though Teacher A's Japanese improved a great deal after full exposure to the language in Japan, she contributed this improvement to learning grammar before exposure, not to exposure itself.

Teacher B

Teaching method

Though she did not deny the importance of grammar, Teacher B did not consider the understanding of grammar as important as listening and using Japanese. She believed that students should practice using the language they are learning from the beginning along with understanding the grammar. Since students do not have the opportunity to use Japanese outside the classroom, the classroom should be the place for this. Students can read and study the grammar book at home by themselves. She expressed her belief that in the foreign language situation, grammar explanation should be restricted to the minimum.

The use of English in the classroom.

Teacher B said that she used English only when the full understanding of the content was important such as giving information from the department, concerning test schedules, scholarships, etc. However, even on these occasions, she used English only when she found that students did not understand even after she had tried to explain, paraphrase, or use other means.

She expressed her belief that the acquisition of Japanese takes place through the actual use of Japanese. If a teacher

were to use English quite often in the class, students would begin to feel that they could use English any time they wanted and not enough time would be spent for the actual use of Japanese. They would fail to realize that during many activities in the classroom, it is crucial to use only Japanese. They would start speaking to the teacher or other students in English as a matter of course, even when they were quite capable of expressing what they wanted to say in Japanese. Using English can actually hinder acquisition. It will deprive students from the opportunity to listen and use Japanese, which might be only possible in the classroom in the foreign language context. Therefore, in order to prevent students from using English in the classroom, she reiterated how she tried to prevent students from using English as much as possible.

Teacher B based her opinions on her experience of learning English and French, her research findings, theory which she learned through her teacher training, and her constant self-study of journals and books. Attending workshops also influenced her opinion, she said.

She learned English in Japan where Japanese was used most of time in the classroom. She complained that before she came to Canada about 3 years ago, she could not speak English at all even though she studied English for 20 years. She then started to use English in Canada and learned it quickly. She also learned French here in Montreal. She took several classes where only French was used. It did not take long for her to learn French, because she had the opportunity to practice French in the classroom through several activities which aimed at

communication. From this experience, she expressed her belief that we have to have contact with a language as much as possible to learn the language. Essentially, we must use it. Therefore, she felt that recent acquisition theory supported her experience. She also expressed her familiarity with several approaches and methods. She seemed to believe in "learning a language through communication," which became well known recently in the Japanese language teachers association in Japan.

She was the youngest among the three teachers and her opinion toward language teaching in general and the use of the students' first language in the classroom, in particular, corresponded to the current trends in Japan. She considered not only the actual impact on the students by using English, but also the psychological impact. The actual impact is that the use of English takes away the opportunity of exposure to the target language. The psychological impact is that students feel at liberty to use English in the classroom any time (i.e., less effort to use L2, Japanese).

Teacher C

Teaching methods

Teacher C believed that understanding grammar was important but not the most important. She, like Teacher B, did not deny the necessity of understanding grammar, but she believed students internalize grammar as their proficiency improves. According to her, learners must be exposed to the language as much as possible and get used to the language. The exposure to the language is crucial. Though she did not mention if speaking practice was also important, she seemed to believe that listening practice should be emphasized more in the early stages of language acquisition. Her ideas were similar to "input theory" proposed by Krashen (1985).

The use of English in the classroom

Teacher C did not oppose the use of English directly. She said that she too sometimes used English, if students did not understand the instruction or information. She, however, tried to use Japanese as much as possible. Even if she used English, she tried to restrict it to the minimal (i.e., one word or one sentence). Unlike other teachers, she even used Japanese during her office hours.

She believed that the most important thing in teaching a language in a foreign language classroom was to give much language input, not to teach grammar. Language input is unlikely to be possible outside the classroom. She believed that if appropriate methods and appropriate techniques were used, lessons could be conducted only in Japanese and that teachers could make

students fully and correctly understand the content of the lesson, even at a beginners' level. Using English takes time away from using Japanese. Students have to have enough input of the language to acquire the language. She emphasized the situation that her students are in, which is a foreign language context as opposed to a second language context. She was aware that the classroom might be the only place that students could hear Japanese. According to her, every effort should be made to try to use Japanese.

Her opinions were based on her experience of learning English and French. She had had teacher training in Japan. However, it was a long time ago and she believed that the methods she had learned were outdated.

She learned French in Paris, where only French was spoken. She did not take the courses there, but she learned French through listening to what people were saying around her. Later, she took several classes in Montreal, but she believed that most of her French was acquired in Paris. She also learned English both in Japan and in Canada. She said that she was impressed that English teachers in Canada conducted their classes very efficiently and effectively by using only English.

It is interesting to note that she thought what she had learned in her teacher training was outdated. She seemed to try to continually update her way of teaching. She did not mention much about practicing speaking, but she did emphasize listening practice quite strongly. It could be because she herself learnt French simply by listening.

Comparison among three teachers

In spite of the differences among these three teachers concerning opinions about language teaching and the use of L1 in the classroom, there is one thing in common. Their opinions are somehow based on the same learning experiences. They all learned a foreign language in a foreign context through grammar-oriented formal instruction. Then they went to the place where the language was spoken as a native language. They all continued their acquisition in a context where they were exposed to the language all the time. However, the three teachers interpret their experiences differently. Teacher A thinks that learning grammar prior to exposure helped her acquire the language, which resulted in her emphasis on grammar in the classroom. Teacher B thinks that communication in the language helped her the most. This is why she encourages students to use the language. Her acquisition of French by "picking it up on the street" taught her that exposure to the language or "input" in the language is important. She, therefore, tries to provide hearing of the language as much as possible.

As mentioned before, the three teachers' beliefs in particular theory or methods influence their way of treating language choice issues. The acquisition theory that Teacher A believes in is that grammar is important, so she teaches grammar. Whether grammar is taught in English or in Japanese is not relevant. The essential point is that the students must understand grammar. English is used because she thinks students understand better without confusion if grammar is explained in English. Teacher B thinks that using English gives students the

feeling that English is "O.K." to be spoken in the classroom. This is against her belief in the theory that students must use the language in order to acquire it. She thinks that using Japanese as a teacher is important. The effect of this on the students is more psychological. On the other hand, Teacher C also believes in the exposure of the language, but her belief is more practical. She thinks that the more students are exposed to the language, the faster they acquire the language. Exposure to the language is the primary cause of acquisition. Based on this theory, she tries to use Japanese as much as possible.

Both Teacher B and Teacher C seem to keep up with the current trends of language teaching, while Teacher C seems to still believe in Grammar-Translation methods. Recent teacher training and her self study helps Teacher B to update her knowledge of language teaching. Teacher C's belief comes from her admiration for the teachers with whom she learned English. It is worth nothing that Teacher C believes that knowledge from her teacher training is outdated. She is conscious of the changes in the field of language acquisition and language teaching, while Teacher A is not.

Result of Questionnaire Data and Discussion

General findings

As mentioned before, mainly Questionnaire Part I will be discussed here. Part II asks about English (L1) use preference for language functions. These results will be briefly mentioned as well.

When students are considered together, 33.3% of the students felt that the teacher used too much English in the classroom (Question 1, see Table 8 in Appendix D). This means that at least one third of the students were not satisfied with the teacher's language choice.

While complete deletion of English use in class was denied by 47.4% of the students (Question 2, see Table 8 in Appendix D), 61.4% of the students thought that if teachers used only Japanese, they could learn more Japanese (Question 3). In other words, students thought exposure to the language would facilitate language learning. Response to Question 8 showed that almost all students considered exposure to Japanese one of the most important factors in the classroom (see Table 8, Appendix D).

