

# LANGUAGE CHOICE IN EFL TEACHING

Student teachers' perceptions

Master's Thesis

Teija Sadeharju

University of Jyväskylä  
Department of Languages  
English  
December 2012



## JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen Tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Teija Sadeharju	
Työn nimi – Title LANGUAGE CHOICE IN EFL TEACHING: Student teachers' perceptions	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Pro Gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Joulukuu 2012	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 107 sivua + 1 liite
Tiivistelmä – Abstract <p>Vieraan kielen opettaja tekee luokkahuoneessa jatkuvasti valintoja luokkahuonekielen suhteen, olivatpa nuo valinnat sitten tietoisia tai tiedostamattomia. Opettaja voi puhua joko kohdekieltä tai oppilaiden äidinkieltä niissä eri vuorovaikutustilanteissa, joita hän oppitunnilla kohtaa. Kielenvaihtaminen vieraan kielen opetuksessa on synnyttänyt paljon keskustelua asiantuntijoiden keskuudessa. Onkin syntynyt kaksi eri ajattelukuntaa: toiset puhuvat äidinkielen käytön puolesta, kun taas toiset kannattavat eksklusiivista kohdekielen käyttöä.</p> <p>Tämä tutkimus keskittyi englannin opetusharjoittelijoiden näkemyksiin äidinkielen ja kohdekielen käytöstä ja siihen, miten he tulkitsevat omia kielivalintojaan. Tutkimuksen pääasiallinen tarkoitus oli kartoittaa, millaisia käyttötarkoituksia opetusharjoittelijat löytävät suomen ja englannille. Tutkimus perustui haastatteluaineistoon, joka hankittiin käyttäen kahta haastattelutyyppiä: puolistrukturoitua haastattelua ja stimulated recall -haastattelua. Jälkimmäisessä haastateltavat tulkitsivat omia kielivalintojaan videomateriaalin pohjalta. Aineisto analysoitiin laadullisen sisällönanalyysin keinoin. Esiin nousi kolme kielenkäytön kategoriaa: opettaja-lähtöinen, oppilas-lähtöinen ja diskurssi-lähtöinen kategoria. Haastateltavat pohtivat myös suomen ja englannin käytöstä koituvia haittoja. Lisäksi haastateltavat toivat esiin opetusharjoittelussa saadut kielenvaihtamista koskevat ohjeistukset ja niiden vaikutukset heidän toimintaansa. Tulokset osoittivat, että haastateltavat kannattivat englannin käyttöä joko ainoana tai pääasiallisena luokkahuonekielenä. Kuitenkin sekä äidinkielelle että kohdekielelle löytyi useita eri käyttötarkoituksia. Tietyn kielen käyttöä selitettiin muun muassa psykolingvivistisillä tekijöillä, pedagogisilla tarkoituksilla sekä vuorovaikutustilanteen luonteella.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords language choice, classroom language, target language, L1, EFL teaching, student teachers, perceptions	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION .....	4
2 TRENDS IN LANGUAGE TEACHING – AN OVERVIEW .....	7
2.1 L1 as the medium of instruction .....	8
2.2 Target language domination.....	9
2.3 Employing the learners’ L1.....	13
2.4 The eclectic approach – room for variation .....	14
3 CHOOSING THE LANGUAGE.....	16
3.1 The nature of classroom interaction.....	16
3.2 Teaching through target language.....	18
3.3 Employing L1 in foreign language teaching.....	24
3.4 Code-switching .....	31
4 THE PRESENT STUDY .....	41
4.1 Aims .....	42
4.2 Selecting the sample.....	42
4.3 Semi-structured interview and stimulated recall.....	43
4.4 Qualitative content analysis .....	46
5 PERCEPTIONS OF LANGUAGE CHOICE.....	49
5.1 Teacher training and planning one’s language choices .....	49
5.2 Considering target language use .....	52
5.2.1 Personal principles – a teacher-related reason for TL use .....	52
5.2.2 Learner-related uses .....	53
5.2.3 Discourse-related use of English .....	58
5.2.4 The disadvantages of using the target language.....	59
5.3 L1 in the foreign language classroom.....	61
5.3.1 Teacher-related use of Finnish.....	62
5.3.2 Learner-related uses .....	63
5.3.3 Discourse-related uses.....	66

5.3.4 The influence of teacher trainers.....	67
5.3.5 The disadvantages of employing the L1 .....	69
6 THE REASON FOR THE CHOICE – LOCATING ONE’S MOTIVES.....	73
6.1 Choosing to speak English.....	74
6.1.1 Personal principles and other teacher-related motives.....	74
6.1.2 Learner-related motives .....	77
6.1.3 Discourse-related motives.....	79
6.2 Choosing Finnish .....	81
6.2.1 Teacher-related motives .....	81
6.2.2 Learner-related motives .....	84
6.2.3 Discourse-related motives.....	91
6.2.4 The influence of teacher trainers.....	96
7 CONCLUSION .....	97
8 BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	105
9 APPENDIX.....	108

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The present study addresses the issue of student teachers' perceptions and interpretations of language choice in EFL teaching in Finland. The focus is on the uses which student teachers appoint to Finnish, the first language shared by the teacher and the pupils, and to English, the target language. The reason for studying this subject is that there seems to be two differing schools of thought regarding the teacher's language use in foreign language teaching. According to the first of the views the teacher should use as much target language as possible in the foreign language classroom (Duff&Polio 1990, Chambers 1991 etc.) The other view regards using the learners' L1 in foreign language teaching as beneficial (see for instance Macaro 2000, Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009). The advocates of the second view do not necessarily underestimate the role of the target language but see the appropriate use of L1 as positive. According to the first view, however, L1 is often regarded to be, more or less explicitly, something that should be avoided. As there seems to be two competing views regarding the teacher's language choice in EFL teaching, it is of interest to study the perceptions of future teachers in order to find out where they stand in relation to this ongoing debate. The purpose of the present study is to find out what kind of thoughts student teachers of English have on the teacher's language choice in EFL teaching. To be specific, the study has two aims. First of all, the purpose is to find out what kind of perceptions student teachers have of the use of English and Finnish in foreign language teaching. Secondly, the aim is to study what kind of motives student teachers find for their own language use. In order to map the perceptions regarding the teacher's language choice, student teachers were interviewed. As for the second aim, video-recorded lessons were shown to the participants during the interview sessions and they were to comment on their own language choices. To summarize, the present study is a qualitative interview study which employs the conventions of semi-structured and stimulated recall interviews to elicit data in order to explore the perceptions and reported practices of student teachers in relation to language choice in the foreign language classroom.

Previous research on teachers' language choice is rather scarce in Finland; however the number of studies is growing. It seems that there is a need for more variation regarding the focus as well as the type of studies. A brief account of studies which have been conducted in Finland and which have more or less similar aims as the

present study is presented below. In addition, the most relevant studies conducted on this issue abroad are given attention. A more detailed discussion on the findings of these studies will be provided later on in chapter 3 as the teacher's language choice and code-switching in language classrooms are given attention.

First of all, code-switching and its functions in the EFL classroom have been studied on several occasions in Finland. Yletyinen (2004) studied both teachers' and pupils' code-switching in the EFL classroom. Reini (2008) expanded on this by studying not only teachers' code-switching but also their language choices. Also Hartikainen (2009) studied code-switching in the EFL classroom. In addition to the functions of code-switching, the influence which a switch may have on the conversation partner's language use was taken into consideration in her study. In all three studies video recordings of classroom interaction formed the data. Yletyinen used discourse analysis, while Reini employed conversation analysis in order to analyze classroom interaction exhibited on the videos. Hartikainen, on the other hand, analyzed the data with the help of categorization. Nikula (2005) had a comparative take on classroom code-switching. She compared code-switching which takes place in the EFL classroom to that occurring in the CLIL (content and language integrated learning) classroom. Like all the researchers mentioned thus far, also Nikula used video recordings as the data. The study by Myyryläinen and Pietikäinen (1988) differs from the aforementioned studies in that the focus was partly on what teachers themselves thought about the language choice in EFL teaching. In this respect this particular study resembles the present study. Myyryläinen and Pietikäinen collected their data with questionnaires as well as by recording lessons. Their aim was to find out to what extent the teachers spoke English, when and why L1 was employed and what kind of attitudes the teachers' had towards the two languages. In addition, the lessons were viewed against the principles of communicative language teaching.

Several differences are to be found in the present study and the studies discussed above. First and foremost, the data of the present study consists of interviews. This is because the focus is on the perceptions of the participants, not on classroom interaction per se. As was mentioned above, the study by Myyryläinen and Pietikäinen and the present study share this characteristic: the focus is on the thoughts of the participants. However, Myyryläinen and Pietikäinen employed questionnaires, not interviewing. In addition, they focused on the amount and use of the target language. In the present study the focus is not on one particular language. Neither is the amount of English or Finnish of particular interest. Reini, Yletyinen, Hartikainen and Nikula, on the other hand,

analyzed code-switching in classroom interaction with the help of recordings. In addition to the type of data collected, also the role of code-switching forms a difference between the present study and the studies mentioned above. In the present study code-switching is not the primary focus. In other words, the points at which the two languages alternate are not granted priority. Instead all language choices, even such where no code-switching is involved, are given attention. Every time a new speech situation arises the speaker makes a language choice: one can continue with the same language that has been used in the previous situation or one might want to switch to another language. In other words, not switching the language is seen as much of a language choice as code-switching. The last difference is found in the participants: the present study focuses on student teachers, while all the studies introduced above concentrated on in-service teachers.

As can be seen from the discussion above, the present study may offer new kind of information in relation to language choice in the EFL classroom in Finland. It reveals the perceptions which student teachers have regarding the language choice as well as their motives for employing the target language and the L1. In Finland the present study is the first to employ interviewing in order to bring out the thoughts of the participants on the language choice. Furthermore, focusing on student teachers instead of in-service teachers creates the opportunity to discover what kind of guidance, if any, they receive in teacher training in relation to the language choice. In Finland there are no official policies regarding the medium of instruction in foreign language teaching. Therefore teacher educators and teachers may foster varying opinions on this issue. This is why the instructions received in teacher training as well as the perceptions and practices of individual student teachers are interesting areas for research.

Although in Finland studies focusing on teachers' perceptions of language choice are rare, several researchers abroad have studied in-service as well as student teachers' views on language choice. For instance, Bateman (2008) studied the perceptions of student teachers. The data which she used consisted of questionnaires, journal entries and observations. De la Campa and Nassaji (2009), on the other hand, used interviewing and stimulated recall sessions for eliciting data. They analyzed also classroom interaction. Unlike in the present study, de la Campa and Nassaji's sample consisted of in-service teachers. To mention other studies which share some characteristics with the present study, Duff and Polio (1990) and Victor (2009) used interviewing as one of the methods for gathering data. Their focus was also on in-service teachers' perceptions of language choice. In addition, Macaro (2000) studied the perceptions of student teachers



with the help of stimulated recall sessions. His purpose was to locate the factors which influence the student teachers' decision making in relation to their language use. It can be said that these studies are in one way or another similar to the present study. For instance, the method for eliciting data is one common feature. Another is the focus. Like the present study, some of the studies focused on student teachers and their perceptions of language choice. It may seem that Macaro's study is nearly identical with the present study. However, there is a difference in the aims of the two studies. Macaro was mainly interested in the attitudes which the student teachers have on code-switching and the factors which influence the participants' decision making. Those factors were personal beliefs and official policies, for instance. In the present study the focus is more on the perceived and reported uses of the two languages. In other words, the present study focuses primarily on the issue of why a certain language could be, should or should not be and is used by the teacher. As one can see, there are similarities as well as differences between the present study and the ones conducted previously by other researchers, in Finland and elsewhere.

Before focusing on the thoughts of the student teachers, the theoretical background of the study must be presented. First an overview of different language teaching methods and approaches will be presented. In particular the implications which language teaching trends have had to the language choice will be given attention. Then a brief description of the nature of classroom interaction will be given. After this the two competing views on the teacher's language choice will be discussed. Arguments for and against choosing the target language as the classroom language as well as for and against employing the L1 in foreign language teaching will be presented. Furthermore, code-switching in bilingual settings in general and in language classrooms in particular will be considered. The findings of previous research regarding these issues will also be discussed.

## **2 TRENDS IN LANGUAGE TEACHING – AN OVERVIEW**

Before introducing different language teaching trends and in particular how they relate to the teacher's language choice, it is in order to first clarify the terminology involved. The concept which describes *how* we teach can be referred to by several terms. One suggestion is a term used by Cook (2001a:199-200), that is *teaching style*. According to the author, this term is more neutral than its equivalent *teaching method*, since it does

not imply such fixedness as the latter does. *Approach* on the other hand can be seen as a more comprehensive phenomenon than method. As Bell (1981:75) states, an approach consists of linguistic and psychological information of what language and language learning is. A method on the other hand is an extension or application of a certain approach. However, sometimes the term *approach* is regarded to carry the same meaning as *method* or *teaching style*. For example Baker and Jones (1998:670-682) talk about approaches such as grammar translation. Cook (2001a), on the other hand, refers to the same phenomenon as teaching style, while according to Bell (1981) it is a method. In the end of the spectrum is *teaching technique*, which refers to a detailed phenomenon such as a certain exercise type, through which a language item is taught (Cook 2001a:199-200).

The present study will adopt Bell's view and use the term *teaching method* to refer to how language is taught while the concept *approach* is considered to have a more general meaning. For the sake of addressing both types here, the concepts are given an umbrella term *language teaching trend*. Although the methods and approaches might seem to belong to the past, many of them are still used in one form or another and the impact they have had on language teaching is undeniable. The notions fostered by different language teaching trends may have influenced also the perceptions of the student teachers who took part in the present study. This is why trends in language teaching and specifically the implications for choosing the classroom language are introduced here. In the following is a description of well known methods and approaches. The basic principles of each trend are briefly described and, more importantly, the implications regarding the teacher's language choice are addressed.

## **2.1 L1 as the medium of instruction**

In the history of language teaching, only the earliest method has exhibited an inclination towards using the L1 as the sole language of communication in the classroom. This method is known as the *Grammar-Translation Method*. Larsen-Freeman (2000:11) describes the view on language learning which this method entails. First of all, the purpose of studying a foreign language is to be able to read literature written in the target language. Secondly, language learning is seen to develop general thinking. In addition, through foreign language grammar one can learn to grasp one's mother tongue better. But as Cook (2001a:202) reminds us, the goal of using this particular method is not to enable learners to actually use the language. As Larsen-Freeman (2000:12-17) points out, the aim is to equip them with linguistic knowledge about the language. It is

said that written language is regarded important while spoken language is seen as inferior. Consequently the skills the learners are expected to develop are writing and reading, as Larsen-Freeman concludes. Since the foreign language is of value only in written form, spoken target language is not present in the classroom unless it surfaces in reading texts out loud (Ericsson 1989:155). It follows that in grammar-translation classrooms the teacher uses only the L1 (Baker and Prys Jones 1998:670).

## **2.2 Target language domination**

In the language teaching trends introduced next the primary language used in teaching is the target language. Moreover, L1 use is often regarded as negative, as something to be avoided. Accordingly, linguistic comparisons between the L1 and the target language are less than frequent. The first example of such a method is the *Direct Method*, sometimes referred to as the *Natural Approach*. Larsen-Freeman (2000:26-27) states that the Direct Method is rather the opposite of Grammar-Translation since the main focus is on spoken language. It is said that the point of language learning is to learn to communicate in the target language. It is also mentioned that the L1 is not used at all: the purpose is to create a direct link between meanings and target language expressions. According to Larsen-Freeman, this entails that the learners ought to think in the target language instead of forming thoughts in their mother tongue. The writer continues by saying that the L1 is excluded altogether in this method and teaching takes place only through the target language. Since the teacher is not allowed to speak the L1, mime and gestures are used in ensuring comprehension, even though it could be more efficient to simply employ the learners' L1 (Baker and Prys Jones 1998:671). The exclusion of the L1 as well as emphasis on oral practice are derived from the thought that foreign language learning should resemble first language acquisition (Brown 1994:44).

Although Baker and Prys Jones (1998:671) see the Direct Method and the Natural Approach as representing one and the same concept, Brown (1994) introduces them separately. However, Brown (1994:99) points out that there are still significant similarities to be found. The writer sees that in both trends the teacher is to provide comprehensible target language input. Furthermore, the learners are expected to start to use the target language when they have developed the necessary language skills with the help of the input they have received. In other words, the learners are to absorb the language from the teacher's speech (Baker and Prys Jones 1998:671). The difference between the Natural Approach and the Direct Method is that the former puts more

emphasis on input, while the latter concentrates somewhat more on practicing the language (Richards and Rodgers 1986:129).

Like the Direct Method, also the *Audio-lingual Method* focuses on oral communication. Perhaps the most distinctive feature of this particular method is that it is based on structural linguistics and behavioral psychology, as mentioned by Larsen-Freeman (2000:35). According to the writer, this means that habit formation and memorizing are the key practices in language learning. Furthermore, mainly the language forms and structures are of importance. More precisely, using the language is the goal of this method, while understanding how the language is constructed is regarded to be quite irrelevant (Cook 2001a:208). Larsen-Freeman (2000:42) also points out that, according to the method, the L1 and the target language should be kept apart since the L1 is seen as an interfering element in language learning. However, there is another view according to which the method was contrastive by nature: the target language and the L1 are said to be contrasted and compared (Baker and Prys Jones 1998:672). The difference in the descriptions might be due to the fact that in the British oral approach such contrastive basis was missing, while it marked the American audio-lingualism (Baker and Prys Jones 1998:672). It is then possible that Larsen-Freeman is referring specifically to the British tradition.

Another point of departure is the role of the teacher in the audio-lingual tradition. The teacher can be seen as the language model for learners (Larsen-Freeman 200:42). Based on this it could be assumed that in an audio-lingual classroom the target language is the classroom language. Celce-Murcia and Prator (1979:4) confirm this assumption by stating that when applying the method “some use of the mother tongue by teachers is permitted”. From this it becomes clear that the target language dominates in the audio-lingual classroom, while the use of the L1 is peripheral. Yet there is an opposing view, which is articulated by Edmonson (2004: 159). The writer suggests that in the audio-lingual teaching tradition the non-native speaker teacher is considered to be an inadequate language model for the learners. This is why the teacher is said to use the L1 in the classroom, while the target language input, which functions as the language model, is provided through various types of audio recordings. In fact, it is said that the teacher actually avoids using the target language in class. The different accounts of the teacher’s language use can be traced to the value placed on the native speaker teacher and equating the non-native speaker teacher with inadequate language skills.

The third method which is in favor of the target language is known as the *Total Physical Response*. As Larsen-Freeman (2000:107) explains, the TPR is one of the

methods which are based on a more general approach: the Comprehension Approach. According to the writer, a common feature in all the methods originating from this approach is that listening comprehension has a significant role and the learner begins to produce language spontaneously when s/he is ready to do so. As one might remember, this feature is also found in the Direct Method/Natural Approach. Another feature of the TPR in particular is that learning is accomplished and meaning conveyed through actions (Larsen-Freeman 2000:111-112), to be more specific, through physical activities (Baker and Prys Jones 1998:681). Both of the characteristics attached to the TPR are said to result from the view that foreign language learning should resemble first language acquisition (Larsen-Freeman 2000:111-112). Employing the Total Physical Response means that the teacher uses imperative mode and interrogatives, while the learners are to react to the teacher's target language utterances (Brown 1994:99). As Larsen-Freeman (2000:112) notes, the learner's L1 is used to introduce the method and to explain its workings. Apart from this the teacher is said to use only the target language when speaking in the classroom.

*Communicative language teaching* is the fourth method which grants the target language a dominating role. This method differs from the other communication-oriented methods in that it does not center on linguistics but instead on communication: the functions which language can perform (Larsen-Freeman 2000:126,131). Using and working with the language are seen as the principles of communicative teaching (Candlin 1981:20-21). It follows that the target language is used as the classroom language. As Larsen-Freeman (2000:132) puts it, "judicious" use of the L1 is allowed but mainly the target language should be used to communicate in the classroom. From this the learner is said to realize that the language is not merely the object of study but a means of communication. Marton (1988:38) agrees by stating that the teacher employing this method may sometimes provide the learners with L1 equivalents of the target language utterances, but this is an exception to the rule. The writer continues by stating that according to the principles of CLT, the target language should be used at all times, even when conducting classroom management. Also Candlin (1981:20-21) recognizes the domination of the target language in the communicative classroom. From his description it becomes clear that, following the method, the learner as well as the teacher should use the target language to communicate in class. The role of the TL as the classroom language is implicitly stated when it is explained that, if necessary, the L1 can be used before the lesson begins in order to help the learner in the learning process.

In addition, the writer makes a difference between authentic and simulated communication, classroom discourse being an example of the first.

The fifth language teaching trend which more or less abandons the use of the L1 is in fact not *a* method; it consists of a *group* of methods, as Larsen Freeman (2000:137-150) points out. The writer defines this trend as *learning by communicating*. It is said that the learning process is viewed from a somewhat different perspective than what is typical for communicative language teaching: the purpose is to learn *by* communicating, not *for* communication. Examples of such a trend are said to be content-based, task-based and participatory learning. According to Larsen-Freeman, the first one integrates language learning with learning of some subject matter while the second centers on problem solving. The third method is said to follow closely the same line as content-based learning, with the exception that while the topics in the first are often academic by nature, the topics addressed in participatory learning are of personal concern for the learners. On the basis of Larsen-Freeman's description it can be said that according to these methods the target language is the classroom language. This can be inferred from the view these methods have on learning: the foreign language is learned by using it. More than anything else, the target language is seen as a tool, not as an object of study. One could argue that especially in content-based and participatory learning language learning is a side product, while the primary goal lies elsewhere.

Another way of listing and categorizing communicative language teaching, the TPR and the three methods mentioned above is provided by Cook (2001a:214-223). The writer sees communicative teaching as an umbrella term from which the TPR, task-based and content-based learning are derived. According to Cook's view there are three variations of communicative teaching. First, there is teaching which emphasizes the social aspect of communication. Secondly, there is information communicative teaching, which includes content-based learning and the Total Physical Response. And finally, there is task-based learning. In relation to the present study it makes little difference how the methods are sorted. What is important is that the role of the target language as the medium of teaching prevails in all the methods discussed in section 2.2.

The last method introduced as a representative of target language-only teaching is the *Silent Way*. According to Larsen-Freeman (2000:60-61), in this line of teaching the learners are treated as active participants. This means that they are responsible for their own learning, while the teacher keeps his/her influence and control to the minimum, clarifies Larsen-Freeman. Like listening, writing and reading, also speaking is seen as an important skill (Larsen-Freeman 2000:64) but it is the learners who do all the talking.

The teacher's talk consists merely of single words, phrases or sentences (produced in the target language), which may be repeated a few times (Brown 1994:98). On the rare occasions that the teacher speaks, target language is the medium of instruction (Ericsson 1989:164). However, it is also said that the L1 can be used when necessary and the knowledge that the learners have of their L1 is exploited in learning the target language (Larsen-Freeman 2000:67). Nevertheless, the dominance of the target language seems to prevail in the Silent Way and the use of the L1 is minimal. Note also that using the knowledge of the L1 as a building block in foreign language learning is quite the opposite of the view adopted in the Direct Method/Natural Approach.

### **2.3 Employing the learners' L1**

Even though the majority of the methods and approaches seem to be biased towards target language-only teaching, there are a few trends which find the use of the L1 beneficial. The first of them is traditionally called *suggestopedia*. However, an alternative term *desuggestopedia* has also been given to the method (see Larsen-Freeman 2000:73). According to Larsen-Freeman (2000:73), the main characteristic of the method is that it takes into account the affective factors which influence learning. In fact, the most important principle in (de)suggestopedia is said to be eliminating the negative feelings which learners may have and which may inhibit learning. In addition, importance is placed on the surrounding physical environment and its influence to the learner's state of mind (Baker and Prys Jones 1998:681-682). As Brown (1994:97) states, the original suggestopedia developed by Lozanov relied on the power of music. According to Brown, the idea was that while engaging in learning activities the learners listen to classical music and are seated comfortably. This kind of relaxedness was seen to enable taking in large amounts of information, concludes the writer.

Ericsson (1989:162) describes employing suggestopedia in language teaching: on a typical lesson the teacher reads texts and dialogs out loud, while the learners follow the text from their books. The books are said to contain two versions of each text: one in the L1, the other in the target language. This description might suggest that the L1 is not banned from the language classroom. In fact it is said that the use of the target language is increased gradually: the teacher uses the L1 whenever it is required, but less and less as the learners become more advanced (Larsen-Freeman 2000:83). This implies that especially in the beginning the L1 is used in the classroom.

