

## Classroom Ethnography: Field Note's Facilitator

John Gunning

Gifu Pharmaceutical University

### Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to conduct a research project investigating when and why students use L1 in the author's college English classes. For that purpose I have chosen ethnography, a qualitative method of data collection as a main research tool, which includes field notes, semi-structured and unstructured interviews, student diaries and a questionnaire. The research was conducted over a period of nine weeks during the university's spring semester which runs from April to July. From an ethnographical account using field notes as a participant observer, I noticed that students were language switching during the freer communicative tasks at a level that seemed to be hindering their language acquisition. As a result of the research, several strong causes of students L1 switching have been discovered which include students working in pairs compared to small groups and individual learning styles. In addition, I have discovered several interesting learner traits concerning L1 switching which are the use of dictionaries and note taking during the communicative task.

## 1. Ethnography-Literature Review

### 1.1 Background

Watson-Gegeo (1988) states that ethnography has been greeted with enthusiasm because it investigates issues such as socio-cultural processes that occur in the class, which includes moment to moment classroom interaction such as teacher-student and student-student utterances. The systematic documentation of teaching-learning interactions using field notes, interviews, diaries, videotaping and formal and informal interviews has the aim of answering research questions developed from grounded theory; theory that is generated from data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) cited in Watson Gegeo (1988). By grounded, researchers mean theory based on collected data and its subsequent analysis in which theory is arrived at through a systematic process of induction. Gegeo (1988) gives examples of two kinds of grounded theory which she

defines as 'substantive' or 'formal'. The former focuses on an empirical topic, such as teacher-student interaction and the latter focuses on a conceptual topic, such as a model for second language acquisition as put forth by Diesing (1971) cited in Watson-Gegeo (1988).

Watson-Gegeo (1988) states that ethnographical studies are intensive detailed observations of a setting over a long period of time which consists of three stages. In the first stage the ethnographer studies all the salient aspects of the setting in the classroom. In classroom ethnography, the researcher may be looking at classroom organization and interaction; identifying and analyzing patterns of student's utterances and then relating this to institutional, social and cultural factors. Watson-Gegeo (1988) further defines the second stage as the topic oriented stage in which the observations become more focused and may include interviewing and analysis of data to generate more focused research questions. Watson-Gegeo (1988) refers to the third stage as the hypothesis-oriented stage in which a hypothesis or research questions may be generated from focused observations, literature, interviews and analysis of field notes. Other researchers (Chaudron, 1986 and Gaies, 1983) assert that qualitative paradigms are naturalistic, uncontrolled, subjective and process oriented which 'describe [as] fully as possible the complexity of second language classrooms' (Gaies, 1983, pg.205).

## 1.2 Participant Researcher-Teacher

There are some who distinguish the difference in research between participant and non-participant observation. Contrary to the separate distinction, Swann (2001) in support of what the linguist Labov identified as 'the observer's paradox' (Labov 1970), contends that being in the classroom or setting up equipment have an effect on learner's language behavior and acquisition. The researcher in effect becomes an unlikely participant. Many researchers have attempted to avoid or minimize, in various ways, the intrusion of their observations in order to obtain the most authentic data as possible. Swann (2001) feels that the role of the participant observer best suits the researcher's situation because the researcher-teacher, can not always maintain a level of subjectivity at every stage of the research process. McDonough and McDonough (1997) contend that the possibility of the teacher to become a full scale ethnographer is unlikely and suggest that a micro-ethnographic approach is more realistic. Compared to a macro-ethnographic approach which looks at entire schools or whole cultures, the micro-ethnographic approach focuses on a more manageable aspect of action research such as all the events that occur within the entity of the classroom (McDonough & McDonough, 1997; Watson-Gegeo, 1988). Swann argues that detachment is not a reasonable research goal:

For educationalists researching in their own institutions, or institutions with which they have a close association, it will probably be impossible to act as a completely detached observer (Swann, 2001, pg. 324).

In research conducted here it would have been very difficult, if not impossible, to separate my role as teacher and that as a researcher. My daily interaction with the students and participating in their failures and successes provided an excellent vantage point to their perspectives during interactions and other classroom events (Canagarajah, 2001).

