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Abstract

This study examined target language (TL) and first language (L1) use in an intermediate level Japanese-as-a-foreign-language (JFL) context at a Western Canadian University (WCU). The ratio of TL and L1 use by students and their instructors (including instructors’ perceived use) and the purposes for which they used the TL and code-switching were investigated to understand how mixed-language use can provide scaffolding for Japanese learners, thus enhancing their second language (L2) learning experiences.

The participants in this study included two focal instructors, six non-focal instructors and 45 students. Six of the instructors were native Japanese speakers, while the other two were Chinese and Tagalog speakers. Forty of the students had Chinese backgrounds, two were Korean, 1 had a Japanese background, and three came from Anglophone, non-Asian ethnic backgrounds. The study was conducted over a three-month period in an intermediate-level JFL class focusing on conversation and composition. The class met four times a week (50 minutes each class) for thirteen weeks.

A qualitative approach was employed, and data were collected through: (a) regular classroom observations and researcher fieldnotes; (b) semi-structured interviews; (c) audio-recorded classroom lectures; and (d) audio-recorded pairwork sessions. Data analysis followed Stake’s (1981) suggestion of coding whole episodes, interviews, or documents and then classifying them according to salient themes that recur.

The findings revealed that language use in such multilingual language classrooms is a complex and dynamic process that changes across interlocutors, task-type and task complexity. Both instructors and students used the TL and L1 (and additional languages,
especially Mandarin or Cantonese) for multiple purposes during teacher-led and collaborative pairwork tasks. The prevalence of code-switching suggests that drawing on a combination of languages provided scaffolding for students, which increased opportunities for receiving and processing TL input. In addition, issues concerning Chinese, ESL and heritage language learners in the JFL classroom and their linguistic needs and preferences are discussed, along with some pedagogical implications.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Identification of the Problem

In recent years, there has been renewed interest in the issue of whether students' first language (L1) should be incorporated in foreign language (FL) courses and if so, how and to what extent. As Macaro (2001) observes, "the exclusive use of the target language (TL) in monolingual foreign language classrooms has recently been the subject of considerable debate" (p. 531). There still remain gaps in the research addressing questions such as: How much TL and L1 is being used by teachers at different levels of FL learning and in different contexts? What differences, if any, are there between FL teachers’ perceived use of the TL and L1, and their actual classroom use of the TL and L1? And how are teachers and learners of FLs using the TL and L1 as mediating tools to learn the TL?

A typical argument is that students of Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) in North America do not have the same opportunities outside of the language classroom to access Japanese, as do learners of Japanese in Japan, for example. For this reason, JFL learners’ main source of language is the language teacher, materials and other students. As Polio and Duff (1994) explain, “what transpires in the classroom is, arguably, even more critical for FL students because the classroom is often the students’ sole source of FL input” (p. 313). In other words, for foreign language students, the target language (TL) is not as easily accessible as it may be for students who are learning the same language in a second language environment. Therefore, these students require more opportunities to receive this kind of language input.
Access to large quantities of TL can help facilitate the process of learning a second language (L2); however, one cannot disregard the necessity to address the issue of quality, as well. Recent research and practice support the view that purposeful incorporation of the LI can increase the quality of TL input and, thus, accommodates language intake (Antón & DiCamilla, 1999; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Cook, 2001a, 2001b; Danhua, 1995; Duff & Li, 2004; Duff & Polio, 1990; Franklin, 1990; Kim, 2005; Macaro, 1997; Nguyen, Shin, & Krashen, 2001; Noor, 1994; Ohta, 2001; Polio & Duff, 1994; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002; Scheers, 1999; Tarone & Swain, 1995; Turnbull, 2001; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002; Wells, 1999). As Levine (2005) argues, “a multilingual rather than a monolingual approach to instruction is necessary because it can both maximize second language use and promote learner autonomy and critical awareness” (p. 110).

However, there has been little research done that has quantified actual TL and LI use by instructors in FL settings. Duff and Polio (1990) investigated levels of TL use in FL classes, including Japanese, and found that teachers used the TL from 10% to 100% of the time. In Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie’s (2002) study of four FL teachers of French, teachers’ use of native language (NL) during the listening activity varied from 0%-18.15%. Teacher 1, who used no LI during the listening activity ended up using 55.51% of LI during the grammar activities. In addition, Dickson (1996), who investigated teacher perceptions of the amount of TL use, found that teacher-talk in the TL characterized between half to three-quarters of their classroom talk. Unfortunately, this questionnaire study only included FL teachers of French, German, Spanish, Urdu, Italian and Russian.
Secondly, there have been few empirical studies that have investigated the benefits of the use of students’ specific FL contexts (Antón & DiCamilla, 1999; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Franklin, 1990; Polio & Duff, 1994; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002). The only studies that examine language use and language learning in a JFL context are from Ohta (1995, 2000, 2001). In these studies, Ohta focuses on peer-peer interaction and assisted performance in the zone of proximal development (ZPD). Her studies revealed that collaborative peer interaction, including the use of the L1, allowed students to learn Japanese in each other’s ZPD. Finally, there have been no studies to my knowledge that address these issues in JFL classrooms, in a North American context, in which the majority of learners are Chinese native speakers learning JFL through their second or third language, English.

As Turnbull and Arnett (2002) explains

future research must determine what this [i.e. maximum use of the L1] really means in terms of the quantity and qualities of TL and L1 use and in terms of when it is acceptable and/or effective for teachers to draw on the students’ L1. More research is also needed to understand what factors … prompt SL and FL teachers to speak the students’ L1. (p. 211)

1.2 The Purpose of the Study

The present study examined the use of Japanese, English and other languages used by instructors and their students during intermediate-level JFL classes. The study focused on what languages they accessed, as well as how and why they used the language(s) to facilitate Japanese learning. The main objective of the study was to investigate language choice and use by the instructors; however, student opinions, perceptions, and language use were necessary to complement the multifaceted nature of JFL classes. In other words, the purpose of this study was to examine what and how
much language (Japanese, English and other languages) was being used by instructors and their students, the purposes for using these various languages and its effects, and, to explore how instructors use language to accommodate their students' prior language learning experience.

1.3 The Questions Guiding the Research

Foreign language classrooms create a challenging teaching and learning environment for instructors and students. Balancing the use of Japanese and English in less than ideal situations is a daunting task. This study investigates some of the more prevalent issues concerning JFL classrooms and the role of the TL (Japanese) and L1 (normally English). The research questions that guide the present study are as follows:

1. (a) What is the ratio of Japanese use to English use by instructors in university Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) classrooms?

(b) What are the instructors' own perceptions about the ratio of Japanese use to English use?

(c) What is the relative ratio of Japanese, English and Chinese use by students in JFL classrooms?

2. (a) For what purposes are Japanese and English used by instructors?

(b) For what purposes are Japanese, English and other languages used by students?

3. How do JFL instructors adapt and adjust their language use to accommodate the language learning experiences of the students in their classes?

1.4 The Significance of the Study

It is hoped that the present study will make several significant contributions to foreign language learning, especially with respect to the role of the L1 (and L2 and L3) in
the field of less commonly taught foreign languages such as Japanese. In a broader sense, this study attempts to add to the growing literature and research on the role of L1 in L2, immersion, and FL classrooms. As Cook (2001b) argues, “bringing the L1 back from exile may lead not only to the improvement of existing teaching methods but also to innovations in methodology” (p. 419). However, there still remains the challenge of determining the most appropriate and effective ways for language teachers to balance the use of TL and L1 (Liu et al., 2004; Turnbull, 2001), both quantitatively and qualitatively, and to evaluate how L1 use during code-switching scaffolds L2 learning and the reasons behind the teachers’ choice to do so (Levine, 2003). As a result, this study may provide insights into the need to “establish some principles for code-switching in FL classrooms by understanding its functions and consequences” (Macaro, 2001, p. 545).

Furthermore, from a sociocultural and sociocognitive perspective and with respect to L2 learners, I hope to make a contribution by examining the role of TL and L1 during peer-peer interactions. With multicompetent language learners in their (Cook, 1999), FL classrooms “should explicitly recognize a situation of diglossia” (Tarone & Swain, 1995, p. 174). As Storch and Wigglesworth (2002) state: “student[s] always approach learning a L2 with expertise in their L1, and this expertise remains a somewhat underexplored resource” (p. 768). By using a qualitative case study approach, the study further investigates the role of L1 as a valuable tool for scaffolding L2 learning. By doing so, the study will offer findings that assist in the understanding of how much TL, L1, and other languages such as Mandarin and Cantonese are being used, as well as the purposes for which these languages are used.
A third contribution is that the study offers a learner's perspective of their instructors' use of the TL and L1. Few studies (e.g., Duff & Polio, 1990; Liu et al., 2004; Macaro, 1997) have included learners' opinions about their teacher's use of TL and L1 use. In order to fully understand the effectiveness of a teacher's balance of the TL and L1, we need to take into consideration the effects that language use has on the TL processing of L2 learners and the most effective way to do this is to directly ascertain the opinions of the learners. The study provides insights on how learners feel about the ratio of their teachers' use of the TL and L1 and their use of the TL and L1 for various purposes. In addition, it will also examine learners' perspectives about their use of TL and L1 for L2 learning, and the purposes for which they feel the L1 (or additional languages) is useful.

1.5 Overview of the Thesis

This thesis consists of six chapters. Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the thesis by giving the background to the present study, identifying the problem and the rationale, outlining the questions that will be investigated, as well as stating the significance of the study to current research in second language learning.

Chapter 2 provides the theoretical framework to this study by reviewing relevant literature and empirical studies related to second language learning. The first section of this chapter explores current issues in foreign and second language classroom and the role of the target language and the first language in such learning environments. The next section will discuss language use from a sociocultural perspective and will review literature on the zone of proximal development, group work and collaborative learning.
Chapter 3 will describe the qualitative approach used in the present study, as well as the methodology, and the data collection and analysis procedures used for the classroom observations, audio recordings of the lectures and pairwork, and the participant interviews. It will also provide a detailed description of the participants (focal teachers, other teachers, and students) and the context of the study including the details of the research site.

Chapter 4 presents a detailed account of the major findings of the present study and then a discussion of the findings. In this chapter, the ratio of Japanese and English use by instructors will be described, as well as their perceived amounts of language use in their classes. The ratio of Japanese, English and other languages used by students will also be presented and discussed. At the end, the purposes for which teachers and students using these various languages will be examined, followed by adaptations and adjustments the instructors implemented to accommodate student learning.

Finally in Chapter 5, the major areas of the findings and their implications will be explored. This will be followed by a discussion of the limitations of this study and suggestions for future research.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will review the literature which provides the context and background for this research study by providing an overview of the knowledge and ideas have been established concerning this topic. It will provide a summary of the key developments and describe the past and current areas of debate on the issue of L1 and TL use in the L2/FL classroom. Moreover, the articles and empirical studies will be reviewed and major themes of importance will be presented to illustrate and situate the relevance of my study. I will begin by examining the literature related to L1 and TL use in second language classrooms followed by a brief description of four approaches to teaching L2 with respect to language use. Next, language use will be discussed from a sociocultural perspective to show how TL and L1 can enhance FL input as it mediates language learning through assisted performance (i.e., teacher-student and student-student interaction) and collaborative dialogue (i.e., student-student interaction) in the zone of proximal development.

2.2 Issues in L1 and TL Use in the Language Classroom

There has been an assumption for the past several decades among second language teaching methodologists and researchers that the use of the L1 in the classroom should be discouraged, and as a result the use of the L2 has been seen as positive and the L1 as negative (Cook, 2001b). However, more recent research and practice illustrate some benefits of using both languages in FL classrooms, resulting in an increased interest in this issue (Antón & DiCamilla, 1999; Cook, 2001a, 2001b; Danhua, 1995; Duff & Li,
n.d.; Duff & Polio, 1990; Franklin, 1990; Macaro, 1997; Nguyen, Shin, & Krashen, 2001; Noor, 1994; Ohta, 2001; Polio & Duff, 1994; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002; Scheers, 1999; Tarone & Swain, 1995; Turnbull, 2001; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002; Wells, 1999). While some researchers are interested in the quantity of language use by instructors (e.g., Dickson, P., 1996; Duff & Polio, 1990; Macaro, 2001; Polio & Duff, 1994; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002; Meiring & Norman, 2002), others are more concerned with the quality of different amounts of L1 versus L2 use (e.g., Antón & DiCamilla, 1999; Chavez, 2003; Duff & Polio, 1990; Ohta, 2001) and the functions of L1 in scaffolding L2 development and use, specifically. Because access to the TL, in terms of quantity and also quality, can be more challenging in foreign language classrooms where access and exposure to native speakers or highly proficient non-native speakers are more limited, more so than in immersion and second language classrooms, language use by both instructors and students is an aspect of teaching and learning that needs further investigation. As Polio and Duff (1994) explain, “what transpires in the classroom is, arguably, even more critical for FL learners because the classroom is often the learners’ sole source of FL input” (p. 313).

2.3 The Role of L1 and TL

The role of the TL and L1 can be broadly separated into several theoretical categories: Macaro (2001) suggested three: the Virtual [L2] Position, Maximal [L2] Position and Optimal [L2] Use Position, but one additional category could be added: Maximum L1 Use Position. Figure 2.0 illustrates an L1/TL continuum representing the four approaches. The Maximum L1 Use position holds that the method used should take maximal advantage of teachers’ and students’ L1 to focus on explanations of L2 grammar,
vocabulary and so on. It is perhaps most aligned with a traditional grammar-translation approach. The Virtual [L2] Position, on the other hand, states that the classroom environment should replicate the target culture by completely eliminating the use of the L1. Therefore, it is believed, a skillful FL teacher is able to teach in the TL and does not need to use the L1 to teach the L2. The Maximal [L2] Position, although also supporting the claim that there is little pedagogical benefit in using the L1 in teaching, takes a more realistic perspective: simulating the ideal target language environment would be impossible and teachers will ultimately incorporate the usage of L1 into their lesson for a variety of purposes. Finally, the Optimal [L2] Use Position is even more tempered but adds a theoretical rationale for L1 use, arguing that there is an important role for the L1 in L2 instruction to assist learners in learning the L2. Each of these will be discussed in turn below.

2.3.1 Maximum L1 Use Position

The Maximum L1 Use Position promotes the learning of the TL through the use of lots of practice by means of the L1. This position is characterized by teaching
techniques in which there is a heavy emphasis on translation and linguistic analyses of TL. The traditional grammar-translation method, cognitive code, and linguistics courses fall under this category since they maximize L1 use by using the L1 to explain and analyze the TL as an object (not medium) of study. Students learn the language (i.e., its grammar) using a deductive approach by learning the grammar rules and acquire the TL through memorization, repetition and/or analysis. By analyzing and translating numerous TL texts from the TL into the L1, and vice versa, it is claimed that students gain a basic foundation of TL knowledge. The grammar-translation method explicitly teaches grammar rules; however, it does not focus on how to use the language in communicative contexts in comparison to the following methods.

2.3.2 The Virtual [L2] and Maximal [L2] Position

The Virtual [L2] and the Maximal [L2] Position both advocate for a target language-only policy. The Virtual [L2] Position is idealistic and is representative of a language use principle while the Maximal [L2] Position is more characteristics of a realistic language use methodology. Support for the Virtual Position and Maximal [L2] Position is illustrated through the Natural Approach and the earlier Direct Method (e.g., as used in Berlitz language schools and in textbooks by H.D. Brown (2000, 2001)). According to Krashen and Terrell (1983), language learners “acquire” the TL by means of the Natural Approach, which simulates a TL setting, and it is through an immersion in the language, particular types of activities and an affectively supportive social context that competency in a language is achieved. This competence is gained from language acquisition, an unconscious process, and not through language learning, a conscious process, it is claimed. Moreover, this acquisition happens by means of the Language Acquisition
Device (LAD) (introduced through the work of Chomsky), an internal language processor, which receives input from one's interlocutors. However, not all the input received by the learner can be acquired. As Krashen (1985) explains in his Input Hypothesis, the learner will be able to acquire those structures that are at his or her next 'stage'. This next 'stage' is predetermined by the Natural Order Hypothesis, which claims that a learner will acquire language in a predictable order. The \( i \) represents the present competence level of the learner, and \( i + 1 \) is the next language rule that can be acquired according to the natural order. If the teacher provides this 'comprehensible input' (i.e., \( i + 1 \)) in L2 and a suitable affective context, then the learner will be able to acquire the next language structure. Therefore, exclusive use of the L2 is necessary to generate as much 'comprehensible input' as possible. The use of the L1 is detrimental; it deprives language learners of the 'comprehensible input' that is vital for second language acquisition.

Chambers (1991) explains how the L2 can be used in most teaching circumstances, in keeping with the Natural Approach. With respect to teacher talk for managerial purposes (organizational instruction, activity instructions, evaluation and correction of pupil's FL performance, and disciplinary interventions), much thought and effort need to be given to selecting the L2 words and phrases used in the class. Furthermore, these words and phrases must be recorded in a logbook and used regularly and exploited linguistically: limited, initially, and then gradually increasing in numbers as learners learn and use the acquired language. The learners will also have to be able to communicate in the L2 and will need to be taught structures to express themselves effectively in the classroom environment. The language functions that need to be
covered are requests, asking for help, apologies and evaluation. The learners must be encouraged to use these phrases since teachers will pretend not to understand them if they use their L1. Lastly, Chambers explains the importance of materials and activity selection in TL-only classrooms. Teachers need to take advantage of materials, in particular, textbooks and tests that exploit the FL and do not overuse the students’ L1. Accordingly, since the teacher is the key source to accessing the TL, it is the duty of the teacher to make all ‘comprehensible input’ available to the learners.

As Halliwell and Jones (1992) advocate, it is crucial for learners to be exposed to the TL being used as a means of real communication for all aspects of language learning. Real communication includes all social interaction including praising, classroom management and even rapport-building chitchat unrelated to the language lesson. This way “it reinforces the notion that ... not the FL [not the L1], is the language for genuine communication in the classroom” (Polio & Duff, 1994, p. 322) so that learners subconsciously do not separate the ‘pedagogical’ functions from the ‘real’ functions of language (Hancock, 1997).

Duff and Polio (1990), suggest a number of techniques to increasing ‘comprehensible input’. Some of these are:

1. Use verbal modifications by repeating utterances used in class, modifying input by speaking at a slower pace, paraphrasing, simplifying the syntax and vocabulary, and making a habit of frequently using useful phrases and expressions.

2. Use nonverbal cues such as visuals and gestures that help contextualize the oral input.
3. Insist on an L2-only policy from the start.

4. Teach grammatical terminology in the L2 from the outset and use it frequently.

5. Let students speak English when necessary.

6. Stress that all language need not be comprehended.

7. Explicitly teach and then use grammatical terms in the L2.

8. Provide supplementary grammatical texts in English. (pp. 162-163)

Halliwell and Jones also stress the importance of the L2 for the development of the learners’ own language learning as they process the L2 in their minds. Furthermore, by allowing students to experience the language as real communication the students will be given exposure to the TL which is more representative of the unpredictable language use utilized by TL communities. Also, in Tarone and Swain’s (1995) study of French immersion elementary school-aged children, it was argued that immersion children rarely get any L2 input in non-academic language styles and that efforts to do so do not seem to have been very successful. Therefore, unfortunately, the L2 becomes labeled as the language reserved for peer-peer and teacher-student interactions in ‘institutional’ domains only. They report that: “In the immersion speech community, the L2 provides a superordinate language style, but the older children need a vernacular for peer-peer social functions that are essential to their social existence” (p. 169). As a result, the learners end up using their native language vernacular for peer-peer interactions since they do not have access to the necessary L2 vernacular. Thus, students not only need maximum L2 input and practice, but also opportunities for interaction across a range of language genres, registers, and interlocutors (i.e. maximum sociolinguistic variation).
2.3.3 The Optimal [L2] Use Position

The Optimal Use Position claims that the L1 can be used as a tool to enhance the learning experience of FL learners. Learners of foreign languages are *multicompetent* language users according to Cook (1991, 1999, 2001a, 2001b) and always have access to their L1 and "in the mind, the L1 is not insulated from the L2" (Cook, 1999, p. 193). Cook (2001b) argues that "trying to put languages in separate compartments in the mind is doomed to failure since the compartments are connected in many ways" (p. 407). For instance,

the two languages are interwoven in the L2 user's mind in vocabulary (Beauvillain & Grainger, 1987), in syntax (Cook, 1994), in phonology (Obler, 1982), and in pragmatics (Locastro, 1987). L2 users are more flexible in their ways of thinking and are less governed by cultural stereotypes (Cook, 1997). The L2 meanings do not exist separately from the L1 meanings in the learner's mind, regardless of whether they are part of the same vocabulary store or parts of different stores mediated by a single conceptual system (Cook, 1997). (Cook, 2001b, p. 407)

Since FL learners are still learning the L2 and their interlanguage may not allow them to perform certain functions in the L2, it is only natural for these learners to code-switch in order to provide the necessary scaffolding in the learning process and to express their understanding of a task before proceeding with it, for example. Therefore, learners and teachers should treat the L1 as a crucial resource that can be exploited to enhance the learning experiences of L2 learners.

One function of the L1 in supporting students' performance in L2 learning is as a cognitive tool (Brooks & Donato, 1994; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002; Wigglesworth, 2002). As Storch and Wigglesworth (2002) argue, "the use of the L1 may provide learners with additional cognitive support that allows them to analyse language and work at a higher level than would be possible were they restricted to sole use of their L2" (p. 760).
Furthermore, the L1 can also have social or interpersonal functions. The L1 provides learners opportunities for intersubjectivity (Antón & DiCamilla, 1999), which allows learners to create a social space in which they can feel comfortable to perform a challenging task together. Especially for lower level FL learners, the L1 use can foster a favourable, cooperative atmosphere that facilitates peer collaboration as they work through a task. Moreover, the learners may use the L1 for jokes and other off-task socializing functions, which can help build rapport and create positive classroom relationships (Hancock, 1997; Swain & Lapkin, 2000). As noted in the previous section, within an academic language learning context, characterized by institutional teacher talk and educational materials, learners often have limited access to vernacular language, which is necessary for peer-peer social functions (Tarone & Swain, 1995). If learners are forced to use the L2 for such interactions, it is likely that this may negatively affect the learner’s attitude and motivation towards any L2 learning experience since “the need to perform the social functions is far greater to the [learner’s] social identity than the need to stay in the L2 (and look like a dweeb) when they have and share the L1 style they need” (p.169). As Chavez (2003) argues, “we are pretending when we tell our students that a monolingual [TL] environment filled with monolingual [L1] speakers is authentic, according to any real life norms. Our students see through this pretence and behave accordingly” (p. 194). On the other hand, as Polio and Duff (1994), in their Maximal Use Position, argued that if students aren’t given an opportunity to develop social language use, they will remain unable to use the L2 for those purposes later. Also, if teachers are not given principles for maximal L2 use, they will lapse into frequent uses of the L1.
Investigations of teachers' use of L1 in foreign and second language classes (Duff & Polio, 1990; Franklin, 1990; Harbord, 1992; Polio & Duff, 1994) reveal that there are many reasons for teachers' use of the L1 in the L2 classroom and their use of the L1 can be motivated by a variety of factors. According to Cook (2001a), there are four factors for which the L1 can be used as a positive tool: efficiency, learning, naturalness and external relevance. If an aspect of the L2 can be learned more effectively and efficiently through the use of the L1, then teachers may choose to use the L1 to assist their students with their performance. Also, L2 teachers who incorporate the L1 can provide necessary or additional scaffolding for a variety of learning purposes such as checking comprehension, explaining complex grammar concepts, and providing supplemental background information (e.g., historical or cultural background) for L2 lesson topics. Furthermore, learners who feel more comfortable (i.e., a feeling of naturalness) executing particular classroom functions or discussing certain topics in the L1, may benefit from the teacher's creation of an atmosphere in which the L1 can be accessed as necessary. Lastly, teachers who encourage the use of both the L1 and L2, including code-switching techniques, and acknowledge their potential benefits for future, real-world situations can equip learners with the tools to be better L2 users. Ultimately, these students are L2 learners and users and will probably not attain native-like proficiency status. Therefore, "language teaching should place more emphasis on the student as a potential and actual L2 user and be less concerned with the monolingual native speaker" (Cook, 1999, p. 196). As Levine (2005) argues, "a multilingual rather than a monolingual approach to instruction is necessary because it can both maximize second language (L2) use and promote learner autonomy and critical awareness" (p. 110).
2.3.3.1 The Learners' Use of TL and L1: Empirical Evidence

In Villamil and de Guerrero's (1996) research involving 54 adult, native Spanish speakers in an ESL course, the L1 assisted the learners in a variety of ways. The L1 was used to gain control of the task by "making meaning of the text, retrieving language from memory, exploring and expanding content, guiding their action though the task, and maintaining dialogue" (p. 60). For example, learners translated texts into Spanish to check the meaning of the English sentences and they would think through words in Spanish, through "private speech" (self-directed speech), before using them in English. In Swain and Lapkin's (2000) study of 22 pairs of grade 8 French immersion, learners kept the task moving forward by using English to determine what steps to take to successfully perform the task, retrieve semantic information, and to manage the task. In addition, the L1 was used when learners wanted to draw attention to their search for specific vocabulary items, focusing on form and performing explanations. It was also used to "frame" utterances or segments in French that were grammatically incorrect and to retrieve grammatical information necessary to complete the task. Here is an example of students using English to focus attention on their search for a French vocabulary item:

J1: *Et elle est tickelée.* How do you say 'tickled'?
J2: *Chatouilée.*
J1: OK. *Chatouilée. Chatouilée.* How do you say 'foot'?
J2: *Le pied.*
J1: Ah, *Chatouilée les pieds.* (p. 259)

Also, Antón and DiCamilla's (1999) data from five dyads of English-speaking adult learners of Spanish as a second language showed how the L1 acts as a critical psychological tool that enables learners to construct effective collaborative dialogue in the completion of meaning-based language tasks by performing three important functions:

---

1 The students were talking about tickling someone's foot.
scaffolded help, establishment of intersubjectivity, and use of private speech. (p. 245)

English was used for scaffolding by using it for managing the task, encouraging each other to maintain interest in the task, keeping their focus on the goal of the task, and talking each other through any problems encountered during the task—especially through parts of the task where each member, on their own, could not have been successful, yet as a dyad were able to collectively be successful. Take for example, the following dialogue in which two novice learners are using the L1 to provide scaffolded help to a problem with accessing the Spanish equivalent of “to arrive”.

R: Do we just start writing? We write the exact same thing? All right . . . imagine we’re going on a trip to Mexico. Tell me what you plan to do on this trip . . . all right . . . start it off . . . I’m horrible at starting things off . . .

T: Let’s say, how do you say, um . . . we’re gonna, we’ll arrive there?
R: Um, *arrivar*, I don’t know, uh, why don’t we say . . .

T: ‘Cause we could say we’re gonna be, we’re gonna get there at, and we can put it in, you know, the date, and the time, and . . .

R: All right, all right, all right . . . to arrive is. I think, it’s like, *arrivar*?
T: Or how about leave, leave?
R: That *después*, leave . . . is, um.

T: Why do we have to have the recorder on?

R: ‘Cause she wants to record everything we say, so watch it.
T: Okay.

R: So we could say, why don’t we say, like, uh, T . . .

T: We just learned, we just learned the word to go, um.
R: *Vamos*?

T: No, the ‘s’ word.

T: To go . . . okay.

R: Okay, you’re right, um . . . (p. 238)

Moreover, the L1 helps guide them through their own thinking processes during complex L2 tasks. Below, English helps then decide what it is they want to say about Mexico City.

19
S: Um... en la ciudad... um... you want to say Mexico City is a big city with lots of people? Hay muchas personas?
D: Okay.
S: Or in Mexico City... let's just say Mexico City is a big city with a lot of people, is that okay?
D: Yeah.
S: I don't want to tell you what to say, I just thought (laugh).
D: No, I don't know what else to say... there's more I want to say, I just can't, we haven't learned it... la ciudad de Mexico... es or está? És....
S: You could say 'hay' there are a lot of people....
D: I was going to say es muy grande....
S: That's, that's great.
D: Y hay... muchos personas... here, how about this? Hay... hay más personas, wait, no, en la ciudad de Mexico, están más personas que Indianapolis... is that right?
S: I don't... say it again....
D: Un, en la ciudad de Mexico, están más personas uh, que... Indianapolis.
S: You want to say there are a lot of people from Indianapolis?
D: There are more people in Mexico City that Indianapolis....
S: So you would say... hay más personas... en la ciudad de Mexico que Indianapolis?
D: That's what I thought....
S: Is that, okay....
D: Hay más personas... okay, en la ciudad de Mexico... que Indianapolis... what else? Does ciudad have an accent?
S: It probably does, but I don't know where (laugh).
D: Okay, what else? (p. 239)

Lastly, the L1 can act as private speech. Even if meant for oneself, private speech could be overheard by other group members and therefore “speech intended primarily for self can also function to inform or direct a co-participant and this play(s) a significant role in how the interaction proceeds” (Wells, 1999, p. 251). Through such collaborative L1 interactions, Antón and DiCamilla’s (1999) conclude that “the L1 is beneficial for [second] language learning, since it acts as a critical psychological tool that enables learners to construct effective collaborative dialogues” (p. 245).
2.3.3.2 The Teachers' Use of TL and L1: Empirical Evidence

Empirical studies show that teachers do use the L1 within their language classrooms regardless of policies or preferences to the contrary. Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002) studied four teachers of beginner's French and found that the range of native language (i.e., English) use during the listening activity ranged from 0% to 18.5%, with a cross-teacher average of 8.80%. However, Teacher 1, who used no English in the listening activity, ended up using 55.51% English during the grammar activity when rules for the possessive were being explained. Teachers in this study used English for a variety of purposes. These include using the L1 for translation of vocabulary items, giving instructions, commenting, and motivating learners to speak in the FL. The researchers also concluded that this study confirmed that code-switching (together with other adjustments) modifies input for FL learning in a desirable way (p. 423).

The research of Duff and Polio (1990) and Polio and Duff (1994), which investigated the amount of TL used in various university level FL classrooms, revealed that FL teacher talk ranged from 10 to 100% percent. Examples of situations in which teachers switched to using the L1 include instances when they were managing the classroom, giving instructions on grammar, providing translations for unknown TL vocabulary, dealing with learners' apparent lack of comprehension, and using administrative vocabulary items.

Franklin's (1990) study looking at TL use in Scottish secondary-level French language classrooms describes the challenges of teaching in the TL. The highest ranking tasks (i.e. tasks that were easily conducted in English rather than in French) were classroom management tasks, explaining grammar, discussing language objectives,
teaching background information, and correcting written work. Activities that were easier to conduct using French rather than English were those related to classroom organization, explanation of activities, and informal chats with students. Overall, the study found that the reason why 95 percent of the teachers (N=201) resorted to not using the L1 was student discipline.

In Dickson's (1996) survey of 508 FL teachers on the issue of spoken language, the data show that English plays a key role in classrooms, even for those teachers who are native speakers of the FL being taught. Teachers in this study mentioned that factors such as disorderly behaviour and low achievement of learners were the main factors that contributed increasing use of the L1, while factors such as departmental policy and teacher's own confidence in their FL use were the least likely to influence L1 use. Many teachers felt that the TL alienated low achievers since it affected their comprehension, increased anxiety and was demotivating. With respect to issues specifically related to teaching in the TL language, 42% of the teachers found it very easy to ask questions in the TL. However, 44% claimed that explanations of meaning were quite difficult and 55% felt that teaching grammar in the TL was very difficult. It appears that any teaching functions that entail the use of language that is above that of what the learners already know will make using the TL difficult because "it is practical and a realistic acknowledgement of time constraints ... and switching to English is thus, in one sense, a way of enriching the content of language lessons" (p. 16).

2.4 A Sociocultural Perspective

According to Sociocultural Theory, developed by Vygotsky and his colleagues, "human consciousness is fundamentally mediated mental activity" and "psychological
processes have to be explained as part of active participation in the everyday world, and not in the world of the experimental laboratory” (Lantolf & Appel, 1994, p.7). Humans, use tools— both physical and psychological— and in collaboration with other people, as mediators to influence and change the world around us. Language (whether L1 or L2), a psychological tool, is a key mediator for the mental activity of individuals.

2.4.1 The Zone of Proximal Development

Unlike, Krashen’s Natural Approach and the LAD (Dunn & Lantolf, 2000; Kinginger, 2001), Sociocultural Theory argues that “human psychological processes do not preexist inside the head waiting to emerge at just the right maturational moment” (Lantolf, 2000, p.14). Mental actions are first experienced as external, materially based, social actions that are initially introduced to a person through social interaction. For example, an adult or an expert will assist the child or novice to execute a specific action. This action will be mediated by a tool: language. At first the child or novice is dependant on the adult or expert and can only perform the action with assistance. Eventually the action will be performed without any external assistance and now any mediated support has been internalized and can be self-regulated. The zone of proximal development (ZPD) is the name given to this difference between what the child or novice could not do alone, yet could perform with the assistance of the adult or expert. The ZPD is “the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86).

Vygotsky’s ZPD is important to language learning for several reasons. First of
all, like the child and adult interaction displayed in the assisted performance, the FL classroom also has experts, the teacher or more proficient L2 learners, and the novice, a less proficient L2 learner. Secondly, language learning occurs on a social plane: a classroom environment involving teacher-student or student-student interaction.

Language, whether it is in the TL or the L1, can be used as a mediational tool to facilitate language learning by providing scaffolding in the ZPD. “In social interaction a knowledgeable participant can create [scaffolding], by means of speech, supportive conditions in which the novice can participate in, and extend, current skills and knowledge to her levels of competence” (Donato, 1994). According to Wood, Bruner and Ross (cited in Donato, 1994), scaffolding has these characteristics:

1. **recruiting** interest in the task;
2. **simplifying** the task;
3. **maintaining** pursuit of the goal;
4. **marking** critical features and discrepancies between what has been produced and the ideal solution;
5. **controlling** frustration during problem solving, and
6. **demonstrating** an idealized version of the act to be performed. (p. 41)

There are a growing number of studies that illustrate how learners use language as a means of providing scaffolding in L2 classrooms (e.g., Antón & DiCamilla, 1999; Macaro, 2001; Ohta, 2000; Swain, & Lapkin, 2000; Tarone & Swain, 1995; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996). Many support the claim that the students’ L1 can be an advantageous resource that promotes and enhances the L2 language learning opportunities (Brooks & Donato, 1994; Turnbull, 2001; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002;
For example, Antón's (1999) report on observations of first-year university French and Italian classes provides evidence for the fact that teachers, "through dialogue, can lead learners to become highly involved in the negotiation of meaning, (and) linguistic form" (p. 314) and through this negotiation scaffolding is supplied for communicative moves such as directives, assisting questions, repetition, and nonverbal devices such as pauses and gesturing.