However, although somewhat contradictory, students did not think using English was a waste of time, since 73.7% of the students disagreed with Question 17. 21.1% of the students thought that English explanation is useless (Question 18). Interestingly enough, 87.7% of the students answered that English sometimes helps them learn Japanese (Question 5).

Inconsistency can be seen in comparing answers to Questions 5 and 21. While 87.7% of the students thought that English sometimes helps them learn Japanese, (Question 5), 56.1% of the

students disagreed with Question 21, (i.e., using English facilitates the acquisition of Japanese). This may be due to the terminology. They may have differentiated the word "learning" from "acquisition." They may have considered "learning" as studying Japanese as a subject matter in order to achieve a good mark in tests or grades. Acquisition could have meant to them the actual gain of skills of communication in Japanese. English helps them to study Japanese, while it does not facilitate them to acquire communication skills. This might also explain the contradiction between answers to Questions 3 and 17. Using English is not a waste of time, since it helps them "learn" Japanese. However, exposure to only Japanese as opposed to using English in the class facilitates acquisition. As mentioned above, students thought exposure to the language is important and using English does not facilitate their "acquisition" much. However, they preferred that teachers use English in class on certain occasions. 88% of the student liked the teacher to use English in order to check their comprehension of the teacher's explanation (Question 22). They also wanted English translation when they did not understand Japanese vocabulary and the teacher's explanation or instruction (Questions 6 and 7). As for the way English should be used, they wanted English translation if they did not understand after the teacher first speaks in Japanese (Question 14).

As for being comfortable/uncomfortable, student opinions did not agree as strongly as above. 36.8% of the students felt comfortable if the teacher does not speak English and 63.2% felt comfortable if the teacher speaks English (Questions 10 and 11).

57.9% of the students felt more comfortable speaking Japanese if the teacher used only Japanese in class and 45.6% of the students felt that if the teacher uses English in class, they tend to use English (Questions 19 and 20). This can be interpreted as meaning that whether teachers use English or not does not necessarily influence student willingness to speak Japanese in class. Moreover, some students felt comfortable in the class where only Japanese is used and others in the class where English is spoken besides Japanese.

There is something else worth mentioning. 64.9% of the students thought it impossible to understand the class if the teacher does not use English at all (Question 4).

When they think the content of the teacher talk is important, English must be spoken since they do not fully understand in Japanese. On the other hand, 66.7% of the students wanted teachers to speak Japanese even outside the classroom (Question 9). This may be because outside the class, the content of teacher talk is mostly unimportant, such as small talk or greetings and so students do not feel that they had to understand fully.

Questions 10, 16, and 17 obtained a considerable number of "don't know" responses. Since these included "double negatives" and/or awkward structure, students may not have been able to grasp the main idea which led them to answer "don't know."

In order to show when students felt that English should or should not be used, the results of Part II of the Questionnaire are discussed below (see Tables 13 and 14 of Appendix E).

In Part II of the Questionnaire, six statements were given and the students had to choose situations which fit each statement. They were allowed to choose as many situations as they thought to be fit. The statements were: 1. They felt English must be used, 2. They felt English helps them. 3. They felt English does not help, 4. They want English to be used, 5. They think English is a waste of time. The results provide interesting insight. Situation 1 is when the teacher gives important information such as a message from the department or announcements about texts, events, etc. Out of a total of 57 students, 19 students (33.3%) thought that English MUST be spoken. Another 22 students (38.6%) felt that English would HELP them. Situation 2 is when the teacher gives instructions. 32 students (56.1%) thought that English does NOT help, and 29 (50.9%) students thought English is a waste of time. In Situation 3, when the teacher requests something from students, 28 students (49.1%) felt that English does not help and 22 (38.6%) felt that English is actually a waste of time. In Situation 4, when the teacher explained grammar or a function, 39 students (68.4%) thought English would help them and 17 students (29.8%) wanted it to be used and 17 (29.8%) students even thought it must be spoken. In Situation 5 when the teacher checks comprehension of the students, answers were diverse. English was considered to be helpful for 28 students (49.1%), but 10 students (17.5%) thought English does NOT help and 12 (21.1%) thought it is a waste of time. In Situation 6, when language is used for social functions such as greeting and small talk, 21 students (36.8%) thought English is a waste of time and 13 students (22.8%) thought that

English does not HELP them. According to students, the responses to Situation 7 demonstrated that English is desirable in certain situations and not in others. Using English is desirable and students thought it helps them for the purpose of giving information, explaining grammar and language functions. English is not desirable and does not help them or it may be a waste of time, when it is used for instructions, requests, and social functions. It is important to note that the results of Part II of the Questionnaire agree with those of Questions 6, 7 and 14 in Part I of the Questionnaire mentioned earlier.

Below, Questionnaire data is briefly discussed for each class separately (see Appendix D, Tables 10, 11, and 12).

Class 1

In Part I of the Questionnaire, 57.1% of the students in Class 1 felt that the teacher uses too much English in class as compared to 33.3% of the overall group when all students were considered together in the above discussion (Question 1, Table 11). More students in this class put importance on exposure to L1 than overall results. Strong preference for Japanese use in class is shown in the response to Question 2. 78.6% of the students thought that the teacher should not use English in class at all (Table 11). This is surprising, considering that 47.4% of the total students (i.e., overall group) in this study thought this (Table 8). Moreover, 71.4% of the students in Class 1 thought they could learn more Japanese if the teacher used only Japanese as opposed to 61.4% of the overall group. 71.4% of the students in Class 1 disagreed with Question 21, which states that

using English facilitates the acquisition of Japanese (Table 11). The overall group result was 56.1% disagreed (Table 8). Student eagerness toward exposure to L1 was shown in the response to Question 9. 85.7% of students in Class 1 wanted the teacher to speak Japanese even outside the class (Table 11).

As for which functions should be carried out in English, compared to the overall group result, 78.6% of the students agreed that the use of English for vocabulary and comprehension check was needed (Question 7 and 22, see Table 11). In addition to that, students thought that the use of English would help when important information was given (Questionnaire Part II, Response 1, see Tables 15 and 16 in Appendix E).

Another interesting point is that even though students put great emphasize on the importance of exposure, they thought it impossible to understand if the teacher were to only use Japanese (Question 4, Table 11). This seems to be contradictory. There may be a gap between what they think is good for them and what they feel comfortable with.

Class 2

In Part I of the Questionnaire, 86.7% of students in Class 2 disagreed with Question 1, which states that the teacher uses too much English in class (see Table 11)

The majority of students denied exclusion of English from the classroom, (e.g., Question 2, 73.3% and Question 3, 52.3%, see Table 11). Interestingly, all students thought that English helps them to learn Japanese (Question 5) and 60% of the students actually thought that English facilitates acquisition of Japanese

(Question 21, see Table 11). This was quite a contrast to the overall group result where only 35.1% of the students thought that English facilitates Japanese acquisition (refer to Table 8). Thus, this class was more for the acceptance of English use in the classroom.

A higher percentage of the students than the overall group results preferred English translation, when they did not understand (84.6%, Question 14) while the overall group result showed only 66.6%. ("don't know" answers excluded, see Table 12). Results from Part II of the Questionnaire showed that at least 5 students out of the 14 (35.7%) in Class 2 either thought that English helps them or wanted English to be spoken for the purpose of social function. Response to Question 9 showed the same result. While overall group results showed 70.4% (Table 9), the results of Class 2 showed 61.5% (Table 12), who preferred the teacher to speak only Japanese even outside the classroom (Question 9). Class 2 accepted the use of English more than other classes for the purpose of social functions and explanation.

While Class 2 accepted the use of English, their feeling of being comfortable was somehow in contrary to this. 73.3% of the students felt comfortable speaking Japanese, if the teacher used only Japanese in class (Question 19, see Table 11). There appeared to be a conflict between what students thought was best for them in order to learn and what they actually felt comfortable with.