### **1.3 Ethnography a Qualitative Approach**

Using the written account of classroom observations in the form of field notes as my main chosen method, I was able to observe student-student interactions that a quantitative, psychometric or conventional observation scheme would not record; students who are reluctant to participate orally, non verbal communication strategies and many other unrecognized variables that can not be counted, tallied, or measured and then referred to in a statistical manner. Van Lier (1988) criticized those who advocate the use of tabulation of classroom interactions by using quantitative observational schemes in suggesting that quality research be equated with measurement. Gaies (1983) further illustrates the failure of experimental research because it does not demonstrate the superiority of a single method. From this point of view, Van Lier (1988) suggests that the use of one observational scheme, no matter how comprehensible, is not valuable without field notes or interviews.

The principle data-gathering instrument for ethnography in naturalistic settings, such as the classroom in my case, was description, with the aim of producing 'thick' as opposed to a 'thin' (restricted) data (Geertz, 1973). Producing 'thick' data, in other words a multilayered package that is as comprehensive as possible, includes all facets of the classroom; the individuals involved, interactions and behaviors and this is attainable by using field notes, interviews, and questionnaires (McDonough & McDonough, 1997). This will here be referred to as ethnographical triangulation of data collection.

### **1.4 Ethnographical Triangulation of Data Collection**

In conventional research circles the term triangulation refers to the combination of different research methods, both qualitative and quantitative. However in the classroom, where the teacher is often the participant observer or observer as participant (McDonough & McDonough, 1997) attempting to use coding systems, tally sheets or counting the raising of hands is difficult and at times impossible. Yet, the triangulation of ethnographical methods combining interviews, student diaries,

questionnaires, video and tape recording is logical for the teacher who is interested in improving teaching methods, approaches and procedures because the data gathered after ethnographical triangulation is 'thick' (Greetz, 1973), multilayered and yields a wealth of information which can be used soon after lessons are completed. Ethnographical triangulation is an important strategy for arriving at valid findings in ethnography.

### 1.5 Some Disadvantages in Ethnography Considered

Some disadvantages of using ethnography are the volume of transcribing that has to be done if using video or recorded data, the time consuming nature of data collection and the difficulty of generalizing results (Ellis, 1994). Taking these factors into consideration ethnography was selected as the observational tool because it best suited research needs and would engage teacher self reflection and the use of field notes in the three stages of teaching; planning decisions, interactive decisions and evaluating decisions (Richards & Lockhart, 1996).

## 2. Research Aims and Teaching Context

The following section will discuss research aims and the teaching context. Furthermore, description of the participants and classroom organization will be presented.

### 2.1 Research Aims

Ethnography can be used to provide feedback to things that are happening in the classroom that are outside the teacher's notice or teacher behaviors outside the teacher's own awareness. Hymes (1981) cited in Watson-Gegeo (1988) refers to this kind of teacher feedback as 'ethnographic monitoring' of the classroom. This is an area of professional development that I hope to be involved with in the near future doing teacher training and assessing for certificate programs. Second, ethnography can help teachers make a difference in their own classrooms. Ethnographic observations of student-student interaction can be a basis from which teachers can reflect on their own practice and to experiment with different approaches, methods and procedures as well as classroom management techniques (Watson-Gegeo, 1988). This study attempts to investigate why students use L1 in the freer communicative tasks, the possible causes for this, and whether or not it helped or hindered their learning.

The purpose of this data is to support the development of alternative teaching techniques and procedures that will encourage students to concentrate on L2 use in the classroom, as I strongly feel that it promotes students learning based on my own training through two pre-service teacher training courses; the University of Cambridge CELTA and School for International Training Certificate programs.

## 2.2 Teaching Context

In accordance with the guidelines outlined by Watson-Gegeo (1988) a university level ESL class of 40 low intermediate learners was observed for a period of nine weeks. Ideally, the observation period would have been 15 weeks, however, due to time constraints the study was conducted over a period of nine weeks.

## 2.3 The Participants

The class consisted of 18 female and 22 male Japanese second year pharmacy students majoring in chemistry attending a university in Gifu, Japan. The students were disciplined and motivated as they needed to score 600 on the Test of English for International Communication to meet the basic requirement in order to pass the class and fulfill a portion of their graduating requirements. The TOEIC is a basic test of business English which many university students in Japan take in order to supplement resumes and give employers a standard to gauge potential employee's English skill levels.