In Storch and Wigglesworth's (2003) study of 24 university ESL students, scaffolding between peers had a number of functions. The pairs used their L1 for task management and task clarification. For example, Pair 6 used their L1, Chinese, for the division of labour, clarification of vocabulary items and issues of meaning, and the discussion of grammatical structures.

Lastly, in Liu et al.'s (2004) study of South Korean high school students studying EFL, 13 high school teachers participated in one 50-minute audio-taped session each revealing that the teachers used code-switching as a scaffolding technique for several specific functions. Firstly, the teachers used Korean (the L1) increasingly more when the lesson involved the explanation of vocabulary, grammar and background information. This switch in language use seemed most often to be triggered when learners appeared to be struggling to comprehend the lesson content. Secondly, all the teachers used the method of frequently translating their English utterances into Korean right after they said it in English. The researchers suggest that perhaps the teachers may have preferred this strategy as being more effective rather than employing some modified L2 input. Thirdly,
the teacher switched to using Korean when they felt the need to highlight important information in order to draw learners’ attention to that FL input.

Although there is increasingly more research being done in L2 and FL settings, there is little research that examines FL learning of less commonly taught languages (Duff & Polio, 1990; Kubota, 1998) - especially that of Japanese as a foreign language (JFL). One researcher who has conducted studies in JFL classrooms is Ohta (2001). She analyzed the language learning processes of university level JFL students by studying the interactions during peer task work. On average, first year students had 23.60% of transcript lines that contained English and second year students averaged 40.85%. When looking at the two numbers, however, Ohta warns readers not to compare the first year percentage with the second year percentage because each group experienced different language tasks that were implemented in a different manner. What is more useful is to look at the overall functions for which the students used English to scaffold their FL learning. With both the first (59.62%) and second year (81.82%) learners, task management proved to be the function that students used the most English. After that, language questions (1st year= 48.08; 2nd year=69.7%) and translation (1st year= 40.38; 2nd year=60.61%) followed, in decreasing order of English use.

Even though this gives us a glimpse of language use in JFL classrooms, there needs to be much more research to fully understand the complex nature of teaching the Japanese language in foreign language settings. Future research needs to include examination of the roles of Japanese and L1 (and even L2, L3) use in JFL classrooms in order to better comprehend and evaluate the classroom dynamics that are unique to JFL teaching and learning in a variety of contexts.
2.5 Group Work, Collaborative Learning, and L1/L2 Use

As argues earlier, peer mediation through collaborative dialogue during L2 tasks can mediate L2 learning (Antón, & DiCamilla, 1999; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Kobayashi, 2004, 2003; Ohta, 1995, 2000, 2001; Swain & Lapkin, 1998, 2000; Swain, Brooks, & Tocalli-Beller, 2002; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996). As Long and Porter (1985) outline, there are five pedagogical arguments for using group work in L2 classrooms. First, they claim that group work increases the opportunities for language practice. Not only is it important to create situation for input but it is crucial for learner to practice output for successful language learning (Swain, 1993, 1995, 2000). Learners need time allocated to not only listening and reading in the TL but for producing language through writing and, in particular, through oral means. Second, group work improves the quality of student talk. Learner-centred tasks, as opposed to teacher-fronted lessons, can promote face-to-face communication which enables learners to take on different roles and positions that allow practice of a variety of language functions such as making suggestions, making inferences, hypothesizing, generalizing, and managing the conversation.

Next, group work helps individualize instruction by allocating tasks to suit individual learner’s needs. The fourth argument for group work is that is promotes a positive affective atmosphere. A small group atmosphere can cater to shy or insecure learners who are intimidated by large class discussions; the group work can help relieve this tension and facilitate learner involvement and interaction. In addition, small peer groups help avoid the stress of the teacher judging one’s responses in front of classmates and can foster more risk taking. Lastly, group work motivates learners because it permits...
greater quantity and quality of language practice in a more comfortable and positive atmosphere.

Kobayashi’s (2004) study of Japanese undergraduate students enrolled in a university-level ESL program demonstrated how one group (Nana, Kiku, and Shingo) worked together to support each other during their oral presentation assignments. Firstly, the group members were able to assist each other in negotiating the task definition and the teacher’s expectations for the presentation. This involved attempts to negotiate the content (done mostly in the L1) in order to meet the criteria of the task (written in the L2). Secondly, the students collaboratively worked through the development of their PowerPoint document through dialogue (in L1) of the English words and phrases they were trying to choose for the written text document. During this part of the task, negotiation took the form of negotiating meaning, making suggestions, and evaluating the appropriateness of lexical items with respect to their audience. Finally, the group interaction involved rehearsing and performance-coaching for the presentation. As other members practiced their scripts, Kiku acted as a peer-coach. The friendly atmosphere created within the group even facilitated a humourous imitation of their teacher’s voice by Kiku causing Nana and herself to break out in laughter. Overall, the group benefited from the collaborative efforts of its members by interacting and negotiating the content in the L2 using their L1, and managing the task in order to produce a high quality presentation (students received an ‘A’ grade, one of the highest marks).

Furthermore, Kim’s (2005) study of collaborative interaction between Korean ESL learners and their interlocutors during oral and written critiques of newspaper editorials and their partner’s opinions found that the ESL learners benefited from
planning for and participating in collaborative dialogue. The ESL participants reported that the collaborative sessions made them “work harder to conceptualize and formulate their ideas in preparation for their interaction” (p. 199) and “were pushed to use the L2 broadly and process it deeply in an actual and potential way” (p. 200). The individual peers attempted to provide scaffolding to each other, by means of the L1, during lexical and rhetorical gaps through a variety of communication strategies: code-switching, meaning replacement, and word coinage. As a result, they “experienced the powerful role that collaborative dialogue can play in helping them to notice and work toward correcting their L2 shortcomings and improving their L2 products” (p. 205).

From a sociocultural perspective, collaborative interaction is important because “dialogue among learners can be as effective as instructional conversations between teachers and learners” since “learners are capable of scaffolding each other through the use of strategies that parallel those relied upon by experts” (Lantolf, 2002, p. 106). As Lantolf and Pavlenko (1995) explain, “the construction of a ZPD does not require the presence of expertise. Individuals, none of whom qualifies as an expert, can often come together in a collaborative posture and jointly construct a ZPD in which each person contributes something to, and takes something away from, the interaction” (p. 116).

In order to increase the chances for social interaction and interlanguage talk, and therefore activity in the ZPD, teachers should include and increase opportunities for collaborative efforts during L2 tasks.

Group and pair work provide learners the opportunity to engage in meaningful interaction, and to like L2 meanings to social contexts as they are given the opportunity to create with language in given contexts. Unlike native speaker - non-native speaker interaction in which there is a clear expert, the roles of novice and expert are fluid and changing in learner-
learner interaction as the learners contribute their individual differences in matured and maturing skills. Additionally, the learners' potential for accomplishments beyond their individual abilities increases when their strengths are collaboratively joined. (Ohta, 1995, p. 97)

In Donato's (1994) study on collective scaffolding, students were given an open-ended L2 task and worked collaboratively to co-construct and mediate their L2 learning experiences. Three university level French as a foreign language students working together illustrated how the learners were able to guide and support each other's learning by providing collective scaffolding. During the task, all learners took on the role of novice and expert resulting in an increase in the development of the individual's L2 knowledge while also contributing to the linguistic development of their peers.

In Ohta's (1995) study, assistance between learners, two "non-experts", was shown to result in collaborative learning in the ZPD. In her analysis of Becky (a learner with higher L2 proficiency) and Mark (a learner of weaker ability), both learners were able to learn within their ZPD and perform at a higher level than they would have been able to achieve if they had each worked on their own. Mark and Becky scaffolded each others' learning through a variety of functions including actively testing hypothesis through language play; conversing in Japanese about the here-and-now; experimenting with lexical choice; using Japanese for conversational management including the modulation of the pace if the interaction, repair, and role negotiation; managing the task; and, having a learning experience that allows each learner to work on their own tasks in the L2 while engaged in meaningful interaction (p. 116). What was interesting in this study was how much of the scaffolding was done using the TL, although there were some instances of L1 use as well.
Although these studies show the benefits of collaborative learning during group work, it should also be noted that in order for the collaborative effort to be effective, learners need to be able to know when and how to provide developmentally appropriate assistance in the ZPD during collaborative tasks: “the provision of developmentally appropriate assistance is not only dependent upon attention to what the peer interlocutor is able to do, but also upon the sensitivity to the partner’s readiness for help, which is communicated through subtle interactional cues” (2001, p.53). These interactional cues are described as bids for help and are most evident when the their interlocutor shows signs of not continuing (e.g., rising intonation, elongating the final syllable of the last word uttered, and slowed rate of speech). When students request or are responding to bids of assistance, their partner communicate this through either, or a combination of, the TL, English, or additional languages. As the studies and the literature indicate, code-switching can be an effective strategy for providing scaffolding and even students, considered “non-experts”, are able to use language to enhance L2 learning.

2.7 Summary of Chapter

The literature illustrates that the debate on TL and L1 use in the L2/FL classroom remains an issue of concern as instructors struggle to balance their TL use principle with the reality of their classrooms. Currently, the debate is centered more on the L1 and if it should be used in the L2/FL language classroom. Those that support a Maximal Use Position would argue that using the L1 would deprives the students of TL input, while those who favour the Optimal Use Position claim that the L1 can be used strategically to support and enhance TL input and therefore act as an effective TL learning tool. From a sociocultural perspective, the L1 can be used through code-switching techniques that can
ultimately take advantage of a student’s zone of proximal development so that interaction between interlocutors can lead to TL input. This interaction can take place between teachers and students, as well as between students themselves. This review of the literature provides a backdrop for this study. The study will investigate the role of the TL and L1 (as well as L2 and L3) and how language is used in the FL classroom. It will examine how much and the purposes for which TL and TL are used and how this affects the FL classroom. Furthermore, it will aim to identify ways in which the instructors adapt and adjust their language use to accommodate their students’ needs.
Chapter 3
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will explain how I approached the study of L1 and TL use in the JFL classroom. In order to achieve a deeper understanding of the issues, a multiple case study approach was selected so that I could take full advantage of studying the participants in their natural environment. As opposed to a controlled, unnatural setting, the teachers and students in the JFL classes provided a real-life, real-context to study the issues that were directly related to the research questions. In order to present results and interpretations that were reliable for portraying the teaching and learning experiences of the participants, data was gathered through multiple procedures. This included observations and audio-recordings of classroom lectures and student pair work. To complement the data from the classroom, interviews were conducted to corroborate the classroom data. These data collection procedures helped with triangulation so that the findings from the data analysis were presented and interpreted as accurately as possible. Data analysis followed an empirical grounded approach. Themes that emerged were coded and analyzed and the major findings will be reported and discussed in Chapter 4 as they pertained to the research questions.

3.2 A Qualitative Approach: Multiple Case Studies

The descriptive and explanatory nature of the present study called for a qualitative approach to investigating the dynamic and multifaceted environment of the JFL learning and teaching classroom. A qualitative research design was more conducive to this type of study where, as Stake (1995) describes, "research questions (are) typically oriented to
cases or phenomena, seeking patterns of unanticipated as well as expected relationships" as opposed to quantitative research questions that "(seek) out relationships between a small number of variables" (p. 41) and "represent happenings with scales and measurements (i.e., numbers)" (p. 40). Furthermore, because this study requires the researcher to investigate each case (the class) within its real-life (sociocultural) context, a multiple case study research strategy was employed (Merriam, 1998) so that an in-depth examination of each of the two classes of intermediate JFL could be conducted.

Case studies are preferred when the researcher has little control over the events and when the study environment includes some real life context requiring the main methods of data collection to consist of asking (e.g., interviewing) and watching (e.g., observing) (Erickson, 1981, cited in van Lier, 1988). In particular, this study followed two central principles: the emic and etic principle. The emic principle is that the research strategy used will be that of an insider's perspective (van Lier, 1988). By collecting data directly from the instructors and students, the researcher develops a clearer and more accurate understanding of the experiences of participants. The etic principle involves the researcher as a focal participant in the selection of the issue(s) and the interpretation of the data collected, thus taking on an outsider's perspective. By relating the emic to the etic issues, a greater understanding of the case will result. This study follows the holistic principle, which proposes that the study be done by examining the phenomenon in relation to the entire system to which it belongs. Thus, the researcher can come to an understanding of not only the instructors and students, individually, but how they influence each other and are influenced by other variables and, in doing so, increasing the understanding of the case in its greater context. Furthermore, the emic and holistic notion
are characterized by analysis that entail “developing categories and concepts that make sense and have functional relevance to the participants in the setting. These categories and concepts (will be)--- developed inductively, in context, and from the ground up” (Johnson, p.148) through thick description.

The multiple case study research method helped illuminate the dynamic, multifaceted nature of the two Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) classes. The study yielded insights within the JFL field as well as for other language instructors by providing naturalistic generalizations (Stake, 1995) that helped to generalize to other cases by becoming part of a new group or by inviting the prospect to modify existing generalizations. The challenges experienced by JFL instructors and how they adapted and adjusted lessons to overcome such language use challenges, could be used by other foreign and second language instructors to enhance their own teaching practices. In addition, future instructors could benefit from this information to understand and be sensitive to such issues in university language classrooms.

3.4 Research Questions

As a heritage language learner (HLL) of Japanese and a former student of JFL classes myself, it was my intention to explore the teaching and learning the Japanese language in a foreign language environment to better understand the processes involved and also to focus on the role of language use in JFL classes in which the instructors and students both have diverse cultural and language backgrounds. An Anglophone university where the JFL instructors and students are non-native speakers of English and where they do not necessarily share the same L1, provides an interesting environment for a case study investigating the dynamics and complexity of FL classes such as the one
mentioned. I wanted to examine how instructors facilitated learning in a JFL environment, in particular, with respect to language use in teacher-student interactions and student-student interactions.

At Western Canadian University (WCU), where the study took place, it is not uncommon for both the JFL instructors and the students to have a background in more than two languages. The JFL classes at WCU are composed of students who are multicultural and knowledgeable about multiple languages and are, therefore, able to interact using their L1, L2 and/or L3. For many students, English is their third language and Japanese their fourth language. In fact, a unique feature of the WCU JFL classes is that the majority of the students who enrol have Chinese ethnic backgrounds and speak either Mandarin or Cantonese, or both. The overwhelming Chinese demographic presented an interesting JFL context for my research.

With these objectives, three research questions emerged. The first addresses the issue of the ratio of Japanese and English use by instructors and students, including the instructors' perceived ratio as well. The second seeks to investigate the purposes for particular language use by instructors and students. The third question examines how instructors use language to facilitate the learning of their students. The research questions are:

1. (a) What is the ratio of Japanese use to English use by instructors in university Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) classrooms?
   (b) What are the instructors' own perceptions about the ratio of Japanese use to English use?
(c) What is the relative ratio of Japanese, English and Chinese use by students in JFL classrooms?

2. (a) For what purposes are Japanese and English used by instructors?

(b) For what purposes are Japanese, English and other languages used by students?

3. How do JFL instructors adapt and adjust their language use to accommodate the language learning experiences of the students in their classes?

3.4 Participants and Context of Exploration

3.4.1 Participants

Two main groups of participants were targeted for this study. The first group consisted of instructors of intermediate (200-level or 2nd year) JFL classes at WCU. This group of participants was further divided into two groups: focal instructors and regular instructors. The focal instructors were both teaching an intermediate level JFL class at WCU. These two instructors were both native Japanese speakers and spoke English as their second language. Ms. Inoue (a pseudonym) had been teaching at WCU for one year and Ms. Yabuno (a pseudonym) had been teaching at WCU for two years. The focal instructors gave permission to have their classroom lectures observed, audio-taped, and to participate in a semi-structured interview. In addition to the two focal instructors, other JFL instructors, currently teaching junior (beginners and intermediate) level JFL at WCU were asked to participate in an interview about their teaching experience. In total, six other instructors participated. These six only participated in the semi-structured interviews. Of these six, four were, at the time, teaching intermediate level JFL classes at WCU. The last two included a JFL instructor at another local higher educational
Table 3.1  Participant Profiles: Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>First Language</th>
<th>Second Language(s)</th>
<th>Higher Education Training</th>
<th>JFL courses taught at WCU</th>
<th>Years teaching at WCU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inoue</td>
<td>focal instructor</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>M.A. Language Education</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; year</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yabuno</td>
<td>focal instructor</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>M.A. Japanese Linguistics</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murakami</td>
<td>regular instructor</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>M.A. Linguistics</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; to 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; year</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>regular instructor</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>English, Japanese</td>
<td>Ph.D. Linguistics</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; to 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; year</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>regular instructor</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>English, Japanese</td>
<td>M.A. Japanese as a Second Language</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; year</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitamura</td>
<td>regular instructor</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>M.A. Sociology</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasaki</td>
<td>regular instructor</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>B.A. Linguistics</td>
<td>none**</td>
<td>none**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanaka</td>
<td>regular instructor</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Buddhism**</td>
<td>none**</td>
<td>none**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*has been teaching 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> JFL courses at another local higher education institution for five years

**2-year college Japanese degree; has been teaching JSL in Asia in private institutions for the about 10 years

institution; and another who was a JSL instructor with about ten years teaching experience. Table 3.1 gives a detailed profile of these participants (all names are pseudonyms).

The second group of participants were the intermediate-level JFL students enrolled in each of the two focal instructors' intermediate level JFL course. Twenty-two students were taught by Ms. Inoue, and another 23 students were taught by Ms. Yabuno. Of these 45 students, 40 were of Chinese background, 2 were of Korean background, 1

---

2 Some aspects of the instructor’s backgrounds not directly relevant to the L1-L2 issue have been altered to protect their identity.
was of Japanese heritage background, and 3 were of Anglophone, non-Asian ethnic backgrounds.

All 45 students consented to participating in the audio-taped classroom lectures. All but five students in Ms. Inoue's course granted permission to have their pair work audio-recorded. In Ms. Yabuno's class, only one student refused to participate in pair work audio-recordings. Furthermore, of these 45 students, a total of 21 students participated in a semi-structured interview about their Japanese language learning experience. Within this group, 8 were from Ms. Inoue's class and 13 were from Ms. Yabuno's class. In addition, a T.A. was assigned to each focal instructor and both T.A.s gave permission to be observed and audio-recorded during classroom lectures and pair work activities. Table 3.2 gives a detailed profile of the participants interviewed (all names are pseudonyms).

3.4.2 Setting

This study took place at a major Anglophone North American university called WCU. As indicated earlier, this university has an ethnically diverse campus\(^3\) and is situated in a city among a mix of cultures and languages. WCU is currently experiencing an influx of students from Pacific Rim countries, especially from Asia.\(^4\) Since the focus of my study was on the language use in JFL classes, the learning environment of this university proved to be an ideal setting as it would provide an ample number of students who are non-native speakers of English and speakers of multiple languages. Furthermore,

---

\(^3\) WCU's 2004 fact guide states that 20.7% off all students enrolled in the 2003-2004 school year were non-Canadians (i.e., have citizenship of another nationality covering the following continents: Central & South America, Europe, Africa, Asia, and Australia) with 34.8% of these non-Canadians holding citizenship from mainland China, Taiwan or Hong Kong. 11.6% of WCU's students are of International Student status and 25.8% of these are from China, Taiwan or Hong Kong.

\(^4\) This information was taken from WCU's Faculty of Arts webpage.
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Table 3.2  Participant Profiles: Focal Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2, L3</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Migration to this country</th>
<th>Major and/or minor</th>
<th>First JFL experience</th>
<th>Purpose for taking Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>Mandarin, English</td>
<td>late teens to 20s</td>
<td>4 years old</td>
<td>Chinese language</td>
<td>• 100 level</td>
<td>• personal interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriella</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>late teens to 20s</td>
<td>Gr.11</td>
<td>Finance &amp; International Business</td>
<td>• took classes outside of school in Hong Kong as young teen</td>
<td>• language requirement for I.B. student exchange**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cassie | Mandarin | English | late teens to 20s | Gr.9 | Biology; Japanese minor* | • Gr. 10  
• 100 level | • language and student exchange requirement and for personal interest |
| Diana | Cantonese | Mandarin, English | late teens to 20s | Gr.9 | Japanese* | • 100 level | • personal interest  
• travelling |
| Justin | English | none | late teens to 20s | born here | M.A. Sc. Biochemistry | • 100 level | • didn't like French; culture is really interesting**  
• peer influence; Arts credits  
• travelling |
| Phil | Mandarin | English | late teens to 20s | 7 years ago | Engineering | • 100 level | • Living in R (dormitory with Japanese exchange students)  
• personal interest |
| Sean | Mandarin | English | late teens to 20s | 4 years ago | Animal Biology | • 100 level | • for Arts credits  
• personal interest |
| Johnny | Mandarin | English | late teens to 20s | 10 years ago | Marketing | • Gr. 9-12  
• 100 level | • personal interest  
• need for electives |
| Isabella | Korean | English | late teens to 20s | 6½ years ago | English or Linguistics* | • 100 level | • career  
• personal interest  
• language requirement |
| Anna | Mandarin | English | late teens to 20s | 6 years ago | Biology | • Gr. 9 | • peer influence in Taiwan  
• culturally similar to Taiwan |
Table 3.2  Participant Profiles: Focal Students (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2, L3</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Migration to this country</th>
<th>Major and/or minor</th>
<th>First JFL experience</th>
<th>Purpose for taking Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kelly | Cantonese| English  | late teens to 20s | 7 years ago | Biochemistry; Japanese minor* | • tutoring outside of school during high school  
• 100 level | • personal interest |
| Michelle | Mandarin | English  | late teens to 20s | 7 years ago | Nursing | • Gr. 10-11  
• last year of high school was spend learning outside of school | • grandfather's influence  
• wants to formally learn language |
| Todd | Mandarin | English  | late teens to 20s | 11 years old | Political Science & Economics; German minor | • Japanese classes outside school for 1 month, then quit  
• 100 level | • peer influence  
• continue language learning  
• usefulness of language  
• worked in Japan for 1-1.5 years |
| Yuan | Mandarin | English  | none       | late teens to 20s | 2 years ago | International Business & Finance | • 100 level | • personal interest  
• peer influence |
| Miho | Japanese | English  | none       | late teens to 20s | born here | International Relations; Japanese minor* | • attended Japanese language Saturday school until around Gr. 7  
• started at 200 level | • communicate with parents  
• future career  
• may relocate to Japan |
| Kwan | Korean   | English  | late teens to 20s | 1 year exchange student from Korea | Japanese & Japanese Literature | • at Korean university and private institute | • necessary for diplomat test |
| Alexis | Mandarin | English  | unknown | late teens to 20s | Psychology | • 100 level | • best friend is Japanese  
• personal interest |
| Darren | Cantonese | English  | none       | late teens to 20s | 5 years old | Statistics; Japanese minor* | • attended classes at a community center before Gr. 9  
Gr. 9-12 | • personal interest |
Table 3.2 Participant Profiles: Focal Students (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2, L3</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Migration to this country</th>
<th>Major and/or minor</th>
<th>First JFL experience</th>
<th>Purpose for taking Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Veronica | Mandarin | English | late teens to 20s | Gr. 5 | Japanese | • Gr. 9 | • personal interest  
• continue language learning  
• grandparents know Japanese |
| Wendi   | Cantonese | English | late teens to 20s | Gr. 9 | General Arts (Economics*; Japanese minor*) | • Gr. 10 | • language requirement*  
• continue language learning |
| Krista  | English | none    | late teens to 20s | born here | Asian Studies or Japanese* | • Gr. 9 | • personal interest**  
• lived in Japan for 1 year |

* undeclared or unsure as stated by student  
** purposes for taking Japanese specifically for pre-university period
because there was no official department wide language use policy with respect to its JFL programs, WCU JFL classes would facilitate a learning environment in which instructors and students could voluntarily communicate in the language(s) which they felt most comfortable. However, it should be noted that both focal instructors mentioned that all intermediate level conversation course instructors met before the start of the academic year and decided to use as much Japanese language as possible for the intermediate-level JFL conversation classes.

In consideration of the selection of the JFL classes for this study, it was vital that the classes sought would be providing optimal opportunities, for both the instructors and students, for a variety of communication, preferably oral language use, with respect to the language input, output and language choice. The classes for the cases were selected according to these pre-determined criteria: (a) opportunities for teacher talk; (b) opportunities for teacher – student interaction; (c) opportunities for student – student interactions; (d) a focus on oral output in L1, L2 or L3. Using these criteria, it was decided that an intermediate-level course with an emphasis on conversation would be the preferred environment for the data collection. Although four individual sections of this course were planned to be offered in Term 1 of the 2002-2003 academic year, two sections were targeted primarily due to practicality issues: one section met four times a week in the morning, and, the other section met four times a week in the afternoon. Furthermore, the instructors of these two intermediate JFL courses willingly volunteered to participate in this study.
3.5 Data Collection Procedures

All the data were gathered during an intensive three-month period (from October to December, 2002) during the first term of the 2002-2003 academic year at WCU. Before the academic term, I met with both focal instructors. Both instructors were given a brief written description of the research study and the details discussed. Any changes affecting the data collection were worked out beforehand and plenty of time was given for negotiating my involvement in their classrooms. For these two sections of intermediate Japanese language class, I attended every class (whenever possible) for a two month period during September to November. Each class met four times a week for thirteen weeks per semester. Each session was 50 minutes in length and, unlike the first year beginner level JFL courses in which the sessions were clearly divided into weekly lecture and laboratory sessions, all intermediate level courses held 4 lecture classes that incorporated lecture and oral practice as one. The intermediate level classes, during the semester, covered Chapters 1 to 5 in their textbook by Miura and McGloin’s (1994) *An Integrated Approach to Intermediate Japanese*. All sections of this course had an identical syllabus, taught the same lesson content and gave the same tests and handouts across all sections. Also, about once a week a Teaching Assistant (T.A.), a Japanese native speaker, came and taught the *kanji* Chinese character lesson.

For the first two months, I attended the two sections (twelve classes per instructor); however, no data were officially collected. As Stake (1995) states, it is important to take the opportunity to become acquainted with the people, spaces, schedules and problems of the cases in study. Therefore, as arranged by the focal instructors, October was used solely for the purpose of building a rapport with the
instructors and, most importantly, with the students in preparation for the data collection in the following months. At this point, I was simply introduced to the students as a Japanese language volunteer and took on the role as in informal participant observer. During this two-month period, I actively participated in assisting the students with their classroom activities. Towards the end of October, the focal instructors and I met once more and it was decided that they felt comfortable with all aspects of my data collection and that I would officially begin my data collection.

Classroom observations were conducted, fieldnotes taken, and classroom audio-recordings were gathered for a one month period from the end of October to the end of November (fourteen classes per instructor). During this time, I was no longer participating in the class activities and my role was redefined as a passive observer-researcher. Pair and group work audio-recordings and student interviews were collected during three weeks in November. Instructor interviews, including both the focal instructors and other instructors, were conducted during November and December. These multiple methods of data collection were utilized as a form of triangulation in order to increase confidence in my interpretation of the cases by providing considerable amount of "uncontestable description" (Stake, 1995).

3.5.1 Observations and Fieldnotes

In order to gain a better understanding of the dynamics of the JFL classes, observations of the lectures were conducted. As Yin (1994) describes, direct observation is a source of evidence especially when the object of the study is not purely historical and, therefore, "relevant behaviours or environmental conditions will be available for observation ... and is often useful in providing additional information about the topic
being studied” (pp. 86-87). Information collected through classroom observations can help corroborate, or even contradict, the information provided by teachers and students through their interviews.

Because the classrooms were small in size, I was able to sit and observe the teacher and students in close proximity where I could see and hear the majority of the classroom interactions. During these observations, I quietly watched and listened as the teacher and students interacted with each other. Moreover, I took written record of this descriptive information so that it would assist in the process of better understanding and interpreting the cases. Since both instructors preferred audio-taping the class lectures as opposed to video-taping, the fieldnotes were particularly helpful for details related to describing events in the classroom that the audio-recording did not or could not provide. These included items such as any writing done on the board or the overhead projector, the content of transparencies used during lessons, any visual aids used to enhance the lesson (e.g., flash cards, drawings and gestures). In addition, the fieldnotes were helpful in making notes of particular participants’ utterances so that these quotes could be examined further after the classes. The fieldnotes were vital for capturing the complexity of the context in which this teaching and learning occurred; the observations were one step in providing multiple realities for each individual case. Since all participants permitted me to observe them, there was not any information that had to be excluded from being reported as part of my study.

3.5.2 Classroom Lectures

Audio-recording the classroom lectures was crucial since the focal point of this study was to evaluate how much language was being used during the lessons. The
recordings were necessary to not only understand what language was being used but also to examine the role of language choice in daily classroom interactions. In addition, the classroom recordings were necessary for calculating and commenting on the ratio of the languages used by instructors and students.

Every class lecture that was attended during November was audio-taped. Because the physical size of the classrooms and the number of students were small, one professional-type cassette recorder was used to audio-record the lessons. The cassette recorder was placed towards the front of the classroom, in between the instructor and the students, so that the instructors' and students' voices could be caught by the recorder. Every class was taped from beginning of class to the end of class regardless of the activity. Again, both instructors, their T.A.s, and their students granted me permission to audio-record their interactions during the class and so I was able to access all the recorded data. After each class, I reviewed each audio-recording. At the same time, I used this time to check over my fieldnotes from the observations and made any additional notes and necessary changes alongside my fieldnotes.

3.5.3 Student Pair Work

Because students were not assigned specific seats in the classroom and since both sections of the JFL classes did not have the same classroom for every class during the week, the students did not always sit with the same partner. Furthermore, since one student in Ms. Yabuno's class and five students in Ms. Inoue's class said that they did not want to participate in the pair work recordings, it was not always possible to audio-record the same pairs. When possible, I tried to audio-record the same pairs.
Six individual cassette recorders were used for student pair work audio-recordings. Before the collection of any data began, students were given a short explanation of how to set-up and use the cassette recorders. At the beginning of every class, six pairs were given a cassette recorder and asked to audio-record any activity that involved pair work. The students were instructed to place the cassette recorder on top of their desk so that it was at an equal distance from the both of them and to keep the tape running from the beginning of the activity until the very end, regardless of whether the students had finished the task early or were off-task.

3.5.4 Instructor Interviews

The interviews were a crucial part of my data collection methods since each instructor was expected to share his or her own distinctive thoughts and experiences; each interviewee provided an invaluable insider’s view that neither the students nor I could gain access. “Key informants ... not only provide the case study investigator with insights into a matter but also can suggest sources of corroboratory evidence --- and initiate access to such sources” (Yin, 1994, p. 84).

The interviews conducted for this study were semi-structured around open-ended questions (see Appendix D for a list of sample interview questions for instructors). Every junior-level (beginner and intermediate) JFL instructor at WCU was requested an interview. Besides the interviews with the two focal instructors, five other WCU JFL instructors volunteered to participate in a 45-minute audio-recorded, semi-structured interview about their JFL teaching experiences. In addition, two other instructors participated in the interview. One was, at the time, a junior-level JFL instructor at another local higher educational institution. The other was a JSL instructor who has
experience teaching international adult students in private institutions throughout Asia. All interviews were conducted in either the instructor's office or in a private room in the library. Also, since these interviews were audio-recorded, only minor notes were taken so that I could attend to the direction of the interview by formulating any related questions and concentrating on any probing that was necessary.

3.5.5 Student Interviews

The students acted as informants, too, and could provide very useful data to add to the evidence collected from the direct observation and the instructor interviews. In order to get a more descriptive and accurate portrayal of JFL classes, students from the two classes were asked to participate in a 30-minute semi-structured interview of an open-ended nature (see Appendix E for a list of sample interview questions for students). A total of twenty-one students participated in a semi-structured interview about their Japanese language learning experience. Within this group, eight were from Ms. Inoue's class and thirteen were from Ms. Yabuno's class. Except for the difference in the interview questions, all student interviews were conducted in the same manner as the instructor interviews. All students were interviewed one-on-one, except for one pair of students who preferred to have the interview conducted as a pair, in a private room in the library or an empty classroom.

3.5.6 Course Materials: Written Documents

Written documents collected during this period included the course textbook, handouts, quizzes and tests. These documents were gathered primarily to examine the amount of Japanese and English the students were able to access. Of particular interest were the handouts, quizzes and tests since the intermediate JFL instructors, either on their
own or collaboratively, created these by themselves for their students. These documents could be analyzed for some of the key language use issues and challenges faced by teachers and students in the JFL courses.

3.6 Transcription Procedures and Conventions

Much of my data was audio-recorded, including the classroom lectures, student pair work, and instructor and teacher interviews. Appendix F provides a detailed account of the transcription conventions used in this study.

3.7 Data Analysis

Qualitative research of this nature requires an empirical approach. “The phenomenon studied cannot be deduced but require empirical observation” and therefore there is the “need to remain open to elements that cannot be codified at the time of the study” since the results will be grounded in the data (Baszanger & Dodier, 1997, p. 10). The process of exploring the phenomenon and describing it makes it necessary to include as many variables as possible so that the interactions can be thoroughly represented and interpreted because “previously unknown relationships and variables can be expected to emerge from case studies” (Stake, 1981, p. 47).

Stake (1981) suggests a method of coding to classify whole episodes, interviews or documents so that the data are more easily accessible during analysis. The data were reviewed and salient themes that occurred more broadly were identified for the classroom lectures, pairwork interactions, and the interviews. This was followed by again examining each of these methods for key themes, in which coding categories were developed as they emerged through the data. Every classroom dialogue excerpt,
pairwork interaction excerpt and interview selection was separated into one of the categories, and when necessary, were assigned to two or more relevant categories.

The data and themes were re-examined again, and organized into salient themes that were then arranged in such a way to develop an argument for this study’s findings. Example quotes from interviews, excerpts from classroom and pairwork dialogue, and support from the course documents will be included throughout the report to illuminate the discussion of the study’s findings. Through these means of analyses, the report will shed light on the complex, dynamic nature of language use in JFL classrooms and will help give a voice to the teachers and learners involved in this L2 learning phenomenon.