Class 3

In Part I of the Questionnaire, 90% of the students in Class 3 felt that the teacher uses too much English in class. This percentage is in contrast to the overall group result of 33.9% (Question 1, see Table 11 in Appendix D).

In general, however, they did not deny the use of English, and a higher percentage of students in this class also accepted the use of English than the overall group results (refer to Table 11). 90% of the students who did not think using English is a waste of time (overall result showed 84%, Question 17, Table 9). 80% of the students also thought that English actually facilitates language acquisition of Japanese (Question 5).

From Part II of the Questionnaire, Class 3, however, did not particularly prefer English translation over explanation. They did not particularly think it would be easier for them to understand if the teacher restated the same thing in English. They preferred English when information is given (Part II of the Questionnaire, Situation 1, Tables 15 and 16). Thus, they preferred English to be used but mainly for giving information.

Class 4

In Part 1 of the Questionnaire, 90% of the students in Class 4 disagreed with Question 1 (Table 11). They did not think that the teacher uses too much English.

Students in Class 4 did not deny the use of English in class. 70% of the students disagreed with Question 2 that the teacher should not use English in class at all (overall group result was 52.6%)

Students thought that teacher use of English prevents them from using Japanese (See Table 12). 25% of the students thought that using English is just a waste of time (Question 17). 80% of the students thought that if they know the teacher will repeat in English when they do not understand, they do not concentrate on what she says in Japanese, (overall group result; 52%, Question 15). They seemed to accept the use of English in class, but thought it did not help acquisition much. They accepted the use of English outside of class also, 55.6% agreed with Question 9 (Table 12).

All students thought that comprehension check in English was useful (100%, Question 22, Table 12), and restating the explanation in English, too, appeared to be preferred (66.7%, Table 12). However, unlike other classes, students of this class did not want English for giving information. Actually 5 out of the total 10 (50%) students thought it was a waste of time.

60% of the students (as opposed to 48%, overall group results) claimed the tendency to speak English in class was higher, if the teacher uses English in class (Question 20, Table 11).

Students in Class 4 seemed to feel that exposure to Japanese helps acquisition. However, they also accepted the use of English. There appeared some conflict between what they thought was best for them in order to acquire the language and what they felt comfortable with or preferred. As I mentioned before, they may differentiate acquisition with learning/studying. They may think that exposure to Japanese helps acquisition and English translation helps learning/studying.

Class 5

In Part I of the Questionnaire, all students in Class 5 disagreed with Question 1. They did not think that the teacher uses too much English (Table 12).

One outstanding thing in this class was that 62.5% of the students thought that the teacher should not use English in class at all (Question 2, Table 12). Considering that the overall group result was 47.7% this figure is quite large. While 61.4% in the overall group, 75% of the students in Class 5 thought they can learn more Japanese if the teacher uses only Japanese (Question 3, Table 12). One of the reasons they emphasized was the importance of the teacher use of Japanese as is shown in Question 15. They felt that they will not concentrate on what the teacher says in Japanese if they know she will give English translation later. Another reason was that all of them thought that exposure is one of the most important factors in language acquisition (100% agreed with Question 8). Their idea of exposure as an important factor for acquisition was shown in the response to Question 9 also. 87.5% of students wanted the teacher to speak Japanese outside the class, too (see Table 12). The overall group result was 70.4% (Table 9).

Fewer students than the overall group results were reluctant to accept the use of English for vocabulary and explanation, while they accepted it for the comprehension check. It is worth mentioning that only 37.5% of the students in this class, as opposed to 66.0% in the overall group result, thought it easier to understand if the teacher gives English translation after

Japanese (Question 14, Table 12). It is either because they did not want English translation at all, which might be the case considering the response to Question 2, or because they did not like the way English was presented in this particular class.

Class 5 had less of a tendency to feel uncomfortable even if the teacher does not speak English and less of a tendency to use English even if the teacher speaks English. They seem to be less affected psychologically by teachers' language choice (Question 10, 11, and 19).

Contrary to the overall group result, more students (75%) thought it possible to understand the class without English (Question 4, Table 12). This may be because this class was more advanced than other classes and so students had more proficiency to understand Japanese in general. Another possibility is that the class was conducted by Teacher C totally in Japanese from the first class. They may have been accustomed to the class without English and consequently, developed other strategies to help them understand (i.e., to make use of non-linguistic skills).

Comparison: Level comparison

In order to see if students at different levels but with the same teacher reacted to the use of L1 differently, Class 1 and Class 3, and , Class 2 and Class 4 were compared.

As mentioned above, Class 1 and Class 3 were taught by Teacher A who used English most of time. Even though there were some differences between these two classes in terms of their Questionnaire responses, there were more similarities.

One interesting difference was student perception toward Teacher A's use of English in class. While 90% of the students in Class 3 thought that Teacher A uses too much English in class, 57.1% of the students in Class 1 felt the same (Question 1, see Table 12). This may be because that, in spite of Teacher A's constant use of English in Class 1, students felt English is necessary in Level 1, where student proficiency level was quite low. Even though there was considerable difference between these two classes, both of them had higher percentages than the overall group results (Question 1).

In contrast to the above results, students in Class 1 were more inclined toward a total ban of English in the classroom (Question 2, Table 12). They also wanted the teacher to speak Japanese outside of class more than those in Class 3 (Question 9, Table 12). This contradiction may be caused by student failure to perceive Teacher A's use of English in the classroom. However, their reluctance toward the use of English in the classroom is stronger than those in the other classes.

Class 2 and Class 4 were taught by Teacher B who sometimes used English. Student perception toward her use of English was the same in both classes. Most of the students did not think she used too much English, which is in contrast to the comparison between Class 1 and Class 3. Though students in both classes denied the total ban of English in the classroom, their belief concerning the effect of English use on acquisition was quite different. While students in Class 2 thought that the use of English facilitates language acquisition, those in Class 4 thought that they could learn Japanese more if the teacher uses

only Japanese in class (Questions 3 and 21, Table 12). Thus their opinion toward the relationship between the use of English and Japanese acquisition was quite different. Like the comparison results between Class 1 and Class 3, this may be because of difference in student language proficiency level. Since the students' Japanese level is lower in Class 2, they thought that English was appropriate in the classroom. On the other hand, the student proficiency level in Class 4 was higher, so they did not feel the necessity for English. Students in both classes appeared to think that when language level is low, English helps acquisition, but as Japanese improves, more exposure to Japanese helps.

As seen above, the student proficiency level may affect the responses to the acceptance of English use. However, their belief concerning the relationship between acquisition and English use is not conclusive. It may be the case that the level of student proficiency does not affect student belief concerning acquisition. The difference among classes may be due to different proportions in the composition of students who have different opinions, irrespective of their proficiency level. Class 1 and Class 2 may have just happened to have more students who accepted the teacher's use of English.

Comparison: Teacher comparison

In order to see whether students at the same level but with a different teacher had similar opinions, the results of Class 1 and Class 2, and those of Class 4 and Class 5 were compared (see Tables 10, 11, and 12).

It is not surprising that the results showed that there were differences in student answers to Question 2 across these two classes. Students in Class 1 felt strongly that the teacher used too much English while students in Class 2 did not (Table 12).

Both students in Class 1 and Class 2 had similar opinions toward the way English should be used, which function English should be used for, the effect of English use on acquisition, and their being comfortable or their preference for English use in specific situations. However, as to desirability of English use, they had quite different opinions.