After observing the class, I was able to conclude that the students had favorable attitudes toward learning languages in combination with the desire to achieve the goal required for graduation. Due to the combination of extrinsic motivation, passing the test and their intrinsic motivation for learning the language the students expressed a high interest level of language acquisition during the observational period. The student comments observed were not idiosyncratic but rather shared by others in the class as a whole (Gaies, 1983). However, a more detailed study on student motivational factors may render different results.

## 2.4 Classroom Organization

The class is organized in a manner that Nunan (1999) describes as teacher-fronted, with learners sitting in rows facing the teacher. The physical setting had desks in rows with no opportunity to rearrange the classroom in order to maximize the use of small groups or larger ones in an efficient manner. The course is taught in a communicative language approach based on the experiential learning model which is realized in a classroom 'by cooperative, task-based learning, with learners working in small groups and pairs' (Nunan, 1999, pg. 83). The classroom setting, with seats difficult to move, and the organization of setting the desks into group circle formations somewhat time consuming was an issue for the teacher when making groups and the pairing and re-pairing of students during activities. However, the class managed to accommodate the setting to the communicative need as much as possible. The students were given a few extra minutes to organize the classroom and desks in round clusters and in such a way that students 'became skilled at cooperating with others' (Nunan,

1999, pg. 84).

### **3. Research Design and Research Implementation**

I conducted this research using field notes, interviews, student class diaries and questionnaire for a period between April and July, nine weeks of the university's spring semester.

In this section, the main reasons for ethnography as the chosen observational tool will be discussed. The justification for the use of field notes, interviews, student class diaries and questionnaire will be considered. To add a chronological dimension to the research (Canagarajah, 2001), methods of data collection were situated at significant points in the progression of the nine weeks. Research aims of investigating the causes for the use of L1 were derived from the first weeks of field note taking. The field notes were supplemented later with interviews and finally a questionnaire was given to students during the last week of the study. The use of interviews as well as a questionnaire was intended to give the researcher a further chance to probe the students about the possible reasons for the language switching.

#### **3.1 Justification and Methods for the Use of Field Notes**

The field notes were taken once a week for the entire 90-minute course, on an observational form adapted from the one used during my in-service teacher training experience (See Appendix A for a sample copy of field notes). The form was divided into three columns and given the following titles from left to right: time, observations and comments. The amount of time spent on lesson sequences and activities was recorded in minutes in the time column. Student interaction, any changes in the classroom setting, non-verbal communication and learners' affective states were written in the observation column. Interpretations were written in the third column. Observation and commentary columns were separated to encourage the observer to think carefully about what they have observed and to try out different interpretations (Swann, 2001).

#### **3.2 Justification for the Use of Interviews**

To triangulate data gathering and to further understand the causes of language switching, two types of interviews were conducted with students. One of the interviews was semi-structured conducted during the third week with two separate groups of four students (see Appendix B for list of questions). The other was unstructured and was casually conducted throughout the nine weeks in the university halls, lounge areas and before and after class. The interviews were summarized by the researcher afterwards, instead of relying on any recording machines or note taking on the spot. This was because the latter methods tend to make the interview more

structured, distract students and overload the teacher for later transcribing (McDonough & McDonough, 1997).

### 3.3 Justification for Use of Student Class Diaries

In the class diaries students were instructed to write in English about classroom events and their reflections for the given lesson. They were also explicitly told this was not a requirement but if they were to complete a diary entry it was to be done outside of class time. The journals were collected at the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> week. The journals provided interesting data for matching students' perceptions of language switching with researcher field notes for the given day or lesson after students had time to reflect on the lessons. This was considered to be the best way to match students' views with the researchers and perhaps of more importance, whether the students believe language switching hinders their ability to learn English.

### 3.5 Questionnaire

A questionnaire (see Appendix C) was distributed to the 40 students to discover their attitudes toward using Japanese in the English classroom during the 9<sup>th</sup> week. The questionnaire items focused on the students' opinions toward the use of L1, the occasions when they think L1 can be used and the perceived effectiveness of L1 in their EFL classroom.