The second method which makes use of the learners' L1 is *community language learning*. According to Larsen-Freeman (2000:95-102), security and trust are the key

principles according to this method. The learners are said to form a community where they can rely on and trust each other. It is pointed out that especially new learning situations are seen as possible threats to the learners. To increase the feeling of security the teacher can inform the learners beforehand of what is going to happen next, explains Larsen-Freeman. The writer continues by saying that using the L1 is perceived to create a feeling of security because it is seen to ensure understanding and to connect old information to new. As Larsen-Freeman states, it follows that especially in the beginning the L1 is used in the classroom. It is also said that later on the target language is used more as the medium of teaching, but the L1 is not excluded from the classroom. Brown (1994:96) offers yet another reason for why the L1 is used in community language learning. It is said that before language learning can take place, the learners have to form a community of trust. According to Brown, this can be achieved through the use of the L1. It is said that the group members can establish relationships with one another with the help of the shared language.

A typical learning situation involving community language learning is described by Cook (2001a:229). With beginner learners the conversation starts in the L1 and the comments made by the learners are translated into the target language by the teacher. After producing the utterance in the L1, the learner is supposed to repeat his/her translated utterance following the teacher's example. Cook (2001a:230) also states that in community language learning the target language is the medium for self-expression and the goal is to improve the learners' lives. These characteristics are attached also to participatory learning (Larsen-Freeman 2000:115). The difference between these two methods seems to be that the former is in favor of using primarily the target language, while the latter appreciates the use of the L1.

## **2.4 The eclectic approach – room for variation**

In addition to the strictly defined methods presented thus far, also a hybrid method is said to be employed in foreign language teaching. Cook (2001a:225) states that an eclectic language teaching method is used in mainstream EFL teaching. As the writer explains, the method emerged in 1930's and up to 1970's it was a combination of grammar-translation and the audio-lingual method. After this it evolved by adopting the communicative aspect of language learning (Cook 2001a:227).

Cook (2001a:228) provides a chart which summarizes the features of the mainstream EFL teaching method. In this chart Cook points out also the weaknesses which this particular method has when viewed from the perspective of second language



research. The lack of L1 role is said to be one of those weaknesses. This issue is not further explained, consequently it remains rather vague. The writer may be referring to classroom language or to the role of the L1 in the language learning process. If the first interpretation is the correct one, then the writer is implying target language domination. However, it was not explicitly mentioned what, if any, implications the eclectic method has regarding the classroom language. It may be that since the method is a hybrid, there are no specific guidelines regarding the teacher's or the pupils' language choice. It is interesting that Cook sees this eclectic method used in EFL teaching as an independent method or, following the terminology used by writer, an independent style. The reason for doing so is apparently that even though EFL teaching combines several established methods, it is "more than the sum of its parts" (Cook 2001a:228).

An eclectic approach to language teaching is also addressed by Brown (1994:14-15, 187-188). It is said that instead of following some specific method, the language teacher should develop a dynamic approach which combines different options in a way that suits the teacher and his/her pupils as well as the goals of language learning. In other words, the teacher should tailor one's own approach according to one's understanding and experiences of language learning and teaching, and revise and update one's teaching whenever the need for a change arises. Instead of clinging to a predefined method teachers are encouraged to decide for themselves.

If the era of methods as such is over and the current line of thinking in modern language teaching circles encourages teachers to make independent choices, there is room for variation when it comes to classroom practices. Furthermore, in Finland there are no regulations which would dictate the language choice in FL teaching. These factors enable teachers to use their own judgment and to make personally motivated decisions in class. It should still be pointed out that although the golden age of methods is over, and despite the fact that some of the language teaching trends presented above are obviously outdated, it is probable that at the least traces of them can be found in the principles and practices of language teachers even today. For these reasons it is interesting to study the perceptions of teachers, and in the case of the present study, those of student teachers, in order to find out where they stand in relation to the views on L1 and target language use.

As can be seen from the overview of language teaching trends, most of them have been/are in favor of using only the target language in the classroom. According to scholars, this is also the case in foreign language teaching in general: the target language dominates, or is at least expected to dominate, in FL classrooms. However,

there are some who advocate employing the learners' L1. Target language-only teaching is being challenged as the benefits of the use of the L1 are promoted. These two competing, but not necessarily opposing views are discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

### **3 CHOOSING THE LANGUAGE**

This chapter starts off with a brief description of the nature of classroom interaction. This is because it is in order to shed light on the context in which the teacher makes the language choices. This gives a background for the discussion that follows. After introducing the characteristics of classroom interaction, the uses, benefits and disadvantages of speaking the target language in the classroom as well as of employing the learners' L1 are presented. It should be reminded that the focus is on the teacher's, not on the pupils' language choice. In addition to discussing the roles of the two languages in the FL classroom, factors which may influence the teacher's language choice are considered. These factors relate to code-switching in bilingual settings in general, and in language classrooms in particular. Furthermore, findings of previous research on both language choice and code-switching are considered.

#### **3.1 The nature of classroom interaction**

Since the present study focuses not only on student teachers' perceptions but also on their classroom practices and decision making, it is worth while to dedicate a few pages to the nature of classroom interaction, which may in one way or another influence the teacher's language choice. The purpose is to describe the context in which the teacher makes language choices. First the nature of school and language classroom is briefly described. After this the different tasks or forms of interaction in which the teacher engages in the classroom are given attention.

In a school, and in this case in a foreign language classroom, the participants are fixed: it is the teacher and the pupils who take part in the interaction. In the present study the teachers and their pupils have the same L1, and the pupils, being at intermediate level of language learning, can make use of the foreign language. The social roles of the participants are also clear: the teacher is an instructor who facilitates learning and the pupils are there to learn a language they do not yet master (Edmonson 2004:155-156). Furthermore, the teacher has more social power than the pupils. Thus

the teacher can impose a language on the pupils and even ask them to use a certain language. Of course there are situations in which it is seemingly irrelevant which language the pupils use and thus it is for the pupils to decide which language they speak. Another characteristic of the school environment is formality. The school forms an institutional and public context, which makes the interaction between the participants quite formal. Of course the degree of formality varies according to the teacher. Some might want to have a distant and formal relationship, while others prefer forming a warm and relaxed relationship with the pupils. In addition to individual teachers and their preferences, the cultural context in which the participants live influences the formality of the classroom interaction.

Teaching the subject matter is without a doubt the main task in which the teacher engages in the classroom. According to Edmonson (2004:161) there are two major functions being performed in the classroom: one relates to language practice (communication) and the other to providing language instruction. Indeed, the latter is said to be one of the main pedagogic functions taking place in the language classroom (Nunan 1989:27).

The teacher also practices classroom management. According to Edmonson (2004:161), classroom management can be described as organizing the class so that it is an optimal place for learning. The writer states that this includes several functions, such as marking the beginning/end of the lesson, disciplining, announcing the plan for the lesson, giving instruction for the upcoming tasks and being deliberately friendly. Edmonson goes on to clarify the last aspect: the teacher may show interest in the learner as a person, regardless how skilled or unskilled that person is in relation to the subject matter. This function can be seen to have social roots since the focus is on the relationship between the teacher and the learner. Brown (2007: 241-244, 253) provides further constituents of classroom management. According to him, organizing the physical classroom environment, considering the teacher's body language and voice, and functions such as praising are also part of classroom management.

Walsh (2006:17) states that there are two types of language to be found in the classroom. One of them is called pedagogic language. The writer equates this pedagogic language with teaching the subject matter, among other things. The second type of language is labeled as social language, which is used when expressing opinions, for instance. If Walsh finds only these two types of communication in the classroom, it is possible that he sees classroom management as part of what he calls pedagogic language. However, the writer does not state what other functions "pedagogic language"

might entail. More importantly, Walsh introduces the concept of social language. This kind of communication could perhaps have a connection to informal speech. This brings us to the definition of classroom interaction which is employed when describing the classroom situations referred to by the participants of the present study.

In the present study the view on classroom interaction differs somewhat from the ones introduced thus far. Teaching the subject matter is seen to consist of language instruction, doing exercises and checking them as well as organizing the class in relation to these functions by controlling turn-taking and giving instructions. Classroom management, on the other hand, is seen to include praising, reprimanding and directing attention. In addition, in the present study a distinction is made between positive feedback provided by the teacher in relation to IRF-sequence (initiation-response-feedback) and praising. *Positive feedback* is used to refer particularly to the IRF-sequence and to accepting the pupil's answer to a question asked by the teacher. In other words, this kind of feedback relates to teaching the subject matter. *Praising*, on the other hand, is not seen as a part of the IRF-sequence. Instead it is regarded to be the counterpart of reprimanding, and thus a part of classroom management. When praising, the teacher approves and encourages pupil behavior and shows appreciation. The third type of interaction is formed by informal, genuine communication. This kind of talk does not relate to teaching the subject matter or to classroom management. An example of such interaction is asking for the time when one suspects that one's clock is showing the wrong time.

As the characteristics of classroom interaction and the types of speech situations which the teacher faces in the classroom have now been briefly described, the focus can shift to the actual issue at hand: the teacher's language choice in the FL classroom.

### **3.2 Teaching through target language**

There are several reasons why monolingual teaching which employs only the target language came into being. As Meiring and Norman (2002:27) explain, the Direct/Natural Method with its ban of the L1 was a reaction to its predecessor grammar-translation and its L1 dominated teaching. The writers state that it gave rise to excluding the L1 from foreign language teaching. In addition, Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009:23-24) point out that as a result of the monolingual teaching norm, teachers with lacking target language skills began to resort to the L1 in the classroom. It is said that using the L1 in FL teaching became to symbolize teachers' incompetence. Vice versa, the extensive use of the target language began to signal that the teacher was a skilled

professional. According to Butzkamm and Caldwell, this increased the importance of clinging to the target language: it was a way to create and maintain a professional image of one self. Furthermore, Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009:16-18) note that some teachers simply do not have the chance to decide for themselves: official policies may dictate the language choice in foreign language teaching. The writers also point out that teachers are not always familiar with the L1 of their students, which forces them to use solely the target language in their teaching. This conduct is refuted by suggesting that future language teachers should have command of the TL as well as of the learners' L1 (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009:25). However, as Freeman and Freeman (1998:219) point out, many teachers are faced with a situation in which learners with varying first languages are in the same class. As is stated, it is not reasonable to expect the teacher to have command of all the languages present in the classroom.

As was mentioned above, the Direct/Natural Method brought target language domination into language classrooms. One of the principles behind this method is that foreign language learning should resemble first language acquisition, as was shown in chapter 2. According to Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009:26-30), this perception results in avoiding the L1 in foreign language teaching. However, Butzkamm and Caldwell (*ibid.*) as well as Cook (2001a:153-154) feel that this kind of similarity does not exist since the two learning situations differ greatly. Butzkamm and Caldwell (*ibid.*) elaborate on these differences. According to them, one of the differences involves time. It is said that the kind of language immersion which takes place as one is acquiring one's L1 cannot be achieved in foreign language classrooms because there simply is not enough time. In first language acquisition the child is exposed to language all the time. In FL learning, however, the time available for language learning is limited to a few hours per week. Thus FL learning cannot imitate L1 acquisition, claim the authors.

Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009:30-31) go on presenting several other differences between L1 acquisition and FL learning. When compared to L1 acquisition, the one-on-one interaction between the competent speaker and the learner is limited in FL teaching. Secondly, in FL classrooms there are fewer opportunities to use the language being learned than in L1 acquisition. Thirdly, when learning a foreign language, the learner can make use of his/her L1, which on its behalf reduces the use of the target language. The fourth difference described by the authors lies in that the L1 and the FL have different roles in the learner's life, which is bound to affect the learning situation. Unlike the foreign language, the L1 is the intimate language of the individual, which is learned in close interaction with one's caregivers. Finally, in L1 acquisition one starts to

learn the language from scratch. The foreign language learner, on the other hand, has previous knowledge of at least one language. Therefore, it is argued, the learning of a foreign language should be based on previous knowledge, that is, knowledge of the first language. Also Harmer (2001:131) concludes that as one is learning a new language, it is done through the already existing linguistic world. Furthermore, the implication of this is that L1 support can increase the target language input (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009: 30-31).

As was mentioned previously, one of the shortcomings of monolingual teaching is said to be that it can create unwanted use of the L1 as the teacher cannot meet the demands of monolingual teaching. This means that the teacher may begin to use the L1 all the time if s/he does not have a proper command of the target language (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009:86). Edmonson (2004:172) presents another shortcoming of monolingual teaching. According to him, using only the target language and not indicating what he calls world-switches by changing the language accordingly can be unwise in a pedagogical sense. By this the writer means that the learner might not grasp the teacher's intended message because even though the interaction has changed from communication to teaching, the teacher has not switched codes accordingly (from the TL to the L1). In addition, Allwright and Bailey (1991:173) note that if the teacher insists on target language use, the learners may experience anxiety because they are not allowed to use "their normal means of communication", that is, their first language. This brings to mind what Larsen-Freeman (2000: 95-102) says as she describes community language learning: the L1 can be used to create a sense of security.

Thus far the roots of favoring the target language, the comments against TL-only teaching and the negative outcomes of target language use have been discussed. Next a different perspective regarding TL use is adopted as it is viewed in a positive light. Using the target language in the foreign language classroom is regarded beneficial by many. To begin with, authentic use of the TL is appreciated. Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009:31-33), for instance, advocate using the target language for communication as well as for instruction. According to the writers, using the TL for real communication (as opposed to using it only in relation to language exercises) moulds the classroom environment into one that resembles more the outside world. By this the writers mean that there are opportunities for using the language in authentic situations and thus the pupils get to learn practical language. This is regarded ideal because then the learner can make use of the language which s/he has learned also outside the classroom walls.

Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009:38) go on emphasizing the importance of authentic target language in FL teaching by saying that the target language should be used whenever it is possible. The teacher can, for instance, speak the target language when giving homework, praising or correcting the learner. An interesting point that the writers make is that in foreign language teaching the basic principle should not be arranging as much time as possible for the actual language exercises. Instead, time should be devoted for using the target language when dealing with other issues that may arise during the lesson. The reasoning behind this claim is that not only exercises proper, but also this kind of authentic interaction provides opportunities to learn the language.

Butzkamm and Caldwell's view on the benefits of authentic TL use is supported by Crichton (2009). She conducted a study on the benefits of teachers' target language use in relation to the development of pupils' communication skills. Crichton analyzed classroom interaction taking place in the FL classrooms of five Scottish secondary schools and conducted interviews with pupils. Crichton's findings revealed that pupils learned to use formulaic expressions when communicating with the teacher in the target language. In addition, pupils gained language awareness and familiarized themselves with everyday language as the target language was used when addressing issues which do not necessarily relate to the syllabus.

The importance of target language input in general is also acknowledged by many. According to Harmer (2001:132), the teacher is the primary source of TL input for the learners, which is why the teacher should try to use the foreign language as much as possible. Likewise, Duff and Polio (1990:154) state that the amount of target language input received in the classroom is crucial for FL learning, since outside the classroom the access to the target language is limited.

Also Bateman (2008) has been interested in the benefits of target language input. She approached the issue by conducting a longitudinal study in Britain on student teachers' perceptions regarding TL use in foreign language teaching. Pre- and post-questionnaires as well as journal entries written by the student teachers were used as the data. In addition, the researcher observed the participants' language use during lessons. According to the results of the study, the student teachers regarded target language use beneficial. They wanted to use the target language as much as possible since it was seen to contribute to learners' listening comprehension, vocabulary acquisition and oral production. In addition the student teachers named activities in which the target language can be employed to a large extent. Daily routines such as warm-ups and

checking exercises were mentioned by the participants. Secondly, situations in which the content is in the target language (listening and reading exercises, vocabulary instruction) the use of the TL was perceived as the number one option.

Not only teachers but pupils, too, have recognized the benefits which teachers' target language use fosters. Crichton (2009) interviewed pupils to find out their take on teachers' target language use. The pupils felt that target language input helps them to learn vocabulary and pronunciation. Interestingly, the pupils also mentioned that the teacher's TL use keeps them attentive: if they do not pay attention, they can miss out on information because the teacher speaks only the target language.

Target language input is clearly regarded as something the learners can benefit from. In addition to learning from the input, employing the target language can be seen as influencing the learners' language use. According to Harmer (2001:132), target language input encourages the learners to use the target language when communicating in the classroom. In support of this claim, Crichton (2009) found in her study that the teacher's target language use encouraged the pupils to produce output and to interact in the target language.

As was mentioned previously, authentic target language use is regarded valuable. It follows that restricting the use of the TL to certain activities is seen to have negative outcomes. This is a major theme in relation to the teacher's language choice. Nikula (2005) found a worrying trend in her study on teachers' language use. She compared the language use of EFL teachers to that found in the CLIL classroom. In the EFL classroom target language use was heavily materials-dependent (Nikula 2005:35). Nikula (2005:45) notes that using English mainly in relation to language practice (i.e. exercises proper) created a sense of artificiality. Therefore the target language speech in the foreign language classroom was rather detached from the speakers' personal concerns. This is said to diminish the role of the target language as means of communication and portray it merely as an object of study (Nikula 2005:54).

Meiring and Norman (2002: 33-34) too emphasize the importance of using the target language as the medium of communication in the foreign language classroom. According to them it is imperative to speak the target language because delivering the most significant utterances in the L1 has a diminishing effect on the role of the foreign language. They advocate using the target language in the classroom in order to give the learners the impression that the language they are learning is an actual tool of communication. These sentiments can be found also in the principles of communicative language teaching, as was discussed in section 2.2.



Victor (2009:41) addresses the same issue as the writers mentioned above by stating that engaging in classroom management in the L1 and reducing the functions of the target language may leave students with the feeling that the target language cannot be used for certain purposes or that the target language can be spoken only in relation to exercises and language instruction. In other words, the major concern of these authors is that learners may acquire a false impression of the foreign language, in that it can be used only in relation to some specific activities. Furthermore, the limited use of the TL is seen as harmful for the language learning process in general.

Studies on the teacher's target language use have also produced results which depict the uses of the target language and the views which teachers' have on the issue. In other words, those results do not point out the benefits or disadvantages of TL use, but present the current state of affairs. Duff and Polio (1990), for instance, conducted a study in the United States focusing on the language use of university teachers who were teaching beginner learners. The aim was to calculate the amount of the L1 and the target language used by the teachers. Secondly, they wanted to identify the variables which influence the teacher's language choice. In order to reach these goals Duff and Polio analyzed classroom interaction and interviewed the teachers. Furthermore, they mapped students' attitudes and perceptions regarding the teacher's language choices with a questionnaire. The results of the study were varying: some teachers used the target language extensively, while others used mostly the learners' L1. Several factors which seemed to affect the language choice were found. These included department policy (in favor of the TL), the time-saving aspect of the L1, the L1 as a means to ensure students' understanding, and, the fact that if the foreign language and the L1 were very different from one another, the likelihood of using the L1 increased. In addition, lesson objectives and materials used were seen as influencing the language choice. Interestingly, the students did not mind the extensive use of target language but the general perception of the students was that their teachers used mainly the L1 as the medium of instruction.

Bateman (2008) studied the perceptions of student teachers, as was mentioned previously. In addition to locating the perceived benefits of target language use, she noticed a change in the student teachers' attitudes towards target language use during the longitudinal study. At first they were in favor of using the target language extensively in the classroom. However, later on some of the student teachers exhibited a change in their perceptions on the importance of target language use. The amount of target language used by the student teachers when giving instructions and talking about

the foreign language culture had reduced. Secondly, the beliefs about one's ability to employ the target language had changed among some of the student teachers. Some of them had found ways of overcoming problems which inhibit target language use, while others felt discouraged even to the point of abandoning the target language.

Myyryläinen and Pietikäinen (1988) concentrated on EFL classrooms in Finland. Their data consisted of teacher questionnaires and recordings of lessons. The researchers found that the target language was used quite extensively but stated that it could have been employed even more as the medium of authentic communication. The teachers regarded target language input as beneficial from the learner's point of view. The study revealed that the target language was used to start and to end lessons. In addition, target language speech seemed to be materials-related.

To summarize the role of target language in the foreign language classroom it can be said that authentic use of the target language is seen as a matter of importance. In other words, the idea of using the target language for communicating in the classroom in general (instead of speaking the TL only in relation to exercises or to certain restricted classroom situations) receives support. Secondly, target language input and the benefits it offers to language learning are valued. Furthermore, not only can the learners obtain information about the language as they are subjected to target language input. By speaking the target language the teacher creates opportunities for the learners to use the target language and encourages the learners to practice their productive language skills. As was shown above, learners themselves as well as teachers recognize the benefits of TL input. In fact, in the study by Crichton (2009) the learners felt that the teacher's target language use keeps them alert and attentive. This on its behalf can be perceived to reduce the need to engage in classroom management, which in this case means controlling unwanted learner behavior and guiding the learners' attention. As the role of the target language has now been discussed, it is time to consider the role of the L1 in foreign language teaching.

### **3.3 Employing L1 in foreign language teaching**

Cook is one of the advocates of L1 use in foreign language teaching. Furthermore, his take on code-switching in the FL classroom is positive. In fact, Cook (2001a:103,105) describes code-switching as inevitable and natural not only in a bilingual society but also in the foreign language classroom where two languages are present. According to him, sticking to one language is limiting and the learner might find switching between languages desirable.

Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) are also in favor of employing the L1 in foreign language teaching. They promote bilingual teaching in which both the L1 and the target language are employed as the classroom language and in the language learning process. The latter refers to teaching which uses the learner's L1 as the foundation for foreign language learning. In relation to this, Cook (2001a:153-154) criticizes the perception according to which the L1 and the target language should be kept apart in the mind of the learner. This would entail excluding the L1 from the classroom altogether. The view is overridden by pointing to findings which indicate that the learner's L1 is interwoven with the new language being learned, be it foreign or second language. Another point receiving critique from Cook is the claim that the target language should be used for real communication in the classroom. As a counter-argument to this, Cook states that speaking one language exclusively when other languages are available makes the situation quite the opposite of authentic.

Edmonson (2004:175) argues that using the L1 in teaching is beneficial since it facilitates comprehension and raises awareness. In addition, employing both languages and alternating between those two can be justified because in some cases it can disturb the flow of target language speech less than using solely the target language in the given situation would. Also Cook (2001a:156-157) emphasizes the benefits of L1 use in relation to learner comprehension. According to him, the L1 can be used to explain grammar (particularly if the L1 and the FL differ greatly in terms of grammar) because complex explanations in the target language may not make sense to the learner. Cook (2001b:414) also states that the L1 can be used for conveying meanings of words and sentences and when checking whether or not the learners have understood those items correctly. The writer continues by saying that when meaning needs to be conveyed, speaking the L1 is an efficient way of assisting the learners. Freeman and Freeman (1998:211) seem to agree with Cook. They claim that using the learners' L1 as the language of instruction can ensure that the learners understand what is being taught. The writers claim that using solely the target language in teaching may result in the learners not comprehending the message and thus no learning takes place.

The efficiency achieved by employing the L1 when giving instructions for tasks and when reprimanding is another issue appreciated by Cook (2001b:415-416). Using the L1 in these situations is said to be effective because comprehension is ensured. In addition, it is said that reprimanding in the L1 is taken seriously by the learners because it cannot be seen as mere language practice, as could be the case when reprimanding in the target language. Chambers (1991:29) too acknowledges that in the fear of losing

control the teacher may find it tempting to resort to the L1. However, she suggests that the L1 should be used for disciplining only in the most problematic situations.

In addition to providing language instruction, giving instructions for tasks and reprimanding, the L1 can be employed also for social purposes: for connecting with the learners. In Cook's opinion (2001b:414) using the L1 for such purposes has some sort of a natural feel to it. Moreover, it is stated that complimenting the learners in the L1 makes the praise feel more real. This is said to result from the fact that when speaking the L1 the teacher considers the learners as their real selves instead of addressing some assumed foreign language personas. As one can see, the reasons for reprimanding as well as for praising in the L1 are similar. Ferguson (2003:43) is on the same line with Cook as he proposes employing the L1 for social purposes. He points out that often the use of the target language is connected to a distant and formal relationship between the teacher and the learners. The use of the L1, on the other hand, can be linked to a closer and warmer teacher-learner relationship. Therefore, suggests Ferguson, the teacher may switch to the L1 in order to build rapport and to encourage pupil involvement.