While students in Class 1 seemed to think that the use of English is useless, students in Class 2 seemed to accept the use of English. 71.4% of the students in Class 1 thought that they can learn Japanese more if the teacher uses only Japanese in class. 46.7% of the students in Class 2 thought so (Question 3, Table 12). Moreover, 75.0% of the students in Class 2 thought that English facilitated the acquisition of Japanese (23.1%, Class 1, see Question 21, Table 12). Since there were not any large differences between these two classes in terms of being comfortable, the difference was not because of their preference but of their belief concerning acquisition. Whether this difference is attributed to the difference in each teacher dealing with the use of English, cannot be concluded. However, it may be the case that since Teacher A in Class 1 used English most of time, students felt conscious of the lack of exposure to L1 and in turn overemphasized the uselessness of English. On the other hand, Teacher B in Class 2 conducted the class mostly in Japanese and students may have experienced difficulty in

understanding the class. Therefore they may think that English would help them understand the class.

The comparison between Class 4 and Class 5 showed several differences in all areas. Students in Class 4 were more inclined to accept the use of English in class while students in Class 5 seemed to prefer Japanese-only in class, although students in both classes did not see the use of English as an acquisition facilitator.

Students in Class 4 preferred English translation if they did not understand Japanese. Students in Class 5 did not think that English translation was desirable (See Table 12, Question 14 and 15). Students in Class 4 claimed that if the teacher used English in class, they did not feel comfortable speaking Japanese, while those in Class 5 did not feel this way (Question 20, see Table 12).

The differences between the results of Class 4 and those of Class 5 cannot be explained by the differences in teachers. Both Teacher B and Teacher C used Japanese most of the time in class. They used Japanese for all language functions.

As seen above there are differences as well as similarities among all classes irrespective of their levels and teachers. These differences may not be due to differences in level nor teachers, but due to characteristics of student composition in each class. The difference in the proportion of composition of students with different opinions may cause these differences, not levels or teachers.

Comparison of different data

Comparison between Observation Data and Teacher Interview Data

The purpose of this section is to examine whether there is a discrepancy between what a teacher says and what she does in class.

There is considerable consistency across interview data and observation data. Teacher A used English most of the time for all functions as she said. She used English explaining grammar both at Level 1 and Level 2.

Teacher B said in the interview that she used English when the content was important for the students to understand fully. The example of Setsubun can be considered to fit this situation. She thought that the concept of Setsubun was important because it was the topic of an entire week. She thought it would be hard to understand only in Japanese, since this event is unique to Japan. This was why she used English to make students understand fully. She also said that she used English after trying to use Japanese in several ways. In general she stated that she always tried Japanese before using English. Results from the observation scheme showed 27.2% of total time devoted to English use in Class 2 and 11.7% in Class 4 (See Table 2). This appeared a bit higher than what Teacher B had said, since she emphasized that she used Japanese most of time and tried to avoid English. However, English always preceded Japanese as she had stated.

In spite of the fact that Teacher C did not oppose the use of English, and stated that she sometimes used English, she did not use English at all during the observation period. Her statements were consistent with her classroom performance.

Considering that the teachers' statements in general corresponded to their actions, it can be said that they are quite aware of what they are doing in class. Their perception of their English use in the classroom appears accurate as far as language choice is concerned.

Comparison between Student Questionnaire Data and Observation Data

One of the questions in Questionnaire Part I asked if students felt that the teacher used too much English in class (Question 1, see Table 12). As one might expect, all students in Class 5, where Teacher C used only Japanese, found that the teacher did not use English too much. In Class 2 and Class 4, where Teacher B used English sometimes, 92.9% and 90% respectively of the students found that the teacher did not use English too much (Table 12, Appendix D). In Class 3, where Teacher A talked 72.4% of the time in English, 90% of the students felt that she used English too much. So far, student feelings and teachers' actions match well (i.e., correspond). In Class 1 where 80.1% of Teacher A's talk consisted of English, however, only 57.1% of the students thought that she used English too much. The difference in student responses in Class 1 and Class 3 may be due to differences in student proficiency levels. Students in Class 3 (Level 2) felt that they needed exposure to the language as they began to understand grammar more, while those in Class 1 (Level 1) felt that they still needed to understand grammar before being exposed to the language. Consequently, students in Class 1 may misinterpret the teacher's

use of English. They may think that the teacher uses less English than she actually does.

It is understandable that students with Teacher B and Teacher C did not think that the teachers used English too much, since these two teachers did not use much English. And it appears predictable that most of the students in Class 3, where Teacher A used English most of the time felt that she used too much English in class. However, interestingly enough, 42.9% of the students in Class 1, where Teacher A used English most of time, did not feel an overuse of English (10% in Class 3, see Table 12).

Comparison between Teacher Interview Data and Student Questionnaire Data

There are some gaps between student and teacher opinion. Students overall accepted English use more than Teacher C and Teacher B. They rejected, however, total use of English while Teacher A used exclusively English in the classroom.

Students thought English sometimes helped their learning of Japanese. Teacher A also thought that English helped students to understand Japanese grammar. Teacher C, on the other hand thought that English use hindered student learning. Although students did not agree on the total use of Japanese in class, which Teacher C supports, they did think exposure to Japanese was important, which was the same opinion as Teacher C and Teacher B.

Teacher B claimed that if the teacher used English in class, students tended to use English. However, as mentioned above, whether teachers used English in class or not did not seem to

influence students' willingness or being comfortable to speak Japanese in class.

Teacher C thought that classes could be conducted only in Japanese and students would understand the class only in Japanese. However the results show that 64.9% of the students thought it was impossible to understand the class if the teacher did not use any English (Questionnaire Part 1, Question 4, see Table 8 in Appendix D).

Both teachers and students thought English might help them for the purpose of giving information. Teacher C thought that English instructions might help students, while students did not think so.

As seen above, there is some discrepancy between student and teacher opinion. Student opinion is more moderate than teacher opinion. Students accept the use of English more than Teacher C and Teacher B, while less than Teacher A. However since student opinion is treated as a whole rather than individual, the results may show the mean (i.e., average) of extreme opinions at times. It is possible that there is variety in opinion among students as is demonstrated among teachers.

CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

In order to summarize the study, the specific research questions will be addressed below (see p. 14).

When and how is the mother tongue of the students used by a teacher in a foreign language classroom?

The observation data show us that there are differences among teachers in terms of their use of the students' mother tongue. Teacher A uses English the majority of the time. Teacher B uses it only when students do not understand the information already given in Japanese. Teacher C uses only Japanese, though she claims that she sometimes uses English, when she thinks English seems to be necessary for students to understand fully.

What is the teacher's opinion/perception about the use of the students' mother tongue?

Teacher B and Teacher C think that English should not be used unless necessary. Teacher B thinks that acquisition will take place through actual use of Japanese. She thinks that the use of English psychologically deprives students from the opportunity to use Japanese, that is, students feel uncomfortable to use Japanese if teachers use English in class. Teacher A thinks that English will help students understand Japanese grammar, which helps students learn Japanese.

What are student opinions/perceptions about the use of their
mother tongue?

Students do not prefer total use of Japanese in class. However, they think exposure to Japanese is one of the most important factors in learning the language. They think that classes taught only in Japanese help them to acquire Japanese, even though they may prefer English in certain situations. There seems to be a discrepancy between what they think is best for them and what they prefer to have happen.

Is there a discrepancy between student and teacher
opinions/perceptions concerning the use of the students' mother
tongue in a foreign language classroom?

Teachers are more extreme in terms of acceptance of English use. They either accept it or reject it. Students seem to have more moderate opinions. They are located between Teacher A and Teacher C on the continuum of acceptance/rejection of English use. As mentioned in the previous section, there are some gaps between student and teacher opinion. What caused these differences, however, is not clear in the present study.