## 4 Findings Made Through the Research

Through the nine-week period of observation and data collection on student-student interaction and behavior the researcher noted that in the freer communicative tasks students often language switched between L1 and L2. Language switching was observed in pairs more than in groups and when students were interacting during the free communicative task due to individual learning strategies and coping methods when negotiating meaning. Furthermore, during interviews and through the questionnaire results a wide range of learner styles and attitudes toward the use of English was detected. Finally, the wide spread use of dictionaries during the freer communicative tasks was observed which at times hindered students developing fluency and speaking skills.

### 4.1 Pairs and Groups

From the communicative approaches that are used in the classroom, asking students to work in pairs or groups is an integral part of language learning behavior and of communicative methodology (McDonough & Shaw, 1993). After reflecting on field notes the use of L1 was predominate in pairs more than in groups. A possible reason for a higher quantity of language switching in pairs may be due to the perceived

gap in proficiency levels which is more exposed in pairs than in groups. This was observed throughout the semester when students of varied abilities were paired. In an article, by Nolasco and Arthur (1986) on teaching large monolingual classes of 40 or more students, it lists nine reasons for teacher resistance to using new ideas and techniques, one of the listed was that teachers perceive that students use L1 while paired. According to the results, Nolasco and Arthur concluded that although L1 was used by some students, there was no evidence that it was universally the case. Contrary to the Nolasco and Arthur article, the use of L1 in pairs proved to be more prevalent during the nine week observational period of this research than the study conducted by Nolasco and Arthur (1986).

However, when grouped with students of varied proficiencies, the higher level students used L1 considerably less, although other members of the group shared lower level proficiency. Their reduced use of L1 may have been due to the greater role differentiation between individuals that is required of small groups (McDonough & Shaw, 1993). Furthermore, group work is dynamic, in that there are a number of different people to react to and share ideas, which may lead to a more natural exchange of language. In an early study of interlanguage talk carried out by Long, Adams, Mclean and Castanos (1970) cited in Long and Porter (1985) the amount and variety of student talk was greater in small groups than in teacher-led discussions. Higher level students may also have the flexibility to choose when to use L1 in negotiating meaning with lower level students. The higher level students can simply rely on or let other students negotiate meaning with lower level students using L1. In an unstructured interview after the class to check the accuracy of field notes, a higher level student commented that he prefers group work over pairs because it is more interesting to speak to a number of different students and he had the chance to speak more English than when paired. Even lower level students commented that they preferred small groups because it was a less threatening performance environment (McDonough & Shaw, 1993).

#### 4.1.1 Disadvantages of Group Work

Group work with a monolingual class may actually promote the use of L1 in some classes especially when the discussion is animated (McDonough & Shaw, 1993) or when the students are off task and chit-chatting about daily routines rather than focusing on the target language or lesson aims. All classes observed were monolingual and this may have been a factor for the use of L1 during the freer use tasks because it was simply easier for students to communicate in Japanese. A higher level student in the class commented during an unstructured interview that using Japanese was simply easier than English, although she clearly was able to produce the English equivalent of her utterances. McDonough and Shaw (1993, pg. 237) comment that 'it is not



surprising that interacting in English in these circumstances may initially be perceived as artificial', which may in fact influence the use of L1 in the classroom.

To conclude this section, teachers should remember that group work is not a panacea and teacher-fronted work is useful for certain kinds of classroom activities and poorly organized group work can lead to more use of L1 than a lock-step lessons (Long & Porter, 1985).

## 4.2 Learner Attitudes and the Use of L1 in the Classroom

Research findings of student attitudes toward the use of L1 taken from interviews, class diaries and results of the questionnaire show that students believe some use of L1 in the class is perceived as being helpful when they are learning English. However, it is the teacher's belief that the use of L1 reduces the students' exposure to English and does not help them develop the necessary skills to acquire higher proficiency levels. The use of L1 in the classroom creates an artificial conversation and one that would not be understood by an interlocutor who does not have Japanese language skills. It is important for students to negotiate all meaning in L2 as practice for real communication that may occur outside the classroom.

### 4.2.1 Interviews and Student Diaries

After classroom observations using field notes and reading student diaries a number of students were interviewed about the use of Japanese during the freer communicative tasks. Three students' attitudes concerning the use of L1 and their answers to interview questions are summarized as follows:

**Student 1:** She felt frustrated because she could not speak fluently and communicate her ideas without stopping to translate first. This kind of interruption in discourse was frustrating for her. During an out of class interview, she stated that using Japanese made her feel less frustrated and at times more intelligent because she felt that her limited English vocabulary made her feel 'stupid'.