As can be seen from the discussion above, several advantages in using the L1 can be found, but this language choice is not without its shortcomings. Harmer (2001:131) exemplifies this by giving a warning considering the teacher's L1 use. According to him, the teacher sets an example for the learners. If the teacher chooses to use the L1 frequently, the learners are more likely to convert to their mother tongue instead of practicing their oral skills in the target language. Secondly, as was shown in section 3.2, using the L1 for communicating in the classroom and thus restricting the use of the target language is seen to have a negative effect on the role of the target language and on language learning in general. Thirdly, translating one's target language speech into the L1 receives critique. Meiring and Norman (2002:33) state that "learning is more effective when learners are exposed to a pure model, e.g. one that does not instantly translate language into the L1 but requires the students to solve the problem of meaning themselves". The writers advocate keeping to the target language instead of making the task of inferring meaning too easy for the learners by translating one's speech. Krashen (1986:81) is on the same line with Meiring and Norman. According to him, if the teacher translates his/her target language speech, the result is that learners begin to ignore target language input since the information is available to them also in their first language.

When considering employing the L1 in the foreign language classroom one should remember what Freeman and Freeman (1998:22) say about this issue. According

to them, employing the L1 is not the same as abandoning the target language. The writers state that the two languages can be used efficiently to provide the learners with comprehensible input. Furthermore, Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009:25) stress that the use of the L1 should always be justified and purposeful.

Employing the L1 in the foreign language classroom has received a great amount of attention in the research circles. In the following relevant studies and their findings are presented. To start with, Macaro (2001) conducted a case study in Britain on student teachers' language choice and code-switching. The aim of the study was to investigate the extent to which the participants used the L1 while teaching and what factors influenced the language choice. The data consisted of video recorded lessons, stimulated recall interviews and follow-up interviews. The amount of the L1 recorded by Macaro was surprisingly small and the participants' reactions to using the L1 were varying. In his article Macaro presents two differing student teacher profiles. One accepted the use of the L1 and considered it to be beneficial, while the other felt at times guilty for resorting to the L1. For instance, the latter felt guilty for speaking the L1 in order to give instructions. However, the same person accepted the use of the L1 in classroom management. This participant's perceptions changed in that she did not feel as guilty as before for employing the L1 in the classroom. The other student teacher had a more positive take on L1 use to begin with. She used the L1 for giving instructions and in order to contribute to the flow of the conversation. This participant did not exhibit any significant changes in her beliefs. In addition to the results discussed above, Macaro found two main factors which influenced the decisions of the participants, one of them being government policies (in favor of the TL), and the other being personal beliefs and experience.

Although Myyryläinen and Pietikäinen (1988) concentrated mainly on the target language, their study also produced information regarding the use of the L1. First of all, the majority of the teachers considered L1 use in foreign language teaching as natural. They used the L1 when dealing with grammar and when addressing issues which were not part of that particular lesson. In addition, the L1 was employed for so called real communication, i.e. when exchanging information. Code-switching from the target language to the L1 occurred when the teacher wanted to ensure understanding and as a result of a slip of the tongue. The teachers' take on code-switching within one speech situation was negative.

Thompson (2006) studied students' and teachers' language use in university FL classrooms in the U.S.A. The data consisted of video recorded lessons and

questionnaires. The purposes of the study were manifold and listening comprehension was one of the points of focus, which is why the students were also administered related tests. As was said, the study focused on several issues, the most interesting in relation to the present study being the contexts in which the teachers used the L1 and their opinions on L1 and target language use. The video recordings revealed that the students' first language was employed by the teachers when providing vocabulary and grammar instruction. In addition, the teachers of the more advanced course used the L1 when addressing issues related to classroom administration, while the teachers of the beginner course chose the L1 when explaining a new topic or assignment (i.e. when providing instructions).

The teachers were also asked when the L1 should be used at least to some extent. According to the teachers, grammar instruction and situations where it seems that the students have trouble in understanding the teaching material were the most common situations in which they employed the L1. Also, classroom administration was ranked high by the teachers of the beginner course. Among the teachers of the more advanced course, on the other hand, vocabulary instruction was one of the three most common factors creating a need for some L1 use. Least important areas regarding L1 use were giving feedback, establishing solidarity, practicing one's own language skills (when the teacher and the students had different first languages) and responding to students' use of the L1 i.e. accommodation. Also, classroom management was seen as less important by the teachers of the more advanced course, while the teachers of beginner learners regarded it as more significant.

Thompson was also interested in the reasons why the teachers use the target language. In line with Macaro's finding, personal beliefs regarding teaching and learning were seen as the main cause for speaking the target language. Previous teaching experience was another significant reason for TL use among the teachers of the beginner course. For the teachers of the more advanced groups, on the other hand, pedagogical theories were the second important factor behind choosing the target language over the L1.

According to the study conducted by Victor (2009), teachers reported that they use the L1 for grammar and vocabulary teaching. In addition, the L1 was employed in order to correct learner behavior. Similarly, Nikula (2005) found in her study on the teacher's language use in EFL teaching that the L1 was used for discussing grammar and in classroom management. In Victor's study using the L1 was also said to relate to giving instructions for exercises which require several steps or which are perceived to

pose difficulties for understanding. More importantly, resorting to the L1 in such situations was regarded to save time and to minimize confusion. Furthermore, the teachers felt that the L1 is more effective and easier choice in relation to classroom management and to conveying important matters such as announcements. More than two thirds of the students welcomed the teacher's L1 use for explaining difficult concepts, introducing new materials and for making the students feel confident and comfortable in the classroom. Interestingly, all teachers felt that the target language should be used as much as possible, while the students, the more advanced, the more they wanted to include the L1 in the foreign language classroom.

De la Campa and Nassaji (2009) studied the language use of two FL teachers in Canada by analyzing classroom interaction and through interviews and stimulated recall sessions. The purpose of studying recorded classroom interaction was to find out to what extent and in what situations the L1 was used by the teachers. In addition, the interviews and stimulated recall aimed to elicit information regarding the teachers' reasons for L1 use. De la Campa and Nassaji found that the amount of the teachers' L1 varied to some extent between individual classes. The total amount of L1 use was 11,3%. The purposes for which the teachers used the L1 were to some extent the same, the most frequent uses being translating and giving instructions. The more experienced teacher used the L1 also when making personal comments (e.g. sharing opinions), while the novice teacher employed the L1 for administrative issues.

On the basis of the interviews and stimulated recall sessions altogether 16 categories of motives for L1 use were identified. The following categories were mentioned both in interviews and in stimulated recall sessions: students not used to TL input, students' low language proficiency, no time for TL use, class composition, explaining problem areas, student motivation and the facilitative role of the L1. The categories which were present only in the interviews were catering for students' differing objectives for learning the foreign language, the teacher's personal language learning experience and using the L1 as a brain storming tool. There were also reasons for and factors affecting L1 use which were discussed only during the stimulated recall. These were bad acoustics in the classroom, clarifying one's TL speech after speaking too fast, interpretation of student reaction, the bilingual context, being humorous and finally, expressing displeasure.

As de la Campa and Nassaji present the findings, they do not explain or clarify all categories they have found. This is unfortunate since some of them remain rather ambiguous. For instance, stating that student motivation, bilingual context and

interpretation of student reaction are factors causing the teacher's L1 use leaves the reader wondering what exactly the researchers are referring to.

In her study on student teachers' beliefs about target language use Bateman (2008) found that situations in which some kind of complications arise were considered to be prone for L1 use. Examples given by the student teachers of such situations involved attending to pupils who face troubles in understanding or who are struggling with learning. In addition, problems relating to classroom management (discipline) were perceived to be handled in the L1.

Bateman was also interested in the factors which were seen to inhibit target language use, or, to put it another way, the factors that caused L1 use. On the basis of the student teachers' replies, four categories of factors were identified. The first of them was said to relate to the student teachers themselves. Sticking to the target language was regarded a potential source for loss of control. Therefore the L1 was seen as a way to maintain control. In addition, the lack of time, fatigue, avoiding vocabulary which is unknown to pupils, the limitations of the student teachers' linguistic skills, and finally, the need to build rapport were seen as reasons for L1 use. The second category of factors related to pupils. Limitations of the pupils' linguistic skills as well as cognitive skills were seen as factors which cause L1 use. The latter refers to the pupils' capability of dealing with abstract concepts such as grammar. Furthermore, the lack of motivation on the pupils' part was seen to lead to L1 use because if the pupils are demotivated, they will resist the teacher's TL use. The third category involved the subject matter. Teaching demanding topics, such as grammar or cultural knowledge, was seen as a motive for the teacher's L1 use. The fourth category, on the other hand, related to teacher trainers, or as Bateman calls them, instructors. The student teachers stated that they taught in the same way as their instructors (i.e. they made similar language choices). In other words, they taught in a way to which the pupils were used to. It was also mentioned that difficulties had arisen when trying to speak the target language to pupils who were not accustomed to it.

Wilkerson (2008) studied the use of the L1 by five FL teachers in the U.S.A. The data consisted of observations and recordings of classroom interaction. In addition, the teachers were asked to submit written reports on their teaching styles and L1 use. The study indicated that the teachers used the L1 in order to save time. This means controlling the pace of classroom activities, eliminating waiting and lag time, and limiting the turn-taking of students. Secondly, the L1 was employed for demonstrating authority. An interesting feature is that two of the teachers performed this function by



making the students speak the TL while allowing themselves to employ also the L1. Lecturing in the L1 and reducing student participation were other means of demonstrating authority. Thirdly, the L1 was used to reduce ambiguity. This refers to instances where the students were unsure whether their output was correct or did not understand the teacher's TL speech.

Littlewood and Yu (2009) conducted a quantitative study in an EFL setting in China in order to find out to what extent the teachers used the L1, and in what situations and for what reasons they did so. The researchers decided to adopt a new kind of approach to teacher's language use by employing student questionnaires as the means of collecting data. According to the questionnaires, the amount of the L1 and the TL used by the teachers varied remarkably. Some teachers used the target language nearly all the time, while others spoke the L1 to a large extent. In addition, the results indicated that the teachers used the L1 to establish constructive social relationships, to ensure understanding, to save time and to maintain control.

As one might notice, some of the studies focused more on the situations in which L1 use occurred, while others concentrated more on the motives for employing the L1. In some studies these two aspects were intertwined. There are a number of similarities in the findings of the studies introduced above. First of all, the L1 is used in giving instructions and when teaching grammar or vocabulary. Secondly, issues relating to classroom administration and management, including establishing authority, are prone to L1 use. Thirdly, ensuring understanding and solving problems related to understanding, as well as the low language and cognitive skills and low motivation of the learners contribute to the teacher's L1 use. In addition, the L1 is used because of the lack of time. It is also employed for social reasons and for expressing feelings and opinions. The factors influencing the language choice vary from government policies to personal beliefs and experiences, and to the teaching style favored by the teacher educators. As the roles of the two languages in the FL classroom have now been considered, the focus can be shifted on the phenomenon known as code-switching.

### **3.4 Code-switching**

Code-switching is a known linguistic phenomenon which can be found in the language use of bi- and multilinguals. Before discussing code-switching in more detail, it is in order to consider why such a phenomenon is seen as relevant in the present study. According to Baker and Prys Jones (1998:2-3) there are four characteristics of bilingualism. Firstly, proficiency in a language varies across the four skills (writing,

speaking, reading, listening) so that a bilingual person may write better in a certain language rather than speak it fluently. Secondly, only a few bilinguals are equally proficient in both of their languages. Thirdly, not many bilinguals have the same language competence as the monolingual speaker of the given language. Finally, the bilingual's competence in a language varies over time. Following this view, the participants of the present study as well as their pupils can be seen as bilinguals. Of course one has to take into account the context of this special type of bilingualism: the school environment and foreign language classrooms have their own features which affect the communication taking place and make the language situation differ (at least to some degree) from the bilingualism found outside the school walls. This does not, however, change the fact that bilingualism exists in foreign language classrooms. Therefore, both code-switching in bilingual settings in general and in language classrooms in particular are considered relevant phenomena in relation to the teacher's language choice. The issue of code-switching is approached in this chapter by first considering the language modes available for bilinguals as described by Grosjean (2010). After this code-switching is given a brief definition and the functions of code-switching in general are presented. Lastly, code-switching in language classrooms is given attention and related research findings discussed.

As Grosjean (2010: 39-43) puts it, language choice is the decision which the speaker makes when there is more than one language available to his/her use. The speaker chooses the language which is seen as appropriate in the given situation. The writer continues by saying that language choice can be described also in a more elaborate way. It is said that the bilingual person goes through two phases when making the decision to use a certain language. First the bilingual person has to choose the language for the conversation, in other words the *base language*. This decision is called making the *language choice*. Secondly, the speaker decides whether or not the other language can be brought into the conversation. In other words, the speaker decides on the *language mode*. If the speaker finds it suitable to use also the other language, then s/he is in a *bilingual mode*. If, on the other hand, using both languages is not an option, the speaker goes into *monolingual mode*. In the first both languages are activated while in the latter only one of the languages is fully activated.

If Grosjean's view on language choice is taken into the EFL classroom, it means that the teacher can choose either Finnish or English to be the base language. The teacher may want to stick to a monolingual mode or alternate between the two languages during the lesson and also during individual sections of the lesson. In Finland

the English teacher working with upper-secondary school pupils does have the option of choosing the bilingual mode since the pupils are able to understand both languages. A monolingual mode consisting solely of the target language is also a potential option. However, it is unlikely that the foreign language teacher of today would choose the L1 and conduct a whole lesson in the monolingual mode, as was the case when grammar-translation was the prevailing teaching method.

When the speaker is in the *bilingual mode*, the available languages are said to be in an active state simultaneously (Grosjean 2010: 27, 41-43). In such a situation the languages can be brought into the conversation in two ways. As Grosjean (2010:27) puts it: “bilinguals can simply bring in the other language for a word, a phrase, or a sentence (through mechanisms called code-switching and borrowing), or they can actually change the language they are speaking (referred to as changing the base language).” Baker and Prys Jones (1998:58) state that in broad terms code-switching is a change of language within a conversation. It is said to occur within or between sentences, but also in larger constituents. According to Field (2011:93), code-switching that takes place within a sentence is known as *intrasentential code-switching*. It is stated that such code-switching often contributes to the conversational flow and occurs because both available languages are active at the same time. Switching which occurs between sentences is called *intersentential code-switching*, explains Field. These kinds of switches are said to result usually from a change in the speech situation: a new participant enters the conversation or the topic of discussion changes.

Code-switching can also be seen in other terms. As Romaine (1995:121) puts it, “In code-switched discourse, the items in question form a part of the same speech act”. Romaine argues that the switching takes place in a constricted linguistic context, while according to the former view the context of code-switching is not limited. Grosjean (2010:51-52) also implies the limited context by describing code-switching as being temporary. According to his description of code-switching, the speaker uses the base language, switches to the other available language for a moment, and then reverts back to using the base language.

Unlike the authors mentioned thus far, Edmonson (2004) discusses code-switching in a specific context: in foreign language classrooms, which of course is the most essential viewpoint for the present study. Edmonson (2004:155-157) demonstrates that code-switching in the FL classroom constitutes a special kind of code-switching. Therefore, it is said, one might want to use some other term to describe the phenomenon in this specific context. Edmonson (2004:157) himself decides to use the term code-

switching to refer to “any use of more than one language in a discourse segment or sequence of discourse segments by one or more classroom participants, either turn-internally or turn-sequentially.” As Edmonson notes, this is a rather general definition. Nevertheless, he sees it as an adequate enough definition for describing classroom code-switching.

The present study follows the line of not making too intricate distinctions in terms of the type of language choice. In other words, different kinds of code-switches as well as changing and choosing the base language are given equal amount of attention and regarded to be part of one and the same phenomenon: language choice. It should be noted that what was said above is only a brief description of the definitions and terminology related to code-switching. Gaining a complete picture of the issue would require much more thorough discussion. However, here the purpose is only to provide the most basic information on the matter in order to paint a general picture of this phenomenon. Since the present study focuses on language choice and on the different uses of English and Finnish, a detailed account of the intricacies of code-switching is not needed. Instead, it is quite adequate to end the description of the phenomenon here and move on to considering the reasons why bilinguals code-switch. In other words, the pragmatic and sociolinguistic aspects of code-switching will be given attention, while the types, definitions and linguistic constraints of code-switching are left aside.

In addition to defining code-switching, it is of great importance to present its functions since they relate to the very core of the present study. Baker and Prys Jones (1998:60) name several functions of code-switching. The most relevant ones in relation to foreign language teaching are the following: emphasizing a point, compensating the lack of equivalent (the term for a certain concept exists only in one of the languages), reinforcing or clarifying a statement, expressing social connectedness and addressing a certain topic. Romaine (1995:163) adds to the list of functions which have relevance also in the language classroom: through code-switching one can invite another person to participate in the conversation.

Grosjean (2010: 53-55) acknowledges functions of code-switching similar to those mentioned by Baker and Prys Jones and Romaine. According to Grosjean, code-switching may be employed when some concept or notion can be better expressed by using the other language. Secondly, if the speaker is familiar with the vocabulary related to a certain domain only in one of the languages or if such vocabulary is more readily available in one language rather than in the other, code-switching may take place when discussing that domain. Thirdly, code-switching can be employed as a social strategy: to

show speaker involvement, mark group identity, to exclude someone, to raise one's status and to show expertise, for instance.

Grosjean (2010: 63-66) makes a distinction between code-switching which takes place in the bilingual mode and the kind of code-switching that occurs even though the bilingual person is in the monolingual mode. The latter mode entails communicating with a monolingual speaker or with another bilingual who shares only one of the speaker's languages. It is said that the bilingual speaker may code-switch despite being in the monolingual mode. According to Grosjean (2010:66-67), this may be caused by the fact that there are proper nouns which the speaker, instead of adapting them to the base language through borrowing, wants to pronounce in the way they are pronounced in the language they originate from. Another possible reason is that the speaker is familiar with the vocabulary related to a certain domain only in one of the languages (as was mentioned already in relation to code-switching in the bilingual mode) or that the speaker does not know the word in the given language and has to therefore resort to the other language. Edmonson (2004:165) names this kind of switching speaker-oriented and psycholinguistic code-switching. It is said to occur when the speaker is faced with a lack of knowledge or skills or when the use of the target language has not yet become automatic. Furthermore, Gumperz and Hernández-Chavez (1972:98) point out that code-switching does not always have a function; it can be merely a slip of the tongue. Auer (1995:126) uses the term *transfer* to refer to this kind of code-switching.

Gumperz (1982:75-80) discusses the different conversational functions of code-switching. Some of the functions he names are similar to the ones introduced above, but some of them have not yet been addressed in the present study. According to Gumperz, quoting someone and reporting what someone else has said can result in code-switching. Secondly, interjections and sentence fillers can be produced in the other language. Thirdly, code-switching may occur when a message is repeated in the other language (reiteration). Gumperz notes that reiteration is usually employed in order to emphasize or to clarify something. As one might notice, Baker and Prys Jones, too attach emphasizing and providing clarifications to code-switching. However, Gumperz makes an explicit reference to uttering the message first in one language and then in the other. Gumperz links code-switching also to message qualification. This means that qualifying constructions (sentence and verb compliments, etc.) are produced in the other language. Lastly, code-switching is said to mark the degree of speaker involvement in what is said.

Gumperz has also developed a theory according to which code-switching can function as a contextualization cue. Auer (1992:4) explains that contextualization equals creating the context in which the utterances are to be understood. It involves actions which point to some aspect of context, be it the roles of or social relationships between the participants, the relationship of the speaker and the message being conveyed through language, the topic, or the mood in which the utterance is produced. The aspect of context made relevant by the speaker is said to influence the interpretation of the utterance. As Auer (1992:25) points out, contextualization cues include also code-switching.

Gumperz (1991:42-43) elaborates on the issue of contextualization cues by saying that a shift both in the physical setting and in the nature of the interaction can correspond with a shift in the speech varieties being used. An example of this is said to be using a dialect at home while employing the standard language in formal settings. However, Gumperz states that sometimes a change in the language use signals a shift in the nature of the interaction, even though the physical setting does not change. Code-switching in the latter case may function as a contextualization cue. Wei (1998:164) sheds light on the details of contextualization by stating that its functions include, among other things, signaling the end of a turn, a change in the topic, irony, seriousness, social identities and attitudes.

According to Auer's theory (1998, 1995), two kinds of code-switching can be found: one is discourse-related, the other preference-related. Auer (1998:4) depicts the first type as "the use of code-switching to organize the conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance". In one of the examples given by Auer (1998:6-7) of such switching the participants insert a certain German expression into the conversation conducted mainly in Spanish. In this case the purpose of code-switching is to create textual coherence by repeatedly using the same expression in German. Preference-related code-switching, on the other hand, is described by Auer (1998:7-8) as a negotiation between the language preferences of the participants. In addition to the preferences, it is said to relate to the speaker's language competencies (Auer 1995:125). As a result of the negotiation one of the participants may agree to use the language which the other prefers (convergence) or both may continue the conversation in their own preferred languages (divergence).

Preference-related code-switching described by Auer brings to mind the Communication Accommodation Theory introduced first by Howard Giles. Giles and Coupland (1991:60,63) define it as adjusting one's communication so that it matches

with the conversational partner's way of interacting. Pursuing such similarity is also referred to as convergence. The writers explain that this similarity can be achieved with a number of ways, which can be linguistic, prosodic or non-vocal. An example of the first is code-switching. According to Giles and Coupland (1991:71), the reason for accommodating lies in the need to identify oneself with others and to feel socially integrated. It is also pointed out that most of the time people are not conscious of this need. It can be said that when a person accommodates one's speech, s/he is seeking approval and trying to create solidarity (Myers-Scotton 2006:155). Divergence, the opposite of convergence, is a strategy used for emphasizing the differences between oneself and others (Giles and Coupland 1991:65). Convergence and divergence described by Giles and Coupland can be said to be equivalents for the patterns found in the negotiation sequence involved in preference-related code-switching proposed by Auer. Before ending the discussion on these notions it is worth pointing out that preference- and discourse-related code-switching can also overlap, as Auer (1998:8) mentions.

As was mentioned previously, Edmonson (2004) discusses code-switching specifically in relation to classroom context. Edmonson (2004:158-159) states that there are two kinds of speech events to be found in the language classroom: language can be used for pedagogic or for communicative purposes. The former refers to the actual teaching (also referred to as *instruction* by Edmonson), while the latter constitutes using the target language and thus practicing it. Furthermore, the former can be conducted through the L1 or the target language, but the latter involves only target language use. Code-switching is seen to take place when the teacher moves from one type of speech event to the other. Edmonson refers to this as code-switching resulting from switching discourse worlds. However, it is pointed out that language alternation does not necessarily take place every time that a world-switch occurs (Edmonson 2004:161). The language use described by Edmonson can be seen as falling into the category of discourse-related code-switching as described by Auer. As one can see from the discussion above, Edmonson believes that the nature of the speech event may affect the teacher's language use. This brings to mind the theory on code-switching according to which there is a connection between certain speech events and a certain language (Auer 1995:117).

Now that some of the theories regarding code-switching have been presented, it is in order to concentrate more closely on code-switching studies which have been conducted in the foreign language classroom. Nikula (2005:34-35) states on the basis of

her study that code-switching in the EFL classroom indicates changes in classroom activities. For instance, it was found that the teacher switched the code from the TL to the L1 as grammar instruction began. The opposite switch occurred as the teacher moved from grammar issues to discussing a text with the pupils. According to Nikula, marking activity boundaries is important for teachers. As Nikula's data extract proves, this can be done with the help of code-switching. As one can see, there is a connection between what Nikula and Edmonson say about code-switching in the language classroom.

Greggio and Gil (2007) studied teachers' and learners' code-switching in EFL classrooms. From the recorded classroom interaction they found that different types of code-switching were employed in the classroom. The researchers wanted to locate situations in which the teacher's code-switching was frequent. Regarding the teacher of the beginner group those situations were explaining grammar, giving instructions, monitoring/assisting the students and checking exercises. As for the teacher of the pre-intermediate group, code-switching was most frequent in relation to explaining grammar and checking exercises. Greggio and Gil identified also the functions of the teachers' code-switching. The teacher of beginner learners employed code-switching for marking beginning of the class, in order to get the students' attention, to maintain the planned structure of the class, to facilitate/clarify understanding of grammatical rules and structures, to provide translations and to give advice. The teacher of the pre-intermediate group, on the other hand, code-switched in order to facilitate and clarify understanding of grammar and vocabulary, to elicit utterances, to teach pronunciation and when being humorous. It is worth noting that most of the switches were from the target language to the L1.

Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) were interested in the connection of pedagogical focus and code-switching. They studied this phenomenon in a Turkish university where they collected their data by recording lessons held in beginner-level EFL classrooms. The data was analyzed by means of conversation analysis. First of all, the researchers found that the teachers code-switched from English (the TL) to Turkish (the L1) when disciplining and giving feedback. The opposite switch occurred as the teachers shifted frames or topics of discussion. The switch was seen to guide the students' attention during those shifts.

The researchers identified two types of code-switching: teacher-initiated and teacher-induced switching. In the first the teacher switched codes, while in the latter the teacher induced a code-switch, that is, the students were expected to use a different language than which the teacher was speaking (Üstünel and Seedhouse 2005:303).



Teacher-initiated code-switching occurred when the students did not respond to the TL elicitation/question uttered in the target language. Code-switching from the TL to the L1 was employed because it was important that the students would understand the pedagogical focus (i.e. understand what is expected of them). A common strategy was, in fact, to translate instructions into the L1 and to use the L1 to clarify the situation when problems arose in order to ensure understanding. Teacher-induced code-switching occurred as the teacher elicited target language replies by using the L1, and vice versa. The students responded to the pedagogical focus introduced by the teacher by either showing alignment or misalignment. In the case of the former the students produced output in the language which the teacher intended them to use. When expressing misalignment, on the other hand, the students used the “wrong” language and thus opposed the pedagogical focus.

Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002) studied FL teachers’ code-switching from the target language to the L1 in Australia. In addition to focusing on the functions of code-switching, Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie aimed to find out to what extent the teachers used the L1. The average percentage of L1 use was 8,80 which was seen as a rather small number. Code-switching was most frequent in the case of translations and L1 comments made regarding target language linguistic examples. The teachers also used the L1 frequently to encourage the students to speak the target language. This is similar to the teacher-induced code-switching found by Üstünel and Seedhouse.

Lin (1990) focused on language alternation in secondary school L2 classrooms in Hong Kong. The data of the study consisted of audio recorded lessons exhibiting the language use of four teachers. Conversation analysis was used in the interpretation of the data. The study sought answers to the questions of how and why teachers language alternate. The results indicated that teachers’ language alternation was related to teacher-student negotiation, frame marking and teaching the subject matter (e.g. teaching vocabulary and grammar). Lin (1990: 119-122) came to the conclusion that teachers were trying to meet two conflicting demands: to maximize the use of L2 and at the same time ensure that learners understand what is said. The writer suggests that instead of demanding the teachers to use only L2 in the classroom and making them feel guilty for resorting to the L1, they should be encouraged to reflect on their values, attitudes and practice, and to make the kind of choices they see fit in the given circumstances. In addition, Lin proposes that the value of language alternation should be acknowledged.

Yletyinen (2004) was interested in the functions of code-switching in the EFL classroom in Finland. The aim of her study was to find out in what situations code-switching takes place, what type of switches are involved, who switches the language and why. To gain answers to these questions she analyzed video recordings using discourse analysis as the analysis method. In the following is a list of situations in which the teacher used code-switching and the functions which code-switching served. First of all, code-switching was employed in relation to pupil understanding: giving explanations when the pupils have problems in understanding and checking understanding of new language items. Secondly, teaching the subject matter, in this case grammar translation and grammar explanation, exhibited code-switching. Thirdly, teacher code-switching occurred in relation to classroom management: when catching the pupils' attention through a switch and when reprimanding. The teacher engaged in code-switching also when adjusting one's language use to that of the pupils. In addition, sometimes the teacher did not know the needed target language word, which resulted in code-switching. On other occasions code-switching resulted from a lapse, as Yletyinen puts it. Finally, code-switching took place in unofficial interactions (not related to the lesson content) and when moving from one activity to another (separating classroom episodes).

Hartikainen (2009), too, studied code-switching in a Finnish EFL classroom. She found that code-switching occurred in relation to translations, when teaching grammar/vocabulary, when giving explanations regarding the subject matter, and when checking exercises. In addition, code-switching occurred during transitions (from one classroom activity to another) and in relation to organizational functions. As one can see, there are several similarities in the findings of these two studies. However, there are also differences. The teacher in Hartikainen's study did not engage in accommodation, neither was the teacher forced to code-switch due to a lack of linguistic knowledge.

Reini (2008) studied the functions of language choice and code-switching of two teachers by analyzing video recorded classroom interaction. As the method of analysis she employed conversation analysis. Reini also studied the amount of the TL and the L1 used by the teachers. She found that the L1 constituted 60% of the speech of one of the teachers and 51% of the other's. This is quite a significant amount, especially if compared to the percentages of L1 use found in the studies introduced earlier on. The L1 was used in grammar teaching, in giving instructions and when discussing texts with the pupils. Both the L1 and the TL were used when the pupils were engaging in exercises. The reasons for the switches were changes in the participant constellation or

topic, translating, language of the materials, drawing a line between classroom interaction and other kinds of communication, and separating the sequence which is unrelated to the on-going activity from the activity proper. In addition, the language used by the learners affected the teacher's language choice.

The code-switching studies discussed above have produced similar findings. One of the most frequent instances of code-switching in the foreign language classroom seems to be related to teaching the subject matter. Explaining and clarifying grammar and vocabulary were mentioned in several studies in relation to code-switching. Secondly, marking activity boundaries, drawing lines between different kinds of communication, shifting frames, making a transition – this function has been referred to in different ways – is another frequent function of code-switching. Other quite frequent functions of code-switching or situations prone to it are guiding and seeking attention, reprimanding, giving instructions and organizing, clarifying what is expected of the learners, encouraging the learners to produce output, accommodating, translating, checking exercises, and lastly, working with texts and other teaching materials. All the results presented here were mentioned in at least two studies, the most frequent in nearly all of them.

Thus far the implications which language teaching methods and approaches have had for the teacher's language choice have been presented. The nature of classroom communication has been considered as well. In addition, arguments for and against using the target language, as well as for and against employing the L1 in foreign language teaching have been discussed. Code-switching and its functions have also been considered. Furthermore, findings of previous research on the teacher's language choice and code-switching have been presented. In the following chapter the present study will be introduced.

#### **4 THE PRESENT STUDY**

Before discussing the present study in detail, there is one terminological issue to be addressed. The focus of the present study is on student teachers' views on and interpretations of the language choice in EFL teaching. Here *language choice* is used as an umbrella term which includes code-switching as well as choosing the base language for the interaction. Since the definition of the term should now be clear, the aims of the present study can be introduced.

#### **4.1 Aims**

The present study has two main aims. First of all, the purpose is to find out what kind of perceptions student teachers have regarding the language choice in EFL teaching. In order to map these perceptions three student teachers of English were interviewed. To be specific, the researcher employed semi-structured interview in order to elicit information. Secondly, the aim is to find out what kind of motives the student teachers find for their own language choices. For this purpose lessons held by the three participants were recorded and selected video clips were shown to the participants during the interview sessions. The participants were then to comment on their language use and give reasons for their language choices. This method is known as stimulated recall interview. The methods used in collecting the data will be discussed in more detail later on, after the issue of selecting the sample has been addressed. Before moving on it is in order to summarize the aims of the present study. In the following are the research questions to which the study seeks answers.

1. What kind of perceptions do the student teachers have regarding the language choice in EFL teaching?
2. What reasons do the participants give for the language choices they have made in the classroom?

As the participants are student teachers of English, attention is paid also to the role which teacher trainers are said to have regarding the participants' language use. Next the process of selecting the participants for the present study is given attention.

#### **4.2 Selecting the sample**

Altogether three student teachers were chosen for the sample of the present study. They were selected from a group of volunteers and all three were female. The number of participants was reduced from four to three since it became obvious that three participants produce a suitable amount of data for the purposes of the present study. At the same time, keeping in mind the qualitative nature of the study as well as the quite comprehensive amount of data, it would have been too ambitious an attempt to include more than three participants.

The participants were teaching in secondary school at the time of the data collection. There are two reasons why this particular school level was chosen. First of all, most student teachers do their training in secondary school. Thus choosing this school level increased the number of available participants. Another reason is that secondary school provides such an environment which is perhaps most fruitful from the

perspective of the teacher's language choices. Most Finnish secondary school pupils have been studying English already for several years, which undoubtedly makes it more than possible for the teacher to use the target language as the classroom language, if s/he desires to do so. In other words the language skills of the pupils do not pose a hindrance for target language use. However, the pupils are not at upper-intermediate or advanced level, which can increase the number of instances where the pupils are not able to comprehend target language input. In other words, the level of the pupils' language skills creates the kind of conditions where the teacher has to weigh the language options carefully.

Only one school level was included in the study in order to produce more thorough qualitative data. This way it is possible to get a clear picture of teaching at one particular school level. Had I chosen, for example, student teachers from upper-secondary as well as from secondary school, the in-depth description might have suffered. Since the sample is all in all rather small, it would not serve the purpose of the present study to have participants who teach at different school levels.

The participants were selected based on the grade which they were teaching. The aim was to have as little variation as possible considering the language level of the pupils, since it is a factor bound to influence the teacher's language choice. At the time of the recordings two of the participants were teaching grade eight, while the third participant was teaching ninth-graders. Thus it can be said that the teaching conditions in relation to the competence of the pupils was quite similar for all three participants.

The lessons were recorded and the interviews conducted between January and March 2012. At that point the student teachers were approximately half way through the teacher training program. Two of them had been teaching in secondary school previously during the teacher training program. One participant, on the other hand, was at the time of the recordings teaching in secondary school for the first time. As the participants of the present study have now been described, the means of data collection can be given attention.

### **4.3 Semi-structured interview and stimulated recall**

In the present study interviewing was chosen as the means of collecting data. Two kinds of techniques were employed. Semi-structured interview was used to elicit the student teachers' perceptions, while stimulated recall interview was employed in order to find out what kind of motives there are behind the actual language choices. The process of data collection was set to motion by recording lessons held by the

participants. Approximately a week after the lessons of the given participant had been recorded, an interview session was arranged. The session started off with semi-structured interview and proceeded to stimulated recall interview. The nature of semi-structured interview will be described and employing this interview technique for the purposes of the present study will be discussed in what follows. After this a similar description of stimulated recall interview will be provided.

Semi-structured interview lies in the middle of the structured-unstructured continuum of interview techniques (Borg 2006:189-190). As Fontana and Frey (2000:647) point out, in a structured interview all participants are asked the same questions in the same order. In addition, the answer alternatives are said to be predetermined. According to Borg (2006:203), semi-structured interview differs from structured interview in that it is based on “a set of topics or a loosely defined series of questions”. Borg adds that in a semi-structured interview the participants have the opportunity to talk freely of the topic at hand. In other words, when compared to structured interview, semi-structured interview is less strict in nature and leaves room for variation.

In the interviews made for the present study the participants could answer how they saw fit and their responses were not much controlled by the researcher. The unrestricted nature of the interview could be seen also in other points. The order of interview questions could be altered according to the order in which the participants chose to address the issues to be discussed. Clarifying questions were asked when needed. The questions used in the semi-structured interviews concerned the ideal distribution of the two languages and the uses, benefits and disadvantages related to Finnish (the L1) and English. The participants were also asked to describe an unsuccessful and a successful language choice. In addition, they were asked whether or not they plan their language choices and if yes, on what basis they decide on the language in the planning stage. Furthermore, the participants were asked what kind of instructions, if any, they had received from the teacher trainers regarding the language choice. The interview questions used in the semi-structured interviews can be found as an appendix in the end of the study.

While the first part of the interview was semi-structured and focused mainly on the participants' perceptions, the latter part of the interview consisted of stimulated recall. This interview type was chosen in order to find out what kind of motives the participants find for their own language choices. The reason for employing stimulated recall was that it could elicit information about the participants' language use which

could not have been attained in any other way. Some motives behind language choices cannot be identified through observation; instead it may be that sometimes only the participant can tell what exactly caused or affected a certain language choice and what its purpose was. For instance, Macaro (2000) and de la Campa and Nassaji (2009) chose stimulated recall for studying the perceptions and attitudes of their participants. In using stimulated recall technique there is the underlying idea that teachers' actions are influenced by the way they perceive language and language learning (Nunan 1989:66). In a stimulated recall session a stimulus is used "to elicit verbal commentaries about the cognitions (typically thoughts or decision-making) occurring during previously performed behaviours" (Borg 2010:209). In practice this means that the participant watches video recordings or listens to audio recordings of his/her teaching and describes his/her actions giving reasons for them (Nunan 1989:69).

In the present study video-recorded lessons were used as the stimulus and the participants were to comment on their language choices. In order to obtain the material to be used as the stimulus two 45-minute lessons were recorded per each participant. It was important that the recordings would exhibit natural behavior. For this reason the influence which the researcher might have on the student teachers' actions was kept to minimum. Prior to the recordings only the necessary information about the study was given to the participants. Thus the language use of the participants was not affected by the objectives of the present study.

After recording the lessons, the researcher watched the recordings selecting clips to be shown to the participants. The criterion for choosing a clip was that it had to exhibit a language choice of some kind. This included switching from one language to another within or between speech situations as well as choosing the base language for a certain speech situation (a case in which no switch occurs). Language choices in cases where the teacher read aloud written linguistic examples or came up with an example sentence for the sake of exemplifying the targeted language item were not viewed as relevant. This is because no actual choosing was involved in the forming of the utterance: linguistic examples are bound to be in the target language. Neither was translating linguistic examples from one language to another taken into consideration. However, choosing the language for discussing the linguistic examples was seen as an actual language choice. Moreover, translating one's own speech to the pupils was seen as a language choice. An example of such a language choice would be giving instructions in one language and repeating them in the other. The point in selecting the video clips was to locate all language choices made by the participants. In some cases this was

problematic since the language choices occurred with such short intervals that it was impossible to capture only one language choice into one video clip. In such instances the researcher selected a clip containing several language choices, which the participant could then comment on as a whole.

In the stimulate recall session the researcher showed the video clips to the participant. After each video clip the researcher asked why the given language choice had been made. In addition, it was suggested that the participants would evaluate the successfulness of their choices. However, the evaluative comments were not included in the final analysis since the researcher decided to concentrate solely on the motives found for the language choices.

Each student teacher participated in one interview session, during which both the semi-structured and the stimulated recall interview were conducted. The duration of the sessions varied to some extent. The duration depended on how lengthy or concise replies the participant produced. Another factor affecting the duration was the number of clips shown in the stimulated recall interview. This, on the other hand, depended on the number of distinct language choices made by the participant during the recorded lessons. After the interviews had been conducted, they were transcribed focusing mainly on the content and wording. Details of interaction such as laughs, pauses or intonation were generally not taken into account since it was not necessary for the purposes of the present study. One exception to this was made in a case where the participant's tone of voice was crucial in the interpretation of the utterance. Transcribing the interviews was followed by the analysis of the gathered data. The analysis method chosen for the present study and the steps taken in the analysis process are introduced in the following section.

#### **4.4 Qualitative content analysis**

In the present study a form of qualitative content analysis was employed. In particular, the conventions of the method known as the Grounded Theory were used as the basis for data analysis. The Grounded Theory is an analysis method which can be used in both qualitative and quantitative research. When analyzing data according to the Grounded Theory, the focus is not on linguistic features, as it is in studies based on discourse analysis, but instead on the content. Since the purpose of the present study concentrates on *what* the participants say instead of focusing on *how* they say it, the Grounded Theory was seen as a suitable basis for conducting the analysis. Dey (2004:80) describes one of the characteristics of the Grounded Theory. It is said that the



frame for analysis in the Grounded Theory is data-oriented. Dey clarifies this by saying that no preselected criteria or categories are used in the analysis, nor are any hypotheses being tested. There are no preconceptions; instead the categories arise or are discovered from the data itself. The name of the analysis method is quite apt, since the purpose is to produce a theory which is grounded in data (Valanides 2010:62). Furthermore, this kind of approach is said to produce data which is closer to the reality than would be the case with filtering the findings through previous experience and speculation (Strauss and Corbin 1998:12). In line with this, in the present study no predetermined categories were used but the data was analyzed keeping the research questions in mind.

Analyzing the data by means of the Grounded Theory involves coding the data in order to form categories through constant comparison (Dey 2004: 80). The procedure consists of three stages, as Valanides (2010:60-62) demonstrates. In the first coding stage the data is dissected into pieces for a close examination in order to find the similarities and differences of incidents. The data is then assembled and core categories formed. In the third and final stage a theory explaining the phenomenon in question is produced based on the concepts identified. The present study employed this analysis framework. In other words, the interview data was coded and categorized. Before elaborating on this issue, it should be noted that the analysis is divided into two sections according to the research questions and the type of data. Chapter 5 focuses on the data derived from the semi-structured interviews (i.e. on the student teacher's perceptions), while chapter 6 concentrates on the data produced in the stimulated recall interviews (on the motives given for language choices).

The first step of coding involved identifying whether the participants were referring to TL or L1 use in their comments. Comments made on L1 use were separated from those referring to the target language. This was done because the purpose of the present study is to reveal the roles of Finnish and English. This procedure concerned the interview data as a whole. In addition to sorting the data by language, general comments on teacher training and on planning one's language use were analyzed separately from the language-specific comments (see section 5.1 of the analysis). As for the data derived from the semi-structured interviews, it became clear that most of the interview questions had elicited information about the perceived uses of the two languages. In other words, the participants had depicted the possible uses which the two languages may have in the classroom. Categories of uses were formed on the basis of the comments. In the same manner the data obtained in the stimulated recall sessions was first coded according to the language and then according to the types of motives given for that certain language.

Three main categories of language use were identified in both types of interview data. These included teacher-related-, learner-related and discourse-related uses. The first category relates to personal principles and to the participant's relationship with the given language. Edmonson's view on psycholinguistic code-switching (see discussion on code-switching in section 3.4) was broadened and applied to this category. Language choices which were seen to be prompted by the learner's actions or which were seen to occur for the sake of the learner (i.e. for pedagogical purposes) fell into the second category. As for the third category, reported connections between a certain language and a particular type of a speech situation, textual coherence, marking the boundaries of speech situations and signaling the teacher's stance towards what is said were categorized as discourse-related. This category shares some characteristics with Auer's definition of discourse-related code-switching (see section 3.4 on code-switching). In addition to these three categories, one category relates to the influence of teacher training on the participants' language use. Furthermore, comments about the perceived disadvantages of employing each language were identified from the data produced in the semi-structured interviews.

Before moving on to the analysis, a few things should be pointed out. First of all, in the analysis the focus is not on different student teacher profiles but on the profiles of the two languages. It follows that the participants are not identified in the analysis but all three are referred to simply with the word *participant*. When necessary for the interpretation of the data, connections between comments made by one and the same participant will be drawn. Secondly, some of the reported types of language use may overlap. That is to say, the category boundaries are flexible: some learner-related uses may exhibit discourse-related features, for instance. Furthermore, in relation to the recorded lessons and stimulated recall interviews it cannot be emphasized enough that the focus was on how the participants perceived their actions, not on classroom interaction. The researcher did not analyze the actions (i.e. language choices) that took place in the classroom per se. Instead the researcher was interested in how the participants themselves viewed the language choices they had made. In other words, the present study assumed a second-order perspective. Next the focus will shift to the analysis itself.

## 5 PERCEPTIONS OF LANGUAGE CHOICE

In this chapter the data derived from the semi-structured interviews is analyzed. During the interviews the participants were asked a series of questions regarding the teacher's language choice in the foreign language classroom. These questions can be found as an appendix in the end of the present study. First general comments made on teacher training and planning one's language choices are given attention. After this the analysis proceeds to the language-specific comments. Comments regarding the target language are considered first. This is followed by the analysis on the comments concerning the use of the L1.

### 5.1 Teacher training and planning one's language choices

In order to map the background of making language choices the participants were asked whether or not they plan their language use beforehand. Two of them stated that they take language choices into consideration when making lesson plans.

Excerpt 1

Yleensä mä kyllä ajattelen etukäteen sitä oikeestaan aina.

Usually I think about it beforehand every time.

Excerpt 2

Kyl sen katoo kun sen suunnittelee sen tunnin sillei lohkoina, että missä lohkoissa sitte käyttäs mitäkin kieltä.

I do consider it as I plan the lesson in sections, I consider which language I'm going to use in each section.

However, one participant said that she had not paid any attention to her language choices before or during the recorded lessons.

Excerpt 3

Nyt joo! En tämän kyseisten tuntien aikana en ollut sitä miettinyt yhtään. Ja hirveen harmi, et se tuli tällai viimesessä harjottelussa miulle ees nostettii sitä sillee esiin, että "Oletko miettinyt?" "En ole miettinyt". Et se on niinku tosi hyödyllistä nyt ku oikeesti pohtii sitä, et mikä on se tilanne ja sillai joo. En aikasemmin, mut nyt kyllä, kiitos nykyisen ohjaajani.

Now I do! I didn't consider it at all during those lessons. And it's such a shame that it was brought up only in the last training period, that "Have you thought about it?" "No I haven't." It's really useful to reflect on it, that what the situation is. I didn't before, but now I do, thanks to my current teacher trainer.

When the lessons were recorded, this particular participant had not given any thought to her language use. She regarded reflecting on one's language use as important. Consequently, she felt that it was a pity that the teacher trainers had not mentioned this issue to her until in the last training period. The participant was then asked what kind of guidance she had received later on in the training program. In the following is her reply.

Excerpt 4

No nyt oli puhetta et mä laitan aina tuntisuunnitelmiin ihan selkeesti et missä kohassa käytän mitäki kieltä, et ei tuu niinku sitä vaihtokielisyyttä sitte kesken yhen asian, et sit pysytää siinä yhdessä kielessä. Ja sit just se et ei rupee suomentaa itteään sitte vaik tuntuu, että jos on valinnu englannin ni sit pysyy siinä englannissa.

We've agreed that I will put clearly in the lesson plans which language I'm going to use at a certain point, so there won't be any language switching in the middle of one thing, that I'll stick to one language. And that I won't translate myself into Finnish even if it feels, if I have chosen English, then I'll stick to English.

As one can see from this excerpt, the teacher trainer had emphasized consistency in one's language use. It seems that using only one language during one speech situation was valued by the teacher trainer. Alternating between Finnish and English within one speech situation and translating one's speech into the L1 were things which the participant was to avoid. Even though this comment provides information on teacher trainers' advice regarding the language choice, one should bear in mind that these particular instructions were given to the participant only after the videos used in the stimulated recall had been recorded. In other words, they had no influence on the participant's language use during the recorded lessons.

Interestingly, the other participants had received language-specific instructions from their teacher trainers. To be specific, they had been advised to employ Finnish when teaching grammar. In addition to this, one of the two participants had been told that, apart from grammar instruction, English is to be used. As these issues are language-specific, they will be discussed in more detail later on (see section 5.3.4). All in all, it seems that the teacher trainers give differing advice to their trainees regarding language choice. Some advocate using a certain language in a certain situation, others emphasize consistency. Some give no advice whatsoever and do not even address the issue of language choice. During the interview sessions the participants came up with suggestions regarding teacher training and the language choice in foreign language teaching. These ideas were brought up when the interview session was about to end and the researcher asked whether there was anything to add to the discussion. In the following is one of the replies.

## Excerpt 5

Ois aika hienoo oikeesti, ku kattoo tätä miun sillisalaattia, että niinku iha oikeesti, et jos se vaik nostettais sillee jotenki, ihan oikeesti siitä vois olla niinku miun mielest iha hyvi jotai ainedidaktiikkaa, et missä kohdassa. Ja just niinku sellanen tietosuuden herättäminen siihe et mite paljo.. että tota siihe jotenki herätä siihe et mitä siellä luokassa puhuu ja miten.

It would be great, when looking at this hodge-bodge of mine, that seriously, if it would be brought up somehow, I think there could be didactics regarding this issue, that in which point. And consciousness-raising regarding how much.. That you would realize what you're saying and how you're saying it in the classroom.

The participant felt that it would be worth while to teach student teachers how to choose from the two available languages. She also mentioned that consciousness-raising would be in order because then student teachers could reflect on their language use. Another participant suggested that issues related to language choice could be discussed openly and explicitly. She was considering especially the instructions according to which grammar should be taught in Finnish and felt that the student teachers should be allowed to choose for themselves.

## Excerpt 6

Mun mielestä se saisi olla jo valinta, niin kun että jos sen, tai ainaki sitä saisi kokeilla. Miksi ei. Ehkä sen pitäisi olla semmonen mahdollisuus. Et sitä ei niinku epäsuorastikaan missään lue, että opeta kielioppi suomeksi, mutta se on kaikilla niin iskostettu päähän. Et siitä vois ehkä olla kiva enemmän keskustella sitten niin kun yhteisestikin harjoittelijoitten kanssa niin kun, tai ohjaajien ja harjoittelijoitten, mitä luentoja meillä nyt on näistä ollu, ni siellä vois ottaa ihan asiaksi sen, että ohjaajat perustelis meille esimerkiks, miksi se pitää suomen kielellä tai sitte että on mahdollisuus myös englannin kielellä opettaa jos haluaa.