To return to the general research question (See p. 14), there appear to be some discrepancies among teacher opinions/perceptions, student opinions/perceptions, and observed practice concerning teacher use of student's L1 in the foreign language classroom. These discrepancies might influence student proficiency development. However, in the present study, the relationship between these discrepancies and student language

acquisition is not clear. Moreover, what causes these discrepancies cannot be inferred from the present study. It seems that even teachers with similar experience develop different opinions concerning the use of students' L1 in the classroom. There seems to be a variety of opinions among students as well. A further interesting study would be to study how students form their opinions or what influences them in forming their opinions.

From the present study, it cannot be inferred how the use of English in the classroom influences student achievement in Japanese language proficiency. The use of English may enhance the comprehension of grammar which may lead to proficiency development as Teacher A thinks. The use of English may retard student proficiency achievement since the time for input and exposure to Japanese is reduced. Even though the effects on student acquisition are not evident, in this paper through the observation data, it was shown that classes can be conducted only in Japanese. However, whether or not the students really understood what the teacher said is not clear. One possible speculation is that students may not fully understand what the teacher says especially when the explanations of grammar rules are complex. One example of misunderstanding can be taken from Teacher C's class. Even though she explained the instructions of a listening comprehension test in Japanese for over ten minutes, many students still misunderstood the instructions.

Contrary to Teacher C, Teacher A uses exclusively English in class. In this case, students are thought to have understood the grammar explanations. However, the amount of time spent for

exposure to Japanese was relatively small. How this will affect student proficiency development, especially when the exposure to the language is limited to the classroom and students are not expected to hear the language outside the classroom, is subject to further examination. It is possible that the exclusive use of English affects students' willingness to pursue Japanese input.

Thus, the influence of the use of mother tongue on students is not clear in this study. It may influence some aspect of student achievement. It may relieve student tension and anxiety and cause them to relax. Student attendance may increase. Teacher-learner relationships may be easier to establish, since students can communicate better with the teacher in English. If the purpose of the course is translation skills or test preparation, the use of English may enhance meta-linguistic competence and meet objectives efficiently. On the other hand, as mentioned, it may lead to exposure deficiency. It also may prevent students from producing more in the target language, because students may feel free to speak their native language in class. Students may not try to understand in the target language until it is translated.

In order to consider the role of the mother tongue in the classroom, it is necessary to study the relationship between the use of the native language of students and student achievement in the target language. The use of the mother tongue in the classroom may play an important role in language learning in a foreign language learning context. This needs further examination. This present study has begun to explore this question and has attempted to fill a gap in the existing

literature on L1 use in the classroom. In this regard, the study has made a contribution. In addition, it has also raised further research questions.

ENDNOTES

1. Setubun, literally meaning the "division between two seasons" (winter and spring), refers to the bean-throwing ceremony held on February 3. According to the old lunar calendar of Japan, the following day is called risshun, which means the first day of spring. People scatter roasted soy beans inside and outside their homes as they shout "Fukuwa-uchi, Oni-wa-soto." This means "Fortune in, devils out." It is also customary to eat the same number of beans as one's age. In recent years, this festival is held on a grand scale at many temples and shrines. Well-known personalities who were born under the zodiac sign for that year are invited to throw beans from the stage. (Sugita 1985, p.357)

REFERENCES

- Allen, J.P.B., Frohlich, M., and Spada, N. 1984. The communicative orientation of language teaching: an observation scheme. In J. Handscombe, R. Orem and B. Taylor (Eds.) On TESOL '83: The Question of Control. Washington, D.C. : TESOL.
- Allwright, D. 1988. Observation in the Language Classroom. New York: Longman.
- Atkinson, D. 1987. The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource? ELT Journal, 41 (4): 241 - 247.
- Bruck, M. and Schultz, J. 1977. Anethnographic analysis of the language use patterns of bilingually schooled children. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 13: 59 - 91.
- Chaudron, C. 1988. Second Language Classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chesterfield, R., Chesterfield, K.B., Hayes-Latimer, K., and Chavez, R. 1983. The influence of teachers and peers on second language acquisition in bilingual preschool programs. TESOL Quarterly 17: 401 - 419.
- Dexter, L.A. 1970. Elite and Specialized Interviewing. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern Univeristy Press.
- Dunkin, M.J., and Biddle, B.J. 1974. The study of teaching. New York: Holt, Rinchart and Winston.
- Ellis, R. 1985. Understanding Second Language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Finocchiaro, M. and Brumfit, C. 1983. The Functional-National Approach: From Theory to Practice. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Frohlich, M., Spada, N. and Allen, J.P.B. 1985. Differences in the communicative orientation of L2 classrooms. TESOL Quarterly. 19: 27 - 57.
- Guba, E.G. and Lincoln, Y.S. 1981. Effective Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guthrie, L.F. 1984. Contrasts in teachers' language use in a Chinese-English bilingual classroom. In J. Handscombe, R.A. Orem, and B.P. Taylor (Eds.) On TESOL '83: the question of control. Washington D.C.: Winston. 39 - 52.
- Isobe, S. 1988. English? Or Japanese?: the Mother Tongue In the Foreign language Classroom. Unpublished manuscript.
- Krashen, S. 1980. The input hypothesis. In Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and Linguistics 1980. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

- Krashen, S. 1985. The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. London: Longman.
- Legarreta, D. 1977. Language choice in bilingual classrooms. TESOL Quarterly 11:9 - 16
- Milk, R.D. 1982. Language use in bilingual classrooms: two case studies. In M. Hines and W. Rutherford (Eds.) On TESOL '81. Washington, D.C.: TESOL. 181 - 191.
- Mitchell, R. and Johnstone, R. 1984. The routinisation of "communicative" methodology. Paper presented to the 7th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Brussels, August. (mimeo)
- Mitchell, R., Parkinson, B., and Johnstone, R. 1981. The foreign language classroom: an observational study. Stirling Educational Monograph No. 9. Stirling: Department of Education, University of Stirling, Scotland.
- Ramirez, J.D., Yuen, S.D., Ramey, D.R., and Merino, B. 1986. First year report: longitudinal study of immersion programs for language minority children. Arlington, Va.: SRA Technologies.
- Savignon, S.J. 1981. A letter to my Spanish Teacher. Canadian Modern Language Review, 37(4): 746 - 750.
- Spada, N. 1987. Relationships between Instructional differences and learning outcomes: A Process-product study of communicative language teaching. Applied Linguistics, 8(2): 137 - 161
- Spada, N. 1989. A look at the research process in classroom observation: A case study. In C. Brumfit and R. Mitchell (Eds.), ELT Documents: Special Issue on Classroom Centred Research
- Sugita, T. (Ed.) 1985. The Japanese-English Dictionary for Daily Conversation. Obunsha: Tokyo.
- Townsend, D.R. and Zamora, G.L. 1975. Differing interaction patterns in bilingual classrooms. Contemporary Education 47: 196 - 202.
- Wong-Fillmore, L. 1980. Learning a second language: Chinese children in the American classroom. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.) Current issues in bilingual education. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1980, 309 - 325. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

APPENDIX A

Modified COLT (scheme used in this study)

Activity type	No talk	Language choice		Sustained speech			Content						
		L1	L2	Ultra	Mini	Sustain	Management		Focus on language				Other topics
							Class room proc.	Discipline	Form	Function	Discourse	Socioling	

APPENDIX A

Observation scheme to be used for the study

Activity type --- Each activity is described : e.g. drill, translation, singing, discussion, game, explanation, etc.

No talk ----- If the teacher does not speak more than 1 minute, check here.

Language

Choice of language -- Whether the teacher uses English or Japanese.
Whenever he/she switches the language, the observer must record it.

Sustained speech ----- If the utterance consists of one word, it should be coded as ultra-minimal. If the utterance consists of one clause or sentence, it should be coded as minimal. If the utterance consists of more than one sentence, it should be coded as sustained.