**Student 2:** He wrote that if he spoke English the entire class he would be repeating the same words and not really developing his vocabulary. He felt that speaking Japanese led to peer teaching of word definitions. He preferred to compare Japanese and English words and then decide on an appropriate translation for the intended usage of the word or phrase. During an interview, he commented that he wanted to know the exact meaning of the word before putting it into context.

**Student 3:** He was the highest level student in the class. He noted that he used Japanese only with lower level students because he did not want to put them into a situation that made them 'uncomfortable' when he used difficult or abstract words and ideas that were expressed in longer sentences. In an interview, he stated that he did not want to 'stand out' and seem more intelligent than his classmates. Further

research on sociolinguistics and cultural aspects to learning in Japanese classrooms may give more insight into this particular area.

According to the data here, it appears there are a number of other reasons for switching from one language to another but in the monolingual class that was observed most students in their diaries and during interviews commented that they could not express themselves in English, so switched to Japanese to compensate for the deficiency. Similar to the third student above, many students also felt that switching occurred because they wanted to express solidarity with the group. Rapport was established between the speaker and the listener when the listener responded with a similar switch (Skiba, 2006).

#### 4.2.2 Results of the Questionnaire

As noted earlier, the questionnaire was distributed to the students. Of the 40 handed out to students, 35 were returned.

The results of the questionnaire (see Appendix D for results) show that a high percentage of students (45 percent) who participated in the study think that Japanese should be used during the class. The vast majority of students (91 percent) like it when their teacher uses some Japanese compared to only a 3 percent who feel that Japanese should not be used at all in the class. According to students, Japanese is most necessary to explain complex grammar points (30 percent). This was closely followed by the necessity to define new vocabulary (27 percent) and explain new ideas and concepts (27 percent). It is interesting to note that only few students (2 percent) feel that Japanese is necessary to practice the use of phrases or expressions, yet most of language switching occurred during the practice and freer practice sequences of the lessons. In explaining why they think the use of Japanese is necessary in EFL classes, half of the students (50 percent) indicated that it helps them to understand difficult concepts better. Some of the student participants (19 percent) feel that it makes them feel less stressed and less lost. One of the key questions that research has addressed is 'What causes state or situation anxiety?' (Ellis, 1994, pg. 480) and one possible answer to such a complex issue could be connected with learners' perceived problems in listening to and speaking English (Ellis, 1994). More than half of the students (69 percent) believe that Japanese in the class helps them learn English, which may be a cause for the use of L1. Furthermore a number of students (19 percent) thought that Japanese was fairly helpful when learning English. Learners' attitudes toward the use of L1 may account for students' language switching as indicated by the total percentage of the two groups (88 percent)

#### 4.3 Bilingual Dictionary Use

Another issue that was observed during the lessons was the widespread use of

bilingual electronic dictionaries during communicative tasks. Many students were unable to use circumlocutory strategies to negotiate meaning and referred to their electronic dictionaries at such frequent rates that it appeared to hinder their speaking fluency. Furthermore, in real communication the frequent use of dictionaries often seemed to be frustrating for the listener and in fact may have negatively affected communication strategies. There is some research that indicates printed dictionaries help students to learn words, whereas most electronic dictionaries help students to find words, and the fact that retention of words is likely to be better with printed dictionaries (Koren, 1997). Thus, the students may be able to retrieve information quickly, but whether or not it was actually retained needs to be further researched. Therefore, it appears that dictionaries, especially electronic ones, used during communicative tasks may affect the learning situation on two levels by not helping students retain new vocabulary and overuse seeming to hinder real communication skills because of the popularity among students.

## Conclusion

The causes of L1 language switching were observed through ethnographical data collection as an observational tool during a nine-week period. The causes of L1 switching observed in this study were observed in pairs more than in groups and students' attitudes showed that it was often simply easier in a monolingual class to use L1 instead of English during communicative tasks. It was also observed that students sometimes felt it was more socially acceptable to use Japanese in order not to seem too intelligent by other lower level students. For lower level students, use of the L1 was often used to create a less threatening environment for learning.