3.8 Chapter Summary

The methods used to collect and analyze data were chosen to address the three sets of research questions. The observation, recordings and interviews were instrumental in illuminating the context under study and representative examples from the data could be analyzed and yield the findings presented in the next chapter on TL and L1 use in the JFL classroom. Approaching this study from a multiple case study research method yielded for rich, descriptive data representative of the complex yet unique learning context of JFL involving JFL students with diverse language backgrounds.
Chapter 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The chapter will present and discuss the research findings of the study. The findings will follow the original order of the research questions. Sections 4.1-4.3 will cover Research Questions #1a - 1c on the ratio of Japanese and English use by instructors, as well as their perceived ratio of use. These sections will also present the results on the ratio of language use by the JFL students. Next, the findings for Research Questions #2a and 2b will be reported. Question #2a and 2b are concerned with the purposes for which instructors and students use Japanese, English and other languages. The last section covers Research Question #3. Here I will offer the findings on how JFL instructors have adapted and adjusted their language teaching in order to enhance the language learning experiences of their students. This part will also address the unique situation of having a Japanese program with many Chinese NL students, as well as the learning experiences of a heritage language learner. The findings throughout this chapter will be discussed at the end of each section (except for Section 4.1-4.3 which will be discussed together at the end of Section 4.3) to illustrate how the findings connect with past research and current literature on L2 learning. Sub-sections in Section 4.6 will have a discussion of each strategy at the end of its own section.

4.2 Ratio of Japanese and English Use by Instructors

Using the fieldnotes taken from the classroom observations, four classroom lectures (i.e., four individual lessons) from each focal instructor were selected to be transcribed verbatim using a word processor. The criterion used to select the four
lectures was that the lecture had to cover a variety of activities so that they represented a wide range of language use samples. The lectures chosen to be transcribed for Ms. Inoue’s class were the dates of November 4, 12, 19, and 26, 2002. The lectures chosen for Ms. Yabuno were, coincidentally, for the exact same dates.

After the lectures were transcribed, all utterances were categorized by language: Japanese (J), English (E) or a mix of Japanese and English (M). A mixed utterance included more than one word from both languages. When the utterance was composed

Table 4.1 Categories of Utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Utterance</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Japanese or L2,L3 | • *Hai, koutai shite renshu shite kudasai.* {Okay, please change (partners) and practice.}  
|                   | • *Iroiro na courses wo totte imasu.* {She is taking various courses}      |
| English           | • Could be shorter that one page?                                        
|                   | • What does *benri* mean? {What does convenient mean?}                   |
| Mixed             | • *Dakara, kono ga wa* in noun modification sometimes you can change this *ga* and use *no* instead. {And so, this ((nominative case marker *ga*)) in noun modification sometimes you can change this *ga* (nominative case marker) and use *no* (genitive case marker)}  
|                   | • *De,* another example you have in the textbook is *shukudai wo wasureta koto ni ki ga tsukī.* {to notice that (you) forgot (your) homework}  
|                   | • Particle *desu.* {It’s a particle}                                    |

of one Japanese word and one English word, it was categorized as a mixed utterance, as well. Otherwise, if an utterance consisted of more than two words in Japanese and no more than one word in English, the utterance was counted as a Japanese utterance.

Similarly, an utterance consisting of more than two words in English and no more than one word in Japanese considered an English utterance. This method of utterance categorization was adopted after referring to Duff and Polio’s (1990) coding in which single word citations of another language were, at first, given their own separate category.
but were, in the end, collapsed together with the category without 1-word citations. After all the utterances were categorized, the sum for each language utterance was calculated for the individual dates, the individual focal instructors, and for both instructors and dates combined.

To provide an idea of the length of each type of utterance (i.e., Japanese, English or mixed) a word count was conducted. Illustrating the length of each utterance (i.e., the number of words in an utterance) is important because, whereas it is clear where a word begins and ends in English, in Japanese the unit of the word is not so clear due to its agglutinative nature. The word count was done by sampling five pages of classroom lecture transcripts from each of the four lesson dates for each focal instructor. The five page samples were chosen by selecting the five pages which had the most variation in language usage and high numbers in utterances per language category type. To distinguish a standard for establishing the word unit in Japanese, Kaiser et al.’s (2001) book, Japanese: A Comprehensive Grammar, was consulted. (See Appendix H.) After the word count was achieved, the average utterance length was quantified for each focal instructor. The averages were then pooled to give an average for both focal instructors combined. The word count data was compiled to help explain any differences that might emerge in the length of the utterance for individual utterance types.

What follows is the results and discussion for Research Question #1a: What is the ratio of Japanese use to English use by instructors in Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) classrooms? The data show that the ratio of Japanese, English and mixed (i.e., Japanese and English intra-utterance code-switching) utterances used by Ms. Inoue (see Table 4.2) for the four sessions combined are: Japanese (80.6%), English (14.7%), mixed
Similarly, Ms. Yabuno’s data (see Table 4.2) for the same dates show the averages of Japanese (79.4%), English (15.9%) and mixed (4.6%). Interestingly,

### Table 4.2 Language Use Summary for Ms. Inoue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL FOUR SESSIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words per utterance</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOVEMBER 4th**
Lesson content: Test outline; Interview session info & sign-up; Homework check; Ch. 4 Kaiwa\(^5\) #1 lesson, Grammar point: A wa B ni nite iru; betsu ni + negative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words per utterance</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOVEMBER 12th**
Lesson content: Warm up: teacher lead Q & A session; Revised course schedule; Pairwork: Find hanashi kotoba & change to kaki kotoba using Ch. 5 Kaiwa #3 ; Ch. 5 Kaiwa #3 lesson; Return Test Ch. 3 & 4 & review answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words per utterance</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOVEMBER 19th**
Lesson content: Collects intei reflection discussion; Pairwork: Interview Reflection Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words per utterance</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOVEMBER 26th**
Lesson content: Directions to building for interview activity; Final Exam outline; kanji quiz; vocab quiz; Ch.5 Kaiwa #2 lesson, Grammar practice: ‘x’ ni wa ikanai; Adobaisu wo ataeru\(^6\) handout discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words per utterance</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^5\) Kaiwa sections have dialogues. There are three or four dialogues in each chapter.

\(^6\) Adobaisu wo ataeru = Giving advice
both instructors have average percentages that are very similar in all three language use categories. The combined average (see Table 4.3) for both instructors with regard to the ratio of language use is: Japanese (80.0%), English (15.3%), and mixed (4.7%).

With respect to word count for Ms. Inoue’s lectures (see Table 4.2), the average Japanese utterance consisted of 6.3 words, the average English utterance consisted of 6.6 words, and the average mixed utterance was 11.6 words. As illustrated in the examples in Table 4.1, mixed utterances, compared to utterances in only one language, were usually used for explanations involving complex grammar structures or unknown vocabulary and for negotiating the text and therefore, on average, resulted in longer utterances. Ms. Yabuno’s combined average of these sessions is: Japanese (80%), English (16%), mixed (5%), and the average word count for a Japanese utterance is 4.3 words, an English utterance is 5.9 words, and a mixed utterance is 11.4 words. (See Table 4.3.) The combined word count average (see Table 4.3) for each type of utterance was 4.2 words for Japanese, 6.0 words for English, and 11.3 words for mixed. In Ms. Inoue’s language use summary, sessions that have more grammar and test content related lessons (i.e., November 12, 2002 class) had much more English language use (25.6% English use) compared to other dates in which this did not occur (i.e., November 19, 2002 with 3.8% English use).

The average percentage of each language type used over the four sessions illustrates that Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno used almost the exact same ratio of Japanese, English, and, mixed utterances in both their classes. This is interesting in that, despite the fact that the Japanese language program at WCU has no official departmental language policy, both instructors used a high ratio of Japanese (comparable to that reported by
Table 4.3  Language Use Summary for Ms. Yabuno

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL FOUR SESSIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOVEMBER 4th**
Lesson content: *Kanji Quiz*; test announcement; Pairwork: role-play, talk about weekend using *aizuchi*; *Kaiwa #1* listening, oral vs written speech lesson, grammar point: *bestu ni ‘x’ arimasen*, Culture Notes discussion on responding to compliments

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOVEMBER 12th**
Lesson content: return & go over *kanji* quiz with T.A.; Admin re: term schedule; Ch. 5 *Kaiwa #1* lesson, grammar point: ‘*x* ni ki ga tsuku’; Return Test Ch. 3 & 4 & review answers

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOVEMBER 19th**
Lesson content: Discussion: interview reflections, pairwork: interview reflection composition, composition test outline

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOVEMBER 26th**
Lesson content: Grammar lesson: ‘*x* ni wa ikamai’, Lecture: Ch. 5 *Kaiwa #2* lesson; *Adobaisu wo attaeru* handout discussion, Pairwork: Oral: practice Advice handout questions; Oral exam scheduling details; Pairwork: Oral exam practice session

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Polio and Duff (1994) for Japanese classes); the JFL instructors are free to use as much or as less TL as they, individually, choose to use and yet both instructors’ use of language was very similar. Even though the intermediate JFL instructors had met before the

---

7 Back-channeling cue (e.g., Oh really? Is that right? Oh! Wow! Uhuh).
academic year began and agreed to use as much Japanese language as possible, this agreement was quite informal and each instructor was left to interpret and act upon this decision as they wanted.

[For] 200 level, we had a meeting at the beginning and ah we decided that we should use Japanese as much as possible. All of us. ... It's ah second year students. They know the basic grammar and ah they don't have much exposure to Japanese other than the classroom. That's the basic reason. (Yabuno, Interview, November, 2002).  

This principle is also echoed by Ms. Inoue, who commented that, for the 200 levels, “I talked with other teachers who are also teaching the same course and we decided to speak as much as Japanese in class, so in that sense we are trying to speak Japanese intentionally in class.” (Interview, November, 2002).

In addition, both instructors used English and code-switching in their teaching of Japanese language. Even from before the term began, it was clear that the instructors were aware that teaching intermediate level Japanese would involve the use of English.

Of course we knew that some students will be really uncomfortable just, you know, being exposed to Japanese because most of the students finished their 100 level in here, and for the 100 level courses, teachers, we know that teachers, any teachers, are using more English than Japanese... So, so we talked about this but we hoped that even the students who are not confident in communication or listening ... ability, they could, we knew that they would feel uncomfortable at the beginning but they would be, they would get used to all this environment.... So, um, I anyway I and many other teacher, too, try to make them feel comfortable first of all, and then we hope that they could get used to listening to only Japanese and then also to find out solutions, what they could do if they don't understand, or they could guess what we are saying, and I also told them some important things I would say in English not in Japanese so that they can feel a little bit more comfortable probably. (Ms. Inoue, Interview, November, 2002)

From comments such as this, it was apparent that language choice was influenced by many variables such as student confidence, classroom atmosphere, and teaching methods.

---

8 All instructor and student interviews were conducted in English.
at beginner levels. When asked about their thoughts on Japanese-only policy in a foreign
language setting, Ms. Inoue commented about the challenges of teaching in Japanese only:

I don't really like Japanese-only policy because, as I said, [for] some
important announcement I don't think that we should speak in Japanese, or,
some grammar probably, because they, students have to comprehend.
And for the comprehension they need language [that] they know. So, still
for the 200 level, they are still in the stage of like a really improving from
first level to [a] more advanced level. So, some students are not really
strong in terms of speaking and listening especially [because] they are
only in Canada; they don't really have friends to practice their Japanese.
(Interview, November, 2002)

From the students' learning perspective, Ms. Yabuno explains:

I think in my class it doesn't have to be Japanese only. And if, first of all
if it takes a long, long time for students to communicate in Japanese to
each other and if there's some kind of misunderstanding, well it is good if
they can overcome that and they can use some strategies and then
communicate, that's great, but if that's ((i.e., communicating in Japanese))
the purpose of the class then I think it's great to use Japanese but for
trying to you know to teach them certain function and stuff. So, to make it
more effective I think it's good to use English sometimes when it's
necessary.... Between the students. (Interview, November, 2002)

From these comments, it seems that Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno favoured the Optimal
Use position, which states that their preferred teaching method incorporates as much TL
as possible while also acknowledging the benefits of the L1 in learning the FL.

The relatively high amount of TL may have been influenced by several factors. First,
because both instructors are native speakers of Japanese and have studied English as their
second language, this may have influenced the choice of language, resulting in a lower
use of English and higher use of Japanese, although this inference cannot be confirmed
by the present data. Furthermore, my physical presence in the classrooms and the
influence of the tape-recorded sessions may have affected the language use ratio. Since
both instructors commented about trying to use as much Japanese as possible, it would
not be surprising if the instructors tried to use more of the TL than they would regularly. Lastly, since both teachers were aware of the purpose of the study and are both recent graduates from coursework in the field of second language teaching, it would not be surprising if they consciously made efforts to speak more Japanese than usual. However, from my personal comparison of the twelve classes (per instructor) of observations previous to any data collection, and the fourteen classes (per instructor) that audio recording and observations of classes were done, there was no apparent difference in lesson delivery.

Table 4.4 Language Use Averages for All Four Sessions: Focal Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words per utterance</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Inoue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words per utterance</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Yabuno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words per utterance</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to the word count, although it appears that the Japanese utterances tended to be shorter, it needs to be mentioned that due to the nature of the Japanese being an agglutinative language, utterances that have lower or identical word counts may in fact be longer or shorter than its English equivalent when translated into English. Examine the following examples in Table 4.5. The length and quantity of the utterances has also been influenced by textbook or handout texts since, for example, teachers’ repetition of textbook dialogue excerpts and handout questions, mostly in Japanese, has also been
included in the total number of utterances and word counts. Despite the various influences on TL and English output, there was still access to a great quantity of TL input for students.

Table 4.5  Comparison of Japanese Utterance and its Equivalent in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese utterance</th>
<th>Number of Japanese words</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Number of English words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motto muzukashii bun ni shite kudasai.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Please make it into a more difficult sentence.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nihonjin desu.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is a Japanese person.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mixed category of utterances of both instructors revealed that utterances using code-switching were twice to two-and-a-half times as long as the English and Japanese utterances. This would help explain the function of intra-utterance code-switching; it was used for the most part for explaining complex concepts or for functions that would require use of language which the students did not know in the TL. (See Table 4.1.) Explanations of grammar and sentence structure or for conducting administrative duties such as exam outline and announcements were the most common purposes for which these code-switching techniques were used.

4.3  Instructors’ Perceptions of Japanese and English Use

The amount of TL and English use actually used in the classroom often did not reflect the amount of language the teachers thought they were using or were ideally trying to use. Although all the teachers who were interviewed found it most favourable to use as much Japanese as possible, the teachers also mentioned that, for a variety of reasons, it was not realistically possible to conduct the entire lesson in only the TL. Section 4.3 will
address Research Question #1b: What are the instructors’ own perceptions about the ratio of Japanese use to English use?

4.3.1 Instructors’ Perceptions

On average (see Table 4.4), the eight instructors perceived themselves to be using about 61% Japanese and 39% English in their intermediate level JFL classes (except for instructor Tanaka who taught JSL in Japan) although the perceived Japanese and English language use responses ranged from 20-80%. Ms. Murakami, who was the only instructor to report using less than 50% Japanese and more than 50% English even though she favoured the Optimal Use Position, commented that the nature of the course forced her to use a lot of English.

With the schedule we have [and] as many chapters we have to cover, ah the lecture itself is mostly geared for grammar explanation. And that’s about eighty per cent time. And the twenty per cent, I’d like to squeeze into activities: pairwork. So they can at least use Japanese to each other... With the schedule we have, yes, it’s very difficult. Yeah. No matter how good the textbook is the students want some explanation why we’re using this form instead of that form... [So, I use] a lot of English, unfortunately. (Murakami, Interview, November, 2002)

Of these eight, one instructor mentioned that she would prefer to have a Japanese-only language policy at WCU. Instructor Young, who has (and is the only one to have) a graduate degree in teaching JSL, claimed that, given the chance, she would choose the Direct Method. However, since students’ attitudes reflected the thinking that, “We’re in Canada anyways, so what’s the use?” and “Why do we have to speak all Japanese? We’re in Canada.” (italics show instructor emphasis), Ms. Young had decided to not use the Direct Method at WCU even though she thought (and was the only one to think so) it was possible to teach the intermediate JFL classes all in Japanese.
Moreover, instructor Murakami explained that the Direct Method might have been possible if the number of students were decreased to an ideal number of twelve because with a class of thirty, it would be difficult to interact with each individual student to ensure that the entire class understood the language lesson. Nevertheless, in her opinion, with the composition of the classes as they were and with the majority of the students coming from Asia, the Direct Method might not have been such a good idea since her experience told her that Asian students seemed to be afraid to raise their hands to ask for help when they did not understand. For both these instructors, the teaching of grammar seemed the most challenging aspect of teaching in Japanese.

Table 4.6 Perceived Use of TL and English by Instructors for Intermediate JFL Classes

| Instructor | Role            | Japanese (%) | English (%) | Apparent Philosophy On L1 Use
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inoue</td>
<td>focal instructor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Optimal Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yabuno</td>
<td>focal instructor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Optimal Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murakami</td>
<td>other instructor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Maximal Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>other instructor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Optimal Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>other instructor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Maximal Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitamura</td>
<td>other instructor</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Optimal Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasaki</td>
<td>other instructor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Optimal Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanaka</td>
<td>other instructor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maximal Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of two focal instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Maximal Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of other instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Optimal Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of all instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Optimal Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, among these instructors the decision to use Japanese or English seemed to be mostly affected by what was being communicated to the students and, therefore, the prevailing reason for resorting to English had to do with (1) concerns about the

---

9 This represents what I felt was their preferred personal philosophy on L1 use as interpreted from their interviews. Although Ms. Murakami and Ms. Young seemed to support the Maximal Use Position, in the context of teaching JFL at WCU, they felt that the most effective approach was the Optimal Use Position (despite the fact the Ms. Murakami’s self-reported use of the TL was only 20%)
effectiveness of the lesson in terms of comprehension by students (especially of grammatical concepts) and (2) the restrictive time allocated to the course. (See Section 4.4.1.) As Ms. Chen explained, her use of English was influenced by:

time constraints, that's a practical reason, and in order to teach form. Ah, it's useful.... It's actually more efficient and effective [to use] English to teach like grammar ... [and I] need to explain ...more complex structures: relative clauses, subordinate clauses, and so on. Student[s] will understand very easily, and quickly if you can explain to them in English and then [we can] move on to do some activities in Japanese. So it's not worth wasting, you know, ... too much time in explaining grammar or trying to use the target language [to teach it]. (Interview, December, 2002)

Similarly, Ms. Young commented that

I specifically want [to use] ... English in giving important grammar points, yeah, because when I use everything in Japanese there's this tendency [for students] to misunderstand what I'm saying, especially [with respect to] language, you know, so basically that's the only thing [that] I want to use English. Other than that I want to use everything in Japanese. (Interview, November, 2002)

Later in the chapter, reasons behind instructors' language choice and use will be examined in further detail in order to provide a more thorough understanding of the multifaceted nature of language use in the JFL classroom.

4.3.2 Focal Instructors' Perceptions

Ms. Inoue perceived her L1-L2 balance to be 80% Japanese and 20% English.

This is almost identical to the results from the classroom lectures that revealed that Ms. Inoue did actually use 81% Japanese and 15% English. As for Ms. Yabuno, she thought she was using 60% Japanese and 40% English when in fact she used about 79% Japanese and 16% English. The discrepancy between what teachers think they are doing versus what is actually occurring in the classroom is representative of what other studies have reported (e.g., Liu et al., 2004). However, instead of over-estimating the use of the TL as
in most studies, the teachers in the present study under-estimated their use of the TL. As mentioned previously, many factors may account for the high percentage of TL use. The most obvious influence of an increase in TL ratio would be the incorporation of Japanese utterances read and repeated directly from textbook, handouts, or overhead transparencies.

Since most of the intermediate-level instructors admitted to using a lot more English at the beginner level, it would only be natural for some English to still be part of the JFL learning environment and this is reflected in the comments made by both focal instructors. At the pre-semester informal meeting between intermediate level JFL teachers, the teachers discussed the issue of TL and English use. This probably became an issue because, as many teachers mentioned in their interviews, a high ratio of English was being used to teach Japanese at the beginner level. The overall consensus was that they would make a commitment to use as much TL as possible. This implies that there would be some use of English, although preference would be given to the use of TL in most cases as was suggested at this informal pre-semester meeting. As Ms. Yabuno explained:

> when I explain grammar or some complicated things [at the intermediate level] ah the students have to understand; then, I use English so that they will understand for sure. And, also some announcement[s], if it’s complicated then it has to be read in English... When time is pressing, I have to switch to English so that they’ll just understand when I say something just once. (Interview, November, 2002)

Since both teachers acknowledged the use of English in their JFL classes, it was interesting to learn that the actual ratio of languages used in the class did not greatly differ from the self-reported L1/L2 ratio in both Ms. Inoue’s and Ms. Yabuno’s classes.
4.3.3 Perceptions of Focal Instructors’ Students

For the two classes in which data were specifically collected, the students of the two focal instructors who volunteered to be interviewed also commented on their own perception of the balance of English and Japanese used in their classes. The range of perceived Japanese and English language use for Ms. Inoue was from 5-50% and 50-92%, respectively. The averages among these eight students were 30% for English, and 70% for Japanese use. The responses from the 13 students interviewed from Ms. Yabuno’s class ranged from 15-30% for English language use and 70-85% for Japanese language use. The averages are 28% for English and 72% for Japanese use. The total average for students of both classes is English (29%) and Japanese (71%).

The students in Ms. Inoue’s class, on average, perceived the Japanese ratio to be 10% less than what was reported by Ms. Inoue: Ms Inoue perceived her Japanese use was 80% while her students thought it was closer to 70%. However, the students in Ms. Yabuno’s class perceived the Japanese ratio to be 10% more than what their teacher thought. Interestingly, students in both classes perceived the ratio to be quite similar, despite being taught by different teachers who, individually, reported either 10% less or 10% more than what their students claimed.

Most students made positive comments when asked to comment and reflect on the balance of language use by their instructors. Some examples include:

Brad: “Twenty [%] English, which I think is fine. I think it help me. It improve my listening skills because she said she speaks a lot of Japanese. Yeah, so I think it helps.”

---

10 Many students were not native English speakers and their English has not been edited for grammaticality below and elsewhere in the thesis.
Diana: "I would say, well, she speaks a lot of Japanese but at the same time she knows when to like explain things in English." "It would be better if um she could if there were more time, okay, for the class and it would be better if she speaks more Japanese.

Justin: "I'd say it's (the ratio) probably about right for me. ... She knows, you know, sort of where to go with it. And I can see that a lot of people in the class have no problem. They follow her most of the times. ... A lot of them can answer her questions, you know."

Table 4.7 Perceived Use of TL and English of Instructors by Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor: Ms. Yabuno</th>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Japanese Language Use (%)</th>
<th>English Language Use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gabriella</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miho</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwan</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor: Ms. Inoue</th>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Japanese Language Use (%)</th>
<th>English Language Use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendi</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Average for Both Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese Language Use (%)</th>
<th>English Language Use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Isabella: “I think she tries to speak more Japanese as much as possible unless we don’t understand.” “I’m fine [with this balance].”

Of the 21 students who were interviewed, only one student had something negative to say:

Phil: “I wish she could speak more English so we can understand better. Sometime she speaks a lot; too fast. I really have a hard time.”

From the student responses, the balance of Japanese and English used by Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno seems to be satisfactory and although the ratio of the languages still seemed to be at a challenging level, students did not appear to be discouraged by this. The instructors were able to respond to student needs by adjusting the amount of TL use when students felt uncomfortable or could not understand. Other intermediate-level JFL instructors who were using much lower levels of the TL or did not want to or could not use high levels of the TL might find these student comments encouraging. On the other hand, Phil’s comment revealed that teachers were perhaps not modifying their TL use sufficiently to facilitate students’ comprehension and that is an area that deserves more attention as well.

4.4 Ratio of Japanese, English and Use of Other Languages by Students

This section will cover Research Question #1c: What is the relative ratio of Japanese, English and Chinese use by students in JFL classrooms? As mentioned earlier, WCU’s Japanese program had no official language use policy. The teachers were able to interpret and implement their unofficial decision to use “as much Japanese as possible.” This attitude was also evident in the language use by students, as they were never explicitly told to use Japanese only or to avoid using English or any other first, second or third languages such as Mandarin, Cantonese or Korean. During my two-month
classroom observations, I never heard the instructor force or even encourage students to use the TL although it was an implied expectation when the task involved direct practice of the TL, especially during oral practice tasks. Since oral tasks tended to be short (between 2 to 7 minutes) and structured (e.g., using the textbook or handout as a guide), students were able to stay on-task by using the TL the majority of the time. However, tasks involving writing, in particular composition-writing tasks, involved an increase in language use other than the TL. The data reveals that the ratio of language used during pair work tasks were as follows: Japanese (42%), L1 (English or Chinese) (50%), and mixed (a combination of English, Japanese and/or Chinese) (7%). However, during oral tasks, the TL ratio was clearly higher: Japanese (70%), L1 (28%), and mixed (2%). The data support the observation that writing tasks increased the amount of collaborative dialogue involving L1 and mixed utterances while decreasing the amount of TL use, whereas oral tasks had the opposite effect. Here are two typical examples excerpts of student pairwork tasks. The task for Excerpt 4.1 involved writing a reflective composition after conducting interviews with Japanese international exchange students.

The task for Excerpt 4.2 was to practice the function of praising while having a conversation about family members. Translations follow utterances in curly brackets.

The native languages of the students are provided at the end of excerpt titles.

**Excerpt 4.1**  
**Interview reflection composition task (Miho: HLL, Sheri: Chinese)**

1. Sheri: We have to write like three paragraphs. (laughs)

2. Miho: We can write this class is everyday or something. We can just write ++. (laughs)

3. Sheri: I don’t know. I think she said about like she taking something about cultural + like the only class that’s all in English is cultural="
4. Miho: Oh yeah, it’s um + it’s Arts I think it’s called Arts Studies but it’s like um + Asia it’s like + it’s like Canadian Asian + I think cultural I think +.

5. Sheri: Is it business and + (xxx).

6. Miho: Okay. Um + ((laughs uncomfortably)) Um. ((mumbles something))

7. Sheri: (xx).

8. Miho: How about like the hardest class she is taking is + that because it is all in English? Does that make like=

9. Sheri: ((laughs)) Kind of like I wrote kind of like in another ++.

10. Miho: That’s okay. It means the same thing, right?

11. Sheri: ((mumbles as she reads what they have written thus far)) +++

12. Miho: Okay, yeah so. Yeah so we can write like Kanako-san no ichiban muzukashii ka-, kamoku is like course? {Kanako’s most difficult sub-, ‘kamoku’ is like ‘course’?}

13. Sheri: Um, subject.

14. Miho: Subject. Kamoku wa. {Subject is} + I think it’s called yeah um did she say what it’s called? I think it’s Art Studies.

15. Miho: She said something cultural.


(Pairwork, November 19, 2002)

Excerpt 4.2  Role-play: Talk about weekend and practice using aizuchi
(Isabella: Korean; Gabriella: Cantonese)

1. Isabella: [Okay ((laughs)) Ah + senshu no doyoubi ni watashi wa tomodachi to ah KFC ni + it-te hirugohan wo tabe-ta ato de kankoku no eiga wo mimashita. {Ah + this past Saturday, I with my friends ah we we-nt to ah KFC and after we a-te lunch we watched a Korean movie.}

2. Gabriella: Oh, sou desu ka. {Oh, is that so?}

3. Isabella: Hai. Eiga wa tottemo ah + omoshirokatta desu. {Yup. The movie was very ah + it was very entertaining.}
4. Gabriella: +++ *Sou desu ka.* (both laugh) {Is that, right?}

5. Isabella: Ah + *nichiyoubi ni wa + tomodachi ni* ((particle choice error; should be to)) *TWU ni itte shukudai wo shimashita.* {Ah + on Sunday + friend ((dative marker)) went to TWU and did homework.}

6. Gabriella: +++ Oh. *Sou na n desu ka.* {Oh. Is that so?}

7. Isabella: *Tomodachi ga atarashii hito wo watashi ni shoukai wo shite kuremashita.* {My friend introduced a new person to me.}

8. Gabriella: *Sou desu ka.* {Is that right?}

9. Isabella: + Ah ++ Ah + (xxx). *Atode + tomodachi to karaoke ni itte + ah + uchi ni ++ ah uchi ni +=* {After that + I went to karaoke with my friends + ah + home ++ ah home ((dative marker))+=}

10. Gabriella: =*Sore wa yikkata desu* ((rising intonation)). {=That was great.}

(Pairwork, November 4, 2002)

As evident from these typical excerpts, composition writing tasks involved more negotiation of the content and the language structures and, therefore, resulted in more use of English, whereas the oral conversation tasks involved more interaction in the TL and less negotiation of content and language was necessary because students usually used a model text to guide them through these type of tasks.

In the both JFL classes, the teacher did not discourage the use of other languages by students, and students used other languages without much hesitation. Both Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno knew that their students were using other languages, such as English, Mandarin, Cantonese and Korean. Ms. Inoue’s comment reflects of the teachers’ attitude towards students’ L1, L2 and, even, L3 use:

I don’t mind they’re speaking whatever languages they like, in Chinese, or English, of course. Japanese, I don’t mind, and I kinda notice that ... some stronger students prefer or tend to speak or try to speak Japanese, but
probably other students don't really want to speak in Japanese because they're not really confident and or they don't know how to express so they tend to speak back in English [@] or Chinese... I don't mind. ... For smaller groupworks, the most important thing is anyway they share their opinion and they brainstorm. (Interview, November, 2002)

4.4.1 Classroom Lectures

During classroom lectures, which were teacher-fronted, there was very little student-teacher interaction. Student-talk comprised only 12.6% of all utterances over the four sessions in which data was analyzed, while teacher-talk dominated: 87.4%. The majority of the student-talk consisted of Japanese use (73.7%) with some English use (25.8%). In addition, almost no use of code-switching occurred during the lecture sessions.

Table 4.8 Language Use by Students during Classroom Lectures (All Four Sessions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of utterances by students (total for session n=5602)</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>520 (9.3%)</td>
<td>182 (3.2%)</td>
<td>4 (0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words per utterance</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ratio of utterances by students as percentage</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ratio of utterances by students as percentage of total</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1.1 Japanese Language Use

Although there seemed to be a high ratio of Japanese language use by the students, much of this did not involve any creative use¹¹ of the language. The Japanese uttered by students consisted mainly of repetition of teacher utterances (see Excerpt 4.3), responding

¹¹ "Creative language use involves the recombination of familiar elements (words, structures, and prefabricated patterns) in new ways to produce utterances that have never been produced before by that particular individual (for that individual. They are therefore unique).” (Nunan, 1999, p. 77)
to teacher led question-and-answer tasks (see Excerpt 4.4), and referring to information directly from the textbook, handouts (e.g., re-enactment of a role-play scenario) (see Excerpt 4.5) and kanji flashcards (see Excerpt 4.6). Furthermore, the majority of student-talk was initiated by the teacher and, therefore, the language choice for responses was in large part under the control of the instructor. As Ms. Yabuno points out, "I think when I want my students to talk back in Japanese I think I should talk to them in Japanese. It’s more natural. If I ask them in English and if I expect them to speak back in Japanese it’s kind of strange" (Interview, November, 2002). As a result, since the instructors used the TL about 80% of the time during the lectures, it is not surprising that student utterances would also result in high frequencies of Japanese.