I think it should be a choice already, or at least you should be able to try it out. Why not. Maybe it should be an option. It isn't written anywhere, not even implicitly, that teach grammar in Finnish, but it's hammered into everyone's heads. It would be nice to discuss it more together with the student teachers, or with the teacher trainers and the student teachers, on these lectures we have had, it could be addressed there, the teacher trainers would give reasons why it has to be in Finnish or then there should be the option to teach in English if one wants.

The participant suggested that the student teachers and the teacher trainers could discuss the issue of language choice together during lectures. She also felt that the teacher trainers should give reasons for the conduct they promote. In addition, the participant suggested that the student teachers should be granted the opportunity to make their own language choices. To conclude the discussion on teacher training and language choice, the student teachers advocated autonomy in decision making, open and shared

discussion and consciousness-raising. Next the perceptions regarding the use of the target language are analyzed.

## **5.2 Considering target language use**

The interview data revealed that the participants' main principle was to speak primarily English in the classroom. Furthermore, most of the target language uses named by the participants were learner-related. The participants felt that using the target language is important since it is beneficial from the point of view of language learning. In addition it was perceived that by speaking English the teacher can contribute to the affective climate of the classroom and attend to the learning needs of the pupils. One discourse-related use of target language was also found: speaking English was attached to a certain kind of a speech situation. The disadvantages of speaking English concerned the language learners. It was said that using the target language in the classroom may jeopardize pupil comprehension and discourage participation. I shall begin the analysis from the participants' personal principle, according to which English should be the main language used by the teacher.

### **5.2.1 Personal principles – a teacher-related reason for TL use**

The importance of speaking English in the classroom was emphasized by all participants. In fact, using the target language as the medium of instruction seemed to be the main principle for all of them, as the following excerpts reveal. The participants were asked what, in their opinion, is the ideal distribution of the two languages in the foreign language classroom.

Excerpt 7

Kaikki englanniksi.

Everything in English.

Excerpt 8

Mä haluaisin pyrkiä siihen, että kaiken vois esittää englanniks.

I would like to aim at expressing everything in English.

Excerpt 9

Mun mielestä vois olla melkee koko tunti enkuks. Tottakai opettajan pitäis osata niinku tietää se ryhmän taso.

I think the whole lesson could be in English. Of course the teacher should know the level of the group.

These comments were produced by three different participants. This indicates that using English as the classroom language was the main principle for all three participants. The principle which was brought up in the beginning of the interviews is a suitable starting point for the following analysis, in which the perceptions of the uses of English are given attention.

### **5.2.2 Learner-related uses**

Speaking English in the classroom was perceived to be important considering the pupils and language learning. First of all, providing target language input was seen as valuable. The participant quoted in excerpt 10 was asked to give reasons for her principle, according to which English should be the primary language in the classroom.

Excerpt 10

Aina ei tarvi niinku kääntää suoraan, vaa että sais sen niinku et ne oppilaat sais mahollisimman paljon sitä inputtia.

You don't have to always translate right away, but to make it so that pupils will get as much input as possible.

The participant protested against translating one's speech into the L1 and emphasized the importance of TL input. Providing extensive input for the pupils was appreciated. Similar sentiments can be found in the excerpt below. This particular participant was asked on what basis she plans her language use.

Excerpt 11

Ihan vaan että miten ne ymmärtää ja miten ne sais mahollisimman paljon sitä niinku inputtia englanniksi. Mahollisimman paljon englanniksi, sillä tavalla mä perustelen ne sitten.

Just that how they understand and how they could get as much input in English as possible. As much in English as possible, that's how I justify them.

Two factors were said to guide the decision. First of all, the participant stated that she takes into consideration the pupils' ability to comprehend. Secondly, it was said that the aim is to provide extensive target language input. However, the participants quoted in excerpts 10 and 11 did not articulate what exactly makes TL input valuable.

In one of the input-related comments the teacher's target language use was explicitly linked to the benefits which it offers to the language learner. The participant was asked what the possible benefits of using the target language in the classroom are. In the following is her reply.

## Excerpt 12

No hyöty on ihan selkee, siis mahdollisimman paljon vaan oppia kuulemaan sitä, oppia kuulemaan kaikki arkipäivän ilmasut niinku alakoulusta lähtien. Ja yläkoulussakin niihin on totuttu, niin ihan vaan kuulla sitä kieltä koko ajan ja oppia ne käsitteet sillä kielellä.

The benefit is obvious, learning to hear it as much as possible, learning to hear all everyday expressions starting from the elementary school. And in the junior high school they are used to them, so just hearing the language all the time and learning the concepts in that language.

Again the role of target language input was emphasized. It was said that by subjecting the pupils to target language input the pupils grow accustomed to the language. This resembles Crichton's findings (2009), according to which the pupils were able to familiarize themselves with everyday language with the help of the teacher's target language use. It is also possible that the expression "learning to hear" was used to refer to practicing comprehension skills. The underlying idea is that the pupils learn English not only from explicit language instruction but also from language exposure. In addition, the participant appreciated the fact that the pupils learn concepts in the target language. By this the participant may have been referring to vocabulary acquisition in general. On the basis of the comment it could also be said that the participant was in favor of direct learning, which was discussed in section 2.2 in relation to teaching trends. According to the principles of the Direct Method, the aim is to get the pupils to form a connection between the target language expression and its meaning without the assistance from their L1 (Larsen-Freeman 2000:26-27). This line of thinking was present in the participant's reply.

In addition to providing input from which the pupils can learn the target language, using English as the medium of instruction was seen to create opportunities for the pupils to use the target language and to encourage productive language use. The participant was asked why she thought that the teacher should speak English in the classroom.

## Excerpt 13

Antaa mahdollisimman paljon mahdollisuuksia niille oppilaille ymmärtää ja kuunnella ja käyttää sitä kieltä. Et niinku olla esimerkkinä siihen, et jos siellä sanotaan että – et hirveen monet opettajat sanoo, esmes miulla ainaki sanoo aina, että tota et ”joo, tunnilla puhuttaa sitte vaa englantia”, mut sit miun mielestä opettajanki pitää noudattaa sitä.

To give as much opportunities as possible for the pupils to understand and listen and use the language. To act as an example, if it's said that – many teachers say, for example to me they say always, that “yeah, during the lesson we speak only English”, but I think that the teacher should also comply with that.



The participant felt that the pupils should be granted opportunities to listen and use the language. In other words, both receptive and productive language skills were taken into consideration by the participant. She also pointed out that one should practice what one preaches. If one advocates using English as the classroom language, one should comply with this rule by speaking English, thus encouraging the pupils to use the target language as well. In other words, the participant brought up the link between the teacher's and the pupils' language choices. The same connection can be found also from the following excerpt. The comment was made when asked about the possible benefits of the teacher's target language use.

Excerpt 14

Sitten kun pitää sen tietyn linjan, ni myöskin oppilaat sitten oppii käyttämään sitä. Niinku sillä tunnilla ei ymmärretä mittään muuta ku tätä kieltä, niin myös tervehtivät ja kysyvät kaiken sitten englanniksi.

When you stick to the routine, the pupils will also learn to use it. On that lesson they don't understand any language other than this, so they will also greet and ask all questions in English.

According to the participant, the teacher can act as an example for the pupils. It was stated that if the teacher determinedly speaks only English, the pupils will follow the lead and begin to use English when communicating in the classroom. In other words, the teacher's target language use was seen to encourage the pupils to speak English. The participants quoted in excerpts 13 and 14 shared the view of Harmer (2001:132), according to whom target language input encourages the learners to use the target language when communicating in the classroom. Furthermore, Crichton (2009) found in her study that the teachers' target language use encouraged the pupils to produce output and to interact in the target language. All in all, the participants seemed to share the view of the student teachers studied by Bateman (2008). In Bateman's study the student teachers put value on target language input because it was seen to contribute to learners' listening comprehension, vocabulary acquisition and oral production.

One of the participants emphasized also authentic target language use. The participant was asked what possible benefits English use has.

Excerpt 15

Kyllä mun mielestä siitä on hyötyä. Mun mielestä se myös varmasti niinku tekee oppilaillekin sen niinku aion tunteen siitä, että hei, tässä nyt oikeesti opiskellaan kieltä ja että sitä voi käyttää ihan koko ajan jokapäiväsissä tilanteissa. No kyllä ne mun mielestä varmasti oppiiki sillo paremmin jos oikeesti puhutaan koko ajan englantia. Se tuntuu ehkä vähän feikiltä, jos aina tulee vaikka ohjeet suomeks ja sitte niinku, että "nyt sitte enkkua".

I do think that it's beneficial. I think it surely also creates an authentic feeling for the pupils, that hey, we're actually studying the language and it can be used all the time in everyday situations. I think they do learn better if we actually speak English all the time. It may feel a bit fake if the instructions are always in Finnish and then "now English".

Using English for communicating with the pupils was seen to contribute to language learning. Furthermore, communicating in English was seen as authentic language use, while speaking the target language only when engaging in exercises was considered to be "fake". This issue was also addressed by Nikula (2005:45), who stated that the EFL teacher in her study used the target language mainly in relation to language exercises, which resulted in artificiality. In addition to promoting authentic language use, the participant quoted above stated that the teacher's target language use gives the pupils the impression that the foreign language can be used for communicating in everyday situations. Similarly, Meiring and Norman (2002: 33-34), among others, promote using the target language in the classroom because it conveys to the learners that the foreign language is a vehicle of communication.

In addition to the learner-related reasons discussed thus far, the teacher's target language use was viewed also in relation to the affective aspects of learning. According to the participants, by using English the teacher can create positive feelings and relieve the negative ones. For instance, one participant promoted using the target language even in the case of miscomprehension. According to her, solving such a situation by modifying the target language input can create positive learning experiences for the pupils. The following comment was made when discussing the reasons for employing the target language in the classroom.

#### Excerpt 16

Jos puhut luokassa jotain, mikä sitte näyttää siltä, et porukka ei ymmärrä vaikka sitä kieltä siinä tilanteessa, niin ni se pitäis pyrkiä oppimaan, tai siis mä toivoisin, et mä pystyisin ilmasemaan sen jollain sellasella tavalla uudelleen, mä pystyisin yksinkertastamaan lauserakenteita ja ilmasemaan sen sillai, et ne ymmärtäis sen englanniks. Ettei, tai jotta oppilaille tulis sellanen fiilis, että pystyy tota ymmärtämään sitä englantia, et se ei oo niinku heiän ymmärtämisestään sinänsä kiinni.

If you're saying something in the class and it seems that the group doesn't understand the language in that situation, then you should try to learn, or I hope that I could express it again in such a way that, I could simplify the sentence structures and express it in such a way that they would understand it in English. So that the pupils would get the feeling that they can understand English, that it's not up to their comprehension.

The participant felt that in a situation where the pupils face problems in understanding target language speech it is good to clarify the situation in English. It was said that if the teacher modifies and simplifies the input so that the pupils are able to understand it,

they will not feel as if failing to understand because of their inadequate language skills. This aspect relates to the self-esteem of the pupils as language learners. In connection to the self-esteem of the language learner, Allwright and Bailey (1991:179) suggest that if the learner is not able to understand the teacher's question (or any target language utterance, for that matter), repeating it in exactly the same way implies that the problem is in the learner. Rephrasing the question, on the other hand, takes the blame away from the learner and thus contributes to the learner's self-esteem.

Like the previous excerpt, also the following relates to the affective aspect of language learning. The participant felt that the teacher can relieve the pupils' fear of making errors by speaking the target language. She was asked what possible benefits there are in target language use. In the following is her reply.

Excerpt 17

Just sitä niinku semmosen ilmapiirin luomista sinne luokkahuoneeseen, et se on semmonen yhteinen kielen ja kommunikoinnin ja oppimisen ympäristö. Et tekeehän opettajaki puheessaan virheitä ja sitte se, että miust tuntuu jos senki näyttää, että "hei, nyt mä mokasin, mitähän mä nyt sanon tai puhun" tai näin, ni sit ne oppilaatki ymmärtää sen, että siinä ei oo mitää niinku pahaa. Et kun sitä käyttää sitä kieltä, niin tärkeintä on vaa se, että saa sitte ittensä ymmärretyks kuitenkin.

Creating the kind of atmosphere in the classroom that it is a shared environment of language and communication and learning. The teacher does make mistakes when speaking and I think that if you show it, that "Hey, now I blew it, what am I saying here" and so on, then the pupils will understand that there's nothing wrong with that. That when you use the language, the most important thing is that you get understood.

The participant felt that target language use has positive effects on the classroom atmosphere. Admitting that sometimes even the teacher makes mistakes and adopting meaning-oriented approach were seen to convey the impression that committing errors when communicating in the target language is acceptable. Pupils may indeed fear committing errors and feel anxious when faced with the challenge of communicating in the foreign language, as Allwright and Bailey (1991:173-174) mention. It can be said that the participant saw the teacher's target language use as relieving those anxieties among the pupils.

In addition to target language input, authentic language use and the affective factors involved in language learning, the issue of catering for the pupils' needs was taken into consideration. Speaking the target language was seen as a means of attending to the differing needs of pupils as language learners. The following comment was made when reflecting on the disadvantages of L1 use.

## Excerpt 18

Siinä on myös mahdollisuus eriyttää sillä tavalla, et ku käyttää sitä kohdekieltä, ni pystyy eriyttämään sitä hommaa. Et ku antaa sit niille vahvemmilleki vähä jotai haastetta siinä hommassa.

It is also a possibility to tailor the teaching, by using the target language you can tailor your teaching. You're giving challenges to the skilled pupils.

It was suggested that the teacher can attend to the needs of the skilled language learners by speaking English. The teacher's target language use was perceived to provide challenges for the talented pupils. However, the participant did not comment on how the needs of the less skilled pupils could be catered for.

### 5.2.3 Discourse-related use of English

Discourse-related target language use was also referred to by one of the participants. She linked English to a specific speech situation. Auer (1995:117) describes a theory according to which there is a connection between certain speech events and a certain language. The following excerpt reflects such a view. The participant was asked in what situations the target language should be spoken. In the following is her reply.

## Excerpt 19

Sellanen keskustelu ehdottomasti, niinku et suulliset harjotukset ois iha hyvä tehdä [englanniksi]. Sitte tota miun mielest myös sisältökysymykset ois iha hyvä olla ehkä, tai sellaset niinku kappaleitten sisältökysymykset ja sellaset ymmärtämishommat vois olla iha hyvä olla englanniks. Niissäki tietysti on tilanteita, just et heikoimpien kanssa se tulee tietysti siinä se niinku haaste. Mut ku mä niinku käsitän sen sillee, että mä haluaisin pyrkiä, et kaikessa, ni mä en osaa sanoa oikein sellasta niinku yhtä tiettyä.

Conversations absolutely, like oral exercises would be good to do [in English]. And I think that it would be good if questions about the content, or it could be good to have questions about the content of textbook texts and comprehension things in English. There are of course situations, like it can be challenging with the less skilled pupils of course. But as I see it, I would like to use it in everything so I can't really name anything in particular.

The participant linked speaking English to engaging in language exercises with the pupils. Conducting exercises in which the pupils practice oral production and comprehension skills were seen as situations in which the teacher should use English. This brings to mind one of the theories of code-switching, according to which a certain language can be linked to a certain speech event (Auer 1995:117). Furthermore, Bateman (2008) got somewhat similar results as she studied student teachers in Britain. The participants of her study felt that the target language can be used in relation to listening and reading exercises, i.e. in exercises where the content is in the target language.

The participant quoted in the excerpt above also stated that using the target language as the classroom language may be difficult when there are pupils with lower language skills in the classroom. In excerpt 18 the teacher's target language use was considered in relation to the skilled language learners. However, here the issue is looked at from a different angle. Note also that the participant seemed to favor using English as the classroom language: she expressed her desire to speak the target language in every situation. This comment reflects the participants' principle according to which the target language should be the primary vehicle of communication in the classroom.

#### **5.2.4 The disadvantages of using the target language**

In addition to pondering on the uses of the target language, the participants also considered the possible disadvantages of using the target language in the foreign language classroom. One shortcoming mentioned by the participants relates to learner comprehension, or rather miscomprehension. The participants identified two sources of miscomprehension. First, the teacher's target language can be too demanding for the pupils. Secondly, the pupils may fail to grasp the message due to a lack of attention or the fact that they are not used to having a teacher who uses excessive English in the classroom. Excerpt 20 addresses the mismatch of the language used by the teacher and the language skills of the learners, while in excerpt 21 also the other causes of miscomprehension are acknowledged.

Excerpt 20

Jos se on väärällä niinku taitotasolla niihin oppilaisiin nähden, ni sillo se saattaa aiheuttaa ahistusta. Et jos se on niinku liian vaikeeta, et sit ei yksinkertaisesti vaa ymmärrä, ni sit se saattaa aiheuttaa vaa tosi paljon sellasta hämmennystä ja ongelmia siinä sit siinä oppimisessa. Et se on tosi vastuullinen homma siinä, et miten sä puhut ja mitä sanastoo sä käytät.

If it is at a wrong competence level in relation to the pupils, then it can cause distress. If it's too difficult, that they simply cannot understand, it can cause a lot of confusion and problems in learning. It's really a big responsibility, how you speak and what kind of vocabulary you use.

Miscomprehension was said to take place if the difficulty level of the teacher's language exceeds the language skills of the pupils. Like in excerpts 16 and 17, here too the affective aspect of learning is referred to. The participant saw the danger of using English as the classroom language in that the pupils may experience anxiety when they are supposed to comprehend language which exceeds their competence level. The language choice and in particular the level of difficulty of the teacher's language were seen as important matters which the teacher should consider.

The participant quoted above discussed miscomprehension resulting from TL input which is above the pupils' competence. In addition to this, difficulties were said to arise when the teacher speaks English and the pupils do not pay attention. Furthermore, the pupils might not internalize the message which the teacher is trying to convey because they are not used to a teacher who uses English as the sole medium of instruction.

#### Excerpt 21

Ja haitta on ehkä sitten se, että jos siellä on heikkoja oppilaita tai niin kun jos ei kuuntele tai ei oo tottunu siihen, että kuulis kaiken englanniksi, ni sitten voi tippua kelkasta. Tai voi olla hankalempaa päästä alulle. Varsinki jos siellä ei sitten oo visuaalista tukea, ni sitte jos siellä vaa puhuu englantia, ni sitte jos menee ohi korvien, ni sit se menee.

And the disadvantage is maybe that if there are less skilled pupils or if they're not listening or are not used to hearing everything in English, then they may not be able to keep up. Or it may be harder to get started. Especially if there is no visual support and you're talking only in English, then if they miss it, then they'll miss it.

By naming these factors which may cause problems in understanding the participant presented an interesting differentiation. The language used by the teacher may indeed be too challenging for the pupils, especially to those who are less competent language users. Secondly, the pupils may fail to understand the message because they are not paying attention. It is worth pointing out that confusion resulting from the lack of attention can occur regardless what the classroom language is. In other words, failing to understand due to the lack of attention is not language-specific. Thirdly, the problem might be related to unfamiliarity, as the participant pointed out. If the pupils are used to obtaining information in Finnish, they may not receive the message which is delivered to them through spoken target language. The participant also felt that the danger of not comprehending increases if the teacher speaks solely the target language and there are no visual aids to assist the pupils' understanding.

In the two excerpts discussed above the disadvantage of using the target language was linked to difficulties in pupil comprehension. The next excerpt also addresses the disadvantages of speaking English but concentrates on the feelings of the pupils. In other words, the comment relates to the affective side of learning, which was referred to already in excerpts 16, 17 and 20.

#### Excerpt 22

Ei oo rohkeutta kysyä sitte jos opettaja käyttää koko ajan vaan englantia, ni sitte tuntuu et pitäis kysyä myös englanniksi, niin sitte ei uskalleta kysyä ohjeistusta uuestaan.

They don't have the courage to ask if the teacher uses only English all the time, then they feel that they should also ask in English, then they don't dare to ask for the instructions again.

The link between the teacher's and the pupils' language use was brought up again, this time in a negative light. As one might remember, the teacher's target language use was seen to encourage pupils' oral production (see excerpts 13 and 14). However, target language use can also be regarded as discouraging participation. According to the participant, the danger in TL use is that the pupils might get the impression that they are obliged to speak English because the teacher uses only the target language. Pupils may interpret such a situation so that speaking Finnish is undesirable or even forbidden and that the only language to be used in the classroom is English. As the participant suggested, if the learner is uncomfortable with expressing oneself in the target language, the result can be that the s/he says or asks nothing at all. To summarize the participant's thoughts, the teacher's excessive use of the TL may intimidate the learner and in fact discourage participation. This relates to what Allwright and Bailey (1991:173-174) say about anxiety from which the learners may suffer if they are not allowed to use their first language in the classroom.

Before moving on to other issues, a brief summary of the perceived uses and disadvantages of the target language is in order. First of all, the teacher's target language use was regarded to be of value because it provides the pupils with target language input and thus with opportunities to learn and use the language. In addition, authentic target language communication was appreciated. Secondly, target language use was seen to have positive outcomes in relation to the affective factors which influence learning. Thirdly, by using the target language the teacher can cater for the needs of the skilled language learners. Furthermore, it was mentioned that English should be used when engaging in certain kinds of exercises with the pupils. As for the disadvantages attached to using English as the classroom language, jeopardizing learner comprehension and creating anxiety and fear were mentioned. In the next chapter the perceptions on the role of the L1 in the foreign language classroom are considered.

### **5.3 L1 in the foreign language classroom**

Four categories of Finnish use were identified on the basis of the semi-structured interviews. First of all, teacher-related use of Finnish was described by the participants. Secondly, the participants felt that the L1 can be used for learner-related reasons. Thirdly, discourse-related use was mentioned by the participants. They saw a

connection between speaking Finnish and certain speech situations. In addition to these three categories, the instructions given by teacher trainers were said to contribute to L1 use. The disadvantages of L1 use were said to relate to reduced learning opportunities and to a lack of challenges. In addition, language alternation was seen to have negative outcomes and to confuse the pupils. It can be said that the disadvantages of L1 use were nearly always viewed from the pupils' perspective. The perceptions of the uses of Finnish and its disadvantages will now be discussed in detail, beginning with the teacher-related category.

### 5.3.1 Teacher-related use of Finnish

The participants linked Finnish use to the teacher's inability to express oneself in the target language. In other words, the participants felt that Finnish can be employed when psycholinguistic problems arise. This term is adopted from Edmonson (2004:165), who explains that psycholinguistic code-switching occurs when the speaker is faced with a lack of knowledge or skills or when target language use is not automatized enough. In other words, the foreign language competence of the teacher is the key issue here. In the first excerpt is a reply produced when asked on what basis the language choices are made when planning lessons. In the second excerpt an unsuccessful language choice is described. In both excerpts it is implied that problems in expressing oneself in the target language result in L1 use.

#### Excerpt 23

Aina kyllä tavallaan lähdän siitä, että miten mä voisin nyt tän vetää enkuks, tai jos se tuntuu hirveen hankalalta, ni sitten suomeksi.

I always try to think how I could do this in English, or if it feels really hard then in Finnish.

#### Excerpt 24

Jotku vähän hankalammat tehtävänannot, missä on niinku monta just alakohtaa, esimerkiks "nyt teet näin, sit seuraavaks näin ja sit teet näin ja sit vielä ton", ni sit jotenki tuntuu, että.. Joskus ku on ehkä itelleki ollu se sillee niinku epäselvä se tehtävänanto, tai sillee niinku joo, pään sisällä ehkä selvä itelleki, mut sillee että sit ku se pitäs suullistaa ni se tuleeki sillee "öö öö, sitten eiku siis niinku tälle näin". Ja sit jos sä enkuks koitat alkaa sitä, jos sä oot vielä ite vähä epävarma siitä, ni sillo kyllä ne oppilaatki on että "mitä, tosta ei nyt oikeen ehkä saa selvää" ja sillee. Et sillo on ehkä helpompi, on ollu, tuntunu helpommalta niinku sanoo suomeks.



Some a bit more difficult instructions for tasks, where there are many phases, for example “now you do this, and then like this and then like this and then that one”, then it somehow feels that.. Sometimes when you feel that the instructions are still unclear maybe even to yourself, or ok, they may be clear in your mind but when you try to say it, it comes out as “umm umm, and then, no I mean like this”. And then if you try to say it in English and you’re a bit uncertain about it, then the pupils will be like “what, I don’t really get that” and so on. In those situations it is maybe easier to, it has been, has felt easier to say it in Finnish.