Ethnography is a manageable method for self reflection as it is not time consuming and at a rudimentary level it is not overly difficult compared to a quantitative type research project. Furthermore, qualitative data collection methods can be used in practical teaching situations and directly applied to issues important to the teacher at that moment. It is this researcher's interest to further study the causes of L1 language switching using ethnography in the field of sociolinguistics; of particular interest are male and female pairings and the effect of pairing and grouping students together who are not a part of the same social 'click'.

**Appendix A: Sample Copy of Field Notes** (Copied from primary source for easier reading)

Time	Observation	Comments
9:00-9:10	Roll Call	
9:10-9:15	T Modeled	I thought low TTT. Time
	exercise-described favorite restaurant using Nouns	
	Adjectives Ss paired (3) min. describe	Better modeling maybe get on board
	favorite rest. Students talking about food Pseudo free-not describing resturants Ss not talking	2Ss drawing (visual learners?)
9:24-9:40	Passed out photos and worksheets. Instructed students to work on predicting skills. Modeled each category for students.	*Boardwork!*
9:27	Students working in pairs. Worksheet No# 7 categories. Ss. Language /too much writing.	Make this more fluency practice? Find someone who?
9:35	T circulating/Individual instruction	
9:39	Ss use of L1 when finished or near finished	Only produce English during class activities not outside? Motivation? Intrinsic? Not there?

## Appendix B: Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. How often do you speak Japanese during English class?
2. What is the main reason for speaking Japanese during English class?
3. Does using a dictionary help you to speak less Japanese?
4. How much English do you study outside of class?
5. What could the teacher do to help you speak more English during class time?

### Results of Semi-Structured Interviews

1. How often do you speak Japanese during English class?

A majority of students said that they spoke Japanese during English class at higher rates than what the teacher thought was acceptable. Some said they tried to speak as much as possible in English and a few replied that they did not know.

2. What is the main reason for speaking Japanese during English class?

The answers varied according to student levels and proficiencies. Higher level students tended to mention during negotiation of meaning it was more efficient and practical to use Japanese. Lower level students answered that it was easier to speak Japanese.

3. Does using a dictionary help you to speak less Japanese?

Most students commented that it helped them to speak less Japanese. A few students commented that using a dictionary sparked them to speak L1 in class. One student stated that 'if I see Japanese characters I only want to speak Japanese'.

4. How much English do you study outside of class?

All students replied that they did not study outside of class.

5. What could the teacher do to help you speak more English during class time?

Many students commented that they wanted to speak to the teacher more during class time or that they wanted the teacher to speak more 'directly' to pairs or groups. Some students mentioned that they wanted more 'sample sentences' before breaking into pairs or groups. Some students wanted the teacher to use Japanese during the lesson.

## Appendix C: Questionnaire on L1 Use in Class

This questionnaire aims to find out your feelings toward using Japanese in the English classroom. Your answers will be used for research purposes only.

Thank you for your cooperation.

1. Should Japanese be used in the classroom?

Yes

No

2. Do you like your teacher to use Japanese in the class?

Not at all

a little

sometimes

a lot

3. When do you think it is necessary to use Japanese in the English classroom?

a. to help define some new vocabulary (words you don't know)

b. to practice the use of some phrases and expressions

c. to explain difficult grammar points

d. to explain difficult ideas

e. to give instructions

f. to give suggestions on how to learn more effectively

g. other reasons, please write here \_\_\_\_\_

4. If you think the use of Japanese is necessary in the classroom, why?

a. It helps me to understand difficult ideas better.

b. It helps me to understand new vocabulary better

c. It makes me feel at ease, comfortable and less stressed.

d. I feel less lost.

e. Other, please write here \_\_\_\_\_

5. Do you think the use of Japanese in the classroom helps you learn English?

no

a little

fairly much

a lot

6. How often do you think Japanese should be used in the classroom?

never

very rarely

sometimes

fairly frequently

7. What percentage of the time do you think Japanese should be used in the class?

Choose one.