Excerpt 4.3 Repetition of teacher utterances


2. Students: Motte iru. {To have ((speech style)).}

3. Yabuno: Motte ru. {To have ((written style))}

4. Students: Motte ru. {To have ((written style))}

5. Yabuno: Kore wa ii desu ne. Chotto wa chotto desu ne. Nimai arimasu keredomo. {This is good. ‘Chotto’ is ‘chotto’, isn’t it? ‘Nimai arimasu keredomo’;}

6. Students: Nimai arimasu keredomo. {However ((written style)), there are two sheets.}

7. Yabuno: Nimai arimasu ga. {However ((speech style)), there are two sheets.}
8. Students: *Nimai arimasu ga.* {However ((speech style)), there are two sheets.}

9. Yabuno: *Nimai arimasu kedo.* {However ((speech style)), there are two sheets.}

10. Students: *Nimai arimasu kedo.* {However ((speech style)), there are two sheets.}

11. Yabuno: *Ee, ‘ne’ wa ii desu ne. Nani wo shite irassharu no.* {Um, ‘ne’ is fine, isn’t it? “Nani wo shite irassharu no.”}

12. Students: *Nani wo shite irassharu no.* {What are you doing ((written style; honorific form))?}

(Classroom Lecture, Yabuno, November 4, 2002)

**Excerpt 4.4 Responding to teacher led Question-and-Answer task**

1. Inoue: *Ja, kazoku nan desu keredomo, Jaison no kazoku dare ga imasu ka. Otoo-san, okaa-san= {Okay, about their family, who’s part of Jason’s family?=}

2. Students: =Onii-san. {=Older brother.}

3. Inoue: *Onii-san. {Older brother.}

4. Students: *Imouto. {Younger sister.}

5. Inoue: *Imouto-san + desu ne. Sore to Jaison. Dakara, gonin kazoku desu ne. Jaa, more information. Sukoshizutsu diiteeru kikimasu keredomo. Otoo-san wa donna hito desu ka. {Younger sister, + right? And Jason. And so, it’s a family of five, isn’t it? Okay, more information. I’m going to ask you details little by little. What kind of person is his father?}

6. Yuan: *Se ga takai. {Tall.}


8. Ron: *Daigaku= {University=}

9. Inoue: =Daigaku + de [oshiete iru. {=Teaches [at + a university.}

10. Ron: *[Oshiete imasu. {is teaching at.}
11. Inoue:  
Un, daigaku de oshiete imasu ne. Nani wo oshiete ru n desu ka. {Mhm, 
is teaching at a university, right? What is (he) teaching?}

12. Students:  
Amerikashi. {U.S. history.}

13. Inoue:  
Amerikashi. Amerika no rekishi. Amerikashi desu ne. {U.S. history, 
The history of the United States. American history, right?}

(Classroom Lecture, Inoue, November 4, 2002)

Excerpt 4.5 Referring to information from a ‘Responding to Praise’ handout

1. Yabuno:  
Aa, kawaii ojyou-san no koto. {Oh, what a cutie ((i.e., to a girl))!}

2. Students:  
Iie, tomdemonai. {No way!}

3. Yabuno:  
Ma, sugoi kooto. Takakatta deshou. {Wow, what a fabulous coat!
Expensive, wasn't it?}

4. Students:  
Iie, honno yasui mono yo ho ho ho. {((laughs)) No, it's quite a 
cheap thing, you know, ha ha ha.}

5. Yabuno:  
Ho ho ho te (x). ((Students laugh)) Kore ano otoko no hito wa 
tsukawanai desu yo ne. (xx) dakara ne. Onna no hito no speechi 
desu ne. Hai. + E ga ojyouzu desu ne. {'Ho ho ho' is (x). This um 
men don't use (this), do they? It's because of (xx), right? It's 
female speech, isn’t it? Okay. + (You're) such a good painter!}

6. Students:  
Iie, sore hodo demo. {No, not really.}

7. Yabuno:  
Sore hodo demo. {Not really.}

8. Students:  
Sore hodo demo. {Not really.}

9. Yabuno:  
Ii oheya desu ne. {What a nice place!}

10. Students:  
Iie, tonde mo arimasen. {No, no way!}

11. Yabuno:  
Tonde mo arimasen. {No way!}

12. Students:  
Tonde mo arimasen. {No way!}

(Classroom Lecture, Yabuno, November 4, 2002)
Excerpt 4.6  Referring to Information from Kanji Flashcards

1. T.A.:  Kore wa nan deshou.  {What is this?}
2. Students:  Soudan.  {Consult.}
3. T.A.:  Imi wa.  {Definition?}
4. Randy:  Consult.
5. Lana:  Consult.
6. T.A.:  Consult.  Sou desu ne.  + De, chotto + kyou jikan ga nai n de eeto hyaku ni peeji wo akete kudasai.  De, eetoitsu mo douri issho ni yomimashou.  Konkai wa juurokuban made.  Jimuin.  {That's right. + And, + we don't really have time today and so please open to page 102. Okay, let's read together like always. This time (we'll do) until #16. Office.}
7. Students:  Jimuin.  {Office.}
8. T.A.:  Tate mono.  {Building.}
9. Students:  Tate mono.  {Building.}
10. T.A.:  Genkan.  {Foyer.}
11. Students:  Genkan.  {Foyer.}
12. T.A.:  Hari gami.  {Poster.}
13. Students:  Hari gami.  {Poster.}

(Classroom Lecture, Inoue, November 19, 2002)

These excerpts exemplify the three key points. First, they show how the teacher dominates the interaction and how her questions lead the students to answer in Japanese. Although the students could answer in English, it would seem inappropriate and unnatural; there is an implied expectation that the students will respond in Japanese and that they are being socialized into such practices. Secondly, the responses elicited by the teacher do not require the student to use Japanese creatively. They simply need to access...
the required Japanese words and phrases and reproduce or repeat this information for the instructor. When students attempt to make any creative use of Japanese, the utterances tend to be short and the exchanges do not last more than a few lines. Excerpt 4.7 presents one example. It involves Todd, whose past experience with Japanese includes working a couple of years in Japan. Todd’s answers are atypical (Lines 2, 4 and 10) because of their creativity or unpredictability (double underlines were added to emphasize the areas of creative use of language) yet the content of the responses all involve items learned at an intermediate level and resembles genuine, meaningful communication.

Excerpt 4.7 Grammar lesson: ‘x’ ni nite iru (‘to resemble ‘x’’)

1. Inoue: *Ja, Todd-san wa + onii-san ga iru n desu tte, iru n desu tte.* {Then, Todd + (you) said you’ve an older brother, (you) said you have (one)?}

2. Todd: *Onii-san to- aniki to otouto.* {An older brother and, older brother and a younger brother.}

3. Inoue: *Ja, Todd-san wa onii-san ni nite imasu ka.* {And so, Todd, do you resemble your older brother?}

4. Todd: *Zenzen nite imasen.* {I don’t resemble (him), not at all.}

5. Inoue: *Zenzen nite imasen. Sou desu ka. Ja, otouto-san wa Todd-san ni nite imasu ka.* {Don’t resemble at all. Is that, right? So, does your younger brother resemble you, Todd?}

6. Todd: *(x).*

7. Inoue: *Docchi ni mo nite imasen. Sou desu ka. Yobkata desu ka.* ((laughs)) {Doesn’t resemble either. Is that so. That’s good, is it?}

8. Todd: *Aaaa.* {Oh!}

9. Inoue: *Aaaa.* {Oh!}

10. Todd: *Betsu ni.* {Not particularly.}
Thirdly, opportunities for genuine student-teacher interaction are very limited. Students seldom are initiators of interactions and teachers appear to leave little room for student-initiated discussions or questions. For the most part, student participation is restricted to responding to requests made and commands given by their instructors. Therefore, this, again, limits the amount of Japanese and English students could have potentially accessed or used during the lectures. Overall, student-talk, as revealed by the data, was characterized by 1) a high ratio of TL use; 2) non-creative talk; and, 3) minimal student-initiated interaction.

4.4.1.2 English Language Use

With respect to English language use, the data from the classroom lecture show that the students’ use of English was also to a great extent determined by the teacher. For example, students tended to use English to reply to requests for translations and when instructors posed questions in English. The following two excerpts help illustrate this point. The first excerpt is from Ms. Yabuno’s November 4, 2002 class (underlining was added to draw attention to key sections). During this part of the lecture, the instructor was reviewing parts of a conversation text from the textbook using an overhead transparency and asking for translation of certain terminology.

**Excerpt 4.8 Grammar lesson: bestu ni ‘x’ nai (‘not particularly’)**

1. Yabuno: Not right. *Sou desu yo ne. {That’s right, isn’t it?} ((laughs)) Negatibu desu yo ne. {It’s negative, right?} ((Ss laugh)) Kono goro {Around now} without this + “bestu ni” ga nakattara {if there was no ‘bestu ni’} it’s not there + reason
ne. It’s not special reason. + Desu yo ne. {Right?} ‘Betsu ni’ + has a meaning of nani? {what?}

2. Students: Not particularly.

3. Yabuno: Not particularly. Sou desu yo ne. {That’s right, isn’t it?} So this is an adverb. Betsu ni mezurashiku arimasen. ++. De kore wa + used with negative. Mezurashiku arimasen. ++. Li desu ne. Mezurashii, i-adjective desu. Mezurashiku arimasen desu ne. De wa, kondo wa mou ichido teepu wo kikimasu. Kondo wa hanashi no naiyou + hanashi no naiyou kangaenagara teepu wo kiite kudasai. Naiyou tte wakaru. {It is not particularly unusual. ++ And this is + used with negative. It’s not particularly unusual, is it? ++ That’s good, okay? Unusual, it an i-adjective. It’s not particularly unusual, is it? Then, next (we’re) will listen to the tape once more. Now, the content of the story + while thinking about the content of the story, listen to the tape please.}

4. Students: ((no response))

5. Yabuno: Naiyou, Nan desu ka. {Content. What is it?}


7. Yabuno: Content. Sou desu ne. {That’s right, isn’t it?}

(Classroom lecture, November 4, 2002)

In this next excerpt, the students respond to the instructor’s request that is made in English.

Excerpt 4.9 Lesson: Chapter 5 Kaiwa #1

1. Yabuno: Nihyakuhachi gou shitsu desu yo. Genkan no doaa no soba ni hari gami ga shiteatta deshou. {Room 208, right? There was a poster near the entrance, wasn’t thee?} Did you notice that she ((i.e., on cassette tape)) used rising intonation here? ++. Hari gami ga shiteatta deshou. {There was a poster, wasn’t there?} ++. This rising intonation indicates?

2. Students: ++.

3. Yabuno: Shite atta deshou. {Was there, wasn’t it?}
During this part of the lesson, Ms. Yabuno asked the students to explain why there was rising intonation at the end of this sentence: *Genkan no doaa no soba ni hari gami ga shite atta deshou* {There was a poster near the entrance door, wasn’t there?}. Since Ms.
Yabuno asked the question using English, it invited students to respond, most naturally, in English. As Gabriella starts to guess in English, it sets an atmosphere for English language use. Even when the instructor switched to using Japanese part way through this part of the discussion, the students continued to answer in English until this aspect of the discussion came to a close. This was also found to be true in Polio and Duff’s (1994) study where teachers’ use of English set the stage for students to use English, too.

A third, common way that students used English was during administrative tasks. In these situations, the instructor usually began the interaction in English because these discussions often involved more complex terminology and seemed to be valued as important interactions and, therefore, the instructors appeared to change their language use for effectiveness and efficiency. In the following example in Ms. Inoue’s class, the instructor is addressing the oral exam. Although Ms. Inoue began addressing the topic of the oral exam in Japanese, she quickly switched to English (see Line 1). This set a precedent for English language use for this particular topic.

**Excerpt 4.10 Oral exam announcement**

1. Inoue: Hai, chotto ii desu ka minasan. Ooraru eguzamu no + ororaru eguzamu no first paato wa I will tell you. It’s not just you pick the topic. I will ask you to talk about, “Okay, please talk about this.” {Okay, everyone. The oral exam’s first part I will tell you.}

2. Students: OH.

3. Inoue: Okay, that’s the first part. And then you say, based on the information you got from the ah interviewee, okay? And then the second part, is I ask you more specific questions and then you answer. ++.

4. Lana: Are the topics similar to the sakubun/tesuto no topikku? {topic of the composition/test?}
5. Inoue: Ah, ah, ah I don’t know. ((Ss laugh)) I cannot say yes or no. You can, you can have this paper, you can have this sheet with you.

6. Lana: Seriously?


8. Lana: Oh, really?


10. Lana: (xxx) memorize (xx).

11. Inoue: No. No. No. Sorry, no. I’m sorry, no. You cannot. You cannot have this sheet [but you can take a look at this + ‘til the last minute, okay, entering the room.

12. Students: [Aw. ((laughs))]

13. Inoue: I will ask other teachers again and then if you’re allowed to have this sheet I will let you know, okay? So you can this sheet but please study. Do not look at the sheet when you’re doing the exam. + ‘Til the last minute you can have take a look. ++.

(Classroom lecture, November 26, 2002)

These excerpts from the classroom lectures reveal that the instructor was a key factor with respect to the type of language uttered by the students. More often than not, it was the teacher influencing the students’ use of English rather than vice versa. This is probably so because both Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno are native speakers of Japanese and feel much more comfortable and natural speaking Japanese rather than using English, although when they felt it was necessary (e.g., tasks that are more linguistically demanding or of high importance such as grammar lessons or exam announcement) they code-switched.
In summary, the data show that students used Japanese when the task involves repetition of teacher utterances, answering teacher led question and answer tasks, and referring to information directly from textbook, handouts, and flashcards. Moreover, English was often used by students during requests for translations, answering questions or responding to discussion started in English by the teacher, and for administrative task related interactions.

4.4.2 Pairwork Tasks

Pairs selected for analysis were chosen to represent a variety of language pairs: English native speakers (Justin & Krista), heritage language learner & partner (Miho & various partners), Korean native speaker & Chinese native speaker (Isabella & various Chinese native partners), Mandarin native speakers (Phil & various partners; Johnny & Anna; Belinda & Joanna), and Cantonese native speakers (Cynthia & Madeleine).

Table 4.9 Pairwork Groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>L1 type</th>
<th>Total number of sessions recorded</th>
<th>Total number of minutes recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justin or Krista, and their various partners</td>
<td>English native speaker &amp; non-English native speaker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miho &amp; various partners</td>
<td>Heritage language speaker &amp; non-heritage speaker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella &amp; various partners</td>
<td>Korean native speaker &amp; non-Korean native speaker</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Phil & various partners
Johnny & Anna
Belinda & Joanna                     | Mandarin native speakers                        | 10                               | 94                              |
| Cynthia & Madeleine                 | Cantonese native speakers                       | 3                                | 39                              |
Data from the pair work were originally transcribed verbatim using a word processor and the counting of utterances was done in the same way as with the classroom lecture transcripts except that the language categories increased to seven to also include: Chinese (C), Japanese and Chinese (J&M), English and Chinese (E&C), and, Japanese, English and Chinese (J&E&C). After all the utterances were categorized, the sum for each language utterance was calculated for the individual dates, the individual pair groups, and for both pair groups and dates combined. This resulted in the ratio of English, Japanese and other languages used by the students. The word count for the pair work was the same as with the classroom lecture transcripts.

Student-talk during the pairwork tasks (including groups of two to five students) showed a drastic difference when compared with the ratio of language use during the classroom lectures. Japanese use (73.7%) during lectures consisted of a large portion of all the utterances spoken by students. However, this decreased dramatically during the pairwork sessions. Overall, Japanese use dropped to 47%, whereas the ratio of English (39%) and mixed (4%) utterances increased. Similar results were found in Levine’s (2003) study where a questionnaire based study, based on student beliefs (and not actual observations), revealed that the TL was used less by students than instructors. This was always the case except for when students interacted with instructors; when the interaction was between a student and their instructor, TL use increased.

Pairs in which the common L1 was English used more English (52%) than the TL (43%). As for Chinese students who were able to access both English and Chinese (e.g., Mandarin or Cantonese), these two languages combined were used on average about 38% of the time. Students who had access to Chinese used various combinations of mixed
utterances of Chinese (Japanese and Chinese; English and Chinese; and Japanese, English and Chinese) more than mixed utterances of Japanese and English. Overall, pairs who shared Chinese as a common language used more code-switching (8%) than those who only shared English (5%). The following excerpt illustrates the complexity in language use by students during a composition task.

**Excerpt 4.11 Writing task on topic of “My Country” (Phil, Joanna, Vivian, Joanna: Mandarin, Krista: English)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Joanna: Mandarin, Krista: English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amelia: The most important is tourism. Uuhh. ((laughs))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Phil: Tourism?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Joanna: Tourism [is kankou. {Tourism [is ‘kankou’}.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Phil: You can say famous + instead of important (x). +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese &amp; Mandarin</th>
<th>Joanna: Garden City is + the most important + you want to say that? Then just add it then!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Joanna: Gaaden machi ichiban taisetsu na, + ni xiang yao jiang ma? Na jiu, jia jingqu jiu hao le ba! {Garden City’s most important + you want to say that? Then just add it then!}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Phil:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Joanna:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Joanna: De= {((Particle de))=}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Phil: =No, no, no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Vivian: No, I’ve got=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandarin &amp; English</th>
<th>Phil:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Phil: Qianmian shi, yinggai shi + (x). Qianmian shi + (x). Bu shi, qianmian shi (xx) {In the beginning, it should be + (x). No, in the beginning (xx) is famous for what?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandarin &amp; English</th>
<th>Krista:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Krista: Gaaden machi wa +. {Garden City (topic marker wa)+.}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Phil: (x).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Vivian: How about the grammar, the grammar point?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Name of city had been replaced with pseudonym.
14. Phil: Yeah, *wa de* {((topic marker *wa*)) ((particle *de*))=}

15. Vivian: *Gaaden Machi wa* + *de*. {Garden City ((topic marker *wa*)) + ((particle *de*))=}

16. Phil: *Gaaden Machi wa* {Garden City is} ++ 'kay, what you wanna say? Famous for + fishing? Or=

17. Vivian: We can say Vancouver has a lot of salmon so + and tourism.

(Groupwork, November 5, 2002)

Another interesting point is that the average Japanese utterance by students decreased from 8.9 words during the lectures to 3.2 words during pairwork sessions. English utterances still were about 4 words in length and mixed utterances about 8 words. Whereas during the lectures, the students often only repeated or read off sentences from textbooks and handouts, pairwork interaction was more diverse and less structured. As a result, utterances did not always consist of entire sentences but consisted of just a few words or short phrases instead. Since English and mixed utterances were less predictable, the average length of the pairwork utterances seemed to have changed very little from those uttered during the lectures. The following excerpts illustrate typical interactions between student pairs. The first shows students interacting during an interview preparation task while the second excerpt is during a composition task. The third example will illustrate language use during an oral practice task.

Excerpt 4.12 Interview reflection composition task13 (Amelia: Mandarin, Krista: English)

1. Amelia: *Senkou wa nan desu ka.* + {What is (your) major? +}
2. Krista: And *dou-*? Why? *Dou shite + kono senkou wa=* {And *wh-*? Why? Why + this major ((topic marker *wa*))=}

3. Amelia: =Chose? (laughs))


5. Amelia: =Erabeta. {=Able to choose.}

6. Krista: *Erabeta? {=Able to choose?}

7. Amelia: To chose? +++ *Doushite += {To chose? +++ Why +=}

8. Krista: =Doushite. {=Why?}

9. Amelia: *Kono senkou wo=* {This major ((accusative marker *wo*))=}

10. Krista: Would it be *kono* or *sono* because= {Would it be this or that because=}

11. Amelia: =Sono. {=That.}

12. Krista: Sono. {That.}

13. Amelia: [Senkou wa +++]. {[Major ((topic marker *wa*)) +++.}

14. Krista: *Senkou wa +++ dou shite era-, erabi- (x)ta ka. {[Major ((topic marker *wa*)) +++ why did (you) cho-, choo- (x)?]


16. Krista: =Erabu. {=To choose.}

17. Amelia: Erabu. {To choose.}

18. Krista: Erabimasu ka. {Do (you) choose?}

19. Amelia: *E-ra-bi-ma-su-ka. {D-o (y-o-u) c-h-o-o-s-e?}

(Pairwork, November 15, 2002)

**Excerpt 4.13** Interview reflection composition task (Johnny & Anna: Mandarin)

1. Johnny: Okay. Ranhou jiu. {Then.}
2. Anna: *Nihon de wa, + right?* {In Japan}

3. Johnny: Uhuh. *Nihon de wa na jiu shi (x) nihon de wa (x) lots of quiz.* {In Japan that is (x) in Japan (x) lots of quiz.}

4. Anna: Mm. + Oh!

5. Johnny: Marketing=

6. Anna: =Or we can talk about like + *nihon de wa ichinenjuu* {in Japan all year long} like semester, two semester and she needs like some credits so she takes + this many courses.

7. Johnny: Um. +++

8. Anna: *(xxx) jiu mei de xie.* {*(xxx) nothing to write.*}


   So nice. {Yes (xx) first year. So easy ah.}

10. Anna: Per semester. *(xx) eh. Name tamen bi women duo a.* {*(xx) eh. Then they have more than us ah.*}

11. Johnny: Per semester?


13. Johnny: *Liang ge* semester. *Women ye shi liang ge* semester. {Two semesters. We also have two semesters.}

14. Anna: *Name mei ge term shiwu ge credits. Eh, shi ba? [San, san wu yishiwu.* {Then every term fifteen credits. Eh, right? [Three, three time five is fifteen.}

15. Johnny: *[Uh, bi women duo. Bi women duo.* {*[Uh, more than us. More than us.*}

16. Anna: Well depends on *(xx) course like four credits (x).*


(Pairwork, November 19, 2002)
Excerpt 4.14 Oral task: Talk using praise and *aizuchi* (Mandi: Chinese, Justin: English)

1. Justin: *Watashi no otouto wa Nathan desu.* {My younger brother is Nathan.}

2. Mandi: *Sou desu ka.* ((laughs)) {Is that, so?}

3. Justin: Nathan wa *totemo seikaku(x) te (x) ga arimasu.* {Nathan has a very (x) (x) personality.}

4. Mandi: *Sou na n desu ka.* ((laughs)) {Is that, right?}

5. Justin: *Sore kara Nathan wa nijuuisai* ((mispronounces nijuuissai)) *desu.* ((rising intonation)) {And also, Nathan is twenty-one}

6. Mandi: *Ee, sou desu ka.* {Oh really?}

7. Justin: *Demo + Nathan wa daigakusei ja arimasen.* [But + Nathan isn’t a university student.]

8. Mandi: *Sou na n desu ka. Sugoi desu ne.* ((laughs)) *Kawaii otouto desu ne.* ((J laughs)) {Is that, so? Wow. What a cute younger brother.}


(Pairwork, November 5, 2002)

As these excerpts illustrate, students can access a variety of languages and language combinations during their pair work tasks. Since students were not discouraged from using their L1, L2 or L3 along with the TL, they were free to use whatever language they felt most comfortable with interacting with their classmates: neither focal instructor told their students to “speak Japanese” when communicating in other languages. The findings support the observation that students did use languages other than the TL during most of their tasks but, as mentioned before, oral practice tasks made use of more Japanese while writing tasks, in which students needed to negotiate meaning as they composed essays, saw a drop in TL use and a rise in L1, L2 or L3 use and code-switching.
4.4.3 Discussion

In this study thus far, the findings have revealed that teachers at WCU are overwhelmingly in favour of supporting the Optimal Use Position. Since Japanese is being taught in a FL setting, where many students enrolling in Japanese classes are not native speakers of English anyway, it may be most effective to adopt a teaching approach that embraces maximizing TL use, while using English when necessary. The intermediate-level JFL teachers who were interviewed claimed that they used anywhere from 60-80% Japanese and about 20-40% English. Interestingly, Ms. Murakami was the only teacher to report using more English than Japanese although she is highly knowledgeable in current L2 teaching methodology and claimed to favour an Optimal Use Position.

Both focal instructors, on average, claimed to be using around 70% Japanese and in fact there actual use of the TL was even higher. Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno seem to be successfully practicing using the Optimal Use Position. Since both instructors claimed to adjust their language use relative to the needs of their students, it would appear that, in general, students were able to keep up while receiving a fair amount of TL input. This was confirmed through the student interviews when most learners reported that the balance of Japanese and English use by instructors was to their satisfaction.

Another key finding is that students spoke very little during teacher-led activities although their output was high in TL when they did speak. The reverse was found to be true during collaborative peer tasks. During peer tasks, students used more English or their NL for communicating and managing what they wanted to say or write. Because
Table 4.10: Language Use Averages for Student Pairwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All language pairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of utterances</td>
<td>2238</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words per utterance</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Chinese language pairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of utterances</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words per utterance</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese language pairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of utterances</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of utterances</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of words per utterance</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentages for each language category listed in this table was rounded to the nearest whole or tenth number, but actual percentages do add up to 100%*
students were still only at an intermediate level, they might have felt that they did not have the necessary vocabulary and language structures to negotiate with each other. Even though the instructors have modelled ways to do this through their own teaching, the students had little experience doing so and, as a result, they resorted to using English or their NL instead since it feels more natural to them. If students are expected to use more TL during peer tasks then they need to be taught how to do this before their teachers can expect students to complete the task with a high ratio of TL use.

4.5 Purposes for Japanese and English Use by Instructors

This section will address the Research Question #2a: For what purposes are Japanese and English used by instructors? First, comments from the instructor interviews will be discussed, followed by comments from the focal instructors’ students. At the end, I will discuss the purposes for which Japanese and English use were observed during the classroom lectures of Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno.

4.5.1 Instructors’ and Focal Instructors’ Comments

The major themes that emerged from the instructor interviews are: 1) comments related to the “ideal” teaching environment and views on a TL-only teaching approach, 2) purposes for Japanese language use, 3) purposes for English language use, and 4) factors affecting language choice and challenges regarding the balance of Japanese and English use, including issues related to student motivation, confidence, classroom atmosphere and student-teacher relationships.

4.5.1.1 The “Ideal” Teaching Environment and Japanese-Only Policy

The overall consensus was that all instructors wanted to use as much Japanese as possible in their teaching. In the ideal situation, Ms. Chen explained that she would like
to always use the TL and take the time to teach the students using Japanese. Moreover, according to Ms. Murakami, a realistic language class would consist of lessons totalling 10 hours per week and would ideally have a class size of twelve students instead of thirty. As mentioned earlier, Ms. Young, if given the chance, would choose the Direct Method of teaching Japanese:

Most of my students ninety, ninety-five percent are all Chinese and there’s a problem involved in that.... Chinese speakers, the way the brain works for them, English is not their first language; Chinese is their first language. I don’t know how they translate it. Speak with them in English and they will probably think in Chinese and then the output will be in Japanese. So it works in three different languages. (Interview, November, 2002)

Although the ideal scenario would be to use Japanese only or primarily Japanese, the learning situation at WCU is less than ideal. When asked about their opinions in terms of a Japanese-only policy, all instructors were reluctant to have such a policy in a context such as the one at WCU. According to Ms. Chen, the present Japanese Language Coordinator, following one specific policy would not be the most effective.

[The] use of language all depends on what you are doing in the class. In some class if you’re dealing with, you know, just as I mentioned before, teaching forms then you need to use English. So, it depends on what you do on specific day. And also depends on the context so we have to be very flexible, I think. There’s no one single model to follow. (Interview, December, 2002)

Ms. Inoue’s reply was similar:

I don’t really like Japanese-only policy because ... [for] some important announcement I don’t think that we should speak in Japanese, or, some grammar probably, because they, students, have to comprehend. And for the comprehension they need language.... Still, for the 200 level they are still in the stage of like a really improving from first level to more advanced level so some students are not really strong in terms of speaking
and listening especially [since] they are only in Canada; they don’t really have friends to practice their Japanese. (Interview, November, 2002)

The unique context of the JFL classes at WCU makes language choice and language use a complex issue. At WCU, all intermediate level instructors and the majority of their students are teaching and learning Japanese through their second or third language: English. For some instructors, Japanese is their second language and English their third language. As a result, instructors are teaching and the students are learning Japanese (besides using the TL) through a common language which is not their native language; they are interacting through English as their second (or third) language.

4.5.1.2 Purposes for Japanese Language Use

The JFL instructors claimed that the TL was used for one main reason: to provide TL input and interaction while learning the Japanese language. Japanese was used for giving instructions or commands, reviewing and practicing Japanese, explaining and giving examples for challenging lesson content, asking questions or having discussions to elicit TL responses, and responding to students who ask questions in the TL. First of all, four of the instructors mentioned that when giving instructions, Japanese was used. For instance, Ms. Young said that she used Japanese for simple instructions and announcements for such things as exams dates and anything that involved classroom management. As for Ms. Murakami, simple commands such as “close the window” or “close the door” were also given in the TL and assignment instructions were written on the board in Japanese as well. Furthermore, Ms. Sasaki explained that instructions and simple questions, especially those that involve set phrases that were commonly used in the classroom, were always in Japanese: for example, pea ni natte kudasai (please get
into pairs), *kiite kudasai* (please listen), *wakarimasu ka* (do you understand?), and *shitsumon arimasu ka* (do you have any questions?).

Secondly, Japanese was used for reviewing and practicing Japanese content, in particular for oral and aural practice. Ms. Murakami claimed that she deliberately reserved the first ten minutes of class for reviewing previously taught structures and that Japanese use for this part of the lesson was strictly enforced. She used this time to interact with students and to have them practice using the sentence patterns or structures that were previously taught. She wanted to create a simulation of real life situations by encouraging students to interact in the TL (and not only to listen to tapes or CDs for authentic input). During this first ten minutes, she never responded in English and, thus, encouraged students to speak in the TL and noticed that “usually after a month or so, [the students tried] to respond in Japanese as much as possible”. Like Ms. Murakami, Ms. Kitamura set aside the beginning part of her lessons for TL speaking and listening practice. “At the beginning of the [class], students seem sleepy; then, I can talk about what I did during the weekend in Japanese. And they, if they miss some words it doesn’t matter. Nothing to do with the quiz, but just [to] enjoy.” Through my observations of Ms. Inoue’s class, it was evident that Ms. Inoue practiced a similar routine, especially after the weekend or with respect to a special event of holiday.

Another use of Japanese was when instructors gave explanations and examples of lesson content. Although all instructors mentioned the challenges of explaining the content in the TL, many instructors still made attempts to incorporate Japanese into their lessons before resorting to English. For instance, Ms. Sasaki and Ms. Ode mentioned that when their students struggled to understand they gave alternate explanations and
examples using simple Japanese before they resorted to using English. Ms. Ode had the following to say:

I have to explain more using different phrases, different words. ... Sometimes I don't mind doing that. Especially [for] explaining ... the meaning of one sentence in Japanese, ... I try to use a different phrase or sentence in Japanese, pretty similar one. Sometimes I do that because translating the meaning into English ... sometimes doesn’t make really make sense. So [in] that case, I try to use Japanese more, and even though I know its more time consuming I don't mind doing that. (Interview, November, 2002)

When Ms. Sasaki gives grammatical explanations, she stated that she would first try to give some examples using Japanese sentences especially with particles that do not exist in the English or Chinese languages (although Chinese has other kinds of particles). In this example, Ms. Sasaki explained how she would teach the difference between two particles that mark location, or the difference between several types of conditional structures:

For example, what is the difference between \textit{ni} and \textit{de}? They both mark locations but the usage is different. The usage is different. So, I give example. And then ... if they don’t understand I give them English explanation. For example if I explain ... conditionals, like in Japanese [there are] \textit{tara}, \textit{nara}, \textit{reba} ... [and] \textit{ba}. I give a lot of examples.

Like these instructors, all other instructors used this method and resorted to using English only when students did not comprehend the Japanese explanation and no other strategy was useful.

Finally, Japanese was used when instructors wanted to ask questions or have discussions in order to deliberately elicit TL responses. As Ms. Yabuno explained, “I think [that] when I want my students to talk back in Japanese I think [that] I should talk
to them in Japanese. It's more natural. If I ask them in English and if I expect them to speak back in Japanese it's kind of strange.” They also reported that they tended to respond in Japanese to students who ask questions in the TL. For example, when students tried so hard to use Japanese Ms. Murakami always tried to answer in the TL, and if students ask questions in Japanese, Ms. Sasaki claimed that she never answered students in English. Even when students asked questions in English, instructors still preferred to reply in Japanese when possible. In these situations, instructors such as Ms. Chen tended to answer using simple Japanese.

4.5.1.3 Purposes for English Language Use

The JFL instructors revealed that their use of English for two main purposes. These are 1) efficiency and effectiveness in time management; and 2) efficiency and effectiveness in comprehension. English was used for explaining grammar, teaching vocabulary, rephrasing or repeating instructions for tasks, providing additive or supplemental materials, discussing comparisons between Japanese and other languages, and explaining and announcing important items such as exams.

The most common reason given for the use of English was for the teaching and explaining of grammar. All instructors mentioned that the teaching of grammar greatly affected their language use because using English was a more efficient and effective method than using the TL. As Ms. Chen explained,

It's actually more efficient and effective [to use] English to teach grammar. ... [F]or example, you need to explain some structures to the students like more complex structures: relative clauses, subordinate clauses, and so on. Students will understand very easily and quickly if you can explain to them ... in English and then [you can] move on to do some activities in Japanese. So it's not worth wasting, you know, using
too much time in explaining grammar or trying to use the target language.
(Interview, December, 2002)

Furthermore, Ms. Young and Ms. Yabuno claimed that they used English when teaching important grammar points because there was a tendency to misunderstand when they explained everything in Japanese; they wanted to ensure that students had clearly understood. Ms. Murakami, whose self-reported ratio of English use was 80%, commented that explaining grammar in Japanese was impossible and, therefore, she used a lot of English in his classes. She usually answered grammar related questions in English because it was economical and time was a big issue for her. In addition, Ms. Chen commented that hearing English explanations helped students feel more secure, especially for the more “cognitive” learners, in particular the Chinese students, who needed to understand structures.

Two JFL instructors also said that they used English for teaching vocabulary. Spending a lot of time to explain one vocabulary item using Japanese would not be an effective use of time even though students received a lot more TL input from a teacher’s effort to explain the vocabulary item in Japanese. Ms. Kitamura recalls her own experience learning English as a second language:

When I came here, ... the instructor was explaining in English. ... “[W]hy [do] they have to use English? ... [To] understand one concept why do I have to struggle?” And I visited [an]other class to observe and the teacher is talking about [the word] basement and the students couldn’t understand [the word] basement. It’s a lengthy time [that] the teacher spent, just to talk about basement. Then, “Why don’t you [say] basement in another language?” Then ... the instructor can spend more time to let [the students] practice or [do] other more important things? Like vocab, they can look at the dictionary. (Interview, November, 2002)
Since Ms. Kitamura's had personally experienced this type of struggle with the learning of vocabulary items, she decided that it was not worth the time and effort to explain a vocabulary item that could be easily communicated by the use of one equivalent English word.

In order to ensure comprehension, JFL instructors stated that they used English to rephrase or repeat what they had uttered in Japanese. In most cases, the strategy used was intra-utterance code-switching. Ms. Sasaki reported that she used this strategy when making announcements about a test or something important so that she could be sure that the students had comprehended her message. This is similar to what Ms. Chen did: simple instructions, for example exam dates, were given in Japanese but rephrased in English to ensure that students had understood.

Because learning a language consists of an appreciation of the historical and cultural background of the society associated with the TL, instructors at WCU also said that they used supplementary materials to enhance their students’ language learning experiences. In most cases, these materials were related to cultural aspects or provided historical background to complement topics being covered in the curriculum. It should be mentioned here that the textbook used at WCU, *An Integrated Approach to Intermediate Japanese* (Miura & McGloin, 1994), incorporates culture and language throughout its lessons and that there is a specific section for cultural notes. These cultural notes are given in English. According to Ms. Kitamura, students cannot be expected to understand an anthropological analysis in Japanese because this would be too difficult. Sometimes, instructors must explain why a sentence may be grammatically correct but culturally unacceptable.
For instance, the first years students learn *kudasai* (please). ... It is [or can be a] request and [a] command. But in certain situations we should not use *kudasai: kudasai* in upper status\(^1\), and also on commercial[s] they don’t use *kudasai* in Japan. And here [in North America], you can use “BUY THIS!” We can’t use [it in this manner in Japanese society]. ... We have to explain this because once they learn certain grammar structures, it’s grammatically correct but culturally, normatively, [it’s] not acceptable regarding [such] ... situation[s]. (Ms. Kitamura, Interview, November, 2002)

Another use for English for discussions involving comparisons between Japanese and other languages. Instructors who shared a common first language background with their students, or had studied other languages offered discussions in English to draw attention to specific cultural or grammatical structures between the two languages. Some instructors, such as Ms. Young, compared *kanji* and Chinese characters. Others, like Ms. Kitamura, had often did general language comparisons between English and Japanese, Chinese and Japanese, and Korean and Japanese. In order to explain the similarities and differences, English had to be used. Furthermore, Ms. Kitamura used their cultural background and *kanji* to improve understanding. For example, she compared Japanese New Year’s with new year’s traditions in other cultures. In addition, words that don’t transfer over socioculturally, such as “granny”, in English, and *obaa-san* (granny), in Japanese, needed to be explained in English since such specific explanations were not provided in the cultural notes in the textbook; it seemed more effective to have teachers explain them in English.