Content

Management

classroom procedure	e.g. instructions about the activities
discipline	e.g. request to be quiet

Focus on Language

focus on form	e.g. explanation of grammar, drills on form
focus on function	e.g. focus on requesting, apologizing
focus on discourse	e.g. "the way sentences combine into cohesive and coherent sequence" (Allen et al. 1984)
focus on sociolinguistics	e.g. explain what is appropriate in a certain context

Other ---- other topic or content

APPENDIX B

Example questions from the teacher interview

Teacher background

- How long have you been teaching Japanese?
- Where have you obtained your teacher training, if any?
- What degree do you hold?
- Have you ever learned another language?

Teaching methods

- Do you believe in a grammar explanation?
- Do you believe in the communicative approach?
- Do you believe in a particular instructional approach or method or techniques?
- What aspects of language skill do you emphasize?

The use of English in the classroom

- Do you use English in the classroom?
- Are you conscious about using English in the class?
- What do you think about using English in the classroom?
 - *Whether it should be used or is desirable?
 - *When it should be used or is desirable?
 - *How it should be used?
 - *Whether or not there is a relation between the use of English in the classroom and student acquisition of Japanese?

- *In what way can it influence student acquisition?
- What are your opinions based on?
 - *Your experience in teaching?
 - *Your experience as a user of a language or languages?
 - *Your experience as a learner of a language or languages?
 - *Research findings or theory?
 - *Other?

APPENDIX C

Example questions from the student questionnaire

1. Level: _____
2. age: _____
3. sex: female male
4. How long have you studied Japanese? _____
Where have you learned Japanese? _____
5. How did you learn Japanese? Mostly,
 1. In class 2. studied by myself at home
 3. by exposure to the language
 4. combination of above (specify: _____)
 5. other (specify _____)
6. Have you ever been to Japan? Yes No
 If Yes, how long were you in Japan? _____

Questionnaire Part I

I would like to know how you feel about the use of English in the Japanese classroom?

1. If you strongly agree with the following statement, circle 1.
2. If you agree with the following statement, circle 2.
3. If you disagree with the following statement, circle 3
4. If you strongly disagree with the following statement, circle 4
5. If you do not know or you cannot say which, circle 5

1. I feel that in general, the teacher uses too much English in class?

1 2 3 4 5

2. I think the teacher should not use English in class at all.

1 2 3 4 5

3. I think we can learn more Japanese if the teacher uses only Japanese.

1 2 3 4 5

4. I think it is impossible for us to understand if the teacher does not use English at all.

1 2 3 4 5

5. I think using English sometimes helps us to learn Japanese.

1 2 3 4 5

6. When I do not understand what the teacher says in Japanese, I like her/him to explain or retell in English.

1 2 3 4 5

7. When I do not understand the vocabulary, I prefer the teacher to give an English translation.

1 2 3 4 5

8. I think the exposure to Japanese is one of the most important factors in the classroom.

1 2 3 4 5

9. I want the teacher to speak only Japanese to me even outside the classroom.

1 2 3 4 5

10. I do not feel comfortable if the teacher does not speak English at all.

1 2 3 4 5

11. I feel more comfortable if the teacher (sometimes) speaks English

1 2 3 4 5

12. I prefer the teacher to speak English when I ask her to do so.

1 2 3 4 5

13. I would find it hard to understand if the teacher mixed two languages in one sentence. (e.g. watashi wa kinou study shite-ne)

1 2 3 4 5

14. It is easier to understand if the teacher first speaks in Japanese and then restates the same thing in English, if I do not understand it in Japanese.

1 2 3 4 5

15. If I know the teacher will repeat in English when I do not understand, I do not think I will concentrate on what she/he says in Japanese.

1 2 3 4 5

16. I do not think it is natural not to speak English in Japanese class since we all speak English.

1 2 3 4 5

17. I think that the teacher using English is just a waste of time.

1 2 3 4 5

18. I think only exposure to Japanese helps us to acquire Japanese. Explanation in English does not help.

1 2 3 4 5

19. If the teacher uses only Japanese in class, I feel more comfortable speaking in Japanese.

1 2 3 4 5

20. If the teacher uses English in class, I tend to use English when I speak.

1 2 3 4 5

21. I think using English facilitates the acquisition of Japanese.

1 2 3 4 5

22. I think using English is useful to check whether or not I understand what the teacher says in Japanese.

1 2 3 4 5

Questionnaire Part II

Answer the following questions by choosing the response(s) below and circling the appropriate number/numbers.

Responses:

1. when the teacher gives a message from the department or informs us about an announcement (the date of the tests etc.) which is not directly relevant to the content of the class, but important information

2. when the teacher gives instructions about activities, or tells us what to do next, e.g. "please read" or "open p.21" or "we will now do a role-play" or so on.

3. when the teacher requests something. e.g. asks students to be quiet, to pass the handouts, to collect the assignment or to pay attention, etc.

4. when the teacher explains grammar or its usage, or the vocabulary

5. when the teacher checks the comprehension of the students e.g. "Could you summarize what I said right now in English?" "how do you say oshieru in English?"

6. conversation, greeting, discussion outside the class.

7. other occasions : specify.

Choose the response(s) from the above.

1. When do you think English must be used?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. When do you think English helps you ?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. When do you think using English does not help?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. When do you want the teacher to use English?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. When do you think using English is a waste of time?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX D Results of Questionnaire - Part I

Table 6

Results: Questionnaire - Part I (Number of students)

Class 1						Class 2					Class 3					Class 4					Class 5				
Q#	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1	3	5	3	3			1	6	7	1	4	5	1	2			1	6	3				2	6	
2	3	8	2	1		2	2	7	4		2	2	4	1		1	2	4	3		1	4	2	1	
3	2	8	3	1		2	5	7	1		1	5	3	1		2	4	2	2		1	5	2		
4	4	9	1			2	8	4		1	2	4	3	1		3	3	1	2	1		2	5	1	
5	2	10	1		1	7	8				2	6	1	2		2	6		2		2	5	1		
6	2	7	3	2		2	11	1		1	1	4	3			1	6		1	2	1	4	2	1	
7	2	9	1	2		1	10	1	2	1	1	6	3	1		2	6	1	1		1	3	2	1	1
8	12	1	1			8	6	1			8	1				9		1			7	1			
9	8	4	2			1	7	4	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	3	2	3	1	1	4	3	1		
10	3	5	2	2	2	3	5	1	3	3	2	4	2		1		4	2	3	1	1	2	3	2	
11	2	6	2	3	1	4	6	5			2	5	2			2	4	1	1	2	1	4	2	1	
12	4	9			1	2	7	4		2	3	7				1	5		2	2	2	6			
13	1	3	5	4	1	1	2	6	5	1	1	2	4	2	1	2		3	4	1		2	2	4	
14	5	4	3	1	1	5	6	2		2	3	3	1	3		2	4	2	1	1	2	1	5		
15	3	4	3	1	3	1	5	5	3	1	1	3	2	3	1	1	1	3	5		1	5	1	1	
16	1		7	2	4	1	3	5	2	4		1	5	2	2			2	4	4	1		3	3	1
17		2	6	5	1		3	5	5	2			7	2	1	1	1	2	4	2		1	5	1	1
18	1	2	7	4			2	5	8		2	1	3	3	1	1	2	3	3	1		1	4	2	1
19	2	4	5	2	1	1	10	2		2	2	4	2	2		1	5	2	1	1		4	3	1	
20	3	4	2	5			7	5	2	1	1	4	4		1	1	5	4				1	6		1
21		3	8	2	1		9	1	2	3		2	5	3			3	4	3			3	1	3	1
22	5	6	1	2		5	8		1	1	1	6	1	1		2	8				1	6	1		