As excerpts 23 and 24 reveal, the participants felt that the teacher has the possibility to resort to Finnish in order to handle problems which may arise when trying to express oneself in the target language. It was also implied that the teacher may not always be as prepared as one could be (excerpt 24). Based on this it could be claimed that the uncertainty and not knowing how to express oneself could be avoided with more preparation. Still, one cannot predict what will happen during the lesson and what kinds of speech situations will arise because of the dynamic nature of the classroom. Be it as it may, the excerpts presented above demonstrate that one of the roles of Finnish relates to overcoming the inability to express oneself in the foreign language. Bateman (2008), too, found that student teachers resorted to the L1 when faced with the limitations of their own linguistic skills. Similarly, Yletyinen’s study (2004) revealed that code-switching occurred when the teacher did not know the needed TL expression.

### **5.3.2 Learner-related uses**

The second category of L1 uses is learner-related. Pupil comprehension received attention from the participants, according to whom Finnish can be employed in order to ensure that the pupils understand the message being conveyed by the teacher. The views of Edmonson (2004:175) and Freeman and Freeman (1998:211) are in line with the participants’ comments: they promote employing the L1 for the sake of learner comprehension. In addition, Wilkerson (2008) and Littlewood and Yu (2009), for instance, found that teachers use the L1 in order to ensure understanding. Two different aspects of ensuring comprehension were brought up by the participants of the present study. First, Finnish can be used proactively to avoid miscomprehension and confusion. Secondly, it can be employed in order to clear misunderstandings which have already occurred. In what follows one can find examples of the first type. Excerpt 25 exhibits the participant’s reflection on the possible benefits of L1 use.

Excerpt 25

Kyllähän sitä niinku voi totta kai käyttääkin, jos ryhmä sitä vaatii, jos ryhmässä on vaikka paljon heikkoja et sillee, et parempi sitä on sitte käyttää sitä äidinkieltä ohjeistuksissaki ja tälle, ettei heikoimmat tipu kelkasta, totta kai.

It can be used of course if the group needs it, if there are weak pupils in the group, then it's better to use the mother tongue when giving instructions and so on, so that the weakest pupils don't fall behind, of course.

The participant focused on the pupils' ability to understand what the teacher says. In other words, the linguistic skills of the pupils were considered. It was implied that less competent learners may fail to understand the intended message. The L1 was seen as a means of keeping every pupil on track, regardless of their language skills. This notion was found also by de la Campa and Nassaji (2009) and Bateman (2008), whose studies proved that L1 use was sometimes caused by the limited language skills of the learners. On the basis of the excerpt above it may be assumed that the participant was considering the pupil's language skills and their ability to understand the target language used by the teacher.

Ensuring comprehension was considered also in relation to discussing content which is difficult for the learners to understand. The participant was asked in what situations Finnish should be spoken.

#### Excerpt 26

Jotku kielioppiasiat on yksinkertaisesti sellasia, et koska niissä tulee sitä käsitteistöä tai sellasta niinku, mitä ei pystyis välttämättä selittämään englannilla. Siinä kielioppihommissa, missä on käsitteistöä ja asioita, mitkä on äidinkielelläkin ehkä vaikeasti hahmotettavissa, että.. Niinku ei kaikki muista tai niinku ymmärrä tai hahmota välttämättä aina, et mikä oli verbi.

Some grammar issues are simply like that, because there is the terminology or things which you couldn't necessarily explain in English. With grammar things in which there is the terminology and things which are maybe hard to grasp even in the first language, so.. Not everyone remembers or understands or grasps what a verb is.

The participant felt that if the topic (in this case grammar) is demanding considering pupil comprehension, Finnish can be employed in order to help the pupils to grasp the intended message. A similar opinion is expressed by Cook (2001a:156-157), who states that grammar can be taught in the L1 because the learners may not be able to understand complex grammar explanations if delivered in the target language. Furthermore, the participant focused on the cognitive skills of the learners, not necessarily on their linguistic skills. Bateman (2008) got similar results when studying student teachers' language use. According to her study, the limited cognitive skills of the pupils were one of the causes for the teacher's L1 use. It is also worth noting that Thompson (2006) and Victor (2009), among many others, found that the L1 was used for grammar instruction.

The excerpts presented above related to preventing misunderstandings by speaking Finnish. In the following excerpt the focus is on situations in which

miscomprehension has already taken place. In such a situation the pupil has failed to comprehend the message, for one reason or another. The following comment was made as the participant considered the possible benefits of employing Finnish in the classroom. Finnish was seen as the solution when the pupils experience difficulties in comprehending. Again, the participant seemed to be in favor of using the target language as the classroom language and speaking Finnish was seen as an exception or the last resort.

Excerpt 27

Pystytään niinku korjaamaan väärinymmärryksiä ja semmosia. Mä vaan toivoisin, et se ois vaa semmosissa tilanteissa, missä iha oikeesti niinku ei vaa muuten päästä eteenpäin.

You can set straight miscomprehensions and the like. I'd just hope that it would be only in situations where you can't proceed in any other way.

Eventhough the participant admitted that speaking Finnish has its benefits, using English as the medium of instruction was preferred over Finnish. Nevertheless, the participant felt that through Finnish the teacher can respond to confusion and miscomprehension and clarify the situation. This is in line with the findings of de la Campa and Nassaji (2009) and Bateman (2008). They found that the L1 was used in order to solve problems in understanding. In conclusion, the participants of the present study felt that Finnish can be used in order to help the pupils to comprehend, both by preventing miscomprehension and by attending to miscomprehension which has occurred.

Another learner-related use of Finnish was said to be enabling the pupils to participate in the conversation. When asked about a situation in which the L1 should be used, the participant presented as an example a situation in which she and the pupils had engaged in a conversation about wearing hats and using mobile phones in class.

Excerpt 28

Sillo jos oikeesti on pitäny keskustella asiasta, esimerkiks mulla tuli just niinku tää tommonen hattu/kännykkäkeskustelu, et se oli oikeesti semmonen pitempi, et mun mielestä se oli niinku ihan hyvä ehkä vetää sit suomeks, koska siinä mielessä oppilaatki ehkä sitte ajattelee, et he voi nyt kans vastata suomeks. Et siitä tuli niinku semmonen ihan aito keskustelutilanne. Jos sä haluat käydä jonku semmosen keskustelun just jostain tommosesta niinku tärkeestä vakavasta asiasta, mikä oikeesti koskee muitaki tunteja ku sitä enkun tuntia, et ihan koulun sääntöjä, ni hyvähän se varmaan on sitte ihan suomeks sanoa, koska sit myös ne oppilaat varmaan tuntee, että he ovat niinku samalla tasolla, et hekin voivat sanoa sitten heidän mielipiteensä asiasta. Sillo voi tulla semmonen fiilis, et suomi on iha ok, ihan oikea kieli vetää asia.

If you really have to discuss something, for example I had this hat/phone conversation, it was really a longer one, so I think it was good to go through it in Finnish because in that sense the pupils feel that they can also answer in Finnish. So it became a real conversation. If you want to have a discussion over something important and serious like that, about something that doesn't concern only the English class, about the school rules, then it is probably good to do it in Finnish because then the pupils feel that they are on the same level, that they can express their opinions. Then you might get the feeling that Finnish is ok, the right language in that situation.

The participant felt that by choosing Finnish as the language of the interaction the teacher can grant the pupils the permission to speak the L1 and thus give them the opportunity to participate in the conversation. This probably relates to the language skills of the pupils. If the language of the conversation were English, the pupils would not be fully able to take part in the discussion since they would not be able to express themselves fluently in the foreign language. Speaking Finnish in such a situation was seen as enabling pupil participation. In relation to this, Ferguson (2003:43) mentions that the teacher can use the L1 to encourage pupil involvement, because L1 use constitutes a warmer and more personal a relationship than speaking the target language would.

### 5.3.3 Discourse-related uses

In addition to the two categories introduced this far, discourse-related uses of the L1 were found. Like in the case of target language use, the participants named specific speech situations to which they linked the use of the given language. In this case Finnish use was linked to three different situations. In the following is an example of one of them. The participant was asked in what situations the L1 should be used.

Excerpt 29

Tulee vaan mieleen siis oppitunnin ulkopuolella käytävät asiat, mut en mä niinku oppitunneilla, en oikeestaan nää, että miksi, miksei vois jotain asiaa kiertää ja sanoa se englanniksi.

Only the issues which are dealt with outside the lesson come to mind but during the lessons I don't, I don't really see why, why you couldn't go around it and say it in English.

What was meant by "outside the lesson" remains unclear, but one possible interpretation is that the comment refers to topics which do not relate to teaching the subject matter but perhaps to administrative issues or to informal communication. If so, previous research has found similar uses of the L1. For instance, Thompson's study (2006) as well as de la Campa and Nassaji's study (2009) indicated that administrative matters were dealt in the L1. In addition, Yletyinen (2004) found that code-switching occurred

in relation to informal speech situations. Note that the participant of the present study did not attach much value to speaking Finnish in class and instead wondered why the teacher would use the L1 since it is possible to express oneself in English.

Another speech situation to which Finnish was linked was reprimanding, an aspect of classroom management. The participant quoted below was reflecting on the topic of successful language choices.

Excerpt 30

Ku pitää niinku ojentaa tai sillee niinku. Niin sillen tuntuu, että suomeks, tai et on ollu ihan ok sanoa suomeks.

When you have to reprimand or something. Then it feels that in Finnish, or that it has been ok to speak Finnish.

The participant depicted a connection between Finnish use and reprimanding. Excerpt 30 echoes the findings of several previous studies. For instance, Nikula (2005) and Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) reported on similar L1 use by teachers.

#### **5.3.4 The influence of teacher trainers**

In relation to L1 use, the participants mentioned also the influence which the teacher training program and their teacher trainers have had on their language choices. This forms the fourth category of L1 uses. It seems that employing Finnish does not always result from personal beliefs and motives. Sometimes the L1 is used because the student teachers are advised to do so in a certain situation. Teaching grammar was said to be such a situation. The following comment was made when discussing the ideal distribution of the two languages.

Excerpt 31

Mun mielestä kieliopitki vois vetää englanniks, mutta norssilla on tehty aika selväks meille, että kieliopit pitäis, pitäis niinku vetää suomeks.

I think grammar too could be taught in English, but at Normal School they have made it quite clear to us that grammar should be taught in Finnish.

Excerpt 31 exhibits a clash of the participant's principles and the instructions she had received from the teacher trainers. The participant felt that grammar could be taught in the target language, but the teacher trainers had advised her to provide grammar instruction using Finnish. In the following is yet another comment about the rule of teaching grammar in Finnish. The participant was asked to consider situations in which the L1 should be used.

## Excerpt 32

Meitä nyt opastetaan kielioppi tota niinku opettamaan se suomeksi. Ja minä sitten sen teen tässä harjoittelussa, mutta en tuu sitä ite sitte opetustyössä tekemään. Mutta näin meitä ohjeistetaan, että kielioppi suomeksi ja kaikki muut englanniksi. Mutta tota, ei kyllä mä ite koen, jos mä pitäisin nuo tunnit täysin niinku mä ite haluaisin, niin aina englanniksi.

We are told that grammar is taught in Finnish. And that's how I do it during this training but I'm not going to do it as a teacher in working life. But that's what we're told, grammar in Finnish and everything else in English. But as I see it, if I had my way, I would always use English.

Also this particular participant had been advised to teach grammar in Finnish. The participant felt that the teacher trainers' instructions regarding grammar teaching do not comply with the conduct she prefers. She stated that during the training program she acts according to the instructions, but she is not planning to teach grammar in Finnish in the future as an in-service teacher. In addition, the participant mentioned that the use of target language had been promoted, except when grammar instruction was concerned. This may imply that the principle of using English as the classroom language was to some extent influenced by the teacher trainers. However, it is important to acknowledge that only one of the participants mentioned that English use had been advocated by the teacher trainers. In other words, the data does not indicate that all participants had been advised to use mostly the target language. Furthermore, the participant stated that she would like to use English in every situation. This supports the interpretation according to which the will to speak the target language is personally motivated.

The reported influence of teacher training on the language choice can be compared to the role which official government and department policies have regarding language choice. The key issue here is that the teacher's decisions are influenced from outside; the teacher has to comply with the "rules" set by someone else. Macaro (2001) found that one factor influencing the language choice of student teachers was the government policy. The study by Duff and Polio (1990), on the other hand, revealed that the department policy, among other things, had bearing on the language choice. In both cases the policy in question promoted target language use. Quite contrary, in the case of the present study the conduct promoted in teacher training was said to involve mostly the use of the L1.

Regarding the influence of teacher trainers, Bateman (2008) found that one of the factors which inhibited the student teachers from using the target language was the teaching style, i.e. the language use, favored by the teacher trainers, or instructors as she calls them. It should be noted that the student teachers in Bateman's study had not been

advised to employ the L1 in certain situations. Instead, they felt that they had to make similar language choices as their instructors because the pupils were used to that certain kind of language use. In relation to this the student teachers mentioned that they had encountered problems when trying to speak the target language to pupils who were not used to it.

### **5.3.5 The disadvantages of employing the L1**

In addition to pondering on the uses of Finnish, the participants were also asked to consider the possible disadvantages of employing the L1 in the foreign language classroom. Excessive use of Finnish was regarded to be harmful conduct from the point of view of language learning since it takes away something which target language input can offer. First of all, it was said that pupils will not learn to use the target language if the teacher uses the L1 excessively.

Excerpt 33

Jos opettaja käyttää koko ajan pelkästään äidinkieltä ni miun mielest se on vähä niinku sillee karhunpalvelus niille oppilaille. Et tietyl taval joo, et kyllähä nyt niinku ymmärretään se kieli sitte ehkä hirveen selkeesti ja kokonaisvaltasesti niistä asioista, et niinku samal taval ku äidinkieltä opiskeltais. Et niinku just sellaset kieliopilliset jutut tai muut semmoset, mut sitte siin jäis se kielen käytöllinen tai niinku se.

If the teacher uses solely the first language all the time, I think it's a disservice to pupils. In a way yes, they will maybe understand the language really clearly and comprehensively from those things, in the same way as they are studying their first language. Those grammatical things and things like that but then language use would be left out.

The participant felt that although using the L1 as the medium of instruction enables the pupils to understand the language as an object, they will not learn the practical side of the language if it is not used in class. In other words, they will not learn how to actually use the language through merely studying the language in Finnish. This opinion resembles that of Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009:31-33), who promote authentic target language communication for it teaches the learners practical language use. The participant seemed to differentiate the language as a linguistic system and the object of study from the language which is the vehicle of communication. Following the participant's thoughts, learning a language means studying as well as practicing the foreign language in the classroom. It seems that language practice taking place with the teacher and aside from exercises proper was considered to be beneficial. Using Finnish, on the contrary, was perceived to deny this benefit from the pupils.

Secondly, it was said that if the teacher uses the L1, s/he may be neglecting the needs of the (talented) language learners.

#### Excerpt 34

Se ois niinku miust tosi julmaa sitte niille, ketkä on esimerkiks tosi vahvoja ja hirveesti sillee. Niin ni tota, et ne ei sais ollenkaa sitten sitä niinku vähä jo yli rajojen input- tai sellasta, että niinku niille tulis uutta tai jotain.

It would be cruel towards those who are really gifted. That they wouldn't receive input which slightly exceeds their skills, or that they wouldn't get anything new.

The participant felt that if the teacher uses Finnish excessively s/he is wronging the skilled pupils. The importance of target language input for the most talented pupils was emphasized by the participant. This is because she saw TL input as a means of attending to the needs of the pupils by providing challenges to them. A similar opinion was analyzed previously in relation to the uses of English (see excerpt 18). Not surprisingly, both comments were made by the same participant.

Interestingly, in excerpt 34 there is also a reference to input which slightly exceeds the learners' skills. This notion can be traced to Krashen's input hypothesis. According to Krashen (1986:2), people learn the language as they are subjected to input which is slightly above their current language competence. As one can see, there is a clear connection between Krashen's hypothesis and the participant's comment. As excerpts 33 and 34 demonstrate, L1 use was perceived to take away something from the pupils, something which TL input can offer. This was seen as one of the shortcomings of L1 use.

Another type of disadvantage relates to language alternation. One of the participants felt that using Finnish and English side by side confuses the learner, since it brings out the differences of the two languages.

#### Excerpt 35

Sekottaa. Monet käsitteet on aivan erilaiset suomeksi. Monet kielioppitermit on englannissa paljon kuvaavampia kuin sitten suomessa. Esimerkiksi epäsuora esitys, epäsuorat kysymyslauseet, ni ei ne ees oo epäsuoria esityksiä, niin se sitten hämmentää monesti. Tai sitten rupee miettimään, jos vaikka aikamuotoja kertaa, ni sitten rupee et eihän suomessa ees oo tämmöstä tai eihän englannissa oo. Nii mun mielestä se hämmentää paljon jos sitä ruvetaan, koko ajan tuuaan kahta kieltä, opetetaan rinnakkain.

It confuses. Many concepts are totally different in Finnish. Many grammatical terms are much more accurate in English than in Finnish. For example indirect speech, indirect interrogative sentences, they aren't even indirect, so it's often confusing. Or then you start to think, let's say you're revising the tenses, then you're like there's no such thing in Finnish or no such thing in English. So I think it's really confusing if you bring in two languages all the time, teach them side by side.



This comment was made in relation to grammatical concepts and the terms which are used to describe them. The participant mentioned that some structures of English, and thus the terms for those structures, might not even exist in the learner's L1. Therefore using the two languages in the classroom confuses the learner. The participant seemed to feel that the language system can be best described by using that specific language. In this particular case the argument goes that English grammar is best explained when using English as the medium of instruction. This kind of reasoning is quite the opposite of what Cook (2001a:156-157) believes. He advocates employing the L1 for grammar instruction, especially if the two languages differ significantly grammar-wise.

It is worth noting that the participant was probably referring to contrastive foreign language teaching as well as to choosing the classroom language. Based on this comment the participant seemed to be in favor of "English only" medium and non-contrastive language teaching. These features are typical of the Direct Method, which was discussed in relation to language teaching methods and approaches (see section 2.2). Again it can be said that Cook would refute the participant's view. In fact, Cook (2001a:153-154) states that there is no reason for keeping the two languages apart since research findings indicate that the two are intertwined in the learner's mind.

The confusing characteristic of language alternation was viewed also from a slightly different angle.

#### Excerpt 36

Jos ei mieti niinku tunneilla et kumpaa kieltä käyttää ni se voi hämmentää myös kun opettaja sitten yhtäkkiä vaihtaakin kesken lauseen suomeksi tai englanniksi. Että kun minä mietin sekä suomen kielellä että englannin kielellä, ni mä en hoksaa kun mä vaihan kieltä, ku se on niin kaikki vaan niinku ymmärrettävää, mut sit se voi opiskelijalle olla sillee, että no niinku häirittevä, et sieltä tuleeki yhtäkkiä suomenkielinen sana välistä.

If you don't think about which language you are going to use during the lessons, then it can be confusing when the teacher suddenly switches to Finnish or English in mid-sentence. When I'm thinking in Finnish and in English, I don't notice when I change the language because it's all comprehensible but for the student it can be like distracting that there is suddenly a Finnish word in the middle.

As can be seen from the excerpt, language alternation was seen as something to be avoided because it confuses the learner. To be specific, the participant was describing intrasentential code-switching. She seemed to believe that the L1 can surface randomly and disturb the target language speech if one does not actively consider one's language choices.

While the two excerpts discussed above related to the disadvantages of language alternation from the pupil's point of view, in the following excerpt the focus is elsewhere. Translating one's target language speech into Finnish was regarded to have negative outcomes considering the role of English in the classroom.

Excerpt 37

Jos niinku vaikka ohjeistaessa tai aina niinku niitä oppilaita ojentaessa käyttää äidinkieltä, esim. vaikka että sanoo kaks kertaa eka enkuks ja sitten kolmannen kerran niinku suomeks ni oppilaat varmaan oppii siihen että ”okei, no nyt ei tarvi kuunnella et sit se sanoo sen kumminki vielä suomeks”. Et tavallaan se tärkein informaatio tulee niinku aina kumminki suomeks, et ei niinku tartte tavallaan pinnistellä, et ”kyllä se ope niinku aina heittää sieltä suomeks”.

If for instance when giving instructions or when reprimanding you always use the first language, for example if you say it twice in English and then the third time in Finnish, then the pupils will probably learn that “okay, now we don't have to listen, the teacher will say it in Finnish anyway”. In a way the most important information is always delivered in Finnish, so they don't have to struggle, it's like “the teacher will surely say it in Finnish”.

According to the participant, if the teacher repeats his/her target language utterances in in the L1, the pupils will grow the habit of not listening at all when they hear the target language in the classroom. Krashen (1986:81) discusses the same phenomenon. He criticizes translating one's speech into the L1 since the outcome can be that the pupils start to ignore target language input. The phenomenon described by the participant can become a vicious cycle. If the teacher translates his/her speech, the pupils will not be attentive when the teacher tries to communicate in the target language. Because the pupils are not paying attention, the teacher fails to deliver the message in English. It follows that the teacher gets frustrated and resorts to the L1 again. Breaking this cycle may be quite a challenge for the teacher. In a sense this particular disadvantage can be seen as relating also to the teacher. If the pupils begin to ignore target language speech, it causes grief to the teacher who tries (in vain) to communicate with the class in the target language.

The participant's comment brings to mind also the worry expressed by Nikula (2005) and Harmer (2009), among others. As was discussed earlier on, they feel that limiting the use of the target language to language exercises while discussing important matters and communicating in the classroom in the L1 diminishes the role of the target language as the vehicle of communication. This view was echoed in the participant's comment.

In conclusion, four categories of Finnish use were found. First of all, a teacher-related category was identified. It was said that Finnish can be used when the teacher

faces a psycholinguistic problem, in other words, when the teacher has difficulties in expressing his/herself in the target language. Secondly, learner-related uses formed one category. In specific terms, ensuring pupil comprehension and creating an opportunity for the pupils to participate in the conversation were such motives. Thirdly, L1 use was linked to certain speech situations. These were addressing matters which belong “outside the lesson” and reprimanding. Fourthly, complying with the instructions received in the teacher training was said to cause L1 use. One of the negative outcomes of speaking Finnish in the foreign language classroom was said to be reduced language learning opportunities and neglected language learner needs. Furthermore, alternating between English and Finnish was considered to be a source of confusion from the pupil’s perspective. It was also seen to diminish the communicative role of the target language. Now that the participants’ perceptions on both target language and L1 use have been analyzed, the analysis shifts to explore the data derived from the stimulated recall sessions. In other words, the motives which the participants find for the language choices that they have made in the classroom will be given attention.

## **6 THE REASON FOR THE CHOICE – LOCATING ONE’S MOTIVES**

This section of the analysis operates on the data produced in the stimulated recall sessions. The focus is on how the participants account for the language choices they have made during the recorded lessons. The participants reflected on their language use with the help of the video stimulus and tried to locate the motives for the language choices. Before moving on to the analysis, it is worth while to consider the language use which took place during the video-recorded lessons as a whole. There were noticeable differences in the language use of the participants. One of the participants alternated between the two languages frequently. It followed that no one language could be seen as dominating. Another spoke English in most cases, but used also a significant amount of Finnish. The third participant, on the other hand, spoke primarily English with only a few exceptions. In the following the motives for speaking each language are presented, starting with the motives found for target language use.

## 6.1 Choosing to speak English

Altogether three categories of motives for target language use emerged from the interview data. To be specific, teacher-, learner- and discourse-related motives were found. First I shall analyze the motives related to the participants themselves.

### 6.1.1 Personal principles and other teacher-related motives

It was found that the use of the target language reflected the participants' principles. As was shown previously, the participants felt that English should be, if not the sole, then at least the primary language in the classroom. The excerpts to be presented here exhibit this principle. For instance, the participants seemed to speak English when they found no reason for choosing Finnish. In other words, English was seen as the default language of the classroom while Finnish was the exception, used only when necessary. To be specific, the participants chose to speak English when they felt that the content to be conveyed and/or the target language used in the given situation were seen as easy enough for the pupils to comprehend. One of the comments describing such a motive relates to classroom management. In the classroom situation the pupils were engaging in an exercise. During the exercise the teacher controlled unwanted pupil behavior in the target language.