Lastly, English was commonly used for explaining and announcing important items such as exam dates, test content, interview activity scheduling. Written

\[^1\] This refers to the informal register used between the well-acquainted; it is considered rude and impolite when used for commands and requests especially with strangers and people of higher social status (e.g., elders, teachers, etc.)
assignments (see Figures 4.1) and tests (see Figures 4.2, 4.3, 4.4. and 4.5), written on the overhead transparency, used English to ensure that the instructions are clear.

The documents collected from the classes I observed support the claim that important items such as quizzes, test instructions, and oral examination assignment handouts were written in English, whereas practice handouts and homework sheets tended to be in Japanese. Ms. Yabuno explained that some students whose L1 was not English couldn’t even understand the English instructions on exams and tests and so JFL instructors at WCU had to use simpler, easier vocabulary so that their students could answering questions.

**Figure 4.1** Composition Task Outline

宿題：作文
「私のふるさと」
（スピーチの原稿）

intro
body
organization

conclusion

提出：月曜日

(Inoue, Classroom Lecture, November 4, 2002)

**Figure 4.2** Test Topics’ Outline

Chapter 3 & 4
- Grammar
- Textbook, 会話
- Functions
  - Request
  - Permission
- Cultural aspects
- handouts

(Inoue, Classroom Lecture, November 4, 2002)
Figure 4.3 Composition Test Outline\textsuperscript{15}

作文の試験について

○ 11月22日（金曜日）
○ トピック：？？インタビュー関係があること
○ 原稿用紙1枚

Evaluation
Content 2    Accuracy  5
Coherence 3   Genkooyooshi 2
Complexity 3

15点

(Yabuno, Classroom Lecture, November 1, 2002)

Figure 4.4 Final Examination Outline

- Vocab kanji
- Listening
- Grammar
- Short writing
- Complete a dialogue
- Cultural aspects

(Inoue, Classroom Lecture, November 26, 2002)

Figure 4.5 Composition Test Outline

1. Intro
2. Body
3. Conclusion
   ○ Interviewee's opinions/thoughts
   ○ Your opinions/thoughts 〜（いい）と思います

Dictionary: Eng - Japa
            Japan-Eng
            Both

OK

(Inoue, Classroom Lecture, November 21, 2002)

\textsuperscript{15} Genkooyooshi is a standard composition writing sheet. It looks like a grid paper and has 400 boxes (i.e., one letter/punctuation per box).
4.5.1.4 Factors Affecting Language Choice

The key factors that affect language choice and, as a result, directly influence language use include practicality, L1 of students, and creating a comfortable learning environment for the learners. In terms of practicality, instructors were primarily concerned with issues of time. Unlike most North American university programs, WCU's academic year is shorter by about one month, only offering about 110 hours of instruction for an entire academic year. Instructors felt the pressure of covering the curriculum and trying to cram the content into all their lessons because of the textbook as curriculum. This tight schedule definitely had its effects on language choice. As three teachers explained,

we have a very hectic schedule ... [and so] we have to compromise a little bit ... in order to save time. ... We may want to just explain something in English and get it over with in two minutes rather than spending like ten, fifteen minutes on that.” (Chen, Interview, December, 2002)

Fifty minutes [per class] is not long enough. ... When the time is pressing, I have to switch to English so that [the students] will just understand when I say something just once and [then] we can move onto the activity. (Yabuno, Interview, November, 2002)

I'd like to [explain] ... everything about grammar without using English and it's challenging ... but I can't do it here. ... I prefer not to because my students will not ... understand it and I [will] have to repeat it again right from the start. So, it's a waste of time. (Young, Interview, November, 2002)

Explaining grammar tended to be a common culprit of resorting to English in order to save time: “If it's a grammar related questions, [I] usually answer in English: much faster; economical. [Explaining in Japanese] wastes time. ... Time
is a big issue” (Murakami, Interview, November, 2002). Besides grammar, instructors had to cut down on wait time when trying to elicit responses from students. Ms. Inoue thought that her Chinese student learning attitudes often resulted in minimum participation during teacher-fronted activities. When trying to interact with her students, she tried to be patient until someone said something in response but often found that she didn’t have time to wait, and that she had to give up and say something first.

Language use was also affected by the students’ L1. Because the majority of students who enrolled in Japanese classes at WCU were native speakers of Chinese, teachers found it somewhat challenging to teach to students who were ESL learners. As mentioned earlier by Ms. Young, about ninety to ninety-five percent were Chinese background students and in her opinion the students had difficulty when it related to instruction of grammar points in English. Furthermore, teaching Chinese native speakers required a mix of English and Japanese because Japanese language structures are very different from Chinese. As experienced by Ms. Inoue, English used on tests also needed careful consideration because many ESL students did not understand instructions that native speakers found quite easy and clear.

Although having many Chinese language background students proved challenging, there were also some benefits. With respect to explaining vocabulary or teaching kanji, students were able to grasp the idea of a word by simply looking at the kanji and using their Chinese language background to provide some scaffolding. In addition, instructors did not have to spend time explaining how to write the kanji. Therefore, the focus on kanji teaching time decreased and with that the use of English, overall, also decreased.
Moreover, instructors who, themselves, have a Chinese language background were able to use Chinese to assist student learning. For example, Ms. Tanaka, who had recently taught Japanese as a second language in Japan with ninety-eight percent of her students coming from a Chinese language background, found that she tended to speak in Chinese since it was much easier to explain Japanese through the use of Chinese, rather than in Japanese or English. At WCU, Ms. Chen, who could speak both Mandarin and Cantonese, used Chinese to help her students but only if it was outside of class time. This was to be fair to all students who attended her classes and to not isolate those who did not know Chinese. “I think it's okay to teach them in Chinese if it helps ... because English ... for many of them is not [their] native language.” If students preferred or felt more comfortable to ask questions in Chinese, then she responded in Chinese, too.

The third factor affecting language use was the goal to create a comfortable learning environment for the learners. Several instructors mentioned that English helped to motivate their students and to create a classroom atmosphere that was more conducive to language learning. For example, a former student of Ms. Kitamura had revealed to her that in her previous Japanese learning experience the instructor used only Japanese and that she couldn't understand the lessons. In her opinion, she described the previous experience as very bad and she felt that she could only retain about thirty percent of the lesson content. As a result, Ms. Kitamura commented that using English made her students feel safe and secure, allowing them to learn Japanese without feeling threatened. Similarly, Ms. Yabuno claimed that some students felt uncomfortable being exposed to a lot of Japanese. She mentioned that she was concerned about their psychological and emotional state because she really wanted her students to enjoy what they did in class.
Finally, Ms. Tanaka thought that using only Japanese would offend her students and would upset the balance of languages in the classroom needed to create an atmosphere in which the students would feel comfortable to speak Japanese.

4.5.2 Student Comments

This section will discuss the use of Japanese and English from the students' perspective. Students offered their views on Japanese only policy, and explained the purposes for which they had experienced Japanese and English being used by their instructors (Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno), and gave their opinions on why they think teachers chose to use the language that they did when teaching intermediate JFL.

4.5.2.1 Thoughts on Japanese-Only Policy

Overall, students were not in favour of a Japanese-only policy. The students' main concern was that they would have difficulty understanding what the instructor was saying and worried about missing important information. Comments revealed by Justin were typical:

If she teaches everything Japanese ... we’d be a lot confused, you know. ... If she was using simple Japanese I’m sure we could all follow it but, you know, that’s not necessarily effective. And some of the concepts, she couldn’t explain properly. Like we wouldn’t understand the Japanese in order to be able to use them. ... I can probably can figure [it] out faster [in English rather] than if she was using Japanese. (Interview, November, 2002)

And as Isabella states, a Japanese-only method would affect all areas of learning such as instructions for activities and homework, explanations of cultural points, lessons involving *kanji*, understanding vocabulary and grammar points. If the classes were taught all in Japanese, students would “be very tired,” their learning experiences would be “frustrating” and they would “feel uncomfortable using English” to ask for help: the
“comfort level dissipates”. Students felt that they would visit the instructor’s office hour more often since they could not understand the lesson and would feel intimidated to ask for help in class.

Some benefits that the students offered for in the use of Japanese-only were that it would give them more exposure to the TL and that there would be more interaction with the TL. Moreover, students might learn new vocabulary during explanations that were all in Japanese. Also, since students would get to listen to an entire hour of Japanese, students would greatly benefit from the modelling of teacher talk in order to learn and listen to increased quantities of real Japanese speaking style. Although TL only has its benefits, there are some obvious trade-offs such as less understanding and more confusion. As comment by Isabella illustrates the dilemma: “if we have forever, ... then we could do everything in Japanese. That would be great. But, you know, we don’t have forever.”

4.5.2.2 Purposes for Japanese Language Use

According to the data from the student interviews, the consensus is that the instructor seemed to use a lot of Japanese except for when students may not or have not understood. When students were asked to describe the purposes for which their instructors used Japanese, most students replied by stating that the instructor used English when students were confused or did not understand. This implies that instructors most likely used Japanese for multiple purposes and switched to English when student reaction told them that they did not comprehend the Japanese. This is illustrated in Diana’s comments:

I would say, well, [that] she speaks a lot of Japanese but at the same time she knows when to like explain things in English and when to explain
things in Japanese. And, um well I don't know about other people but ... [I] don't carry a blank face like 90% of the [time] ... [and] usually she knows that we don't understand. And she would explain it again in Japanese until we understand or, you know, in English. (Interview, November, 2002)

A practice mentioned by students was that the instructor tended to continue with their attempts to explain by means of using other or simpler Japanese before changing to English. Although most students did not mention any functions in particular, the few things that were mentioned include the use of Japanese for instructions and for the textbook dialogue lessons. One student even mentioned that she thought Ms. Inoue taught grammar mostly in Japanese.

4.5.2.3 Purposes for English Language Use

The students who were interviewed claimed that, in general, the instructors appeared to switch to English after reading the facial expressions of their students or when students did not respond when asked questions. For instance, Johnny commented that “when she’s going through grammar and um when the class doesn’t respond to something, you know, maybe that means that we don’t understand this [and] so then she’ll explain it again in English.” Also, Todd mentioned that, “I’ve noticed at first she was trying to explain it in Japanese. When people ...[have a] ... , “Hmm?” face and they were like ((makes a confused facial expression)) and she’ll go on in English.” The teachers were able to recognize when students did not or could not follow what was being said in Japanese. This seemed to have been a successful strategy because when asked to comment on the balance of TL and English use by their instructors, none of the students complained that they would have wanted their teacher to speak more English; in fact, all
students mentioned that they were either fine with the balance of Japanese and English or had wanted even more Japanese.

The majority of the students thought that the teachers’ use of English was for the purposes of comprehension and clarification. The classroom functions for which students observed teachers using English in this manner is for explanations about homework and tests, teaching grammar, making announcements, talking about assignments, giving instructions, and explaining complex vocabulary. Furthermore, one student noticed that his teacher used English for teaching cultural content since cultural explanations involved grammar and vocabulary that has yet to be taught. For him, the teacher did this for the purpose of efficiency since it got the point across to the students faster than using Japanese.

Another way that teachers used English was for the purpose of providing the background and context to set phrases so that students would know the appropriate contexts for their usage. As Krista explained, “after it’s explained to me in English I feel okay. ‘So, here’s the three reasons [for using this particular set phrase]’ … [and] I know that I can definitely use this word.” As, mentioned earlier in this chapter by Ms. Kitamura, students cannot be expected to understand anthropological analysis in Japanese because this would be too difficult. Even the cultural notes section in the textbook is written in English. Finally, another student thought that English was used to teach grammar because the textbook explanations happened to be in English. The use of English by teachers during grammar lessons, she thought, was perhaps influenced by the fact that the grammar explanation for each new grammar point was provided in English.
Even though this was an interesting point, this was one function for which none of the interviewed teachers mentioned as a reason for using English during grammar lessons.

4.5.2.4 Reflections on Instructors’ Language Use

Overall, the majority of the students noted that they were satisfied with the amount of Japanese and English being used by their teachers. None of the students interviewed felt the need to have their teacher use more English and several students said that they would not mind if their instructors used more Japanese. Even though Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno used Japanese 80% of the time, a relatively high percentage compared to other studies of TL use (e.g., Duff & Polio, 1990; Liu et al., 2004), the students did not feel that the instructors used too much or too less Japanese. Moreover, this is consistent with results from Duff and Polio’s (1990) study in which the majority of the students reported that they were satisfied with the ratio of TL and L1 being used by their instructors.

As Diana and Isabella commented, Ms. Yabuno used a lot of Japanese but she also regulated her use of the TL by accessing the English language when she felt necessary. From the interviews, it appeared that the students were satisfied with the balance of TL and English use and that this was in huge part a result of the students knowing that their teachers were using English as an additional tool to scaffold their learning experiences. Furthermore, because the students were seldom told to or felt direct pressure to use the TL exclusively, the atmosphere of the class allowed students to use their L1: because the students observed that their teachers used English when teaching Japanese, the students felt safe to do the same.
The majority of the students stated that, from the point of view as learners, their teachers’ use of English was useful and necessary. The function for which students felt it most necessary was during their grammar lessons. As Jason said:

I think when we’re going over the grammar points ... [English] is important because you need to understand, you know, why they’re using the forms [that] they’re using. As much as people say [it], the translation isn’t always accurate. I think it is important, sometimes, to actually, you know, if you get the meaning of the sentence in one language then you can sort of look at that sentence in another language and get a feel for it. And, so yeah I think the grammar points and the examples they use there are important, [to be] in English. ... If she was using simple Japanese I’m sure we could all follow it but, you know, that’s not necessarily effective. And some of the concepts, she couldn’t explain properly. Like we wouldn’t understand the Japanese in order to be able to use them. ... That wouldn’t be very effective, right? ... I can probably can figure that out faster than if she was using Japanese. (Interview, November, 2002)

Students not only found that English use during the grammar explanations were efficient and effective, but they also felt, as the teachers definitely revealed in their interviews, that time was an important factor in terms of the curriculum and the time period that teachers had to cover the required course materials. If more time was available for the course, students would want the teacher to use more Japanese since there would be time to try and comprehend the explanations in Japanese. As Diana commented,

if there were more time ... for the class ... it would be better if she speaks more Japanese. Like, I don’t mind her repeating the same thing over and over again until I really understand the whole thing in Japanese. But since we only have an hour or fifty minutes so we can’t really do that. (Interview, November, 2002).

Some students mentioned that they preferred to have instructions explained in English. Ms. Inoue’s student, Johnny, stated that students didn’t necessarily ask for clarification of instructions when they were not sure and sometimes they have even assumed that they have understood. Also, Phil mentioned that sometimes the teacher
spoke a lot of Japanese and spoke it very fast. He really had a hard time and hoped that she would speak more English so that he could understand her explanations. On the other hand, several students stated that they enjoyed the high frequency of Japanese spoken in class. They felt that they were being forced to listen to Japanese and that this helped them develop and improve their overall language skills. Even though this proved to be challenging, students mentioned that they preferred to hear their teacher use simple Japanese before resorting to English use. As Todd explained:

I think it’s important to immerse yourself in the environment so that get comfortable in the language because we have, we’re expose[d] to so little Japanese outside of school.... [F]our hours [a] week is all we have. So, like the more Japanese we listen to, that we practice, yeah. The more we write the better we get: the more comfortable we get with the language. (Interview, November, 2002)

For the most part students appeared to have adjusted well to their teachers’ balance of Japanese and English use in the classroom. Especially with new vocabulary items, students noticed that teachers used Japanese first and then automatically, after a short pause, said the English translation. This way, students were able to hear the Japanese and then hear its equivalent in English. Anna described her experience with such practice as follows:

So, [the] first thing, she says that in Japanese once; [she] just want[s] to see if people understand. And also, I think it’s a good practice for us because [the] first time we can listen to a Japanese part and then [we can] see how much we understand and then compare to the English part to see if that part we got ... [it] correct. ... If I don’t understand, yeah, ((laughs)) I will be waiting for the English part. (Interview, November, 2002)

When students had trouble understanding, they were able to find other methods to assist themselves such as searching for the English explanations in the textbook, asking a fellow classmate, and referring back to the texts (e.g., instructions on handout or pictures...
on the overhead projector). In general, the students in both classes appeared to be satisfied with their instructors' use of language in the classroom. This would probably not have been the case if English was not a part of their lessons. The instructors used a variety of strategies using language to scaffold their students learning. (See Section 4.6.) Furthermore, as will be discussed in the next section of this chapter, students were able to provide strategies to assist each other as well.

4.5.3 Classroom Data

As mentioned earlier, it was found that Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno used an average of 80% of Japanese in their classrooms. As mentioned by their students, their teachers used a lot of Japanese for a variety of functions. Because the TL dominated almost all aspects of their teaching, the focus here will be to get an understanding of the purposes in which the instructors switched to using English. From the four sessions selected for data analysis, English and mixed utterances comprised 20% of all spoken language in class.
Table 4.11  Top Five Purposes for English Use (English & Mixed Utterances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Ms. Inoue</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ms. Yabuno</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td># of utterances</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td># of utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>administrative</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>grammar</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>review test answers</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>draw students’ attention</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>important/key words</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>back to back translations</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>back to back translations</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ease of use; efficiency</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>draw students’ attention</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>review test answers</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, it was found that the instructors’ main purposes for English language use and mixed utterances varied quite significantly. Ms. Inoue had a strong preference for using English and mixed utterance for administrative tasks (168 utterances), whereas Ms. Yabuno only had a total of 17 utterances for ‘administrative purposes.’ Ms. Yabuno used English and mixed utterances most frequently for grammar related tasks (178 utterances), while Ms. Inoue used only 30 times. The top use of each instructor did not even make it as one of the top five purposes of the other instructor. I will illustrate how the instructors used English and mixed utterances for five of these purposes: explaining grammar, addressing administrative issues, giving back to back translations, drawing students’ attention, and reviewing test answers.

The data revealed that Ms. Yabuno, who used English and mixed utterances the most for grammar related tasks, and Ms. Inoue, who used it much less, used English to
 supplement the grammar (or metalinguistic) lessons because some structures 1) carry nuances or were complex and best explained in English, 2) use key grammatical terminology, and 3) utilize the same terminology but serve different grammatical functions (i.e., comparative analysis). In the following example, a student asked if two phrases had identical meanings: *Ikanai wake ni wa ikanai* and *ikanakute wa ikemasen* and Ms. Inoue helped explain the slight difference in meaning that each word carries.

**Excerpt 4.15  Grammar Lesson: ‘x’ wake ni wa ikanai (‘cannot do ‘x’’)**

1. **Inoue:** *Ikanakute wa ikemasen. Onaji imi desu ne. Imi wa onaji.*  {I have to go. It's the same meaning. Meaning is the same.} The same meaning. Almost the same meaning but the phrase is different. So in this case gakusei B  {student B} feels kind of obligation because sensei's coming. I must go.

(Classroom Lecture, Inoue, November 26, 2002).

In this example, Ms. Inoue uses English to describe a slight difference in the two structures. Even though they both mean ‘I have to go,’ *ikanai wake ni wa ikanai* has a feeling of obligation while *ikanakute wa ikemasen* does not.

Instructors also used English when they used grammatical terminology during their grammar lessons. In the following, Ms. Yabuno uses the English terms for ‘honorific form’ and ‘humble form’ instead of using its Japanese equivalents.

**Excerpt 4.16  Lesson: Chapter 5 Kaiwa #1**

1. **Yabuno:** *Ukagaitai n desu ga. Ukagau.*  {May (I) ask (you a question)? To ask (humble form)} Honorific form or humble form?

2. **Students:** Humble.

3. **Yabuno:** *Jya moto no doushi wa nan desu ka.*  {Okay, what is it's original verb?} Humble form of what?
4. Paul:  

*Kiki. Kiku.* {To ask. To ask.}

(Class Lecture, Yabuno, November 12, 2002)

In this next excerpt, Ms. Yabuno begins to explain how the noun modification of *kata* and *hito*, both meaning ‘person’, can change when modified by *se ga takai* (tall). When she describes the noun modification she used the terminology ‘modify’, ‘noun’, ‘noun modification’ and ‘noun modifying clause’.

**Excerpt 4.17 Lesson: Chapter 4 Kaiwa #1**

1. Yabuno: This whole thing: *se ga takai* {tall} + or *se no takai* {tall} modify this noun *kata* {person} or *hito*, *ne* {person, okay?}. Dakara, *kono ga wa* {And so, this ((nominative case marker *ga*)) is} in noun modification sometimes you can change this *ga* {((nominative case marker *ga*))} and use *no* {((genitive case marker *no*))} instead. But when your noun modifying clause is very long, you don’t use *no* you use *ga* {((nominative case marker *ga*))}. But if it’s very short you can use no instead of *ga* {((nominative case marker *ga*))}.

(Class Lecture, Yabuno, November 4, 2002)

Other grammatical terms used were: particle, structure, past tense, negative, adverb, adjective, noun phrase, *te*-form, irregular humble form, plain form, causative form.

Thirdly, English was used to help compare two different uses for the same terminology. In the following example, Ms. Yabuno describes the difference in usage of the term *saki*. Here, Ms. Yabuno explains the difference between two usages of the word ‘*saki*’. To make her explanation clear, she not only provides an example of where students have heard the word ‘*saki*’ previous to this lesson, but she also explains the difference in English.

**Excerpt 4.18 Lesson: Chapter 5 Kaiwa #1**

1. Yabuno: *De kono saki to iu ji desu yo ne. Osaki ni shitsurei shimasutte iu no wa leaving before someone ne. Sono saki desu yo ne. {Okay*
and this word 'saki'. The meaning of 'osaki ni shitsurei shimasutte' is 'leaving before someone," alright?) Before. *Demo kore wa* {But this} refers to destination. The end. The other end where you go. ... Where you’re studying + university you’re studying at. *Ryuugaku saki.* {Study abroad destination.}

(Class Lecture, November 12, 2002)

The second use of English was for administrative tasks, which include items related specifically to announcing tests, discussing schedule changes and such. During the month of November, the students were involved with preparing to interview native Japanese speaking international students studying English at WCU. In this next excerpt, Ms. Inoue tried to explain to her students about the scheduling of the actual interviews. At first she began to explain things in Japanese but as the content of her message got more difficult to express, not due to language difficulty but difficulty with the scheduling process, she switched to English. It would seem that Ms. Inoue used English so that what she wanted to express could be communicated clearly and quickly.

**Excerpt 4.19 Interview scheduling announcement**

1. **Inoue:** *Kono aida kikimashita keredomo san-ji, yo-ji sono jikantai de daijoubu desu ka, mina-san. Juuichi-gatsu juuhachi-nichi no san-ji, yo-ji. De, dochira demo ii n desu. Mou muzukashii no de Mou muzukashii no de *{(l)} asked you the other time three o'clock, four o'clock is it okay around that time, class? Three o'clock, four o'clock of November 18th. And either one is fine. Because it's too difficult*

(Class Lecture, November 4, 2002)

The third purpose for English was for translating from Japanese to English or vice versa within the same utterance or by means of sentences one after another. As students mentioned in their interviews, this is one strategy the teachers used to help students with Japanese phrases and vocabulary. Most times, the teacher would say the Japanese word or phrase and then immediately follow it with its translation. This strategy assisted
students by providing the meaning of the word or phrase so that students could understand the meaning right away without having a break in communication; the teacher could prevent students being confused and the lesson did not need to be interrupted simply to clarify the definition of the word or phrase. Also, as Anna mentioned, it could help students quickly check if they had understood what the teacher had just said.

Excerpt 4.20 Lesson: Chapter 5 Kaiwa #3

1. Inoue: *Dou desu ka.* {How about it?}
2. Ernie: *Sangyoume.* {The third line.}
3. Inoue: *Sangyoume.* The third line. {The third line.}

(Class Lecture, November 12, 2002)

Excerpt 4.21 Interview reflection composition task

1. Inoue: Take out your own sheet *jibun no ruusuriifu de ii desu.* {Your own sheet your own loose-leaf is fine.}

(Class Lecture, November 19, 2002)

Excerpt 4.22 Lesson: Chapter 5 Kaiwa #3

1. Yabuno: *Sou desu yo ne. Sono toki ni kimetara dou.* {That's right. How about deciding at that time?} How 'bout ++. deciding it + that time, ne. {Okay?} *Sono toki ni kimetara dou.* {How about deciding at that time?}

(Class Lecture, Inoue, November 19, 2002)

As these examples illustrate, by immediately giving students the English equivalent the students understood the word or phrase and the lesson continued without being interrupted. Also, students' thought processes as they listened did not need to be interrupted either. These small and short instances of assistance seemed to be a useful strategy as it provided scaffolding to students who mentioned that they usually had difficulty with vocabulary.
English was also used to draw students’ attention to certain words and phrases and for emphasis. For example, towards the end of a quiz Ms. Inoue announced “thirty seconds!” to alert students as to how much time was left. Also, when she read from a handout on giving advice that listed the individual expressions along with their corresponding degrees of politeness, she drew the students’ attention by announcing in English “the difference is” before she began her explanation of the various degrees of politeness that each expression represented. Ms. Yabuno used English in the same way. This following excerpt illustrates a situation when Ms. Yabuno was trying to have students identify the missing (i.e., implied) particle of a sentence from the dialogue in the textbook. When students didn’t answer, she tried using English two separate times (Line 3 and 5) in order to emphasize the element that the students should be examining. The text that the students were trying to analyze has been double underlined.

Excerpt 4.23 Lesson: Chapter 4 Kaiwa #1


2. Yabuno: ‘Nado’? ‘Nado’ dake de ii n desu ka. {'Etcetera'? You're fine with 'etcetera'?} + Look at the structure. + Josei no bengoshi + mada ookunai. Jyoshi irimasen ka. {Female lawyers + not many yet. Don't (you) need a particle?}

3. Students: ((no response))

4. Yabuno: Joshi wa. ++ Josei no bengoshi + mada ookunai no yo. {The particle? ++ Female lawyers + there aren't many yet, you know.} Particles. ++ Nan ga hitsuyou desu ka. {What is necessary?}

5. Students: ++. (x).

6. Yabuno: Nani. {What?}

7. Shelley: Wa. {Topic marker wa.}

8. Yabuno: Wa. Sou desu yo ne. {Topic marker wa. That's right, isn't it?}
Lastly, the English was used when answers to the test were reviewed. Even though Japanese was used, for the most part, during the lessons that involved these test items, it seemed that the task of reviewing test answers signalled a switch into English. There are two reasons that can help explain this. First of all, it is a review of the answers and, therefore, the teachers wanted to make test comments clear to all students – especially to those students who might have answered the question incorrectly. Secondly, since it was a review session, in order to save time instructors used English in order to be time efficient. A third explanation could be because they were not trying to save time, but because they were running out of class time. This was the case with Ms. Inoue, who left the test answer review session until the very end of class with only a few minutes left to go over the answers. However, both instructors used an increased amount of English during these times. What follows is Ms. Inoue’s review of section four on the test.

Excerpt 4.24 Test answers’ review session

1. Inoue: Section four, the next section. + Why the underlined part is inappropriate. Your explanation in English. I want (x) you to write something + talking about praising if somebody praises + your family members. If you say, if you write Japanese people do not agree with that kind of comment. If your answer is that + not enough explanation. Okay? Lots of people say Japanese people do not agree. Japanese people do not praise + ah your own family members. That’s not enough, okay? I wanted you to write it is impolite or it is rude to say something good about your family members. That’s important part. It is rude. It is impolite. Or, Japanese people are humble. They don’t want to show off. Okay? That kind of + words I was looking for.
In this excerpt, Ms. Inoue did not use Japanese at all, even though she used Japanese
during her actual language lessons. In Excerpt 4.25, Ms. Yabuno is reviewing the
answers from section two on the exact same test:

**Excerpt 4.25  Test answers’ review session**

1. Yabuno: *De, eeto niban mite kudasai ne, (And, un please look at number two,
okay?) You’re talking to your close friend, + very close friend,
That means you need to use casual form, casual speech. So if you
use very formal speech like *temo ii desu ka* {can I?} for number two,
[the] formality is wrong. ++. *Sore kara + eeto. (And then, um.) In a
way, a polite Japanese speaker would. You have to say no in a way
a polite Japanese speaker would say ‘*sore wa chotto*’ {but}. + It is
polite but it’s not polite enough. If you’re polite you would provide
some kind of reason. *Watashi mo ima tsukatte iru no de + tsukatte
irukara. (I am using it right now also + because (I’m) using (it).} + A
lot of you used *no de* {because} for reason, to show the reason, but
in casual speech + it should be *kara* {because}. + Didn’t take any
point for that but it should be *kara* {because}. And instead of
*sumimasen* {sorry} it should be *gomen* {sorry}.

(Classroom Lecture, November 12, 2002)

Although, overall, Ms. Yabuno used much less English during her test answer review
sessions, it was one of both teacher’s top five purposes for the use of English. The five
most common uses of the English language for each instructor is summarized in Table
4.11.

**4.5.4 Discussion**

The instructors seemed to agree that they favoured the Optimal Use Position, and
consciously made efforts to use as much TL as possible, while recognizing that code-
switching would be the most effective method for teaching JFL at WCU. The language
of instruction, besides the TL, was English and since many students and even teachers
were ESL, everyone was well aware of the role that L1 played in providing scaffolding to students. Others that have found the use of L1 beneficial include Antón and DiCamilla (1999), Villamil and de Guerrero (1996), and Swain and Lapkin (2000).

The target language was used for a variety of purposes. It was used for instructions, commands, reviewing and practicing TL content, and, explaining and giving examples for challenging lesson content. Furthermore, the TL was used to ask questions or have discussions to elicit TL responses, and for responding to students who posed questions in the TL. According to the students, the instructor used English when they felt that Japanese might hinder the comprehension or negatively affect the clarity of the lesson content. The students mentioned that the teachers’ were sensitive to their needs and were able to interpret their reactions (e.g., blank or confused facial expressions or getting no response) and adjust their TL/L1 use accordingly. The students appreciated their teachers’ use of code-switching and preferred it over a target language-only type of learning environment. Since Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno were able to use high frequencies of the TL and yet still satisfy their students’ needs, it appears that a high ratio of TL use does not necessarily result in insecure and anxious students. This is consistent with Levine’s (2003) study that examined the relationship between language use and anxiety.

4.6 Purposes for Japanese, English and Other Languages’ Use by Students

From the interviews of both the instructors and the students, as well as my own observations during class lectures and pairwork the students spoke other languages other than English. Although the common language between all members of the classroom community was English, for many English was not their L1. For many, their native
language (NL) was Chinese (either Mandarin or Cantonese). This meant that the Chinese background students were learning Japanese through their L2, English, or even sometimes English was their L3. This section will look at issues that revolve around such questions as: When did students use their NL? For what purposes did they feel the needed to use their L1 or English? How did students use language to enhance their learning experience?

4.6.1 Instructors’ and Focal Instructors’ Comments

According to all the JFL instructors, it was quite noticeable that most students enrolled in the JFL classes had Chinese language background. Ms. Murakami even claimed that 99% were Chinese. Ms. Young explained what she observed: “95 per cent are Chinese: mainly from Hong Kong, and then Taiwan, and then Mainland China. Ah, [there are] very few Caucasians like um three, yeah three or four Caucasians.” In fact Ms. Chen explained that perhaps Caucasian student[s] are intimidated: many of them. And maybe that’s why we end up having such large numbers of Chinese speaking students in class with very few Caucasian students, although we are in an English speaking university.”

Despite having many Chinese language background students, most teachers, in general, did not feel its effects during the classroom lectures. However, the students’ L1 and/or English seeped in during small group and pairwork sessions: most students interacted in their L1 and/or English and not Japanese. When this happened in Ms. Young’s class she always told them to “try not to speak any other language except Japanese.” Also, as Ms. Sasaki walked around her classroom, she told students “Japanese only.” As for Ms. Murakami, when students kept talking in their L1 and/or
English and they were off-task, she would approach them as say, “Nihongo de! Nihongo de!” (“In Japanese! In Japanese!”). Interestingly, Ms. Yabuno and Ms. Inoue did not make any such comments during their interviews and no such practice was observed or audio-recorded in either of their classes.

The majority of the instructors saw the benefits of L1 use and no teacher tried to ban its use from their classes. For example, teachers such as Ms. Murakami and Ms. Inoue reported that students used their NL because they may be insecure and not confident in their TL ability and being able to use their L1 made them feel more comfortable. Another purpose for using other language besides the TL is that it is much easier to communicate and discuss their ideas. As Ms. Inoue commented, “the most important this is ... [that] they share their opinion and brainstorm”, and, furthermore, as Ms. Chen added, students may require English or Chinese to “get inspired.” Thirdly, the L1 was used to help students explain grammar structures to each other. In Ms. Yabuno’s opinion, this was a very good method:

‘Cause if one student, well, if when they’re working together like pairwork or something, if one of them ah does not understand what’s going on on certain grammar or something, [and so] if the other person can help, and [also] I think it’s going to be very tough to help in Japanese, right? So they can help in English or Chinese of Korean I think that’s good. (Interview, November, 2002)

The other purpose of students use of L1 or English mentioned in the instructor interviews was for the purpose of comprehension checks. Ms. Tanaka observed that students used their L1 to confirm with each other by asking, “Maybe this is what the teacher said?”

In general, instructors allowed students to use their L1 and/or English during peer-peer interaction. If the purpose of the task was to practice their speaking skills then teachers tended to remind students to speak Japanese and for the most part the data
revealed that the students did use Japanese for oral practice tasks. However, during tasks in which students needed to discuss their ideas in order to produce a product in the TL (e.g., writing a composition, creating a list of interview questions, preparing materials for the oral exam) then teachers acknowledged the benefits of the L1 and/or English to verbalize their thinking processes and discuss the content of the task. As Ms. Tanaka said, it's “just natural behaviour” to communicate in the L1 and/or English.