5%

10%

20%

30%

40%

50%

60%

70%

80%

90%

## Appendix D: Results of Questionnaire

1. Should Japanese be used in the classroom?  
yes 45%                      no 55%
2. Do you like your teacher to use Japanese in the class?  
not at all 3%      a little 47%      sometimes 44%      a lot 2%
3. When do you think it is necessary to use Japanese in the English classroom?
  - a. to explain difficult grammar points 30%
  - b. to help define some new vocabulary (words you don't know) 27%
  - c. to explain difficult ideas 27%
  - d. to give instructions 7%
  - e. to give suggestions on how to learn more effectively 7%
  - f. to practice the use of some phrases and expressions 2%
  - g. other reasons, please write here: No response from any students
4. If you think the use of Japanese is necessary in the classroom, why?
  - a. It helps me to understand difficult ideas better 50%
  - b. It helps me to understand new vocabulary better 31%
  - c. It makes me feel at ease, comfortable and less stressed 13%
  - d. I feel less lost 6%
  - e. Other, please write here: No response from any of the students
5. Do you think the use of Japanese in the classroom helps you learn English?  
no 6%      a little 69%      fairly much 19%      a lot 6%
6. How often do you think Japanese should be used in the classroom?  
never 0%      very rarely 60%      sometimes 40%      fairly frequently 0%
7. What percentage of the time do you think Japanese should be used in the class?  
Choose one.

Time	Response
5%	26%
10%	34%
20%	9%
30%	20%
40%	6%
50%	3%
60%	3% (No Students answered higher than 60%)

## References

- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. (2001) 'Ethnography of a Sri Lankan Classroom'. In *English Language Teaching in its Social Context*. Edited by Candlin, C.N. and Mercer, N. Routledge.
- Candlin, C.N. and N. Mercer. (eds) (2001) *English Language Teaching in its Social Context*. Routledge.
- Chaudron, C. (1986) 'The Interaction of Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches to Research: A View of the Second Language Classroom'. *TESOL Quarterly* 20/4: 709-717.
- Diesing, P. (1971) *Patterens of Discovery in the Social Sciences*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Ellis, R. (1994) *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Freeman, D. (1989) 'Teacher Training, Development and Decision Making: A Model of Teaching and Related Strategies for Language Teaching Education'. *TESOL Quarterly* 23/1: 27-46.
- Gaies, S.J. (1983) 'The Investigation of Language Classroom Processes'. *TESOL Quarterly* 17/2: 205-217.
- Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kolb, D.A. (1984) *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Koren, S. (1997) 'Quality versus Convenience: Comparison of Modern Dictionaries from the Researcher's, Teacher's and Learner's Points of View'. *TESL-EJ*. <http://www.kyoto-su.ac.jp/infromation/tesl-ej/ej07/a2.html> (January 1997).
- Long, M.H. and P.A. Porter (1985) 'Group Work, Interlanguage Talk, and Second Language Acquisition'. *TESOL Quarterly* 19/2: 207-228
- Labov, W. (1970) 'The Study of Language in its Social Context'. In Labov, W. (1972) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Labov, W. (ed.) (1972) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.



- McDonough, J and S. McDonough. (1997) *Research Methods for English Language Teachers*. London: Arnold.
- McDonough, J and C. Shaw. (1998) *Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide*. Blackwell.
- Nolasco, R. and L. Authur (1986) 'Try Doing it With a Class of Forty!'. *ELT Journal*, 40/2, 100-6.
- Nunan, D. (1989) *Understanding Language Classrooms: A Guide for Teacher-Initiated Action*. Prentice Hall International (UK).
- Nunan, D. (1992) *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1999) *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Richards, J.C. and C. Lockhart. (1996) *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge University Press
- Slimani, A. (2001) 'Evaluation of Classroom Interaction'. In *English Language Teaching in its Social Context*. Edited by Candlin, C.N. and Mercer, N. Routledge.
- Skiba, R. (2006) 'Code Switching as a Countenance of Language Interference'. *The Internet TESL Journal*. <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Skiba-CodeSwitching.html> (12 June 2006)
- Swann, J. (2001) 'Recording and Transcribing Talk'. In *English Language Teaching in its Social Context*. Edited by Candlin, C.N. and Mercer, N. Routledge.
- Watson-Gegeo, K.A. (1988) 'Ethnography in ESL: Defining the Essentials'. *TESOL Quarterly* 22/4: 575-592.
- Van Lier, L. (1988) *The Classroom and the Language Learner*. London: Longman.