Excerpt 38

Se oli semmonen kommunikatiivinen tilanne, jossa niinku se oli vaa sitä niinku sellasta, et siinä ei ollu ymmärtämisen kanssa sellasta arvoa, mikä ois pitäny selkeyden vuoksi tehdä suomeks. Ni sitten se oli iha sellanen kommunikatiivinen hetki vain herran kanssa.

It was a communicative situation, where it was only that, it didn't have any value considering comprehension, the kind of value that it should have been done in Finnish for the sake of comprehension. It was just a communicative moment with the gentleman.

It seems that the participant regarded reprimanding to be less significant than, say, teaching the actual subject matter. It followed that pupil comprehension was not considered to be crucial in the given situation. As the participant stated, there was no need to ensure understanding, therefore there was no need to employ Finnish. In other words, the reason for speaking English was that Finnish use was not necessary.

At other times the participants tried to follow their principle but the circumstances were not apt for such a principle to be fully realized. The following excerpt relates to a situation in which the teacher was trying to find out whether or not the pupils had previous knowledge of one particular grammar point, or whether it was new to them. This transaction was conducted mainly in Finnish but the teacher code-switched

occasionally from Finnish to English and back. In the following is her explanation for incorporating English utterances into the Finnish speech.

Excerpt 39

En tiiä, se varmaa tuli vaa siis sillee että en niinku.. Varmaa se, että just et ku haluais puhua sitä enkkua siellä, mut sit niinku tilanne on kuitenkin se, että ”Hei, et mitä täs tapahtuu” ja sitte, että niinku semmonen, hämmäntävä hetki.

I don't know, it probably just came like.. Probably because I would like to speak English there but then the situation is like ”Hey, what's happening here” and then like this, confusing moment.

Because of the confusing circumstances the participant failed to put her principle into practice. However, the participant still tried to speak at least some English. This was said to be because of the underlying will to use English as the classroom language. As one can see, the participant *suspected* that this had been the reason for code-switching to English during the speech situation. This implies that the decision to code-switch had been made unconsciously.

In the following is the last example of the language choice made on the basis of the main principle. In the classroom situation the participant had conversed with the pupils in Finnish in order to find out whether they were familiar with the given grammar point. She found out that it was new to them and began to give grammar instruction. When the transition between the communicative situation and grammar instruction took place, the teacher switched from Finnish to English.

Excerpt 40

No öö asia oli sinänsä selvitetty, tällanen niinku et ”mitä täs nyt tapahtuu” -hetki, sain viestin, että asia onkin täysin uusi. Ja sitten palasin siihen ajatukseen, että tunti vedetään englanniksi, ilmeisesti.

Well, the matter was basically clear, this “what's happening” moment, I got the information that it was all new to them. Then I went back to the idea that the lesson is conducted in English, apparently.

The participant's comment reflected her principle according to which English is to be used as the classroom language. Note also that the language choice seemed to be an unconscious one. An indicator of this is the expression “apparently”. Previous research has also found that personal beliefs affect the teacher's language use. For instance, Macaro (2001) found that personal beliefs and experience guide the language choice. Similarly, Thompson's study (2006) showed that these two factors contributed to the teacher's TL use.

While the first teacher-related motive for TL use reflected the principles of the participants, the other teacher-related motive for speaking English can be said to be of a psycholinguistic kind. The meaning of the term must be expanded because, unlike previously in relation to perceptions of L1 use (see section 5.3.1), the lack of linguistic skills or knowledge is not the issue here. Instead, the term is used to imply that the language use is affected or caused by the speaker's relationship with the given language. One such psycholinguistic reason for English use was automaticity. According to the participants, sometimes English was the language which came into mind automatically. It might seem more probable that one's first language is more automatically available when speaking, while the use of the foreign language is not as automatic. However, based on the participants' comments it can be said that also the opposite is possible. English was sometimes employed in the classroom because the expression in question seemed to be more automatized than the Finnish equivalent. For instance, such language use occurred as one of the participants was giving instructions in Finnish about having a presentation. During this speech situation the participant code-switched to English and uttered one phrase, "oral presentation", in English. According to the participant, automaticity was the reason why she engaged in code-switching.

Excerpt 41

Ja se *oral presentation*, ni ilmeisesti oli sana, joka löyty helpommin miun päästä ku *suullinen esitelmä*.

And that *oral presentation*, that was apparently a word which was easier to find in my head than *suullinen esitelmä* [the Finnish equivalent for the expression].

It is possible that the issue of having a presentation had been addressed in English at some point prior to the speech situation in question. If so, this may have affected the availability of the English term *oral presentation*. Be it as it may, the reason for employing English in this particular situation was said to be automaticity. Note that the participant used the phrase "apparently". This indicates that the code-switch in question was made unconsciously. In the interview situation the participant looked for the probable reason for the switch.

A somewhat different psycholinguistic motive for choosing the target language was found in cases of unconscious continuity. This unconscious language choice took place after the teacher had code-switched from Finnish to English in order to provide a linguistic example. What is important is that after providing the linguistic example in English, the teacher carried on with the speech situation in the target language. In other

words, the teacher forgot to switch back to Finnish after uttering the target language example. In the following is an explanation for such language use.

Excerpt 42

Taas se näköjää vaa siis sit jotenki jatku siitä sellai luontevasti, sillä kohdekielellä.

Again it apparently somehow went on in the target language naturally.

As the excerpt indicates, the language choice was a case of unconscious continuity. It is interesting that after continuing to speak English for a short while the teacher switched back to Finnish. It seems that the teacher then became aware of the language which she was using and returned to the language with which the speech situation had been conducted in the first place. The unconscious decision to continue to speak English after providing the target language example was said to be something “natural”. It seems that in the classroom, where it is common to use both Finnish and English, the teacher may find it natural to alternate between the two languages. The naturalness of language alternation and the unconscious characteristic of the language choice can be seen as signs of the bilingualism existing in the foreign language classroom. To end the discussion on the psycholinguistic reasons for employing English, it can be noted that both automaticity and unconscious continuity were reported also by Yletyinen (2004), albeit she used different terms to describe such language use.

### **6.1.2 Learner-related motives**

The second category of English uses consists of learner-related motives. First of all, code-switching from Finnish to English was employed in order to gain the pupils’ attention. In the classroom situation the teacher was speaking Finnish with the pupils and having a discussion regarding some previous exercise. During the discussion a need for directing the pupils’ attention arose. As the teacher began to direct the pupils’ attention verbally she also code-switched from Finnish to English. What is important is that code-switching itself was seen as a means of gaining the pupils attention.

Excerpt 43

Musta jotenki tuntuu, et mä teen aina sillei et aina ku tulee joku tollanen. Et jos mä käytän enkkuu ja sit ku tulee joku tilanne, ni sit mä vaihan suomeks et ”Hei, nyt!” Ja sitte jos mä puhun suomea, ja sit tulee joku tilanne ni sit mä sanon enkuks. Onks se sit joku semmonen, et mä oon niinku kokenu sen, että se kielenvaihtaminen saattas niinku aiheuttaa jonku reaktion siellä vastaanottajissa, et ne niinku ehkä havahtuis vähä.

I somehow feel that I always act like that if something like that happens. If I'm speaking English and some situation comes along, I switch to Finnish like "Hey, now!" And if I'm speaking Finnish and some situation comes along, then I say it English. I wonder if it's because I've felt that switching the language might cause some kind of a reaction among the listeners, that they would maybe snap out of it a bit.

The participant described her habit of using code-switching as a way of directing the pupils' attention. It seems that by watching the video clip the participant became aware of her language use in such situations. She noticed a pattern in her language use and located the probable reason for it. This shows that the code-switch exhibited in the video was rather unconscious in nature. Perhaps the most interesting point is that code-switching was said to be employed in both directions, from Finnish to English and vice versa. However, the language choice exhibited on the video clip involved switching to English. Therefore, this particular language choice is here treated as a part of target language use. Furthermore, it is seen as learner-related because the participant explained that the purpose of code-switching was to cause a reaction among the pupils. Similar language use has been identified by Greggio and Gil (2007), for instance, who found that the teacher used code-switching as a tool in seeking attention. Furthermore, Crichton (2009) got interesting results as she interviewed pupils on the subject of teachers' target language use. The pupils felt that teachers' TL use makes them pay attention because the information will not be given to them in the L1.

Another learner-related motive for speaking the target language was found in a situation where the teacher chose to use the same language which the pupils were to speak. The participant seemed to foster the idea that if the teacher uses English, it encourages the pupils to speak English as they engage in language practice. The following excerpt relates to an oral exercise in which the pupils were to speak English. It provides an explanation for why the participant chose to employ the target language during the exercise.

#### Excerpt 44

Ehottomasti käytin sen takia, että ne tottuis käyttämään sitä kieltä myöskin sit siinä parin kanssa. Et vaikka sitä ei missään noissa ohjeistuksissa ei sanota, että puhukaa englantia, niin minkäänlaista suomen kielen tukea ei anneta, että ne ei sais sitte niinku helpotusta, että "no sanotaanpa suomeksi, ku tuollaki lukee suomeksi".

I definitely used it so that they would get used to speaking the language also with their partner. Although it wasn't said in those instructions that speak English, I don't want to give them any support in Finnish so they won't get any relief, that "let's say this in Finnish because it's in Finnish over there too".



The participant had decided to speak English in order to act as an example for the pupils. She felt that by speaking English the teacher can encourage the pupils to do the same. Consequently, it was also implied that if the L1 is present in the situation, the pupils may resort to the L1 instead of speaking the target language. This comment follows the line of thought which was introduced by one of the participants during the semi-structured interview (excerpt 13). It was said that the teacher should practice what one preaches and act as an example for the pupils. Furthermore, the participant agreed with Harmer (2001:132), in that the teacher's target language use encourages pupils' to employ the target language. In addition, Crichton's study (2009) produced findings which support this view.

### **6.1.3 Discourse-related motives**

The third category found in relation to target language use consists of discourse-related motives. Creating coherence was one such motive described by the participants. When discussing discourse-related code-switching, Auer (1998:6-7) gives an example of textual coherence. In the example the speakers code-switch systematically from what can be seen as the base language to the other language when uttering a certain phrase. The code-switch occurs every time that particular phrase is used because the speakers want to create textual coherence. This kind of motive for TL use was found in the participants' comments, albeit the cases of coherence involved larger constituents than single phrases and code-switching was not present. In one situation where coherence was pursued, the participant was giving further instructions for a couple of pupils as they were about to engage in an exercise.

Excerpt 45

Käytin englantia sen takia kun koko tehtävä on ollu englanniksi tähän astikin, ja sitten ohjeistus on ollut englanniksi.

I used English because the whole exercise has been in English so far, and then the instructions have been in English.

The language choice was based on the language which the participant had used earlier when giving instructions to the whole class. In other words, the coherence around a certain function was pursued. In this case that function was giving instructions. Even though the participant stated that "the whole exercise has been in English", the pupils were in fact only getting ready to work on the exercise and used Finnish at that point. From this it can be inferred that the participant was probably referring to the language

choice she had made when introducing the exercise and giving the instructions. In other words, she was not referring to the pupils' language use but to her own.

In addition to creating coherence, another discourse-related motive for speaking English was identified. The target language was used to indicate the teacher's stance towards what is said. As was noted previously in section 3.4, Auer (1992:4) mentions that code-switching can be used to signal the speaker's relationship to the information being conveyed. According to one of the participants, choosing English for practicing classroom management conveyed her stance to the pupils. The following comment relates to controlling pupil behavior and directing attention.

Excerpt 46

Englannissa on, englannin kielessä on paljo paremmin sanoja, millä pystyy saamaan huomiota tai siis sellaisia positiivisia sanoja, millä pystyy niinku saamaan huomion. Suomen kielessä on hirveen paljon semmosia, et jos sä sanot et "Hei pojat" [ankaralla äänellä] niin ni se o.. Nii mä koen sen, et pystyy sillai niinku positiivisemmin ehkä, jotenki ehkä saamaan huomion.

In English, in English language there are a lot more words, with which you can get attention or these positive words, with which you can get attention. In Finnish language there is a tremendous amount of, like if you say "Hei pojat" ["Hey boys", with tough tone] then that's.. I feel that, one can in a more positive way maybe, somehow get attention.

The participant contrasted Finnish and English as the medium for obtaining the pupils' attention. For her, English seemed to provide a lighter and more positive way of controlling pupil behavior. Finnish, on the other hand, was seen as conveying a harsh attitude. Controlling pupil behavior but still maintaining a friendly approach was seen as desirable. It seems that the target language was used to signal this warm and positive take to the pupils.

Altogether three different categories of motives for speaking English were formed on the basis of the stimulated recall interview. The first of them was teacher-related. The participants' personal principles, according to which English is the default language of the classroom, were reflected in the language choices. Also, psycholinguistic causes, such as automaticity and unconscious continuity, were identified as causes for English use. The second category of motives was learner-related. Code-switching from Finnish to English was used in order to gain the pupils' attention. In addition, the teacher chose to speak English in order to act as an example for the pupils. The third category of motives related to discourse. English was used in order to create coherence in the discourse. In addition, English was employed in order to convey the teacher's stance.

As the motives for speaking the target language have now been identified, the participants' accounts of their Finnish use are given attention.

## **6.2 Choosing Finnish**

The motives for employing Finnish in the classroom formed four categories. One of those categories is teacher-related and involves mainly motives with psycholinguistic origins. Another category consists of learner-related motives, such as ensuring comprehension and gaining attention. The third category is discourse-related. It includes motives which relate to coherence, signaling the teacher's stance, marking the boundary of two speech situations, and to the connection between Finnish and certain speech situations. The fourth category, on the other hand, concerns the conduct promoted in teacher training and its influence on the participants' language choices. The analysis of these various motives proceeds in the same order as in the previous sections of analysis. In other words, the teacher-related motives will be analyzed first.

### **6.2.1 Teacher-related motives**

Nearly all teacher-related motives for employing the L1 were of psycholinguistic origin. One of such motives was automaticity regarding the speaker's L1. At times Finnish was more available, more quickly at hand than the target language. The next excerpt relates to a classroom situation in which the teacher was giving further instructions during an exercise. She was going around the class and the pupils were to pick a piece of paper from the hat she was carrying. The base language of the given situation was English. However, at one point the teacher engaged in what seems unconscious code-switching and produced one utterance in Finnish, which was immediately repeated in English.

Excerpt 47

Se varmaa just tuli niinku spontaanisti jostai selkärangasta, ja sit mä olin sillei, et "ah, eiku enkuks" ja sit sanoin sen saman vielä enkuks.

It probably came spontaneously from the backbone or something, and then I was like "oh, no, in English" and said the same thing in English.

From the participant's comment it becomes clear that the automaticity of Finnish was the reason for code-switching to Finnish. When the participant was not concentrating on her language use, a Finnish expression surfaced in the middle of an English speech situation. The mother tongue of the speaker can understandably come to mind more automatically than the foreign language. The code-switch was clearly unconscious in nature. As was mentioned in relation to code-switching (see section 3.4), Edmonson (2004:165) states that one reason for psycholinguistic code-switching (from the TL to

the L1) is that the use of the target language has not yet become automatic. Or, to put it in another way, the speaker's L1 is more automatized than the target language.

L1 use with psycholinguistic roots manifested itself also as unconscious continuity. In such cases the participant unconsciously continued to speak in the language which had been used prior to the utterance in question. The following excerpt relates to a situation in which the class was checking a grammar exercise. The speech situation was conducted in English. At one point the participant switched to Finnish in order to give grammar instruction. After the instruction phase the teacher continued with checking the exercise but did not code-switch back to English, the language she had used previously when going through the exercise.

Excerpt 48

Mut sit ku mä sanoin tossa että ”No niin ja sitten kakkonen” ni siinä on kyllä jääny ihan vahingossa siis suomi päälle, et se oli kyllä ihan spontaani.

But when I said ”No niin, ja sitten kakkonen” [“Okay, and then number two”], I continued in Finnish by accident, it was totally spontaneous.

As the participant continued with checking the exercise, she forgot to code-switch accordingly from Finnish to English. From the teacher-related excerpts presented thus far it becomes clear that the language choices in question were unconscious.

Yet another kind of psycholinguistically motivated language use occurred when the teacher had trouble in expressing herself in the target language. In relation to this, Edmonson (2004:165) mentions that the lack of skills or knowledge can result in psycholinguistic code-switching (i.e. switching to the L1). In one such situation the participant was introducing a new exercise, a game known as sink the ship. The participant was not sure what the game is called in English, which is why she code-switched from English to Finnish and back.

Excerpt 49

Suomea käytin sen takia, koska ennen tuntia rupesin miettimään, että siis tää on laivanupotuksesta kyse, ja mun piti selvittää, että mikä se on englanniksi, ja mä en sitä kattonu, niin mä en ollu satavarma onko se sunk the ship sit se oikee pelin nimi, ni mun täyty sanoa se suomeksi.

I used Finnish because before the lesson I started to think that this is sink the ship, and I intended to find out what it is in English, but I didn't check it, so I wasn't one hundred per cent sure whether sunk the ship was the right term, so I had to say it in Finnish.

The participant code-switched from English to Finnish because she did not know the needed target language expression. After uttering the Finnish phrase “laivanupotus”, the participant reverted back to English. From the participant's comment it becomes clear

that the language choice was caused by the lack of vocabulary knowledge. Such language use was reported also by Yletyinen (2004).

Another case exhibiting a lack of language skills occurred as the teacher had to teach grammar and due to a misunderstanding was not prepared to do so. In fact, the participant had to improvise. She began teaching grammar first in English but after a while she code-switched to Finnish.

Excerpt 50

Varmaa iha paniikkireaktio suomeks sanottuna. Iha rehellisesti. Semmonen.. yritin lähtee sillä enkulla, mut sit totesin, et ei tästä voi tulla mitää, koska mä en oo ite valmistautunu tähä asiaan, ja et mä en oo niinku suunnitellu mitää tähä semmosta, et miten mä selitän sen asian. Ni sit se oli vaa helpompi lähtee sillä. Et ei ollu niinku mitää valmiuksia lähtee sitä tarpeeks selkeesti, varsinki ku siinä oli niin monta sellasta pientä asiaa, mitä piti käyä niin ni, käymään sitte. Se oli sellanen paniikkireaktio.

Frankly, it was probably a panic reaction. To tell you the truth. I tried to do it in English but then I realized that it can't work because I wasn't prepared for it, I hadn't planned how I would explain it. So it was easier to go with that. I couldn't do it clearly enough, especially because there were so many little things to explain so. It was a panic reaction.

In the classroom situation the participant had felt that it was easier for her to teach grammar in Finnish because she thought she would not be able to express herself clearly enough in English without any preparation. This is understandable, since she had to engage in grammar instruction without having any time to plan her teaching, not to mention her language use. Nevertheless, choosing Finnish in that particular situation can be seen as caused by the insufficient fluency in the target language. On the basis of excerpts 49 and 50, it can be said that the participants were not always able to express themselves in the target language. This difficulty was caused by the lack of knowledge or skills. In other words, the language choices had psycholinguistic origins. When faced with difficulties in expressing oneself in the target language, the participants resorted to Finnish.

In addition to the teacher-related motives mentioned thus far, confusion was said to be one of the reasons for speaking Finnish. The following excerpt describes a situation where the teacher was not sure what time it was. It was the end of the lesson when the teacher brought up the issue and simultaneously code-switched to Finnish. Before and after the so called time conversation the teacher used English.

Excerpt 51

Puhuin suomea välissä siinä, ku tuli taas hämmennystä siitä, et paljo se kello nyt sit on ja mitä me nyt tehää.

I spoke Finnish there in the middle because there was this confusion about what time it is and what we are going to do.

The participant felt that speaking Finnish had resulted from the confusion she was feeling in the given situation. Another possible interpretation would be that the informal nature of the speech situation had something to do with speaking Finnish. However, the participant did not indicate such a connection. On the basis of her comment this particular language choice is teacher-related: the participant was confused and therefore used Finnish.

### **6.2.2 Learner-related motives**

The second main category of motives for L1 use is learner-related. The participants stated that they had used Finnish in order to ensure that the pupils comprehend the message being conveyed. In the following excerpt the motive for the language choice is articulated clearly. In the classroom situation the participant chose to speak Finnish when giving feedback on the oral presentation of one of the pupils. In the following is her explanation for the language choice.

Excerpt 52

Varmaan puhuin suomeks lähinnä sen takia että halusin, että hän ymmärtää selkeästi.

I probably spoke Finnish because I wanted her to understand clearly.

As the participant stated, Finnish was used in order to guarantee pupil comprehension. It is also worth noting that the unconscious nature of the language choice becomes apparent from the participant's comment. The participant interpreted the classroom situation and sought after the probable motive for her choice.

As one might notice, in the case of excerpt 52 the L1 was employed in order to prevent possible miscomprehension. In addition to preventing miscomprehensions, the participants stated that Finnish was used in correcting miscomprehensions and clearing up confusion. The following excerpt refers to the latter. In the classroom situation one of the pupils had finished her oral presentation and the teacher was asking the pupils to give peer feedback on the presentation. At that point the teacher used English. Then one of the pupils asked in Finnish for further instructions regarding having the presentation. The teacher code-switched to Finnish in order to clarify the issue. The pupils had been given two options from which to choose: they were to give a presentation or to make a poster. It seemed that not all pupils had understood these instructions correctly.

## Excerpt 53

Suomeks puhuin tossa sen takia, että kun se oli niin epäselvä tilanne, siis sellanen hämmentävä, vähä et mitä siinä oikei tapahtu, ja sit halusin selventää sen, että ku oli tällee kaks vaihtoehtoa.

I spoke Finnish there because it was such an unclear situation, it was confusing, like what was going on, and I wanted to clarify that there were these two options.

Since some of the pupils had misunderstood the instructions or were at least uncertain of what was expected of them, the teacher decided to switch to Finnish in order to provide the clarification. In other words, ensuring pupil comprehension after a misunderstanding was conducted in Finnish. As one can see from excerpts 52 and 53, the participants' actions in relation to pupil comprehension were both preventing and repairing. Using the L1 in order to ensure and clarify comprehension has been reported by other researchers as well. For instance, Bateman (2008) found that the student teachers she studied used the L1 when learners had comprehension-related difficulties. Similarly, Littlewood and Yu (2009) found that the L1 was used for ensuring understanding. Furthermore, Edmonson (2004:175) as well as Freeman and Freeman (1998:211), for example, state that the L1 can be used to ensure learner comprehension.

The participants used Finnish also when speaking with pupils whose competence level was known to be somewhat low. In those situations the focus was on the individual pupils' language skills, not that of the whole group. One probable reason why language teachers may want to address pupils with low language skills in the L1 is that they want to make sure that the pupils understand what is said. Therefore, the participant's L1 use caused by the low language competence of the pupil can be linked to ensuring pupil comprehension. The following excerpt relates to a situation where the class was checking homework and the participant was speaking English. As the participant allocated a turn by asking one of the pupils to provide the answer, she code-switched to Finnish.

## Excerpt 54

Varmaan sen takia et.. oppilas A, mulle on sanottu että oppilas A on niinku yks niistä heikoista oppilaista tunnilla, et varmaan sen takia sit vaihoin suomeksi, mut kyllä mä ny uskon, et vaikka mä oisin ton enkuks sanonu, ni oppilas A ois kyllä ymmärtäny.

Probably because.. Pupil A, I've been told that pupil A is one of the weakest pupils in class, so that's why I switched to Finnish, but I do think that if I had said it in English, he would have understood.

Based on this excerpt, it seems that the low language proficiency of the pupils was the cause for speaking the L1. Likewise, Bateman (2008) and de la Campa and Nassaji

(2009) found that the L1 was used because of the low language competence of the learner. It is interesting that the participant felt that the pupil could have understood the message even when delivered in the target language. It seems that acknowledging the pupil's low language competence resulted in ensuring comprehension in Finnish, even though comprehension would have not been jeopardized from using the target language in the given situation. Note that the participant used the word "probably". This shows that the language choice was unconscious and that the participant interpreted her language use in the light of what she knows.

Finnish was used by the participants not only when they wanted to ensure that the pupils comprehend the content of the message but also when they wanted them to pay attention to what is being said. Gaining attention through language choice (that is, through speaking Finnish) is the second learner-related motive for L1 use. It should be noted that the classroom situations to be discussed next do not relate to classroom management. In other words, in the classroom the teacher sought attention through the language choice only, not through verbal messages aimed to direct the pupils' attention. The following excerpt describes a situation in which the teacher was giving instructions for the upcoming task. The instructions were first given in English, then the teacher code-switched to Finnish and repeated the instructions.