4.6.2 Students' Comments

The student interviews revealed that most students did not use the Japanese except when referring to or creating the required content of the task. It seemed that some students did not feel confident in their speaking ability and hesitated to use Japanese as illustrated in Sean’s comment: “I don’t wanna try and embarrass myself using Japanese.” This was also supported in the classroom data. As they were still at an intermediate level, it still took some time before Japanese utterances would come out more spontaneously and easily. What Phil said is typical of some of the student response: “It’s hard. It’s hard for me to ask question in Japanese. I also have to think to organize [what I want to say] first.” When Phil visited Ms. Yabuno during her office hours, he always prepared his initial question beforehand even though “after when she keep[s] asking me question[s] back [in Japanese] then I will just [think], “Oh, man.” [and say] “Mou ichido” {Please repeat once again}.”

As for Gabriella, she commented that she would use Japanese if “it’s simple like just asking something, ‘What is it?’ ... but [if] it’s too difficult to answer a question then usually [I] use English.” Anna, a student I would describe as quite confident, mentioned that, “I don’t think it’s good to just use your own language [for] the whole class. Then
there's no point of learning that new language [that] you're learning.” She continued by saying that she thinks it would be good to use Japanese when making small talk with classmates. Some of the expressions, but not sentences she emphasized, that she liked to use and makes an effort to use were taihen desu ne {Isn't it hardwork?}, ganbatte {best of luck}, and sayou nara {goodbye}.

With respect to L1 and English use, the students commented that they preferred to use L1 or English because it felt natural, was more comfortable, was easier to understand than Japanese for explanations, and created a better learning atmosphere. First of all, if the student had not been here for a long time and did not speak English fluently, then it felt unnatural to communicate in any other language other than the L1 and/or English when both partners spoke the same language. Isabella, a Korean native speaker, said how she felt awkward having to speak Japanese with another Korean speaker: “I feel kinda um weird speaking Japanese with Korean ‘cause I’m, how I’m supposed to say, ah I’m kinda afraid of what he might think of me speaking. I think they’re gonna think like. ‘Why is she speaking Japanese and stuff?’ ‘Is she showing off?’” This was also a sentiment mentioned by Korean native pairs in Kim’s study (2005). Isabella also shared her story about her experience last year:

We had to do ah oral presentation ... with a partner. So when we have to write a ah write out a short play I had a Korean partner and it was much easier 'cause we both understand what we’re trying to say. (Interview, November, 2002).

Therefore, using the L1 and/or English with a fellow classmate seemed more natural and created more amicable learning relationship; students did not have to feel threatened or defensive.
Similarly, students felt more comfortable using their L1 or English relative to speaking Japanese. Since not everyone was yet fluent in the TL, using the L1 or English would feel much more comfortable than taking risks by using Japanese. Brad, a Chinese speaker who had lived here since he was four years old and was, therefore, fluent in English, commented that even though he knew Cantonese he felt more comfortable communicating in English because he was in Canada. Kelly, shared her thought on L1/English language use:

When you try to learn a second language um you’re not comfortable ... using it. So, maybe you have to use like spend like ah few minutes to put those [Japanese] things in your head before you can actually say it out. So by the time you want to say it ..., it’s already really late. So, I guess ... [if you] wanna get first hand answers [and] ... you wanna instant response and stuff ... I’ll use my first language or English. (Interview, November, 2002)

From these examples, it is evident that, as a result, communicating in the NL or English made students feel more comfortable in class. If a FL student started responding in Japanese, the person at the other end, as mentioned by Isabella and Sean, would likely think that “they’re really cocky”, thus making the learning partnership awkward.

Third, the NL or English, the students felt, gave them a communication tool that allowed them to talk about the language (i.e., Japanese) to enhance their understanding of Japanese, much more than they could achieve if using only Japanese. Gabriella preferred English because she could use English with her partners to ask questions and hear answers in English, too. This, she said, was better and easier to understand because when she was alone, she didn’t feel that she could ask for help. Similarly, Sean and Wendi mentioned that they felt English was useful since he could use it to understand what was
going on during the classes by asking his friends for help. For Sean, he felt that this was more effective than if he were to try to use Japanese.

Lastly, the students mentioned that being able to access their L1 and English helped create a better learning environment in the FL classroom. Allowing the students to use their NL or English created an learning atmosphere that was more conducive to learning. For example, in Brad's interview he mentioned that “if she did say ... you can only speak Japanese, then people might not even, they will participate less in class because they’re shy about using Japanese.” In addition, being paired with and sharing the same L1 helped build friendship and a rapport that was connected with language and culture. Anna who said how, by sharing the NL, she was able to get know more people faster because they had similar backgrounds.

4.6.3 Classroom Data

The data comparing student language use activity during classroom lectures compared to pairwork tasks revealed that student use of Japanese decreased while NL or English language use increased. Why were student using more NL or English and code-switching during peer task? What purposes necessitated the use of NL or English use and code-switching?

The data from the classroom were gathered from three distinct activities. These tasks were chosen because they represented a range of activity types which had the most amount of peer group audio-recordings. The three tasks were: 1) oral practice using praise and back-channelling cues (4 peer groups), 2) an oral examination preparation session (5 peer groups), and 3) a composition writing task (4 peer groups). Each utterance was coded into categories as they emerged from the data. Since the pairs that
shared Chinese as their L1 had more variation in mixed utterances (than those whose common language was only English), in the end, all mixed combinations of utterances were lumped into one language group called 'mixed'. Similarly, all 'common language' (CL) utterances (either English, Mandarin or Cantonese) were combined into one larger language group labelled as 'CL'. As a result, the utterances were separated as either TL, CL or mixed.

Using these three class activities, the utterances were coded and categories for the purposes for language use emerged. It was found that during peer-peer interactive tasks, the most frequent uses of the L1 (English, Mandarin and/or Cantonese) and mixed utterances was for task management, off-task interaction, metalinguistic talk, and meta-task task. Others that were less frequent were translations for NL use, and, for mixed language use, the NL for expressing the actual NL equivalent of a word or phrase that students wanted to write or say in the TL. Table 4.12 and Table 4.13 provides an outline and gives the frequency of NL and mixed use, respectively, during the three peer tasks.

**Table 4.12 Top Five Purposes for CL Use during Pair Tasks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 task management</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 off-task interaction</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 metalinguistic talk</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 meta-task talk</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 translations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.13 Top Five Purposes for Mixed Language Use during Pair Tasks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 metalinguistic talk</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 task management</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 off-task interaction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 NL for actual content</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 translations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task management was by far the purpose for which the CL was used the most. Task management includes utterances that involve managing how to do proceed and carry on the task, negotiating the content of the task, discussing how to structure the actual text (oral or written) (e.g., how to organize what they write) and for maintaining and regulating the flow of the interaction. Off-task and side comments also utilized the CL. This category includes conversations that are not directly related to the task or any comments made on the side that is not directly related to task content. For example, students discussed their other classes, their plans for winter holidays, made jokes and such. The CL was used for metalinguistic purposes. Metalinguistic talk consisted of peer interactions around the Japanese language itself. For example, this could include talking about language choice and structures and also to discuss language problems. On the other hand, students used the CL to talk about the actual task criteria or task instructions (meta-task). In addition, when requesting and replying to requests for translations, student did so by using the CL. This also included unsolicited translations. Lastly, students incorporated the NL when they said the NL equivalent of a Japanese phrase or sentence in order to let the other group member know what it was that they wished to say or write in the TL.

For a variety of reasons, especially those mentioned by the students in Section 4.5.2, students found it effective to use the CL for task management, off-task interaction, metalinguistic talk, meta-task talk, and the giving and requesting of translations. In Excerpt 4.6, during their composition task, Miho and Sheri try to recall the name of the course that their interviewee took so that they could figure out what to write in their interview reflection composition.
Excerpt 4.26 Interview reflection composition task (Miho: HLL; Sheri: Chinese)

1. Miho: I think it's called yeah um did she say what it's called? I think it's Art Studies.

2. Sheri: She said 'something cultural'.


5. Miho: We can write like + I'm pretty sure it's Art Studies 'cause my friends are taking (x). But we can say in Art Studies they learn cultural stuff. + So then + Ichiban muzukashii kamoku wa {the most difficult subject is} or is this [under] another topic? Are we allowed to talk about it?

6. Sheri: Or maybe we can just say the only + just like the only um subject she's taking that's all in English is culture.

7. Miho: Okay.

8. Sheri: Um. ++

9. Miho: How do I, how do I say that (xx)? Kazuko-san wa {Kazuko is} ++ (x) eigo {English}, no I don't know how to say it.

10. Sheri: Kazuko-san wa ++ totte iru kamoku no naka de um + ei- zenbu eigo de + oshite= {Kazuko ++ among the subjects she's taking + en- in all English + teaching=}

11. Miho: =Zenbu eigo + zenbu ++ eigo tsukatte ru no wa. {All English + all ++ the (one) using English.} I think eigo {English} yeah. +++ Wo totte iru Kazuko-san, totte- Kazuko-san ga totte iru. ++ {Kazuko who is taking, take- that Kazuko is taking}

12. Sheri: To-tte iru. {Is taking.} ((writing down)) Totte iru. {Is taking.}

13. Miho: Totte iru. {Is taking.}

14. Sheri: Kamoku. {Subject.}

15. Miho: Kamoku. Totte iru kamoku no naka de. {Subject. Among the subjects (that she's) taking}

16. Sheri: Ka-mo-ku. +Totte= {Subject. Take.}
17. Miho: \(=\text{Naka de + zenbu, zenbu eigo + zenbu eigo +++}.\) {Among all, all English all English} Is it eigo de benkyou shite iru no wa [studying in English is] or is it all she’s taking? Like=

18. Sheri: \(=\text{Benkyou shite iru no wa}.\) {Studying is}

19. Miho: \(\text{No wa. (((genitive case marker no)) ((topic marker wa))) ++ Should we just write Arts Studies ‘cause I think that’s the course name.}\)

20. Sheri: ++ We have to know (xx).


22. Sheri: I’m not sure. ((laughs))

23. Miho: Yeah. \(*\text{Karu- *karucharal}^{16} + to kankei ga aru.\) {Cul- cultural +} Karuchaan ni yotte or karuchaa ni yotte {according to culture or related to culture} + or something? ++

24. Sheri: \(*\text{Karucha.}\) {culture}

25. Miho: Karuchaa ni= {culture ((dative marker))}

26. Sheri: =Ni?

27. Miho: Karuchaa no kankei {related to culture} or something. + Or, karu-karuchaa ni yotte + kamoku desu or something. {According to cul-culture + subject}

28. Sheri: Karuchaa no. {culture ((genitive case marker))}

29. Miho: Kurachaa. ++ {culture}

30. Sheri: \(\text{Ni yotte. What is that ‘ni yotte’?}\) {According to}

31. Miho: It’s like +=

32. Sheri: =I think it’s depending on.


34. Sheri: Karuchaa. +++ {Culture.}

---

{Miho and Sheri decide to use the English word for culture and to use it directly into Japanese by changing it to sound as if it is a katakana word. The word for culture in Japanese is bunka and although we say karuchaa in Japanese, it is evident that they were using the English word since they tried to use it for the word ‘cultural’. \(\text{"Karucharal" is not Japanese. See Section 4.6.3.2 for more information on this.}\)
35. Miho: (xx) ni kankei {related to} ++ ga aru. {has}

36. Sheri: Hm?

37. Miho: Karuchaa {culture} um + to kankei ga aru. {is related to}

38. Sheri: Okay.

39. Miho: Kan- + to kankei +++ kan- de aru or something. ++

40. Sheri: (xxx).

41. Miho: Okay. + Shoot what time is it?

(Pairwork, November 19, 2002)

In this excerpt, the main activity was content management. Throughout most of this excerpt Miho and Sheri tried to figure out what to write and how to write it in Japanese. In Lines 1-5, they tried to figure out the name of the course that Kazuko, the interviewee, was taking. Since they couldn’t recall the exact name, Miho told Sheri (a Chinese student) that she would compromise by deciding to incorporate both ‘Art Studies’ and ‘culture’ in the sentence that they planned to compose. Towards the end of Line 5, Miho was not sure about the placement of this sentence and asked if they should move it to another section of the composition. The dialogue exchanged up to this point occurred all in English. From Lines 9-19 and Lines 23-29, they both worked together to try to construct a meaningful sentence in Japanese. As they negotiated through this process, they code-switched between Japanese and English as Miho and Sheri both attempted to construct the sentence. Then in Line 30, Sheri switched to English to ask for a translation and in the three lines that followed the two partners discussed the translation in English. From Lines 34 to 39, they continued to construct their sentence, until Line 41 when Miho suddenly, worried about the time, blurted out, “Shoot what time is it?” as a side comment.
to draw attention to the fact that perhaps they need to move on more quickly. During this part of the task, Miho and Sheri used English for task management, side-comments and translation purposes.

In Excerpt 4.27, Isabella (Korean speaker) wrote the incorrect kanji and Gabriella (Chinese native speaker) quickly came to the assistance of Isabella to correct this error in kanji selection. In Line 5, Gabriella told Isabella to write the kanji for the word "yesterday" (i.e., 昨日). Isabella wrote the left side part of it incorrectly and in Line 7, Gabriella explains to her that the kanji is incorrect. The rest of the excerpt focuses on the correction of this kanji and is done mostly in English. In the end, it seemed that Gabriella had to write it down on behalf of Isabella who could not understand Gabriella’s explanations for making the appropriate corrections even though most of the interaction involved English, their common language. The discussion over correcting the wrong kanji is an example of metalinguistic interaction. Furthermore, Line 1 gives an example of how students used English to illustrate the phrase that they wanted translated into the TL: "Yesterday we interviewed" Yuri and Aki.

Excerpt 4.27 Interview reflection composition task (Isabella: Korean; Gabriella: Cantonese)

1. Gabriella: Ah, what did we write? Yesterday we interviewed it with blah, blah, blah.
2. Isabella: Okay.
3. Gabriella: Kinou= {Yesterday}
4. Isabella: =Kinou {Yesterday} ((both laugh)).
5. Gabriella: Just write konou. {err}
6. Isabella: Write konou? {err}
7. Gabriella: Eh? No, no, no. The kanji is wrong. The first one’s kanji wrong.

8. Isabella: No? What is it?

9. Gabriella: It’s supposed to be + nichi= {((kanji for ‘day’))}

10. Isabella: =Huh?

11. Gabriella: And then the other part. (xx). ++ ((helps correct kanji)) ++ Same for this one. Beside. + You understand what I mean?

12. Isabella: You have to have=

13. Gabriella: =This (x) ++ ((writing)).


15. Gabriella: Instead of that one.


17. Yabuno: Kanji sonna shinpai shinai yo, tada kaite kudasai. {((You) don’t have to worry about kanji so much, please just write} (I laughs))

18. Gabriella: [Kinou, + here, here, here. {Yesterday}

19. Isabella: [Kinou +. {Yesterday}

20. Gabriella: Um, Yuri-san to Aki-san + ni + intaabyuu wo shimashu-, [shimashita. {(We) interview, interviewed Yuri and Aki}

21. Isabella: [Um. ++ Okay, you want me to write it? ((G laughs))

(Pairwork: Composition, November 19, 2002)

In this next example, the students used English to discuss Gabriella’s confusion over the use of two particles: topic marker wa and nominative case marker ga. This excerpt also illustrates metalinguistic uses of English and code-switching.

Excerpt 4.28 Oral exam practice session (Isabella: Korean; Gabriella: Cantonese)

1. Gabriella: But I don’t understand why you use wa {((topic marker wa))} instead of ga {((nominative case marker ga))}. + Yomi mono ga ++= {readings {((nominative case marker ga))}
2. Isabella: =Because yomi mono (readings) + is not subject. ‘They’ is, ‘they’ is the subject, right? They don’t have to.

3. Gabriella: ++ This one’s wa {((topic marker wa))} is what? What marker again?

4. Isabella: It’s a subject marker but + it’s different. + It’s not the main subject, right?

5. Gabriella: ++

6. Isabella: If you wanna say in English they don’t have to read it, right? They’re not, they don’t have to do the reading. So=

7. Gabriella: =They is the subject, right?

8. Isabella: Yup. So, it’s [omitted here.

9. Gabriella: [Ga. {((nominative case marker ga))} + So, it’s probably=

10. Isabella: =Daigakusei +. {university student}

11. Gabriella: Ga {((nominative case marker ga))} +++. ((laughs))

12. Isabella: If you wanna say daigakusei wa yomi mono wo shinakute mo ii {university students don’t have to do readings}, but, + I think it’s wrong here. It’s=

13. Gabriella: =I still don’t understand like how when to use ah when to use ga {((nominative case marker ga))} and when to use wa {((topic marker wa))}.

14. Isabella: Okay, jugyou wa ichijikan= {classes last for one hour}

15. Gabriella: =See this one. Mainichi shukudai ga nai. {Everyday (we) have no homework.}

16. Isabella: Mm.

17. Gabriella: Shukudai wa nai. {Have no homework.}

18. Isabella: You can say wa {((topic marker wa))} here.

19. Gabriella: +++ ((laughs; confused))

20. Isabella: Here it’s interchangeable.
In Line 1, Gabriella stated her confusion with these two particles. From Line 2 to 12 Isabella tried to help explain the difference to Gabriella. During this discussion, there was extensive use of English as Gabriella tried to understand what her partner was explaining to her. Yet, in Line 13 she was still confused and asked for help again using English: “I still don’t understand like how when to use ah when to use ga and when to use wa.” For the rest of the conversation, they both continued to interact using code-switching as Gabriella tried to grasp the difference in usage between the two particles.

Students also used English for discussing particular aspects of the task itself. This meta-task talk was almost always done in English. When Krista and Amelia prepared for their oral examination, they began to wonder about the procedures of the examination and started to chat. Their conversation is presented in Excerpt 4.29.

**Excerpt 4.29 Oral exam practice session Amelia: Mandarin; Krista: English**

1. Amelia: So maybe in the interview + on the test she will have a sheet and say “talk about the particular part”. Talk about other side. Talk about, yeah.

2. Krista: So basically if you memorize some of these sentences=

3. Amelia: =But can we look at it?

4. Krista: **We cannot look at it while the test is happening.** We can bring it with us, look at it before the exam, and then we have to give it to her in the exam.

5. Amelia: So how about while we look at it. Because she will give us like one minute to look at the sheet.

6. Krista: Yeah, we’ll have time to look at it so.

7. Amelia: We can bring this right?

8. Krista: I’m gonna bring this. I’m gonna bring this. The report, right? +++
9. Amelia: We have to answer questions. What kind of questions?

10. Krista: I don’t know. What kind of questions are on the exam? *Yasashii shitsumon.* {Easy questions}

(Pairwork, November 26, 2002)

As illustrated here, since meta-task talk didn’t always require the negotiation of TL language content, students used their CL as opposed to the TL for such interactions. Besides meta-task discussions, off-task type of conversations were in large part conducted in the same manner. In this next example, Johnny and Anna, two Mandarin native speakers, were discussing their interviewee’s hobbies for their reflection composition. In Excerpt 4.30, Johnny mentioned the singer Kylie Minogue since they were talking about their interviewee enjoying music. Since Anna was not familiar with this singer, she switched into Mandarin (Line 4) to find out who he was talking about. For Johnny’s explanation, he used Mandarin, too (Line 5 and 7). Now that they were engaged in this interesting off-task topic, Anna tried to continue the conversation by asking Johnny about the movie, Wedding Planner in Line 8. Unfortunately, the teacher began to make an announcement, signalling an end to their friendly chat about music and movies.

**Excerpt 4.30 Interview reflection composition task (Johnny & Anna: Mandarin)**

1. Johnny: *[Shumi wa: eiga, kai mono, ongaku.]* {Hobbies are movies, shopping, music}

2. Anna: *[Shumi + eiga, kai mono, ongaku.]* {Hobbies + movies, shopping, music}


4. Anna: *Shi shei ya?* {Who's that?}

5. Johnny: *Shi geshou a.* {She's a singer} ((starts singing tune of song)) *Mei ting guo?* {Never heard of it?}
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6. Anna: Haoxiang ting guo. {Yeah, it sounds familiar}

7. Johnny: Neige, Z jingchang zai bo. + {That, Z ((radio station)) always plays that song}

8. Anna: Kairi Minogu. {Kylie Minogue} Wedding Plannaa. {Wedding Planner} Ni xihuan. {Do you like?} Wedding Planner, ah. Wedding Planner?

9. Johnny: Mm.

(Pairwork: Composition, November 19, 2002)

Excerpt 4.31 illustrates another example of two students who got off task. At the end of their oral examination practice task, Beth and Julie (Cantonese native speakers) started getting off task. Throughout Lines 1 to 9, they talked about the end to the term. They chatted about how it was the last week of classes and that they were scared because final examination week was fast approaching. They continued to discuss other issues in Mandarin such as having to visit Ms. Yabuno for Japanese assistance (Line 4), their winter vacation plans (Lines 10–14), shopping (Line 15) and skiing (Line 17-19). This entire conversation, except for a couple of English words (i.e., Lines 4 and 7) was in Mandarin.

**Excerpt 4.31 Oral exam practice session (Julie & Beth: Mandarin)**

1. Beth: Zhe libai yinggai shi zuihou yige libai le. {This week should be the last week}

2. Julie: Ou, hao kongbu oh! {Oh, it’s scary!}

3. Beth: Wo hao pa oh! {I am scared!}

4. Julie: Jintian yao qu office hour, ranhou laoshi jiao wo du zhong yin. {Today I'll go to her office hour, then the teacher will teach me stressed syllables}

5. Beth: Hao nan nei! {It is so difficult!}

6. Julie: Wo dou ting bu dong. {I don't understand at all}
7. Beth: Ni qing tutor jiao ni le ma? {Have you hired a tutor to teach you?}
9. Beth: (xxx) Wo wangji le. {I forget it}
10. Julie: Na winter na? Winter ni yao zuo sheme? {How about winter? What are you going to do in winter?}
11. Beth: (xxx). Ni yao dai zai zheli ma? {Are you going to stay here?}
12. Julie: Jiu shi deng ba. {Just wait}
13. Beth: Jiu shi deng qian lai! Zhe jiu shi zui xingfen de. Dajia yi da zao jiu qu pai dui. {Just wait for the money to come! This is most exciting! Everybody gets up early in the morning and wait in the line} ((laughs))
14. Julie: Mei cuo! {That's right!} (xxx). Qian yige week jiu hen duo. {The money, it's a lot for a week}
15. Beth: (xxx) Jiu shi you xie dian jiu bao man, you xie dian jiu shi na zhong hen gui de nei zhong. Ni zhidao ma? {It's like some stores will be full of customers, like those expensive stores, you know?}
16. Julie: Mei you. {No, I have no idea}
17. Beth: Na ni yao qu ski trip ma? {Then, are you going on a ski trip?}
18. Julie: Wo genben meiyou qu guo. Conglai meiyou hua guo. {I have never been. Never been skiing yet}
19. Beth: Zhe hen kepa de la. {It's scary}

(Pairwork: Oral Exam Practice, November 26, 2002)

Finally, this last example illustrates how students used their native language (Cantonese) as they fooled around. In Excerpt 4.32, Cassie began to laugh and make fun of the word ‘Canada’ after Mindy pronounced it incorrectly using an English accent.

**Excerpt 4.32**  Interview reflection composition task (Cassie & Mindy: Cantonese)

1. Cassie: =Kanada no. {Canada's}
2. Mindy:  *Kanada no sensei* = ((C laughs)) {Canada's teachers}

3. Cassie:  =Kaneda. ((mispronounced)) {Kaneda.}

4. Mindy:  Ah!

5. Cassie:  Ying ah. {Cool}

6. Mindy:  Kaneda. ((says in English accent)) ((both laugh)) *[Canada no sensei ++ hou ga + yuukou-. {Canada's teachers are (more) friend-} Yih gah jau {Now it's} yau houte ta to + shi {((error))} aiya. {hey!} ((makes correction on paper)).

7. Cassie:  *[Canada no sensei no hou ga + yuukouteki da. {Canada's teachers are (more) + friendly}

8. Mindy:  Shi+te i+ma+su. {Am doing}

9. Cassie:  Kanada yau yut wuang geh. ((laughs)) {Canada has a whole row}

10. Mindy:  [Hy woh, jo mut gwie ah? {Oh yeah, what's going on?}

11. Cassie:  [xx giy whak. {The plan is spoiled} Kanoda. ((laughs))


13. Cassie:  Kamed. ((laughs)) Kanoda. ((laughs))

14. Mindy:  Jau gum yeung. {It's like that}

15. Cassie:  Because she thinks that the teacher in Canada is more friendly, she likes Canada more.

16. Mindy:  [Doo duk who, dahn hiy yiu bo fahn nee dee. {That works, let's add (it)}

(Pairwork: Composition, November 19, 2002)

In Line 2, Cassie found something humorous about the word 'Canada' and began to play around with its pronunciation in Line 3. In Line 6, Mindy joined in by mispronouncing Canada again. They continued working on their composition using Japanese and English; however, the conversation of mispronouncing 'Canada' continued in Cantonese (Lines 9-14). Meanwhile, task management portions of the exchange still used their
native language and, interestingly, the translation of their completed sentence was read out loud in English.

4.6.4 Discussion

The findings revealed that students made frequent use of other languages besides the TL. In Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno’s classes, these languages included English, Mandarin and Cantonese. When peers shared the same LI, they took advantage of their LI to assist them through the process portion of the task. If they did not share the same LI, then the students chose to use English as their language medium for completing the task. Students almost never used the TL to manage the task, discuss the task itself, talk about metalinguistics or make talk off-task or side comments. In fact, much of their communication involved their LI and/or English. Even though students were not discouraged from using their LI/English, they remained on task for the most part and used their access to other languages in a way that helped them complete the task successfully. They were able to communicate with each so that they could make decisions and work through the activity more smoothly and effectively than they could have by using only the TL. The findings from the pairwork are consistent with most of the present literature on this topic.

For example, Villamil and de Guerrero (1996) found that the use of the L1 was an important strategy employed by student during peer revision tasks for purposes of gaining control of the task. Like the students in Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno’s classes, the Spanish ESL students in Villamil and de Guerrero’s study found that the L1 provided the “verbal matrix for interaction” and that the TL was “used mainly to refer to specific parts of the text or during reading, copying, and composing” (p. 60). Swain and Lapkin’s (2000)
study of French immersion students found that students used the English to move the task along (including task management), focusing attention (e.g., searching for vocabulary, focusing on form, retrieving grammatical information), and for interpersonal interaction (e.g., off task and disagreement). The majority of the students in my present study had similar L1 use experiences. In fact, Tarone and Swain's (1995) research on French immersion grade school learners revealed how students used the TL as the institutional language of academic discourse yet switched to the L1 for peer-peer interactions of a non-academic nature. This was also true of students in WCU's JFL classes. When they were talking off-task or discussing items that weren't related to the language task or once they were completed the task, students switched to their NL or English since they needed and preferred the L1 vernacular for authentic, natural communication purposes. As many students and teachers mentioned in their interviews, it felt more comfortable and natural to do so.

Despite the fact that students enjoyed their JFL learning experiences, the student interviews revealed that very few students actively pursued opportunities to use their Japanese language skills. The in-class interactions were characterized by a lack of spontaneous and creative uses of the language. Even on campus, where there were many overseas Japanese students and within the Garden City community where there were many opportunities to practice Japanese with residents, immigrants, visitors, as well as with working visa and student visa individuals, the students did very little to actively practice Japanese. Unfortunately, the only "authentic" communication they had with TL speakers was the one interview that the students had with the one Japanese international exchange student. If students are going to become comfortable and confident in using
and increasing their quantity and quality of the TL, the students will need more
opportunities for genuine communication practice. As Miho mentioned in a follow-up
interview, she had hoped that her teachers would have encouraged the students to use the
TL in class, especially during peer interaction: “the professor didn’t encourage us to
speak [Japanese]” (Follow-up interview, synchronous online chat, April 2005),

4.7 Instructors’ Language Use: Adaptations and Adjustments to Accommodate
Student Language Learning Experiences

Instructors used a variety of language use strategies to accommodate the language
learning experiences of their JFL students. There were four specific ways that instructors
did so. The first strategy used was code-switching. The main way that code-switching
benefited students is that it increased comprehension by drawing on their knowledge of
other languages (i.e., in this case, English). From the teacher’s perspective, code-
switching also functioned as a time saver so that students had more time allotted to
covering the curriculum content and practicing TL activities. In addition, the teachers’
adjustment in the use of English and the use of code-switching during their lessons,
helped model language learning and teaching, and, as a result, students copied their
teachers’ use of L1/English and code-switching throughout their own interactive peer
tasks which helped provide scaffolding and enhance TL input when working
collaboratively on a task. Second, and somewhat related to the first point, instructors
assisted students by means of “katananization” of important words. “Katananization”
refers to teachers pronouncing English words in a Japanese accent such that it was
temporarily adopted as a katakana\textsuperscript{17} word although that particular word does not

\textsuperscript{17} Katakana is the Japanese syllabary system for writing loan words from other languages. Some examples
are Kanada (Canada), koohii (coffee), suupaa (supermarket) and kasutera (castella cake).
commonly exist in Japanese or clearly has a Japanese equivalent that they could have easily used. Students also copied the teacher’s use of this strategy when they were unsure of the Japanese word for a specific terminology. Next, instructors adjusted their language use by acknowledging the needs of JFL learners as ESL. This was particularly relevant to testing situations. A fourth strategy instructors used was by using the language background of Chinese speakers when addressing issues related to kanji. Kanji differences, most often with writing, were specifically targeted towards Chinese background students in order to draw attention to certain details to reduce error and develop an awareness of subtle but significant differences between the two languages. A discussion of each of the four strategies will be provided at the end of each section. Furthermore, at the end of this section, issues regarding heritage language (HL) learners will be discussed by examine how Miho, a HL learner in Ms. Yabuno’s class, coped with learning Japanese.

4.7.1 Code-switching

Code-switching was used throughout the class. By code-switching, I mean the alteration or co-occurrence of two languages within the same excerpt or speech event. It facilitated JFL language learning by helping students draw on their knowledge of English to comprehend TL vocabulary and more complex features of TL instruction. As discussed in Section 4.4, both teachers and students reported that code-switching helped with comprehension and clarification of TL lesson content.
4.7.1.1 Code-switching by Instructors

Code-switching by instructors was most evident during discussions on form and during administrative tasks where focus on comprehension was very important. In Excerpt 4.33, Ms. Inoue organized her students for the interview activity.

Excerpt 4.33 Interview activity announcement

1. Inoue: *Anna-san, Johnny-san wa issho no pea de ii desu yo ne. Sore kara Eugenia-san, Holly-san mo issho no pea de ii desu ne.* {Anna and Johnny you’re fine as a pair, right? And then Eugenia, Holly you’re also fine as a pair, right?} *Michelle-san, Lynette-san, JoAnna-san* {Michelle, Lynette, JoAnna} you can decide who you want to work with, okay. You have to be in a pair though. ++. *De, ++. ja kono hitotachi wa* {And, these people} *the people + in this sessions* you have to go to A-center at three o’clock next Monday for the interview activity, okay? And then these three pairs you have to go to A-center again at four o’clock. + *li desu ne.* {Okay?} *De, kore igai no hito + wa + {And, the other people} first of all you have to find a partner from this class, okay? And then, find a Japanese person.* + *Okay? And these two people kono hito wa T-daigaku, no gakusei desu. Taro A-san, sore kara Masami S-san.* {this person is a student from T-university. Taro, and Masami.} They are, they are, they said they are available for five to six (o’clock). + *Actually we are not having five to six (o’clock) session so maybe you can contact them to arrange your own interview, okay? ++. To iu koto desu ga ++. daijoubu deshou ka. {This is what’s going on. Everything okay?} *Any confusion?*

(Classroom Lecture, November 12, 2002)

What we noticed here is that Ms. Inoue used code-switching to instruct her students about pair groupings and explain where and when the interviews would take place. This information was very crucial to the success of the activity and so Ms. Inoue ensured that she was clear by incorporating English into her explanation to the extent that the ESL students understood it.

Another strategy seen was when the teacher uttered a Japanese phrase and then immediately gave its English equivalent. In Excerpt 4.33 there are two instances of

---

18 The name of the university has been replaced with “T-university”
such use. The TL utterance has been double underlined and the English translation had been dotted underlined. In fact, Ms. Yabuno and Ms. Inoue did this quite often as illustrated in Excerpts 4.34 to 4.36. The first two function as translations.

**Excerpt 4.34 Lesson: Chapter 5 Kaiwa #3**

1. Inoue: *Kore wa onna kotoba desu ne.* *Onna kotoba.* {This is female speech, right? Female speech}. Female speech. *Haitta no yo.* {I went in, you know.} Female speech.

(Classroom Lecture, November 12, 2002)

**Excerpt 4.35 Lesson: Chapter 4 Kaiwa #1**

1. Yabuno: *Kore wa nukete masu yo.* {This has been omitted.} Omitted.

(Classroom Lecture, November 4, 2002)

**Excerpt 4.36 Final exam discussion**

2. Inoue: *Ne, shukudai de takusan kakimashita ne.* {Okay, we wrote many for homework} + *Sore wo mou ichido fukushuu review,* okay? {review that once more} Review those writing. *Fukushuu shite oite kudasai.* {Please review}

(Classroom Lecture, November 26, 2002)

In Excerpt 4.36, Ms. Inoue code-switched to emphasize to the students that they had to review for the final examination. She did this buy saying the key word ‘review’ first in Japanese, then twice in English and then again in Japanese. Not only did code-switching help with the comprehension of teacher-talk but it also acted as emphasis in order to draw students’ attention to important information.

In this last excerpt, Excerpt 4.37, Ms. Yabuno used code-switching for a few more functions.
Excerpt 4.37 Grammar lesson: ‘x’ ni ki ga tsuku (‘to notice ‘x’’)

1. Yabuno: Demo {but} past-tense desu yo ne koko {here, isn't it?}. Can you use eeto ne ++ ‘kigatsuita yo ne’ {um ++ ‘noticed, right?’} + the sentence we have is this one. Shukudai wo wasureta koto ni ki ga tsuta no wa kurasu ga hajimatte kara datta. {When I realized that I forgot my homework was when once class had already begun} It was after the class started. Desu ne. {Right?} Kore {this} past desu yo ne {isn't it?}. Kore {this} + can it be non-past tense here? + Shukudai wo wasureru {Forget homework} (i.e., instead of wasureta, the past tense form). Because we have past tense here. Past tense here kigatsuita {noticed}. ++. Will it work with non-past tense here?