Results of Questionnaire - Part I

Table 7

Over all group results of Questionnaire - Part I

Responses					
Q#	1	2	3	4	5
1	7	12	18	19	1
2	9	18	19	11	
3	8	27	17	5	
4	11	26	14	4	2
5	15	35	3	3	1
6	7	32	9	6	3
7	7	34	8	6	2
8	44	9	3	1	
9	20	18	14	2	3
10	9	20	10	11	7
11	11	25	12	5	4
12	12	34	4	2	5
13	5	9	20	19	4
14	17	18	13	5	4
15	7	18	14	13	5
16	3	4	22	13	15
17	1	7	25	17	7
18	4	8	22	20	3
19	6	27	14	6	4
20	5	21	21	7	3
21	0	20	19	13	5
22	15	34	3	4	1

(number of students)			
Q#	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
1	19	37	1
2	27	30	
3	35	22	
4	37	18	2
5	50	6	1
6	39	15	3
7	41	14	2
8	53	4	
9	38	16	3
10	29	21	7
11	36	17	4
12	46	6	5
13	14	39	4
14	35	18	4
15	25	27	5
16	7	35	15
17	8	32	7
18	12	44	3
19	33	20	4
20	26	28	3
21	20	32	5
22	49	7	1

Results of Questionnaire - Part I

Table 8

Overall group results (%)

Q#	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
1	33.3	64.9	1.8
2	47.4	52.6	
3	61.4	38.6	
4	64.9	31.6	3.5
5	87.7	10.5	1.8
6	68.4	26.3	5.3
7	71.9	24.6	3.5
8	93.0	7.0	
9	66.7	28.1	5.3
10	50.9	36.8	12.3
11	63.2	29.8	7.0
12	80.7	10.5	12.3
13	24.6	68.4	7.0
14	61.4	31.6	8.8
15	43.9	47.4	7.0
16	12.3	61.4	7.0
17	14.0	73.7	8.8
18	21.1	73.7	26.3
19	57.9	35.1	12.3
20	45.6	49.1	5.3
21	35.1	56.1	8.8
22	86.0	12.3	1.8

Table 9

Exclude "don't know" (%)

Q#	Agree	Disagree
1	33.9	66.1
2	47.4	52.6
3	61.4	38.6
4	67.3	32.7
5	89.3	10.7
6	72.2	27.8
7	74.5	25.5
8	93.0	7.0
9	70.4	29.6
10	58.0	42.0
11	67.9	32.1
12	88.5	11.5
13	26.4	73.6
14	66.0	34.0
15	48.1	52.0
16	16.7	83.3
17	16.0	84.0
18	22.2	77.8
19	62.3	37.7
20	48.1	51.9
21	38.5	61.5
22	87.5	12.5

Results of Questionnaire - Part I

Table 10

Each class's total (number of students)

Class 1				Class 2				Class 3			
Q#	Agree	Disagree	Don't know	Q#	Agree	Disagree	Don't know	Q#	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
1	8	6		1	1	13	1	1	9	1	
2	11	3		2	4	11		2	4	6	
3	10	4		3	7	8		3	6	4	
4	13	1		4	10	4	1	4	6	4	
5	12	1	1	5	15			5	8	2	
6	9	5		6	13	1	1	6	5	5	
7	11	3		7	11	3	1	7	7	3	
8	13	1		8	14	1		8	9	1	
9	12	2		9	8	5	2	9	6	4	
10	8	4	2	10	8	4	3	10	6	3	1
11	8	5	1	11	10	5		11	7	2	1
12	13		1	12	9	4	2	12	10		
13	4	9	1	13	3	11	1	13	3	6	1
14	9	4	1	14	11	2	2	14	6	4	
15	7	4	3	15	6	8	1	15	4	5	1
16	1	9	4	16	4	7	4	16	1	7	2
17	2	11	1	17	3	10	2	17		9	1
18	3	11		18	2	13		18	3	6	1
19	6	7	1	19	11	2	2	19	6	4	
20	7	7		20	7	7	1	20	5	4	1
21	3	10	1	21	9	3	3	21	2	8	
22	11	3		22	3	1	1	22	8	2	

Class 4				Class 5			
Q#	Agree	Disagree	Don't know	Q#	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
1	1	9		1		8	
2	3	7		2	5	3	
3	6	4		3	6	2	
4	6	3	1	4	2	6	
5	8	2		5	7	1	
6	7	1	2	6	5	3	
7	8	2		7	4	3	1
8	9	1		8	8		
9	5	4	1	9	7	1	
10	4	5	1	10	3	5	
11	6	2	2	11	5	3	
12	6	2	2	12	8		
13	2	7	1	13	2	6	
14	6	3	1	14	3	5	
15	2	8		15	6	2	
16		6	4	16	1	6	1
17	2	6	2	17	1	6	1
18	3	6	1	18	1	6	1
19	6	3	1	19	4	4	
20	6	4		20	1	6	1
21	3	7		21	3	4	1
22	10			22	7	1	

Results of Questionnaire - Part I

Table 11
Percentage of each class (%)

Class 1				Class 2				Class 3			
Q#	Agree	Disagree	Don't know	Q#	Agree	Disagree	Don't know	Q#	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
1	57.1	42.9		1	6.7	86.7	6.7	1	90.0	10.0	
2	78.6	21.4		2	26.7	73.3		2	40.0	60.0	
3	71.4	28.6		3	46.7	53.3		3	60.0	40.0	
4	92.9	7.1		4	66.7	26.7	6.7	4	60.0	40.0	
5	85.7	7.1	7.1	5	100.0			5	80.0	20.0	
6	64.3	35.7		6	86.7	6.7	6.7	6	50.0	50.0	
7	78.6	21.4		7	73.3	20.0	6.7	7	70.0	30.0	
8	92.9	7.1		8	93.3	6.7		8	90.0	10.0	
9	85.7	14.3		9	53.3	33.3	13.3	9	60.0	40.0	
10	57.1	28.6	14.3	10	53.3	26.7	20.0	10	60.0	30.0	10.0
11	57.1	35.7	7.1	11	66.7	33.3		11	70.0	20.0	10.0
12	92.9		7.1	12	60.0	26.7	13.3	12	100.0		
13	28.6	64.3	7.1	13	20.0	73.3	6.7	13	30.0	60.0	10.0
14	64.3	28.6	7.1	14	73.3	13.3	13.3	14	60.0	40.0	
15	50.0	28.6	21.4	15	40.0	53.3	6.7	15	40.0	50.0	10.0
16	7.1	64.3	28.6	16	26.7	46.7	26.7	16	10.0	70.0	20.0
17	14.3	78.6	7.1	17	20.0	66.7	13.3	17		90.0	10.0
18	21.4	78.6		18	13.3	86.7		18	30.0	60.0	10.0
19	42.9	50.0	7.1	19	73.3	13.3	13.3	19	60.0	40.0	
20	50.0	50.0		20	46.7	46.7	6.7	20	50.0	40.0	10.0
21	21.4	71.4	7.1	21	60.0	20.0	20.0	21	20.0	80.0	
22	78.6	21.4		22	86.7	6.7	6.7	22	80.0	20.0	

Class 4				Class 5			
Q#	Agree	Disagree	Don't know	Q#	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
1	10.0	90.0		1		100.0	
2	30.0	70.0		2	62.5	37.5	
3	60.0	40.0		3	75.0	25.0	
4	60.0	30.0	10.0	4	25.0	75.0	
5	80.0	20.0		5	87.5	12.5	
6	70.0	10.0	20.0	6	62.5	37.5	
7	80.0	20.0		7	50.0	37.5	12.5
8	90.0	10.0		8	100.0		
9	50.0	40.0	10.0	9	87.5	12.5	
10	40.0	50.0	10.0	10	37.5	62.5	
11	60.0	20.0	20.0	11	62.5	37.5	
12	60.0	20.0	20.0	12	100.0		
13	20.0	70.0	10.0	13	25.0	75.0	
14	60.0	30.0	10.0	14	37.5	62.5	
15	20.0	80.0		15	75.0	25.0	
16		60.0	40.0	16	12.5	75.0	12.5
17	20.0	60.0	20.0	17	12.5	75.0	12.5
18	30.0	60.0	10.0	18	12.5	75.0	12.5
19	60.0	30.0	10.0	19	50.0	50.0	
20	60.0	40.0		20	12.5	75.0	12.5
21	30.0	70.0		21	37.5	50.0	12.5
22	100.0			22	87.5	12.5	

Results of Questionnaire - Part I

Table 12

Percentage of each class (%) (Excluding "don't know")

Class 1		
Q#	Agree	Disagree
1	57.1	42.9
2	78.6	21.4
3	71.4	28.6
4	92.9	7.1
5	92.3	7.7
6	64.3	35.7
7	78.6	21.4
8	92.9	7.1
9	85.7	14.3
10	86.7	33.3
11	61.5	38.5
12	100.0	
13	30.8	69.2
14	69.2	30.8
15	63.7	36.4
16	10.0	90.0
17	15.4	84.6
18	21.4	78.6
19	46.2	53.8
20	50.0	50.0
21	23.1	76.9
22	78.6	21.4

Class 2		
Q#	Agree	Disagree
1	7.1	92.9
2	26.7	73.3
3	46.7	53.3
4	71.4	28.6
5	100.0	
6	92.9	7.1
7	78.6	21.4
8	93.3	6.7
9	61.5	38.5
10	66.7	33.3
11	66.7	33.3
12	69.2	30.8
13	21.4	78.6
14	84.6	15.4
15	42.9	57.1
16	36.4	63.6
17	23.1	76.9
18	13.3	86.7
19	84.6	15.4
20	50.0	50.0
21	75.0	25.0
22	92.9	7.1

Class 3		
Q#	Agree	Disagree
1	90.0	10.0
2	40.0	60.0
3	60.0	40.0
4	60.0	40.0
5	80.0	20.0
6	50.0	50.0
7	70.0	30.0
8	90.0	10.0
9	60.0	40.0
10	66.7	33.3
11	77.8	22.2
12	100.0	
13	33.3	66.7
14	60.0	40.0
15	44.4	55.6
16	12.5	87.5
17		100.0
18	33.3	66.7
19	60.0	40.0
20	55.6	44.4
21	20.0	80.0
22	80.0	20.0

Class 4		
Q#	Agree	Disagree
1	10.0	90.0
2	30.0	70.0
3	60.0	40.0
4	66.7	33.4
5	80.0	20.0
6	87.5	12.5
7	80.0	20.0
8	90.0	10.0
9	55.6	44.4
10	44.4	55.6
11	75.0	25.0
12	75.0	25.0
13	22.2	77.8
14	66.7	33.4
15	20.0	80.0
16		100.0
17	25.0	75.0
18	33.4	66.7
19	66.7	33.4
20	60.0	40.0
21	30.0	70.0
22	100.0	

Class 5		
Q#	Agree	Disagree
1		100.0
2	62.5	37.5
3	75.0	25.0
4	25.0	75.0
5	87.5	12.5
6	62.5	37.5
7	57.1	42.9
8	100.0	
9	87.5	12.5
10	37.5	62.5
11	62.5	37.5
12	100.0	
13	25.0	75.0
14	37.5	62.5
15	75.0	25.0
16	14.3	85.7
17	14.3	85.7
18	14.3	85.7
19	50.0	50.0
20	14.3	85.7
21	42.9	57.1
22	87.5	12.5

APPENDIX E

Results of Questionnaire - Part II

Table 13

Overall results of Questionnaire - Part II (number of students) Total = 57 student

Response							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 1	19			17	7		5
Question 2	22			39	28	4	3
Question 3	5	32	28	1	10	13	5
Question 4	9		3	17	11	7	6
Question 5	7	29	22	2	12	21	3

Table 14

Overall results of Questionnaire - Part II (percentage of students)

Response							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 1	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	29.8%	12.3%	0.0%	8.8%
Question 2	38.6%	0.0%	0.0%	68.4%	49.1%	7.0%	5.3%
Question 3	8.8%	56.1%	49.1%	1.8%	17.5%	22.8%	8.8%
Question 4	15.8%	0.0%	5.3%	29.8%	19.3%	12.3%	10.5%
Question 5	12.3%	50.9%	38.6%	3.5%	21.1%	36.8%	5.3%

Results of Questionnaire - Part II

Table 15

Results of Questionnaire - Part II

(number of students)

Class 1

Total No. of students in Class 1=14

Response

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 1	4			5			2
Question 2	8			8	7		
Question 3	1	10	7		3	4	1
Question 4	4		1	5	4	1	
Question 5	1	9	6		4	4	

Class 2

Total No. of students in Class 2 = 15

Response

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 1	7			5	1		1
Question 2	6			10	8	2	
Question 3	1	9	8	1	1	4	
Question 4	3			4	2	3	
Question 5	1	8	5	1	3	5	

Class 3

Total No. of students in Class 3 = 10

Response

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 1	3			2	2		
Question 2	2			7	6	1	
Question 3	1	5	6		2	1	1
Question 4				3	1	1	1
Question 5		4	3		1	4	

Class 4

Total No. of Students in Class 4 = 10

Response

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 1	2			3	5		1
Question 2	3			9	4	1	2
Question 3	2	6	6		3	2	2
Question 4				4	2	1	2
Question 5	5	5	4	1	1	5	2

Class 5

Total No. of students in Class 5 = 8

Response

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 1	3			2			1
Question 2	3			5	2		1
Question 3		2	1		1	2	1
Question 4	2		2	1	2	1	3
Question 5		3	4		1	3	1

Results of Questionnaire - Part II

Table 16

Results of Questionnaire - Part II (percentage of students)

Class 1 Total No. of students in Class 1=14

	Response						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 1	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	35.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
Question 2	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	57.1%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Question 3	7.1%	71.4%	50.0%	0.0%	21.4%	28.6%	7.1%
Question 4	28.6%	0.0%	7.1%	35.7%	28.6%	7.1%	0.0%
Question 5	7.1%	64.3%	42.9%	0.0%	28.6%	28.6%	0.0%

Class 2 Total No. of Students in Class 4 = 15

	Response						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 1	46.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	6.7%	0.0%	6.7%
Question 2	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	53.3%	13.3%	0.0%
Question 3	6.7%	60.0%	53.3%	6.7%	6.7%	26.7%	0.0%
Question 4	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.7%	13.3%	20.0%	0.0%
Question 5	6.7%	53.3%	33.3%	6.7%	20.0%	33.3%	0.0%

Class 3 Total No. of students in Class 3 = 10

	Response						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 1	70.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%
Question 2	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%
Question 3	10.0%	90.0%	80.0%	10.0%	10.0%	40.0%	0.0%
Question 4	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	20.0%	30.0%	0.0%
Question 5	10.0%	80.0%	50.0%	10.0%	30.0%	50.0%	0.0%

Class 4 Total No. of Students in Class 4 = 10

	Response						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		100.0%
Question 2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	200.0%
Question 3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	200.0%	200.0%
Question 4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	200.0%
Question 5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	500.0%	200.0%

Class 5 Total No. of students in Class 5 = 8

	Response						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question 1	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
Question 2	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	62.5%	25.0%	0.0%	12.5%
Question 3	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	25.0%	12.5%
Question 4	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%	25.0%	12.5%	37.5%
Question 5	0.0%	37.5%	50.0%	0.0%	12.5%	37.5%	12.5%