2. Students: ++.

3. Yabuno: Would it?


5. Yabuno: Yes? No? + Okashii desu yo ne. {It's strange isn't it?} When I noticed + that I forgot my homework. Past tense desu yo ne {isn't it?}. Wasureta koto ni kigatsuita. {I noticed that I had forgotten}.

(Classroom Lecture, November 12, 2002)

First, in Line 1, Ms. Yabuno used English to help her student notice the important lesson content that she wanted to focus. Whenever she wanted to point out and emphasize that the verb was in past tense, she used the English words ‘past-tense’ and ‘past’ to let student know to focus on that grammatical feature. Then she stopped to make sure that her students where following her explanation by asking in English “Will it work with non-past tense here?” In the next three utterances (Line 3 and Line 5), as Ms. Yabuno tried to elicit a response from her students, she used English to invite her students to participate and confirm that her argument was being followed and understood. In the end, her requests were denied and she answered her own question. From the teacher’s perspective, code-switching also functioned as a time saver because when students didn’t respond or had trouble understanding the explanations in the TL, they used English to
supplement their TL use so that, ultimately, teachers can get through the teacher-fronted lectures and quickly move onto TL activities.

4.7.1.2 Assisted Performance During Peer Interaction: L1, L2, and L3 Use

When students worked on collaborative tasks, they were also able to take advantage of code-switching to help them tackle language problems by providing assistance to each other in their zone of proximal development. By working together, the pairs were able to help each other get further along with the task than if they were working alone. Here is an example from Miho’s and Sheri’s composition session:

Excerpt 4.38  Interview reflection composition task (Miho: HLL; Sheri: Chinese)

1. Miho: Mm, I don’t think you can nominalize it that way. ++ Toru n ja arimasen. {Don’t take} Yeah, it doesn’t make, toru n ja arimasen. {Don’t take} + Sono kurasu +++. {That class}

2. Sheri: Toranai= {Don’t take}

3. Miho: =To-, [totte imasen. {Ta-, am not taking}

4. Sheri: [Totte imasen. {am not taking}

5. Miho: I think ‘totte imasen’. ‘Cause I what are you trying to nominalize?

6. Sheri: Ah like the whole thing? Kind of like you say um ongaku wo kiku no ga suki desu. {I like to listen to music}

7. Miho: Mm.

8. Sheri: That makes sense, right?

9. Miho: Yeah, that makes sense.

10. Sheri: Yeah, like that.

11. Miho: Yeah, I don’t think it’s the same (x) here. ++

12. Sheri: Wo toranakute then we just= {Don’t have to take ((accusative marker wo))}
In this dialogue, Miho and Sheri are trying to construct a sentence to explain that the student they had interviewed did not take regular classes but took special classes for students in the international program. What they tried to find is the construction for the negative gerund form of the verb ‘to take’ (toru). In Line 1, Miho used her knowledge of Japanese and intuitively came to the conclusion that toru ja arimasen was not what they wanted to write. She requested Sheri’s help in this process by commenting, “Yeah, this doesn’t make sense”, and from Lines 2-6 they tried several constructions of the negative form of toru. In fact, in Line 5, Miho thought that totte imasen “sounded” like an appropriate choice. Yet, she was still unsure and, therefore, asked, “what are you trying to nominalize?” to facilitate more discussion. When, in Line 6, Sheri signalled that she was not satisfied with totte imasen, the pair continued to search for the appropriate form until Line 12 when Sheri said toranakute. Then Miho immediately jumped in to reassure her that this was in fact the form that they were searching for. By working collaboratively and by being able to negotiate the content of the task as a pair, Miho and Sheri helped support each other through this process. By confirming, signalling dissatisfaction, and asking questions to request assistance students provided scaffolding to each other. As a result, using their CL and being able to code-switch enabled the students to successfully find the verb form.
The second example, illustrated by the pair Emma and Phil during their oral practice session, showed the pair trying to negotiate the correct verb choice for ‘to take a test’. In Lines 2-4, Emma and Phil play with two verbs, both meaning ‘to take’. In Line 5, Emma used Mandarin to say aloud the sentence equivalent that they were trying to write in Japanese. In Line 6-9, they tried different forms of the verb toru. After listening to each other’s utterances, in Line 10, Phil noticed that these did not sound correct and that indeed the verb ikeru was the one that they were searching for and tried it out in Line 11, where after hearing the sentence, Emma agreed that this was correct. Finally in Line 14, they were able to construct the correct sentence.

Excerpt 4.39 Role-play using Chapter 5 Kaiwa #1 as guide (Phil & Emma: Mandarin)

1. Emma:  
   Ee. ++ Nihongo no + pureesumento testo ((mispronounces tesuto))  
   ga += {Ah. Japanese language placement test ((nominative case marker ga))}

2. Phil:  
   =To-, totte. {Ta-, take}

3. Emma:  
   Uke- ++. {Ta-}

4. Phil:  
   Uke- {Ta-} Ni lai jiang. {You tell them}

5. Emma:  
   Wo yao shuo ni, ni you meiyou na guo? (((looking in textbook))  
   ++ {I’m asking you, if you have ever taken it?}

6. Phil:  
   Totte. {Take}

7. Emma:  
   Totte? {Take?}

8. Phil:  
   Totta. + Totta. Totta ga aru ((grammatically incorrect)). {Take. Take. Have you take?}

9. Emma:  
   Totta ga aru? + (xxx). {Have ((dative case marker ni)) you take?}

10. Phil:  
   Oh, uketa. ++ {take}

11. Emma:  
   Pureesumento testo wo uke-, uketa? {Did (you) ta- take the placement test?}
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Excerpt 4.40  Role-play using Chapter 5 Kaiwa #1 as guide (Isabella: Korean; Gabriella: Cantonese)

1. Gabriella: Mm, eeto rai- {um, next} uh + until? Raishuu no + pureesument tesuto wo kaite {Write next week's placement test} ((incorrect tense of verb; should be kaita)) atode {later} + kyou- ah jidoukyouju ni + ah ai + te ai + airare + masu. {(((err)) ah ((err)) ((dative case marker ni)) ah ((err)) (err)) (err)) (err))


3. Gabriella: Au, right? {to meet}

4. Isabella: Mm.
5. Gabriella: Ai+rareru. {((err))}

6. Melissa: Ae? {To meet ((infinitive form))?}

7. Gabriella: I dunno a what. ((Isabella laughs)) A i u e. Ae, right? ('a', 'i', 'u', 'e.' ? To meet ((infinitive form)))

8. Isabella: Aerareru. {Can meet}

9. Gabriella: Ae- + rare:masu. {Can meet}

10. Isabella: A, sou desu ka. Wakarimashite. Domo arigatou gozaimashita. (oh, is that right? I understand. Thank you very much.)

11. Gabriella: Iie. {Don't mention it}

(Groupwork, November 14, 2002)

In all three examples of the peer tasks, students were able to negotiate their way through the task by asking and receiving for help. The students were able to identify the cues for help. Even though all peers were still learning Japanese, each learner had knowledge and competencies in different areas concerning the TL. This means that even students could offer to act as an ‘expert’ when their peers struggled. It is not the case that assistance can only come in the form of the teacher. As Ohta (2000) concludes from her studies on JFL students, students are able to express and recognize bids for assistance, and it is possible to have peers provide this assistance. This is one step in the process of internalization of TL forms and can be enhanced with the use of code-switching when necessary. The L1 can function as a cognitive tool that mediates L1 learning. These findings are consistent with other similar studies on collaborative peer dialogue and assisted performance (Antón & DiCamilla, 1999; Arnfast & Jørgensen, 2003; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Ohta, 2001, 2002, 1995; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996); however, there are very few studies that address JFL classrooms and, therefore, there needs to be more
research in JFL settings to develop a greater understanding of learning and teaching processes unique to JFL classrooms.

4.7.2 “Katakanization” of English Vocabulary

Teachers also adopted the Japanese method of incorporating foreign loan words into Japanese language through the use of their *katakana* syllabary. By using this syllabary as a base, teachers used English words and made them into Japanese-sounding words. By doing so, the English word has become, what I call, “katakanized” and is given a Japanese pronunciation and is used to sound like a TL word. The teacher used this strategy for words that were already often used in English, most having to do with grammatical terminology. Such examples from the grammar lectures include: *kajuaru* (casual speech), *negatibu* (negative), *meiru* (male (speech)), and *reguraa* (regular). Other words were used during administrative tasks: *konpozishon tesuto* (composition test), *fainaru eguzamu* (final exam), *risuningu* (listening) and *raitingu* (writing). In the following excerpt, Ms. Inoue explained about the upcoming midterm examination. The *katakanized* words have been double underlined.

Excerpt 4.41 Midterm Exam discussion

1. Inoue: Chapter three and four de *benkyou-shi-ta* *fankushon-wa* + request *sore kara* permission + *plus* etcetera, etcetera. A, *handoauto* mo *chanto mitoite kudasai,* *handoauto.* + *Handoauto* ne. ++ *Ii desu ka.* *Handoauto* kara mo *demasu kara* *handoauto* mo *chanto mitoite kudasai.* ++ *Nani ka shitsumon arimasu ka.* *Foomatto wa daita onaji desu.* The almost the same format, okay? Okay. *Maritipuru choisu mo arimasu.*

(Classroom Lecture, November 4, 2002)

In this excerpt, Ms. Inoue has changed the English words for ‘function’, ‘handout’, ‘format’ and ‘multiple choice’ into Japanese-like words. The advantage of using this method is that the teacher did not need to necessarily teach or use new vocabulary during
her lessons, which might have disrupted the flow of the message and conversation. By inserting English words pronounced as Japanese, it was much easier for students to understand what the teacher is attempting to communicate since it sounded like English words. A list of words for which teachers used *katakanization* is listed in Appendix I.

What is even more interesting is that the students adopted and learned to use the same strategy when they wanted to make English words into Japanese or when they didn’t know the Japanese equivalent and simply changed the English word so that it became Japanese-like. This was evident in Excerpt 4.30 (p. 80) when Johnny and Anna were talking about music and the singer Kylie Minogue. The two students decided to talk to each other using Japanese: *Kairi Minogu*. And later on, Anna mentions *Weddingu Plannaa* for the movie title, “The Wedding Planner.” Here is another example of Johnny, using this method for the course name ‘Consumer Behaviour’. Because he did not know the Japanese for this course name, instead he opted to change it into the *katakana* reading.

**Excerpt 4.42 Interview reflection composition task (Johnny & Anna: Mandarin)**

1. Johnny: *=Ichiban suki na koosu*. (Favourite course)

2. Anna: *Ichiban* + *ichiban*, *ichiban suki na* + *koo*+*su wa* = {Most + most, most favourite course is}

   {Consumer Behaviour}

4. Anna: Do we have to write English?

5. Johnny: It’s okay.

(Pairwork, November 19, 2002)
Although the use of *katakana* is appropriate for foreign words such as names of people and titles of movies, some student learned to use this method for other words that should not be modified in such a way even though the intended message remained clear.

In Excerpt 4.43, Cassie and Mindy are not sure how to write the words ‘cafeteria’ and so they try to pronounce it in a Japanese manner. (See Lines 2, 8 and 9.) Their attempt was not successful but their use of this strategy allowed them to produce a word that was very close to the Japanese word ‘*kafeteria*’; or, in fact, they could have used the word *shokudou*, which they probably do not remember or know.

**Excerpt 4.43**  
**Interview reflection composition task (Cassie & Mindy: Cantonese)**

1. Cassie: Tutor wo owattara kafe-, kafeteria de yoru gohan wo tabemasu a. I:? +  
   {After finishing tutoring, café-, (she) eats dinner at the cafeteria a. }

2. Mindy: *Kafetaria (xx). {err}*


5. Cassie: [Tooii. {It's far}]


7. Cassie: Hie mm hie gum ah? Jau gum ying mun soon. {Is it like this? Just write it in English.}

8. Mindy: Nee goh jau ngym geh ying goy. {It should be correct} [*Ka-fu-teria.]

9. Cassie: [*Ka-fu-.*]

(Pairwork, November 19, 2002)

Excerpt 4.44 shows an example of Miho and Sheri making a Japanese equivalent for the English word *culture*. They should know that the Japanese word for culture is

---

¹⁹ This is the name of the dormitory. The name has been changed.
bunka, yet they still proceed to use the strategy of katakanization to compensate for not remembering the Japanese. This use of changing the word ‘culture’ into *karucha or karuchaa (Line 3-5, 7-9) and the word ‘cultural’ (Line 3) into *karucharal may be influenced by the textbook section entitled “Culture notes” for which the instructor sometimes refers to as karuchaa nooto. Although we do use the word karuchaa, the students were obviously unsure as they tried to use this strategy to make the words *karucha and *karucharal. In this example, the students do not seem to be aware that they used this strategy, as opposed to the previous example in which it was done quite deliberately.

Excerpt 4.44 Interview reflection composition task (Miho: HLL; Sheri: Chinese)

1. Miho: Arts Studies? Mm. Or, cultural studies? ((laughs))
2. Sheri: I'm not sure. ((laughs))
3. Miho: Yeah. *Karu- *karucharal + to kankei ga aru. {Cul- cultural + } Karuchaa ni yotte or karuchaa ni yotte {according to culture or related to culture} + or something? ++
4. Sheri: *Karucha. {culture}
5. Miho: Karuchaa ni= {culture ((dative marker ni))}
7. Miho: Karuchaa no kankei {related to culture} or something. + Or, karu- karuchaa ni yotte + kamoku desu or something. {According to cul- culture + subject}
8. Sheri: Karuchaa no. {culture ((genitive case marker))}
9. Miho: Karuchaa. ++ {culture}

(Pairwork, November 19, 2002)
Excerpts 4.41-4.44, illustrate how students have adopted and learned how to *katakanize* English words so that they became Japanese and, therefore, made it easier to continue their task output in the TL. In this manner, students began using a strategy to deal with unknown or new English vocabulary items. This method seemed to be a useful strategy because there was still effective communication between members of the conversation. However, although many words have their proper equivalent in *katakana*, some words do not and teachers who use *katakanization* need to be aware that their students have adopted this strategy for their own communication purposes and that they must be careful in its use to avoid situations where students would not know the difference between a *katakana* word and one that is simply *katakanized* for oral communication purposes. *Katakanization* may be suitable for oral communication but it could not transfer over to the written medium since these words are not a part of the Japanese language and, therefore, teachers need to make this point clear to their students.

### 4.7.3 Needs of ESL Learners of JFL

The make-up of JFL classes at WCU is unique in that many students who enrol are not native or fluent English speakers. Since the majority of JFL students have come from China, Taiwan and Hong Kong, instructors have had to make certain adaptations to help ESL learners learn Japanese. As Ms. Young mentioned in her interview, she noticed that

> Chinese speakers, they way the brain works for them [is that] English is not their first language; Chinese is their first language. I don't know how ... they translate it. [When we] speak with them in English, ...they will probably think in Chinese and then the output will be in Japanese. So it works in three different languages so I'm not so sure [if] the students' brain really works that way. (November, 2002)
Other teachers brought up this concern as well. When Ms. Kitamura asked students for translations into English, she noticed that many of them had trouble expressing themselves through the English language. She explained that some students had yet to pass the ELPT (a pseudonym acronym), a written composition test to measure a students’ English language proficiency for entry into university-level English courses. The ELPT is used to indicate if students’ English level is high enough for university-level writing courses. Although students who have failed this test cannot enroll in regular English courses, they can still enroll in all other courses. Ms. Kitamura further mentioned that some of her JFL students, even at the third-year level, had not even passed this test. This implies that, in particular for Chinese-language-background students, they might have problems with their grammatical accuracy especially with the tense/aspect system. Ms. Kitamura commented that,

Their speaking, pronunciation, is good but I think the ELPT is looking at accuracy as well, like [the] TOEFL exam. .... Then when I mark, [they can’t even] change the [verb] ‘put’ [in]to past tense. [It should be] ‘put, put, put’, right?. [However, ] they wrote ‘put, putted, putted’.20 (Interview, November, 2002)

The implication for this is that students have difficulty with translation-type questions on exams and it makes it more challenging to mark their answers. Ms. Inoue had the same concerns and shared her thoughts.

I found that some students, whose first language is not Japanese, ... cannot really understand instructions on the exams or tests [that are] written in English. So for example, we use a certain vocab which is obviously clear to English native speakers but maybe [it’s] not really [clear] to second language students. For example, ... like this question, for this kind of question we have to ask for permission using certain structure[s] in Japanese; that’s one thing [that] students have to do. And then in [response] to ... question, they have to give [a] yes or no [response] in [an] appropriate [manner]. So, the instructions say ... make a request or ask for

20 This comment is addressing issues with English translations.
permission, whichever [you choose, and] so you have to decline [by stating] certain reasons. The word ‘decline’, probably some students don’t know the meaning of ‘decline’. So we have to use simpler, easier vocab. ... [This is] probably something [that] we really have to think about. (Interview, November, 2002)

One way in which Chinese-language-background students, more so for those who are less proficient in English, can use their knowledge is with Chinese characters to help them with kanji. In this respect, students have an alternative to relying on their knowledge of English. This will be discussed further in the following section.

4.7.5 Kanji

The huge population of Chinese-language-background students in JFL programs has influenced teachers and students in different ways. Some teachers such as Ms. Chen claimed that it had not influenced their lessons, while others such as Ms. Kitamura, Ms. Murakami, and Ms. Inoue admitted that they adjusted their lessons due to the large number of Chinese speakers. One area in which some teachers adjusted their lessons was kanji teaching. Kanji is one of three types of orthography in Japanese. It originated from Chinese characters and while many are written identically the same, some are unique to Japanese and need to be learned with caution.

Ms. Kitamura commented that if there were no Chinese speakers in her class, that she would spend more time on kanji. Similarly, Ms. Murakami said that there was definitely a direct effect on her kanji lessons: “I don’t go over kanji: not as much as the textbook suggests. I can just skip over, or, focus on reading of kanji in Japanese [instead].” According to Ms. Inoue, the Chinese-language-background students probably wrote better and knew the meaning of each kanji, and therefore, she didn’t necessarily
need to explain their meaning. However, Ms. Chen, who has Chinese language background, warns that

[kanji] sometimes acts as a disadvantage for them. First of all, in terms of writing, the writing of some kanji in Chinese are different from that in Japanese and [students] tend to make a lot of mistakes. And secondly, more importantly, particularly when it comes to reading, when they rely too much on kanji they will neglect the structure and so on. They thought [that] they [know] more or less by reading the kanji. They think they might think that they know the meaning, ... but actually without knowing the structure well ah that's not the case. (Interview, December, 2002)

So how did the JFL instructors use this knowledge to help their students learn Japanese?

The teachers used kanji in two ways: 1) they pointed out differences when writing kanji (kanji versus writing Chinese), and 2) they used kanji to help students get an idea of the meaning of a new word so that teachers did not have to explain every unknown vocabulary item. Todd explained what he saw, especially after a kanji quiz: “When some people make mistake with the kanji, ... [Ms. Inoue] points out the difference between the Chinese character and Japanese character.” As Wendi complained, she noticed that some small parts of the characters were different and that she always got those parts wrong on the quizzes. She found that it was useful when the teacher pointed the differences out since when she looked at her kanji chart, she just thought of the Chinese character. According to Ms. Sasaki, she explicitly showed students differences because she wanted to “make sure that ... [the students] don’t use the wrong character because they use, especially Mandarin people, ...use simplified characters but ... those characters are not ... part of Japanese and we don’t use them.”

Ms. Sasaki explained that she used kanji to help her students with vocabulary. “Yeah, sometimes I write down the word [in kanji characters] and
then [the Chinese speakers] will look at the characters and sometimes they can pick up what I want to say.” Similarly, as Ms. Yabuno points out that, “Chinese speakers, they sometimes ask for Chinese characters and then I’ll show them and I’ll provide [the] furigana (the Japanese pronunciation/reading) for non-Chinese speakers as well.”

It was observed that Ms. Yabuno and Ms. Inoue did focus on Chinese speakers to explicitly teach difference between kanji and Chinese characters. The in-class discussion of such differences did not happen very often because kanji lessons and kanji quizzes occurred infrequently, but teachers did mention that students did get such feedback on individual written assignments. When teachers did do this it was apparent that it targeted Chinese language background students. For example, Ms. Inoue stopped the kanji lesson, lead by the T.A., to point out a difference in the first of the two kanji for the word ‘yousu’\(^{21}\) which means aspect, state or appearance. The point of focus is represented in Figure 4.6.

**Figure 4.6 Comparing kanji with Chinese characters:** 様

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese kanji</th>
<th>Chinese character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>様</td>
<td>様</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{21}\) The kanji for yousu is 様子。The teacher is focusing on bottom right portion of the character 様.
Excerpt 4.45  Kanji Lesson

1. Inoue: Ano, T-sensei yousu tte kanji wo chotto kaite itadakemasu. ((writes the kanji for yousu on blackboard)) Atto ne, chotto minna ni mieru you ni. ((re-writes the kanji for yousu)) ++ Mou sukoshi (xx). ++ Mm. Ano watashi mo onaji nan desu kedo T-sensei to ++ koko ne ((points to bottom right part of the kanji)) + kono koko ano Chainizu kanji mo kore tsukaimasu ka. {Um, instructor T, will you write the kanji for 'yousu'? Oops um, so that everyone can see. A little (xx). Mm. For me it's the same as instructor T but here, okay, here here. Does the Chinese character also use this?}

2. Rachel: (x).

3. Inoue: Arimasu ka. Arimasen ka. {Have (it)? Have (it)?}

4. Students: Arimasu. {We have (it)}

5. Inoue: Arimasu? Hai. Kou yatte kakimasu ka. ((writes Chinese version of the same kanji)) De, ++ koko to koko ((points to bottom right part of the kanji)) ga betsubetsu desu ka [Chainezu kanji wa. {you have it? Okay. Do you write (it) like so? And, here and here, is it separate?}

6. Students: [Hai. {Yes}

7. Inoue: Watashi wa T-sensei to onaji de + kou yatte kaite kou i fuu ni kaku n desu ne. De, nan ka ne ano chuugokukei no hito no kanji kore wo mite ruto koko to koko ga separate + ni natte ru hito ga ooii no de + dou nano ka na ((laughs)) tte zuuto omotte ta n desu kedo. Ano yoku kyoukasho wo yoku mite, mite kudasai ne. Dou natte n desu ka. ((Ss looking in their textbook for the kanji)) ++ {I'm the same as instructor T (I) write like this, write in this manner, okay? And, something okay Chinese background people's kanji there are many in which, when I look at this, here and here is separate. I always wondered how it was. Um, please look, look in your textbook carefully, carefully, okay? How is (it in there)?

8. Brad: Kuttsuite ru. {It's together}

(Classroom Lecture, November 19, 2002)

Two other examples from a previous class include the kanji ‘急’ and ‘渋’.

(See Figure 4.7). Another example from Ms. Yabuno’s class include the
kanji ‘真’, for which many Chinese students wrote the kanji ‘頁’. Although both characters exist in both Japanese and Chinese, enough students wrote the incorrect kanji that the T.A. had to explicitly point out the difference during the review of answers for a kanji quiz. This example is illustrated in Figure 4.8.

Figure 4.7 Comparing two kanji/Chinese characters: 急 and 漢

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese kanji</th>
<th>Chinese character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>漢</td>
<td>漢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>急</td>
<td>急</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top portion of the Chinese version has an extra horizontal stroke, and also there is a stroke coming down directly from that horizontal line;

The horizontal stroke in the middle is longer; it sticks out.

Figure 4.8 Comparing two kanji/Chinese characters: 真 and 頁

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese kanji</th>
<th>What many Chinese students wrote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>真</td>
<td>頁</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the students’ perspective, many said that their Chinese language background helped them with kanji. The majority of the students interviewed claimed that, prior to enrolling in JFL classes, they had the perception that Japanese would be
easy to learn because they knew Chinese. In fact, some students thought that it would be
easy and indeed it had been, at least with respect to kanji. However, there were some
students who were surprised to find out how different the two language are in many ways.
When interviewed about pre-conceived notions of learning Japanese, Todd responded by
saying: “Yes [I thought it would be easy], and I was wrong. ‘Cause I thought like kanji
would be easy and ah, you know [but it wasn’t]. Yeah, that’s like my first impression.”

When students were interviewed and asked how knowing Chinese had helped
them with learning Japanese, almost all students said that it was not that helpful except
when it concerned kanji. Their background of Chinese characters helped them mostly
with the writing of the actual kanji (i.e., stroke order) and with recognition. As Cassie
mentioned, she noticed only a little difference between kanji and Chinese characters and,
therefore, it was easy to write kanji. And Phil commented that the strokes are about 80%
similar. Other students such as Michelle, Anna, Johnny, and Phil argued that the
meanings were quite the same and that it was easy to get an idea of the text by skimming
the kanji. The biggest difference they noticed was with the pronunciation and readings of
the kanji. Unlike Chinese, Japanese kanji characters have multiple pronunciation patterns
and this is one aspect that Chinese students couldn’t rely on their Chinese background for.

Among peers, there were several examples of students using their kanji
background to help them with writing and recognizing kanji during writing tasks. In the
following excerpt, Johnny assisted Anna with writing a kanji by referring to the Chinese
character (Line 4).

Excerpt 4.45 Interview reflection composition task (Johnny & Anna: Mandarin)

1. Anna: Okay. +++ De, ah + ki+ra+ri (xx) koosu wa accounting += {the course
they (err) is accounting}
2. Johnny: =Taikeigakubu. {Systematic studies}

3. Anna: Oh. ((makes correction)) ++

4. Johnny: Kanji is kuaiji. {The kanji is 'accountant'} Hui {((character 'hui'))}. I mean hui {((character 'hui'))}. Kangei. {Welcome party}

(Pairwork, November 19, 2002)

In Excerpt 4.46, Miho, a heritage language learner, asked her group member Sean, a Mandarin speaker, to help her with the meaning of the word for 'located' which was written on a vocabulary sheet (Line 1). In Line 2, Sean explained that “it’s like ‘located’ and then in Line 6 he stated that he guessed the meaning because that is its meaning in Chinese. He then confirmed with Darren, a fellow Cantonese speaker, who also used his Chinese language knowledge to check on the meaning of the kanji.

Excerpt 4.46 Writing task on topic of “My Country” (Miho: HLL; Sean & Darren: Cantonese but fluent English speakers; Kwan: Korean)

1. Miho: What’s ichishite imasu? {located}

2. Sean: It’s like ‘located’.

3. Miho: Oh, really? Okay, we’ll just, why don’t you ((laughs)).

4. Sean: Huh?

5. Miho: [Gaaden Machi22 wa + nishi ni. {Garden City is west} Is it +++?

6. Sean: [No, no, no. Just making it up because it look like Chinese. ((Darren & Sean laugh))

7. Darren: Oh yeah.

8. Sean: [Is it located? Looks like it.


---

22 Reference to the actual city name has been change to Garden City, or in Japanese, G-machi.
In this next example, Gabriella relied on her Chinese language knowledge to create a Japanese *kanji* combination word. This new word she has created, *maika*, is correct. In Line 4, it was evident that Gabriella had used her Chinese knowledge to combine the Chinese characters for ‘every’ and ‘class’ to supposedly create a valid Japanese *kanji*. Also, by trying to affix a Japanese reading to it (i.e., pronunciation) she tried to pass the characters as *kanji*. Unfortunately in this situation, this strategy was unsuccessful.

**Excerpt 4.47 Interview reflection composition task (Isabella: Korean; Gabriella: Cantonese)**

1. Isabella:   *Jugyou wa, ++ ju-gyou* ((writing down on paper))+. {Class is, class}

2. Gabriella:  *Maika*. {((err))}

3. Isabella:  What’s *maika*? {((err))}


5. Isabella:  ++

6. Gabriella:  {((laughs))}

This next excerpt simply shows how Isabella, a Korean speaker, relied on Gabriella’s Chinese background to ask for assistance in writing the *kanji* for ‘tokidoki’ (sometimes) to which Gabriella willingly responded by showing Isabella the characters.

**Excerpt 4.48 Interview reflection composition task (Isabella: Korean; Gabriella: Cantonese)**

1. Isabella:  *Tok-i* how do you write= {Some}
These four excerpts showed that Chinese-language-background students could rely on their knowledge of Chinese characters to help themselves and their peers with some kanji related language situations. With respect to kanji, Chinese-speaking students were able to use Chinese characters to identify kanji characters, attempt to make creative constructions of kanji and assist non-Chinese background peers with writing kanji characters.

Even though both teachers and students claimed that there were advantages to using kanji to help learn Japanese. However, As Ms. Murakami claimed, the Chinese students did just as poorly on their kanji quizzes as other students, although they had beautiful handwriting. It seemed that when used cautiously, kanji could be helpful in certain situations but its use was very limited. Sometimes, it appeared that the teachers and students found some negative transfer when students relied too much on their Chinese background to write, read and pronounce kanji. There definitely needs to be more research into this area to determine the advantages and disadvantages that the knowledge of Chinese characters has on Japanese language learning.

4.7.5 Heritage Language Learners: An Illustrative Case

Among the 45 students who participated in the study, there was only one heritage language learner. Miho, who was born in Eastern Canada and raised in Garden City, was born to a Japan-born-and-raised Taiwanese mother and a Japanese father. She attended
Japanese heritage language classes throughout her elementary school years yet quit after only 5 or 6 years. The WCU class that I observed was the first Japanese language class that she had taken since she was a child. Although she lived on her own, currently, her parents spoke Japanese at home as she was growing up. During high school, Miho took an interest in Japanese entertainment and identified herself as being Japanese. Now, she identified herself as Taiwanese-Japanese although she could relate more to Japanese-Canadians than to Chinese or Chinese-Canadians. She did not know any Chinese.

With her background as a heritage language learner (HLL), Miho was quite different from many of her classmates. She had some oral proficiency in the Japanese vernacular. Furthermore, even though she stated that her grammar was really weak, the pairwork tasks revealed that she had indeed internalized some grammar rules, which allowed Miho to intuitively evaluate TL structures. In the following peer task activity, Miho attempted to create a sentence but her intuition told her that something wasn't quite right about the sentence. In Line 1, the sentence she produced was incorrect. She offered no explanation for her evaluation except for the fact that, “This is weird.” This comment showed that she thought there was something wrong with the sentence, yet she could not identify what the problem was and, therefore, could not explain what she was thinking to her groupmates. In Lines 11, 15 and 17, Miho repeated her initial utterances and acted as if she was vocalizing the sentence for the purpose of listening to herself in order to assess if it “sounds right”. The rising intonation at the end of her utterances, indicated that she was unsure about the sentence. Perhaps, she was vocalizing her private speech since it did not seem as if her groupmates felt the need to assist her, but were, rather, simply waiting for Miho to figure it out on her own.
Excerpt 4.49 Writing task on topic of “My Country” (Miho: HLL; Sean & Darren: Cantonese but fluent English speakers; Kwan: Korean)

1. Miho: *Gaaden Machi no kikou wa sekai de ichiban su- sumi ni? Sumi ni ii kikou desu?* {Garden City’s climate is number one in the world li-, ((infinitive of ‘to live’)) ((dative case marker ni))? ((infinitive of ‘to live’)) ((dative case marker ni)) is good climate?} This is weird. + *Gaaden Machi no kikou wa sekai de ichiban nano, nano de +.* {Because Garden City’s climate is number one in the world} Because it’s the best place to live- I mean because it has very good climate it’s a good place to live. *Gaaden Machi no kikou wa sekai de=* {Garden City’s climate is in the world}

2. Darren: =What’s *sekai*? {world}


4. Darren: Oh.

5. Miho: *Sekai de ichiban nano de sumi yasui desu* ((rising intonation; unsure)). {Is number one in the world, and therefore, is very liveable}

6. Darren & Sean & Kwan: +


9. Miho: *(x) Gaaden Machi no* {Garden City ((genitive case marker no))} ++ was it *Gaaden Machi no* { Garden City ((genitive case marker no))} + what did you +, *kikou* {climate}?

10. Darren: *Gaaden Machi no=* {Garden City ((genitive case marker no))}

11. Miho: =*Kikou wa +++ ichiban ii* ((rising intonation; unsure)). *Ichiban ii?* {Climate is the best. Best?}

12. Darren & Sean & Kwan: ++

13. Miho: *Nan de sumi yasui desu.* {Why it is very liveable?}


15. Sean: How do you say (x)?

16. Kwan: *(xx). (x) ichiban. ((H laughs)) {number one}*
17. Miho: How about **Gaaden Machi umi no chikaku ni arimasu?** (x) **umi no chikaku ni + nano de.**

(Groupwork, November 5, 2002)

Excerpt 4.50 illustrates the same intuitive sense that Miho had about her sentences. In Line 10 she made a grammatically correct sentence yet she found that there was something not quite right about it (Line 12) by saying, “This makes sense.” in a sarcastic tone. This, again, appeared to be vocalized private speech since her response was a reflection commentary on her sentence. In a follow-up interview she confirmed that she was indeed vocalizing her private speech in order to see if the sentence sounded correct and this was a strategy she used often.

Another HLL feature exhibited in this excerpt and in Excerpt 4.51 was a weakness with kanji. In Line 1 of Excerpt 4.50, Miho didn’t know the kanji or even the reading for the word ‘forestry’. This was evident because in Line 2, Darren created the word ‘forestry’ by using the words ‘ki’ (tree) and ‘sangyou’ (industry) and combining them to mean ‘industry of trees’. Miho laughed at his response and continued her search for the kanji. Then, she found the vocabulary list sheet for the activity and pointed to an item. Sean was able to read the kanji for ‘forestry’ and let Miho know that it was pronounced ‘ringyou’ (and not ‘sangyou’) when he said, “Is it ringyou?” Even having heard the pronunciation of this kanji she was still not sure because she did not know the Japanese reading for ‘forestry’. Therefore, she continued to persist and pointed (Line 5) to a kanji and asked if that particular one was the kanji for ‘forestry (Line 7)’. Finally with Kwan’s confirmation, Miho determined that she had located the correct kanji.
Excerpt 4.50  Writing task on topic of “My Country” (Miho: HLL; Sean & Darren: Cantonese but fluent English speakers; Kwan: Korean)

1. Miho: [Forestry. What’s forestry?
2. Darren: *Ki no sangyou.* {Industry of trees} ((Miho laughs))
3. Miho: *Gaaden Machi no san-* (Garden City’s ind- oh is this it ((points to vocabulary list))?
4. Sean: Is it *ringyou*? {forestry}
5. Miho: Yeah, it’s this one?
6. Darren: *Rin-*. {For-}
7. Miho: Is that tree, forest ((asks S & D to examine the kanji))?
8. Sean: Maybe.
10. Miho: So, what is it? *Gaaden Machi no sangyou wa ringyou desu.* {Garden City’s industry is forestry.} Vancouver’s industry is forestry? ((laughs))
11. Kwan: (x).
12. Miho: ((A bit of sarcasm in tone)) This makes sense.
13. Darren: The main industry *omoni.* {main}
14. Miho: *Omo na sangyou wa + ringyou.* {The main industry is forestry}
15. Darren: *[Omo na.] {Main}
17. Miho: Okay. ((laughs))

(Groupwork, November 5, 2002)

Similarly, in Excerpt 4.51 Miho relied on her peers for *kanji* assistance. This time she wanted to write the *kanji* for ‘fishery’ and again pointed to a *kanji* on the vocabulary sheet. Once Sean confirmed her ‘guess’, she explained that she identified that particular
kanji because it had the kanji for ‘fish’ as part of the first kanji of fishing industry. The kanji for fish is an easy one which is usually learned at an early primary school level. She most likely remembered this from her heritage school days. She also confirmed this to be true in her follow-up interview.

**Excerpt 4.51**

Writing task on topic of “My Country” (Miho: HLL; Sean & Darren: Cantonese but fluent English speakers; Kwan: Korean)

1. Miho: Okay, so we can just say it’s forestry and fishery. ((Kwan laughs then Hana laughs)) Which one is fishery? + This one?
2. Sean: Sure.
3. Miho: I only notice the fish. ((laughs)) ++ Ringyou + oh, how about, how do you say it’s not only forestry but also fishery?

(Groupwork, November 5, 2002)

To summarize how Miho, as a HLL, had to adapt and adjust in the JFL classes, Excerpt 4.52 contains a conversation between Miho and Sheri (Chinese speaker) about the challenges of learning JFL as a HLL.

**Excerpt 4.52**

Interview reflection composition task (Miho: HLL; Sheri: Chinese)

1. Miho: I wanna learn like everything. ((laugh))
2. Sheri: I think your Japanese is pretty good. I think you just had trouble with kanji. ((laughs))
3. Miho: And the vocabulary. Like you keep on saying, I think you know more of the vocabulary than me.
4. Sheri: But I don’t know (xx). I have to think very slow.
5. Miho: ‘Cause like when I, ‘cause when people like + like say something and use hard words, I don’t like I have no idea. But I think you would know.
6. Sheri: But I have to think slowly.

---

23 The kanji for fishery is 漁業. The kanji for fish is 魚.
7. Miho: At least you know. ((laughs)) And so (xx) my grammar is really bad. +++ Like you know in *ga* {((Nominative case marker *ga*))} and stuff like that? I don’t know when you use it. ((laughs)) That’s why I’m (x) studying (xxx). And then, and then you (xxx) but I don’t even know. So, I have to study.

8. Sheri: (xxx).

9. Miho: Well, I, I have to study for the test but like before I didn’t know (about grammar rules at all).

(Pairwork, November 19, 2002)

Miho realized that she was weaker with vocabulary and *kanji*. Furthermore, she revealed that her grammar knowledge was “really bad” because until now she “didn’t even know” the grammar rules. In a follow-up interview in 2005, Miho confirmed that the observations and interpretations described her language learning accurately. When asked if she felt that she acted as a “language broker” between the teacher and her group members she had mentioned that she never felt that she took on this role because her Japanese was at the same level as her peers. In fact, Miho felt that her grammatical knowledge was weaker than the rest of the students since she had not taken any beginner-level university courses in JFL. She felt that the others had “learned Japanese properly from the start,” however she had not. For Miho, code-switching proved to be useful because she had trouble expressing why a Japanese phrase sounded “weird”. She was able to ask for assistance using English and used it to explain why she may have felt this way. Because she did not have a solid background in the formal learning of the grammar rules, it was even more useful her Miho to be able to access both Japanese and English to communicate with and get appropriate assistance from her peers.

4.8 Chapter Summary

The findings revealed that instructors in this institution were using a high ratio of TL (80%) in the JFL classes and that this was similar to what the Ms. Inoue and Ms. Yabuno had perceived themselves to be using. Furthermore, the students felt that the teachers used the TL about 70% of the time and the majority of the students were satisfied with their instructor’s balance of TL and English use. The data also found that instructors used English and utilized code-switching as a strategy to enhance the learning experiences of their students. The students said that they did not favour a TL-only policy and that they benefited from their teacher’s use of code-switching. Overall, both teachers’ and students’ concerns over TL use was related to challenges with comprehension and clarity of lesson explanations. As a result, the teachers and students used a variety of language-related strategies to enhance the learning of the Japanese language. Finally, the chapter also highlighted the different kinds of expertise that students from different ethnolinguistic backgrounds contributed to the classroom learning situation: for example, the Korean students brought their knowledge of Korean syntax, which is similar to Japanese; the Chinese learners brought their knowledge of Chinese characters, which are similar to kanji; and the HLL brought her own tacit knowledge of Japanese in the form of grammatical intuitions.
Chapter 5

Implications of the Study

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will introduce and discuss the pedagogical implications of this study. It will be suggested that strategic and purposeful use of code-switching by instructors can enhance FL learning. Also, students' use of code-switching during peer tasks offers necessary access to TL use and the negotiation of TL structures as they complete a task. Furthermore, by being aware and adapting FL programs according to the language needs of the students, FL learning experiences and opportunities for more effective scaffolding, and, thus, input, will be available to the students. The limitations of this study include the subjectivity of the researcher due to the qualitative nature of this case study research, the small number of cases selected and the size of each class (i.e., number of students), the refusal of the use of video-recording, and the fact that only just over half the students participated in interviews. Also being explored will be the direction for future research in the areas of TL and L1 use, as well as for JFL teaching and learning. The chapter will end with some concluding remarks.

5.1 Pedagogical Implications

This study focused on language use in JFL classrooms. Of particular focus was the use of the TL and the CL for enhancing Japanese language learning. The study showed that strategic uses of the TL and CL can be useful from both the teachers' and the students' perspective. For the teacher, it can provide scaffolding to students, especially during complex or important tasks where effective communication is critical. For students, the need to comprehend and to do so in a clear and efficient manner was the
main goal during classroom lectures. During pairwork, students used the TL and L1/NL to negotiate the content and manage the task. In other words, the students found it necessary to adjust their language use to improve communication in order to meaningfully complete the task. Overall, the instructors were able to adjust and adapt to student needs through a variety of language-related strategies.

First of all, teacher use of English, when strategically motivated, can be an effective mediating tool for language teaching. Most importantly, code-switching helps increase comprehension, especially during form-focused lessons and administrative tasks. The important point here is to be able to meet the needs of the students, and adjust the level of scaffolding as necessary. According to the students, the teachers used English in areas where they might otherwise struggle or showed signs of struggle. Other than these times, the teacher used as much TL as possible without jeopardizing comprehension, thus preventing any negative effects with respect to opportunities for input. This study calls for raising the awareness of instructors who use a high ratio of English in their FL teaching and/or are afraid to increase their TL use because they feel that it will negatively affect their students confidence or motivation. As the majority of students in this study reported, they were clearly satisfied with their instructors' ratio of language use; they were satisfied even when their teachers' were using as much as 80% of the TL in class. Therefore, teachers do not necessarily have to assume that high quantities of TL use will have a negative impact on their language classrooms. The key is to use the L1 strategically to enhance and complement the TL, and to adjust their language use according to the specific needs of their students and not necessarily according to
department policies, self-imposed principles, or because it’s convenient for the teacher to use the L1 without seriously considering its use.

Secondly, the study suggests that code-switching during collaborative tasks can support L2 learning. Because many students did not use the TL during teacher-led lectures, pairwork activities can provide much needed opportunities for language negotiating and TL use, in general. This study found that students used a fair amount of L1, English and mixed utterances during the process part of the language task. This implies that use of the CL was a natural and comfortable strategy, yet effective in that it helped students manage the task by negotiating the TL content necessary to successfully complete the task. Although code-switching helped students complete the task, in every instance the TL used was only to refer to TL items from textbooks, handouts, written notes and such. Unfortunately, there was seldom creative or spontaneous use of the TL. Perhaps it can be concluded that the students did not have the language tools to perform these functions in the TL. More evident is that fact that students rarely had in-class opportunities to be creative and spontaneous. If students are expected to use the language for authentic communication, students must be given the language tools and the encouragement to do so.

Finally, the study suggests that teachers and program coordinators need to consider the language backgrounds of their students and adjust their program, curriculum and methodology accordingly. The study raises questions about how the JFL curriculum can be modified in such a way that learners can engage in more spontaneous, creative language use, as listeners and speakers, using the TL. In this case, there were many Chinese-speaking students enrolled in the JFL classes and teachers made several
adaptations to accommodate this population. For example, the teachers were sensitive to their needs and helped them with certain aspects of the Japanese language such as explaining the difference between similar kanji pairs, simplifying exam instructions for Chinese ESL students, and modifying TL input through the use of code-switching. With such high enrolments of Chinese-language-background students, programs may find it beneficial to even have a separate stream for Chinese students and to have the TL taught not through the common language of English, but rather through Chinese directly. With some non-Chinese students and HLLs claiming that they felt that the Chinese students had an advantage over them, the popularity of JFL among Chinese students may in fact discourage students of other ethnic and language backgrounds from enrolling in these classes. The issue of attracting more non-Chinese students definitely needs further investigation. Furthermore, HLLs, who have their own different set of needs, often get neglected in the process since there are usually few HLLs that enrol in JFL classes at this institution (for reasons unknown) and more importantly, regular FL classes are not designed to cater to HLL needs. In terms of TL and L1 use, having different streams can further enhance JFL learning experiences because the Chinese speakers can learn JFL using the TL and their NL; non-Chinese, non-HLLs learners can benefit from more attention to their needs, especially when it comes to kanji and vocabulary lessons; and HLLs can benefit from lessons with an almost exclusive use of the TL.

The role of the L1 in FL learning remains a complex issue. The most challenging aspect of TL/L1 use is determining how much, in addition to in what ways the use of the L1 is “appropriate” and the “most effective”. Since every FL class is not exactly
identical to any other FL class, this issue continues to be an intriguing one that requires further investigation.

5.3 Limitations of the Study

The qualitative nature of this study requires that the researcher be involved in interpreting the data. Data were collected from a number of sources so that these sources could provide information to support the findings, regardless of the researcher’s subjectivity, thus strengthening the internal validity of the study. Despite the triangulation of teacher and student interviews and the classroom lecture and pairwork audio recordings, it is not possible to completely eradicate the researcher’s role in the data analysis process. The researcher herself is often considered an instrument in qualitative research.

Two cases were the primary object of investigation and, although the two JFL classes provided a wealth of information, generalizing from this study to other populations is not possible. However, the case study can provide information that can contribute to the current research on similar issues on TI/L1 use and individuals or groups who are experiencing similar learning contexts can use this study to try and understand their own teaching or learning experiences. Furthermore, the study sheds light on the different experiences of students from different backgrounds learning the same language, Japanese.

The relatively small size of each class (less than 25 students in each of the two classes) meant that I could only record a limited number of pair groupings during peer tasks. This was because not all students consented to the audio-recordings. Therefore, there was great variation in the number of pairs that were audio-recorded during every
task. At the most, five pairs (total for both classes combined) were available for analysis. If students were given a tape-recorder and yet chose not to record their sessions, then I did not get access to that pairwork recording. However, the pairs and excerpts selected were representative of the learning experiences of the students.

Another point is that during the first meeting with the two focal instructors, I asked the teachers if I could videotape their lectures. Their response was that the video recording would distract students and perhaps make them uncomfortable. Therefore, the only recording device accessible were the cassette recorders. The video recordings would have been useful to observe any body gestures that the instructor or students may have used when communicating to each other. Furthermore, I could have observed the facial expressions of the students, especially before and after instances of code-switching in order to see the reactions of the students to the lesson. Also, since I used one professional tape recorder to record the classroom lectures, it may have been helpful to have another recording device to catch all the utterances, especially of those students who spoke softly or sat the farthest from the tape recorder.

Lastly, only about half the students participated in the interviews. In addition, the interviews (with both instructors and students) were done only once and no follow-up interview or discussion session took place. Also, after data analysis was complete, member checks were not done for both instructors and students. One exception is with Miho, with whom I had a follow-up online chat interview about her HLL experiences.

5.4 Directions for Future Research

This study attempted to fill a gap in the literature on LI and TL use and, in particular, research concerning Japanese-as-a-foreign-language classes. Due to the
limited scope of this research, in addition to the limitations mentioned in the previous section, I would like to suggest a few areas for future research. From the best of my knowledge, this present study, aside from Ohta (2001, 20001, 1995), is the only study that examined the role of language during JFL classes. Although Ohta's looked only at peer tasks, my study also addresses code-switching and scaffolding provided by instructors to their students. Furthermore, this study is unique in that it also investigated the effects of having many Chinese-language-background students in JFL classes in a North American context, a trend that may continue in the future, given recent immigration patterns. The study illustrated code-switching practices not only in the TL and English (the main instructional language besides the TL) but also with additional languages in the same conversation.

To get a more thorough understanding of the experiences of the Japanese language teachers and their students, it would be more effective to not only interview them once but to do research for a longer period with a few interviews during the entire period. Having focus groups of students only, teachers only, and students and teachers might yield evidence of more interesting information that could either confirm or perhaps even contradict the findings of this study. It would be exciting, for example, to find out if the teacher's L1 status had any effect on teaching JFL, especially to a majority Chinese class. Would native speakers of English or native speakers of Chinese teach differently from the two teachers observed, and if so, how?

A similar study with non-native teachers of Japanese could demonstrate how non-native speakers of Japanese cope with the challenges of teaching Japanese through their own L2 or L3, perhaps.
A topic for further investigation would be to examine the role of ESL learners in JFL classes and how they cope with issues of language (TL, English, and NL) in classes where the teacher is proficient in the TL, yet less proficient in English. It would be interesting to see how teachers and students would negotiate the language gap and what strategies they would use (with respect to language) to scaffold their learning. Similarly, it would be interesting to conduct a study about a North American JFL (Chinese stream) class taught by a Chinese speaking instructor and to what extent they would use English to teach Japanese to Chinese-language-background students.

5.5 Concluding Remarks

This study investigated the role of the TL and L1 in a JFL learning context where many students had Chinese language background. A total of 2 focal instructors, 6 other instructors, and 45 students (21 of whom participated in interviews) participated in the study through classroom observations, interviews, and pairwork audio-recordings. The data showed that teachers used a relatively large amount of TL while students' TL use during peer tasks was about half that of the teacher. Both teachers and students made use of code-switching to assist learners by providing scaffolding in the zone of proximal development. It was found that teachers used a variety of linguistic and pragmatic strategies to help students learn Japanese. The unique processes and effects of JFL learning for Korean, Chinese, and Japanese HL speakers were also identified and illustrated.

As a former university JFL student and a HLL, as well as a secondary school Japanese teacher, it was very rewarding to conduct research in an area that is of personal and professional interest. Because I was always intrigued by the large Chinese-speaking
student population enrolled in JFL classes at WCU, this gave me an opportunity to understand this phenomenon and to get a glimpse of the popularity of Japanese among Chinese youth.

Also, I became quite interested in how Miho was experiencing her JFL classes. Like other HLLs, she felt that her grammar basis was weak and that kanji and vocabulary were the most difficult aspects of learning Japanese as a HLL. Because I could relate to her experiences, it was interesting to see what strategies she used to overcome the challenges. What was the most salient was that her Japanese language learning was connected to her identity as a Japanese-Taiwanese. She felt that she should know Japanese because she was Japanese; this was exactly how I felt during my own undergraduate years. Interestingly, of all the students in the study, I became most acquainted with Miho.

The experience of doing research has been both challenging and exciting. I learned a lot from the study itself, as well as the process of conducting research. Upon reflection, the discussions with the participants about their language learning/teaching were the highlights of the data collection and seeing how all the data merged together to form this thesis has been a most rewarding experience.
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Appendix I

Informed Consent Form for Focal Instructors

Title of Study: Language use in Japanese as a Foreign Language Classrooms

Faculty Advisor
Dr. Patricia Duff
Associate Professor
Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education
604-822-9693

Graduate Student
Emy Nakamura
Master of Arts Candidate
Department of Language and Literacy Education
The University of British Columbia
XXX-XXX-XXX
M.A. Thesis research

Purpose
The purpose of this study is to examine teacher and student communication patterns in Japanese as a foreign language classrooms (JFL) in a local university setting. I am interested in the roles of first, second, and even third languages in JFL learning environments. I will be examining how JFL instructors adapt their language use to enhance communication with students when teaching Japanese.

Procedures
Your participation will involve a 30-45 minute audio-taped interview, a questionnaire and classroom observation sessions during Term 1 of the Winter 2002 academic year at The Western Canadian University. The classroom observations of the seminar sessions of Intermediate Japanese (i.e. JAPN XXXX) will occur four times throughout the term. These four classroom observations will be audio-recorded with the permission of the students involved and would be during weeks 4-8. For the interview session, I would be glad to arrange an interview on campus at a time convenient for you.
Confidentiality
Any information resulting from this research study will be kept strictly confidential. Participants will not be identified by name and where necessary pseudonyms will be used for anonymity in any reports of the completed study. Audio-tapes and transcribed documents will be kept in a secure filing cabinet and will be identified only by a code number.

Compensation
In appreciation of your involvement in the study, each participant will receive an honorarium in the amount of $200.

Contact
If you have any questions or desire to for further information or feedback with respect to this study, you may contact Emy Nakamura at XXX-XXX-XXX or emyn@interchange.ubc.ca, or, the faculty advisor, Dr. Patricia Duff at 604-822-9693 or patricia.duff@ubc.ca.

If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research participant you may contact the Director of Research Services at The University of British Columbia at 604-822-8598.
STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

Title of Study: Language use in Japanese as a Foreign Language Classrooms

I understand that my participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please fill in the information below.

Be sure to keep a signed copy of page 3 for your own records, and pages 1-2.

___ I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

___ I consent to participate in this study.

Name

Signature ____________________________ Date ____________

Phone number ____________________________

Witness ____________________________ Date ____________

Please keep this copy for your records.
STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

Title of Study: Language use in Japanese as a Foreign Language Classrooms

I understand that my participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please fill in the information below.

Be sure to keep a signed copy of page 3 for your own records, and pages 1-2.

_____ I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

_____ I consent to participate in this study.

Name
Signature Date
Phone number
Witness Date

Please return this copy to the researcher.
Appendix II
Informed Consent Form for Non-Focal Instructors

Title of Study: Language use in Japanese as a Foreign Language Classrooms

Faculty Advisor
Dr. Patricia Duff
Associate Professor
Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education
604-822-9693

Graduate Student
Emy Nakamura
Master of Arts Candidate
Department of Language and Literacy Education
The University of British Columbia
XXX-XXX-XXX
M.A. Thesis research

Purpose
The purpose of this study is to examine teacher and student communication patterns in Japanese as a foreign language classrooms (JFL) in a local university setting. I am interested in the roles of first, second, and even third languages in JFL learning environments. I will be examining how JFL instructors adapt their language use to enhance communication with students when teaching Japanese.

Procedures
Your participation will involve a 30-45 minute audio-taped interview during Term 1 of the Winter 2002 academic year at The Western Canadian University. I would be glad to arrange the interview on campus at a time that is convenient for you.

Confidentiality
Any information resulting from this research study will be kept strictly confidential. Participants will not be identified by name and where necessary pseudonyms will be used for anonymity in any reports of the completed study. Audio-tapes and transcribed documents will be kept in a secure filing cabinet and will be identified only by a code number.
Compensation
In appreciation of your involvement in the study, each participant will receive a $40 gift certificate to a local bookstore.

Contact
If you have any questions or desire to for further information or feedback with respect to this study, you may contact Emy Nakamura at XXX-XXX-XXX or emyn@interchange.ubc.ca, or, the faculty advisor, Dr. Patricia Duff at 604-822-9693 or patricia.duff@ubc.ca.

If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research participant you may contact the Director of Research Services at The University of British Columbia at 604-822-8598.
STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

Title of Study: Language use in Japanese as a Foreign Language Classrooms

I understand that my participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please fill in the information below.

Be sure to keep a signed copy of page 3 for your own records, and pages 1-2.

____ I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

____ I consent to participate in this study.

Name ____________________________________________
Signature _________________________________________ Date __________________________
Phone number ______________________________________
Witness ___________________________________________ Date _________________________

Please keep this copy for your records.
STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

Title of Study: Language use in Japanese as a Foreign Language Classrooms

I understand that my participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please fill in the information below.

Be sure to keep a signed copy of page 3 for your own records, and pages 1-2.

_____ I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

_____ I consent to participate in this study.

Name
Signature _______________________________ Date ________________
Phone number _______________________________
Witness _______________________________ Date ________________

Please return this copy to the researcher.
Appendix III

Informed Consent Form for Students

Title of Study: Language use in Japanese as a Foreign Language Classrooms

Faculty Advisor
Dr. Patricia Duff
Associate Professor
Department of Language and Literacy Education
Faculty of Education
604-822-9693

Graduate Student
Emy Nakamura
Master of Arts Candidate
Department of Language and Literacy Education
The University of British Columbia
XXX-XXX-XXX
M.A. Thesis research

Purpose
The purpose of this study is to examine teacher and student communication patterns in Japanese as a foreign language classrooms (JFL) in a local university setting. I am interested in the roles of first, second, and even third languages in JFL learning environments. I will be examining how JFL instructors adapt their language use to enhance communication with students when teaching Japanese.

Procedures
Your participation will involve being observed by the researcher during your Japanese class. This will include up to four classes of the seminar sessions (JAPN XXXX) during Term 1 of your Winter 2002 academic year at The Western Canadian University. These observations will be audio-taped

Confidentiality
Any information resulting from this research study will be kept strictly confidential. Participants will not be identified by name and where necessary pseudonyms will be used for anonymity in any reports of the completed study. Audio-tapes and transcribed documents will be kept in a secure filing cabinet and will be identified only by a code number.
Contact
If you have any questions or desire to for further information or feedback with respect to this study, you may contact Emy Nakamura at XXX-XXX-XXX or emyn@interchange.ubc.ca, or, the faculty advisor, Dr. Patricia Duff at 604-822-9693 or patricia.duff@ubc.ca.

If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research participant you may contact the Director of Research Services at The University of British Columbia at 604-822-8598.
STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

Title of Study: Language use in Japanese as a Foreign Language Classrooms

I understand that my participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please fill in the information below.

Be sure to keep a signed copy of page 3 for your own records, and pages 1-2.

I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

I consent to participate in this study.

Name ________________________________
Signature ________________________________ Date ______________
Phone number ________________________________
Witness ________________________________ Date ______________

Please keep this copy for your records.
STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

Title of Study: Language use in Japanese as a Foreign Language Classrooms

I understand that my participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please fill in the information below.

Be sure to keep a signed copy of page 3 for your own records, and pages 1-2.

____ I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

____ I consent to participate in this study.

Name ___________________________________________

Signature _______________________________________ Date ______________

Phone number _____________________________________

Witness _________________________________________ Date ______________

Please return this copy to the researcher.
Appendix IV

Instructor Interview Guide

1. For what purposes do you prefer to use English as opposed to Japanese in the Japanese classroom? Why? For what purposes do you prefer to use Japanese as opposed to English in the Japanese classroom? Why?

2. What do you feel is the role of English in your Japanese classroom?

3. To what extent, and by whom, are languages other than Japanese or English used in your class? Which languages are used for what purposes? What are your views about the use of additional languages (such as Chinese) in your classes?

4. What languages do students generally use to communicate with one another in class?

5. What do you think is the ratio of English to Japanese language use in your Japanese classroom? Is the language you choose to use throughout your sessions something you so consciously (i.e. through lesson planning)? How, if at all, does your use of English or Japanese change over time?

6. What are your thoughts about Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) classes that are taught only in the target language? Do you think it is possible to do so? In your opinion, is it an effective method for teaching JFL? What challenges are there in trying to teach in this way?

7. What kind of tasks or activities have you found to be successful in maximizing Japanese language use among students? What kinds of tasks or activities have you found to be not as successful in maximizing Japanese language use?

8. What are some of the challenges or issues that you have encountered in teaching students whose first language is not English, and for whom Japanese is the third or even fourth language? Have you had to learn to adapt or modify your lessons to accommodate such learners? What types of accommodations have you implemented?

9. How do you think that your teaching style or lesson planning has been influenced by the increase in Chinese-as-a-first-language students? How do you think this affects students enrolled in the Japanese class who are non-native speakers of Chinese? How do you balance these two elements within the same classroom environment? What impact does the presence of Chinese-background students have on your approach to literacy tasks and instruction?
Appendix V

Student Interview Guide

1. Can you tell me briefly about your past experience learning Japanese prior to this course? What is your major? Why are you learning Japanese? Why did you decide to study Japanese at WCU and why did you choose this course in particular? What are the best features of the class, in your opinion?

2. What do you think is the ratio of English use to Japanese use by your instructor? Would you like your instructor to use more English? Would you like her to use more Japanese? Why or why not? How do you think the use of one or the other language affect your language learning?

3. What are your thoughts about intermediate Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) classes that are taught only or almost all in the target language? What challenges would you face in such a class? What benefits would you receive in such a classroom environment?

4. For what purposes would you prefer that the teacher use English as opposed to Japanese in the Japanese classroom? Why? For what purposes do you prefer the teacher to use Japanese as opposed to English in the Japanese classroom? Why?

5. In general, what kind of tasks or activities do you find to be useful in challenging and maximizing your Japanese language use and language learning? In general, what kind of tasks or activities do you find to not be as challenging or not as useful in maximizing Japanese language use?

6. Do you have any opportunities to practice Japanese outside of class? Please explain.

7. (Chinese-as-a-first-language students) In what ways is knowledge of your first language, Chinese, helpful in learning Japanese? Do you have opportunities to use Chinese in class as well as Japanese and English? How, in what situations? Do your teachers use your first language background to help you learn Japanese? How, any examples? How often do you find your teachers use your first language background to help you earn Japanese? How do you think this makes non-Chinese-as-a-first-language students feel? How different do you the learning situation would be if all the students in the class knew Chinese?

(Non-Chinese-as-a-first-language students) If your first language is not Chinese or English does your teacher use your first language background to help you learn Japanese? How often do you find your teachers using your first language background to help you learn Japanese? In regards to the Chinese-as-a-first language students, how often do you find your teachers using their first language background to help them learn Japanese? How does it make you feel?
What advantages or disadvantages are there in studying Japanese in a class like yours with students from different language backgrounds? In what ways do you think your experience would be different if all the students in the class spoke English as their first language?

8. What is your opinion about the textbook? How do you find the mix of English and Japanese throughout your textbook?

9. How has learning Japanese changed you?
Appendix VI

Transcription Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>beginning of overlapping speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>words cut off by or cutting off a partner’s utterance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w-o-r-d</td>
<td>short pause in the middle of a word, usually in between syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+; ++; +++</td>
<td>one second pause; two seconds pause; three or more seconds pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x); (x); (xxx)</td>
<td>one unclear word; two unclear words; three or more unclear words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL</td>
<td>loud speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underlining</td>
<td>emphasized speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>italics</td>
<td>Japanese words in romanized form (only in translations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘word’</td>
<td>gloss or citation form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘...’</td>
<td>in excerpts, quotation marks indicate reported speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>author’s insertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((comments))</td>
<td>comments of relevant details pertaining to interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>unusually lengthened sound or syllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x-</td>
<td>(attached) cutoff word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(err)</td>
<td>untranslatable sequence of letters or mispronounced word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{}</td>
<td>translation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix VII

### Katakanization Word List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Katakanazation word</th>
<th>English equivalent</th>
<th>Katakanazation word</th>
<th>English equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shichueeshon</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>fainaru</td>
<td>final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buranku</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>omitto</td>
<td>omit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obiasu</td>
<td>obvious</td>
<td>regulaa</td>
<td>regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guramaa</td>
<td>grammar</td>
<td>fakuto</td>
<td>fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puroburemũ</td>
<td>problem</td>
<td>piriioddo</td>
<td>period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paamishon</td>
<td>permission</td>
<td>gaarisshu</td>
<td>girlish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undaarain</td>
<td>underline</td>
<td>rukkusu</td>
<td>looks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kotorasuto</td>
<td>contrast</td>
<td>kontekisuto</td>
<td>context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sesshon</td>
<td>session</td>
<td>familii neemu</td>
<td>family name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderu no</td>
<td>model dialogue</td>
<td>Chainiizu</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dataroggu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fankushon</td>
<td>function</td>
<td>padatonaa</td>
<td>partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handoutauto</td>
<td>handout</td>
<td>poĩto foomu</td>
<td>point form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foomatto</td>
<td>format</td>
<td>ruusuriifu</td>
<td>loose leaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maritipuru choisu</td>
<td>multiple choice</td>
<td>essei foomu</td>
<td>essay form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negatibu</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>'daburu-speesu</td>
<td>double space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akusepputaburu</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>intorodakushon</td>
<td>introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipu</td>
<td>skip</td>
<td>konkurujon</td>
<td>conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaputaa foo</td>
<td>Chapter Four</td>
<td>bodii</td>
<td>body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hai skuuuru sisutemu</td>
<td>High School system</td>
<td>meeru</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yangaa</td>
<td>younger</td>
<td>raiburari</td>
<td>library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konfuujon</td>
<td>confusion</td>
<td>rekuchaa</td>
<td>lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kajuara</td>
<td>casual</td>
<td>biridingu</td>
<td>building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spilichi sutairu</td>
<td>speech style</td>
<td>miliaa paakingu</td>
<td>meter parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kasutamiaa</td>
<td>customer</td>
<td>dailaggu</td>
<td>dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noosu Amerika</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>risuningu</td>
<td>listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>famiriit</td>
<td>family</td>
<td>raitingu</td>
<td>writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sain uppu shiito</td>
<td>sign-up sheet</td>
<td>muubu</td>
<td>move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaa</td>
<td>pair</td>
<td>bookabu</td>
<td>vocab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ribaizudo</td>
<td>revised</td>
<td>oopuningu</td>
<td>opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konpozishon tesuto</td>
<td>composition test</td>
<td>kurouzingu</td>
<td>closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ooraru eguzamu</td>
<td>oral exam</td>
<td>finisshu</td>
<td>finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shiito</td>
<td>sheet</td>
<td>ekušupaato</td>
<td>expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maakingu</td>
<td>marking</td>
<td>kariuchaa</td>
<td>culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paato</td>
<td>part</td>
<td>forouppu</td>
<td>follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taamu</td>
<td>term</td>
<td>dissenbaa twerubu</td>
<td>December twelve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VIII

JAPANESE WORD COUNT CONVENTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>EXAMPLE ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td>One word/attached</td>
<td>1. conjunctive: aida, -ba, dattara, de (copula), kara, ga, keredomo, -nagara, nara, node, shi, -tara (including dattara), -tari/-dari, -tatte, -te kara, -te mo/-de mo, -te wa, to (samuku naru to), toki (hima na toki), uchi, 2. adverbial: bakari, dake, demo, gurai/kurai, hodo, koso, nado, nanka, nante, shika, to, shika, to (pikapika to hikaru), -zutsu 3. focus: datte, made, mo, wa (ni wa, e wa, to wa, kara wa) 4. case: de, e, ga, kara, made, made-ni, ni, no, wo, to, yori, to (with), yori, 5. conjoining: ka (or), to (and), toka, ya 6. question: ka 7. quotative: to 8. final: mon(o), ne, no, yo, wa 9. phrasal: ni atatte, ni kanshi(te), ni taishite, ni totte, bi tsuite, ni yoreba, ni yotte, wo motte, to shite, 10. comparative: yori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational noun</td>
<td>One word</td>
<td>Mae, maka, uchi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time noun</td>
<td>One word</td>
<td>Koro, toki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical noun</td>
<td>One word</td>
<td>Mon(o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives-noun modifying</td>
<td>One word</td>
<td>Furui hon, shizuka na machi, pinku no fuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalizer</td>
<td>One word</td>
<td>Koto, mono/mon, no,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>One word</td>
<td>Totemo, ima, yugata ni, kitto, amari,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative/questions words</td>
<td>One word</td>
<td>Kore, sore, are, dore, Kono, sono, ano, dono, Kou, sou, aa, dou, Kochira, sochira, achira, doshira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>One word</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 "One word" means that items in this category can stand alone as one word. "Attached" words are those in which the item is not counted as a word since it is usually attached to the end of other item. "Attached" examples are those that have a dash before the item e.g., -nagara, or -tachi. These only become counted as one word once it is attached to another word such as tabenagara (while eating) or watashitachi (we, us).
### Japanese Word Count Conventions (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Attached</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-domo, -garu, -gata, -goro, personal: -san, -sama, plural: -ra, -tachi</td>
<td>Nominalizing: -sa, kata e.g. (tabekata), -mi</td>
<td>Adj forming: -teki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structural noun</td>
<td>One word</td>
<td>Hou, mama, tame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence ending</td>
<td>One word/attached</td>
<td>Haizu, kamoshIREnai, -mai, mitai, ni chigai nai, n(o) da, rashii, sou (hear say), -sou (likely to), -ta, -takatta, -ta aru, -te ageru, -te hoshii, -te hoshikatta, -te ikw/-teku, -te iru/-teru, -te itadaku, -te, kudasaru, -te kureru, -te kuru, -te miru, -te morau, -te okw/-toku, -te shimaruru/-chau, -te yaru, tsumori, -tte, wake, hazu, you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**V+masu verb ending**
- V+masu verb ending

**Negative ending (verb)**
- V+masu verb ending

**VERBAL NOUN**
- Active form of verbs
- Passive form of verbs

**Negative conjunctive**
- One word/attached

**-te form verbs**
- V+te: vkatte ageru, -ta (past/perfect ending)
- Attached: -ta: natta, kureta, atta, data, shita,

**V tai form**
- Attached: Tabe-tai, morai-tai

**Counters**
- Attached: -kai, -mai, -sai

**Indirect quotations**
- One word: To iu, to, -tte/te,

### Other Items

- English words pronounced as Japanese: Counted as Japanese word

- English contractions: One word

---
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