#### Excerpt 55

Varmaankin.. Tässä just on vaikee, ku ei nää niinku tonne luokkaan, et mikähän siinä se hetki on niinku sit ollu. Mut mä luulen, et ainaki ku siellä kuulu olevan aika paljon sellasta hälyä, et voi olla, et sitte siellä on niinku näyttäny musta siltä, et ihmiset ei oo niinku kuullu, kuunnellu, kuullu kautta kuunnellu, tai sit siellä on ollu semmosia niinku "täh"-ilmeitä, et niinku "Mitä?" et varmaan sit jotenki hypänny sillee niinku suomeen. Mut et varmaa niinku suomeks sitte, että niinku päästään eteenpäin. Tavallaan että jos mä nyt sanon suomeks tän, ni sit ne tajuu oikeesti ja voiaan päästä eteenpäin. Ainahan noilla tunneilla on se aikapaine, mikä on kyllä tosi ikävää.

Probably.. It's difficult because you can't see into the classroom, what the situation is, but I think that because there seems to be quite a lot of noise, so it might be that I thought that people don't hear, listen, hear or listen, or then there were these "huh?"-expressions, that "what?", so I've somehow jumped into Finnish. But it came out in Finnish probably because then we could move on. In a way that if I say this in Finnish now, then they will really get it and we can move on. There's always the time pressure on those lessons, which is really sad.

In the related classroom situation the pupils were not paying attention to what the teacher was saying. The participant described the class as restless. It was also pointed out that it was noisy in the classroom so it is possible that even though some pupils were paying attention, they were simply not able to hear because others were being noisy. The participant thought that by speaking Finnish she could gain the pupils' attention.



Although the participant code-switched from English to Finnish and repeated the instructions, she did not emphasize the function of the switch itself. Instead it seems that using this particular language, the L1 of the learners, was seen as the key factor in gaining attention.

In relation to gaining attention through L1 use, Greggio and Gil (2007) found that code-switching to the L1 was used as a means of gaining the pupils' attention. In one of their data excerpts the teacher asked a question twice in the target language, but since the learners did not reply, the teacher switched to the L1 and immediately gained the learners' attention (Greggio and Gil 2007:379). In addition, Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) found that teachers often gave instructions first in the target language, then in the learners' L1. However, they concluded that the reason for switching to the L1 when giving instructions was related to ensuring understanding, not to gaining attention.

The language use of the participant quoted in excerpt 55 brings to mind the negotiation sequence described by Auer (1998: 7-8). In the context of foreign language classrooms the sequence may be realized in the following way: if the teacher's target language speech does not produce the reaction which is hoped for, the teacher can switch to the learners' L1. In other words, the teacher can switch to the language which is preferred by the learners. It is possible that this had some part in why the participant quoted in excerpt 55 code-switched to Finnish. It is worth noting that the participant looked for the explanation for her language use from the surrounding situation. From her reaction to the video clip it becomes apparent that the language choice was made unconsciously.

It is also interesting that the participant quoted in excerpt 55 mentioned that lessons are plagued by the lack of time. This suggests that the number of goals to be achieved during the lesson requires a swift pace. There is reason to believe then, that the motive behind the language choice was at least partly caused by the lack of time. In other words, the participant decided to use Finnish in order to keep up the pace. This line of thought consists of interrelated factors. The participant regarded using Finnish as the medium of instruction as an effective way of catching the pupils' attention. Using this notion as the starting point it can be postulated that if the pupils pay attention, they receive and comprehend the teacher's message, which means there is no need for further clarifications or repetitions. Thus, using Finnish can be said to save time.

In the following excerpt the time constraint is seen as the main reason for employing Finnish. In the classroom situation the participant had instructed an exercise in Finnish.

## Excerpt 56

Varmaa just tullu tossa sillee niinku että voi ei, meillä on kiire, pitää nopeesti niinku saaha tää juttu tehtyä. Siksi valitsen suomen. Siellä oli tosi levotonta ja just sillee niinku, että he halus jo syömään, ja ajattelin et no suomeks jos mä ohjeistan, ni menee helpommin, ne kässä nopeemmin ja saahaan nopeemmin niinku tehtyä.

Probably I thought there that oh no, we're in a hurry, we have to get this thing done quickly. That's why I choose Finnish. The class was really restless and they wanted to go and have lunch already and I thought that in Finnish the instructions will go easier, they will understand them faster and we can get it done faster.

The participant stated that by using Finnish the pupils would understand the instructions straight away. From this perspective the comment can be linked to ensuring understanding. However, the participant mentioned that the class was restless at the time. On the basis of the previous excerpt it may be assumed that the restlessness of the pupils coincided with not paying attention. When viewed from this perspective, the Finnish use described by the participant can be linked to gaining attention. Furthermore, as was pointed out in relation to excerpt 55, ensuring that the pupils are paying attention contributes to comprehension. In other words, these two factors are intertwined. As the participant stated, if the instructions would be received and understood, the class could engage in the exercise without delays and stay on schedule. For the sake of saving time, the participant decided to speak Finnish. The same motive for L1 use has come up also in previous studies. To mention a few, Victor (2009) and de la Campa and Nassaji (2009) got results which indicated that the L1 was used because it was seen as time-saving.

In all but one classroom situations referred to above the teacher tried to use the target language but the result was that the pupils did not pay attention. The exception to this was the situation where the teacher decided to employ Finnish right from the start in order to save time. The participants seemed to be under the impression that by choosing Finnish they will obtain the pupils' attention efficiently. However, the comments discussed above did not offer any possible reasons for the pupils' tendency of ignoring target language speech and of paying more attention when the teacher speaks Finnish. One of the participants touched upon this issue during the stimulated recall session. The following comment relates to a situation which took place towards the end of the lesson. Using English the participant asked the pupils to take a handout with them on their way out. After a while she code-switched to Finnish and repeated the message. In the following is the participant's explanation for code-switching to Finnish.

## Excerpt 57

Siksi koska tää mun hieno opetusideologia ei toteudu vielä tämmösessä harjottelujaksossa. Elikkä se vaikka mä ite haluaisinkin hirveesti niille sen enkun kielen sinne niinku ahtaa korvien väliin, ja että sillä tunnilla puhutaan enkkua ja ymmärtäis niinku huomaamattaanki kaikki niinkun semmoset kehotukset ja käskyt englanniksi, niin täyty varmistaa suomeks, että ne kuulee sen, että ne niinku rekisteröi, että täytyy ottaa jotain. Se ei välttämättä se sana ottaa, ne ei hoksaa, että mitä se on. Jos sanoo että take niin ne, se on niille vaa yks englanninkielinen sana, ne ei välttämättä rekisteröi sitä, et se tarkoittaa, et siellä on joku.

Because my great teaching ideology doesn't yet come to existence in this kind of a training period. Even though I would really like to thrust the English language into their heads, that in this class English is spoken and that they would understand without even noticing all these requests and commands in English, but I had to ensure in Finnish that they hear it, that they register that they have to take something. The word take doesn't necessarily, they don't notice what it is. If you say take, then they, it's just another English word to them, they don't necessarily register that it means that there is something.

The participant seemed to be suggesting that the pupils in question were not used to a teacher who uses English as the classroom language. Therefore she had to resort to Finnish in order to deliver the message. In relation to this, the participants of de la Campa and Nassaji's study (2009) mentioned that at times L1 use resulted from the fact that the pupils were not accustomed to target language input. Similarly, the student teachers of Bateman's study (2008) reported that the language use of the pupils' regular teacher inhibited the use of the target language in the classroom. The pupils were not used to TL input which is why difficulties emerged as the student teachers tried to employ the target language.

Based on the excerpt presented above it seems that the pupils regarded target language speech as mere language practice but not as a means of communicating real meanings. This scenario was depicted by one of the participants during the semi-structured interview as she was considering the disadvantages of L1 use (see excerpt 37). In relation to this, Victor (2009:41) and Meiring and Norman (2002: 33-34), among others, emphasize the importance of using the target language for authentic communication, otherwise the pupils may get the impression that the target language relates merely to language practice and is not used for conveying meaning. This can be the very reason why the pupils referred to in the excerpt above did not always take notice of the participant's target language speech.

It is also worth noting that the participant used the expression "my great teaching ideology". Yet again the participants' main principle was referred to. Moreover, the

participant quoted above is the same one who previously mentioned that target language use had been advocated to her in the teacher training (see excerpt 32). The strong expression about one's own ideology indicates that the will to use the target language in the classroom welled from the participant's own principle, not from the instructions given by the teacher trainers.

The third type of learner-related L1 use involved accommodation. During the recorded lessons the pupils seemed to use mainly Finnish to communicate with the teacher. It followed that at times the teacher accommodated her speech according to the pupils' speech. This means that if the pupils spoke Finnish, the teacher sometimes switched to Finnish even though the base language of that speech situation was otherwise English. The situation referred to in the next excerpt took place as one of the pupils commented on an exercise by stating in Finnish that at least he had done it already. At that point the teacher code-switched to Finnish and responded to the pupil's comment.

#### Excerpt 58

Siks koska oppilas puhu – heitti suomeks sieltä, ni sit siihe miun mielest on luontevaa vastata sitte suomeks, vaikka siihen ois voinu aivan hyvi vastata englanniksi.

Because the pupil spoke – said something in Finnish, so I think it's natural to reply in Finnish, although I could have easily replied in English, too.

As the excerpt shows, the teacher's language use was influenced by the language used by the pupils. Therefore, it can be said that the teacher's language use was learner-related. The teacher accommodated her speech according to that of the pupils.

Giles and Coupland (1991:71) see accommodation as a way of fulfilling the (most often unconscious) need to create a social connection between the individuals taking part in the conversation. Similarly, Baker and Prys Jones (1998:60) mention that one of the functions of code-switching is to create social connectedness. This is probably true also in the case of accommodation practiced by language teachers. The teacher may want to create a sense of similarity and unity, in other words, to converge with the pupils. By accommodating the teacher can contribute to the social relationship of the classroom participants. Ferguson (2003:43) mentions that the use of the target language is often times linked to a distant relationship between the teacher and the learners. Unlike the target language, employing the L1 can be connected to a warmer teacher-learner relationship. It is said that for this reason the teacher may decide to use the L1 for creating and maintaining the social relationship with the learner. Bateman (2008) and Littlewood and Yu (2009) found that the L1 was, in fact, used to build rapport. In

addition, cases in which the teacher switched to the language used by the learner were found by Yletyinen (2004) and Reini (2008).

It is worth noting that the accommodation exhibited by the participants of the present study can be seen as participant-related code-switching, following the definition used by Auer (1998:7-8). It is said to involve a negotiation over the language preferences of the interactants. In the classroom situation described in the excerpt above, the negotiation ended with the teacher converging to the language used by the pupil.

### **6.2.3 Discourse-related motives**

The reasons for using Finnish in the English classroom have up to this point been related to the interactants present in the classroom. As for the third category of Finnish use, the focus is on discourse. One of the discourse-related motives for speaking Finnish was pursuing coherence. By speaking Finnish, the coherence of language choices was built around a certain topic, for instance. The following comment was made regarding a situation in which the teacher chose to speak Finnish because the topic at hand had on a previous occasion been addressed in Finnish. The class was about to check a grammar exercise. Because the targeted grammar item had been previously discussed in Finnish, the teacher decided to use the L1 when going through the exercise.

Excerpt 59

On opeteltu tää ilmiö suomeks ja kaikki käsitteet on niillä, jos tohon tarkistukseen jotain liittyy, ni täytyis selittää ne suomenkielisten termien avulla, ni sitten tota käytän suomea.

They have learned this phenomenon in Finnish and they have all the concepts, if there is something involved in checking the exercise, I'd have to explain it with the help of Finnish terms, so I use Finnish.

In the classroom situation the participant felt that she might have to explain the grammar item further when checking the exercises. Because the exercise involved grammar which the participant had taught previously in Finnish, she decided to use that same language when discussing the exercise with the pupils. In other words, the participant pursued coherence in relation to a certain topic.

Another example of using Finnish in order to create coherence relates to the language of the content being addressed. More specifically, the language of the materials influenced the teacher's language choice. This type of language choice took place as the participant was instructing a word test in English. When giving instructions

the participant code-switched and uttered one word in Finnish before returning to the base language. In the following is the participant's account for the situation.

Excerpt 60

Mää pistin sinne tärkeimmät osat noista tehtävänannoista, ni käänsin sitten suomeksi, elikkä esimerkiks tummennettu ja olikohan siellä, että alleviivattu tai jotku tommoset, ni olin sitten laittanu sinne sulkeisiin suomeksi, ni sama homma. Elikkä mitä luki paperissa, paperissa oli käännetty *bolded* ni tummennettu.

I put the most important parts of the instructions, I translated them into Finnish, for example *bolded* and *underlined* and things like that, I had put them in brackets in Finnish, so the same thing. In other words, what was on the paper, it was translated on the paper, *bolded* was tummennettu [the Finnish equivalent of *bolded*].

The participant chose to code-switch to Finnish during a situation where English was the base language because she followed the language choices of the written material. Therefore, it can be said that creating coherence between language use of the teacher and the language of the materials was the reason for the language choice. Materials-related language choices were noted also by Reini (2008). Such choices were labeled as quoting the textbook or other materials. However, the participant of the present study did not read directly from the papers, instead she gave instructions in her own words, but inserted one word in Finnish in order to create textual coherence between her language and the language of the materials. In addition, Duff and Polio's study (1990) revealed that the language used in the materials was seen to have an effect on the teacher's language use.

In addition to pursuing textual coherence, Finnish was used to indicate that the teacher really meant what she was saying. In other words, the stance of the teacher was signaled with the language choice. In one such situation the teacher employed Finnish when controlling pupil behavior. To be specific, the teacher was having a conversation with pupils about why they are not allowed to wear hats during the lesson. In the beginning of the situation the teacher spoke English but then a switch to Finnish occurred.

Excerpt 61

Heti ku mä alan puhua suomeks ni mulla alkaa tulla semmosta totisempaa juttua sieltä, siis sillee niinku, et tossa vielä ku mä puhuin enkuks ni sillee mä niinku hymyilin ja se oli niinku semmosta niinku, et se ei ollu semmosta läksytystä. Et sitte niinku, heti ku mä niinku aloin, tai niinku vaihoin suomeks heti, ku se juttu meni oikeesti sillee totisemmaks, et tästä tulee nyt niinku ongelma, et nyt tästä pitää niinku oikeesti keskustella.

Once I start to speak Finnish the things I say are more serious, like, there when I was still speaking English I was smiling and it was like, it wasn't telling off. Once I started, or switched to Finnish, immediately when the thing got more serious, that this is going to be a problem, that we really need to discuss this.

The participant described how the conversation became serious as she started to speak Finnish. As her stance changed, similarly a code-switch from English to Finnish occurred. It can be said that the language choice indicated the participant's stance. By speaking Finnish the participant showed that she was being serious. The reason why teachers may decide to speak the L1 in such situations can also be due to the fact that speaking the L1 reduces the purposes of the verbal interaction. It can be claimed that speaking the target language relates always to language learning and teaching. The teacher is, if nothing else, providing input when speaking the target language. When this is stripped away, the focus is solely on the message being conveyed. Thus the teacher can indicate that the matter or the topic of discussion itself is of significance. In relation to this, Cook (2001b:415-416) states that if the teacher uses the L1 when reprimanding, the learners take the message seriously. This is said to be because in that case the teacher's speech cannot be interpreted as language practice.

Finnish was used to convey the teacher's stance also when praising. The participant stated that she had wanted to emphasize the praise by using Finnish. The class had just finished checking an exercise in English and the teacher complimented the pupils by saying "Good job." After this the teacher code-switched to Finnish and repeated the praise.

Excerpt 62

Ehkä sitte varmaan just että ku siinä oli niinku keutilanne tai jotain. Toi on ollu varmaan aika spontaani, mä luulen. Just sillee, et ku keutilanne, ni haluu oikeesti vielä sit suomeks oikein painottaa, et oikeesti hei, hyvin tehty.

Maybe because it was a praising situation or something. That was probably pretty spontaneous, I think. Like a praising situation so you want to really emphasize it in Finnish that hey, well done.

In this particular case Finnish was used in relation to positive classroom management, while in the previous example it was used in reprimanding. It seems that by choosing Finnish the participant wanted to show the pupils that she was being sincere, that she really meant what she said. In other words, the language choice conveyed the teacher's stance. Cook (2001b:414) believes that praising in the L1 makes the compliment feel real. This view is justified by saying that when speaking the L1 the teacher treats the learners as their real selves instead of as assumed foreign language personas.

Furthermore, Ferguson (2003:43) thinks that the L1 is suitable for building rapport, since it indicates a close and warm social relationship. As for previous studies, Littlewood and Yu (2009) and Bateman (2008) found that building rapport had a connection to the L1.

The participant quoted above did not explicitly bring up the function of repetition, instead she focused more on the information which speaking Finnish conveyed. However, praising first in English and then in Finnish certainly emphasized the message on its part. As was shown in section 3.4, Gumperz (1982:78) sees reiteration as one of the conversational functions of code-switching. According to him, the message delivered first in one language can be reiterated in the other language for the sake of emphasis. Before moving on it is worth noting that the language choice seems to have been an unconscious one. This can be seen from the participant's word choices: she used expressions such as "maybe" and "I think".

The third discourse-related motive was found in a situation where the teacher used code-switching from English to Finnish in order to indicate that one speech situation has ended and another one is about to begin. As Auer (1998:8) and Edmonson (2004:158-159) state, such changes can be indicated by switching the code. In the related classroom situation the class had finished checking an exercise and the pupils were talking about the absence of some of their peers in Finnish. The teacher joined the discussion by speaking Finnish, while the previous speech situation had been conducted in English. This informal conversation functioned as a sort of a transition between the previous and the upcoming speech situation. Below is the participant's explanation for the language choice.

Excerpt 63

Siksi koska tiesin lähestyvänä kielioppiasiaa, jonka tuun käymään suomeksi, nii sit se tuo jonku näköstä semmosta siirtymää sit siihen, että se ei yhtäkkiä vaihu niin kun että, että ei tulis niin selkeesti yhtäkkiä se vaihto.

Because I knew that I'm closing in on grammar instruction, which I would go through in Finnish, so it brings some kind of a transition into it, that it doesn't suddenly change, so the change wouldn't come so suddenly.

This speech situation which the participant named "transition" was conducted in Finnish on the basis that the teacher was soon about to initiate a new speech situation with Finnish as the medium of instruction. In addition, the participant wanted to make the switch between the languages subtle. This was achieved by using one and the same language both in the transition phase and in the upcoming speech situation. By code-switching the participant was marking the shift from one speech situation to another.



Similar tendencies have been noticed by other researchers as well. For instance, Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005), Lin (1990) and Hartikainen (2009) found that code-switching occurred when changes such as described above took place.

The fourth discourse-related motive for L1 use had to do with the nature of the speech situation. As was the case with motives for target language use, there were instances where the participants perceived a connection between the given language and the speech situation at hand. For instance, Finnish was used to communicate in a situation described as informal. In the classroom situation one of the pupils initiated the informal conversation as he expressed his concern regarding the presence of the video camera. The teacher engaged in the speech situation in Finnish. In the following is her explanation for the language choice.

Excerpt 64

Aloitin tuntia enkuksi niinku. Ja sitten kun tuli tää huolestuminen tästä kuvaamisesta, ni se oli sellanen epävirallinen kahdenkeskinen keskustelu siinä. Että se ei ollu ees niinku koko luokalle.

I was starting the lesson in English. Then came the worry about the filming, it was an informal conversation between us two. It wasn't even directed to the whole class.

It seems that code-switching to Finnish resulted from the informal nature of the situation and the fact that the participant was addressing an individual pupil. Yletyinen (2004) found that the teacher code-switched when engaging in informal conversation with one of the learners. However, in Yletyinen's study the teacher code-switched from Finnish to English, not from English to Finnish.

Speaking Finnish was also connected to a reprimanding situation. In the classroom situation the pupils were engaging in an exercise. One of the pupils was reading aloud a target language text for the rest of the class. Another pupil started badgering the pupil who was reading by asking her to repeat one of the target language phrases several times.

Excerpt 65

Ni sit jotenki must tuntuu et jotenkin siitä tuli, et mulle tuli vähä niinku semmonen ojentaminen. Just mä niinku näin ton semmosena, et ”selvästi oli *meals*”, niinku että oppilas A:lle semmosena ojennuksena, et ”haloo, et älä nyt niinku”. Et varmaan just että ojentaminen usein mulla kyllä tulee suomeksi. Se vaan tulee jotenkin niin automaattisesti aina suomeks.

I think that it became, that it was a reproof. I saw that as a, that “selvästi oli *meals*” [“clearly it was *meals*”], like I saw that as a reproof for pupil A, that “hello, come on now, don't”. Probably it's that I often do chastise in Finnish. It just somehow automatically comes out always in Finnish.

The participant saw a connection between this particular speech situation and speaking the L1. She even stated that she often uses Finnish when reprimanding the pupils. Reprimanding in the L1 is, in fact, promoted by Cook (2001b:415-416) because it is said to be effective for two reasons: the learners take the message seriously and comprehension is ensured. Furthermore, teachers seem to employ the L1 when controlling pupil behavior. This has been proven by Macaro (2001), Victor (2009) and Bateman (2008), for instance. Note how expressions such as “I think” and “probably” were used by the participant. This implies that the language choice was at least to some extent unconscious. When explaining the language choice afterwards the participant looked for an explanation in her usual practices.

#### **6.2.4 The influence of teacher trainers**

All the motives for Finnish use have thus far related to language choices which were made independently by the participants. The motives analyzed next differ from the previous ones in that Finnish was chosen in order to follow instructions. Two of the student teachers reported that they had chosen to provide grammar instruction in Finnish, simply because the teacher trainer had advised them to do so. In the following is an explanation as to why grammar was taught in Finnish.

Excerpt 66

Siksi, koska näin meille on ohjeistettu, opetetaan kielioppi suomeksi.

Because we have been instructed that grammar is taught in Finnish.

The participant did not provide any other reasons for choosing the L1 in the given situation. It is clear that the language choice was made in order to comply with the instructions received in teacher training. As the excerpt proves, the conduct promoted by the teacher trainers had an effect on the participant’s language choice. Similar cases of obeying policies have been found by Macaro (2001) and Duff and Polio (1990). However, the policies in those cases promoted target language use. In addition, Bateman (2008) found that the student teachers had trouble in employing the target language in the classroom because the teacher trainers (i.e. the original teachers of the classes in question) language use differed from that of the student teachers.

Five different groups of motives for using Finnish in the language classroom were found in the participants’ comments. First of all, one group of motives was teacher-related. Psycholinguistic factors and confusion were included in this category. Secondly, Finnish was employed for learner-related reasons. The first of them was ensuring understanding, while the second was gaining attention and thus saving time. In

addition, code-switching to Finnish was used in accommodation. The third category was formed by discourse-related motives. According to the participants' comments, Finnish was used in order to create coherence. Furthermore, Finnish was spoken in order to signal the teacher's stance towards what is said. Code-switching from English to Finnish, on the other hand, was used to mark the boundary between different speech situations. In addition, Finnish use was linked to certain speech situations. One such situation consisted of informal conversation, while another related to reprimanding. The fourth and last category related to teacher training and the instructions received from the teacher trainers. To be precise, Finnish was used when teaching grammar because this was the conduct promoted by the teacher trainers.

## 7 CONCLUSION

In this concluding chapter the findings of the present study are discussed and their implications considered. First of all, the uses appointed to Finnish, the L1, will be compared to those linked to English, the target language. Secondly, the language-specific uses mentioned by the participants during the semi-structured interviews will be compared to those that came up during the stimulated recall sessions. Thirdly, the findings of the present study will be compared to those of previous studies. After this I shall make some suggestions regarding the role of teacher trainers. Lastly, the strengths of the present study as well as its limits will be considered and suggestions for further research will be made.

I shall begin the discussion by considering the findings made on the basis of the semi-structured interviews. To be precise, the perceptions regarding each language are compared to one another. First of all, the participants felt that English should be the default language used in the classroom. The participants agreed on this, but their take on L1 use varied to some extent. Two of them were more open towards employing the L1 in the classroom, while one participant was more in favor of English only-teaching. The principle of using solely or mainly the target language was the only teacher-related reason found for speaking English. Similarly only one teacher-related use was attached to Finnish. It was said that the L1 can be resorted to when one has difficulties in expressing oneself in the target language. In summary, teacher-related English use was linked to personal principles, while Finnish use was attached to psycholinguistic factors.

Although only one teacher-related use was found for each language, the participants found several reasons for employing the two languages for the sake of the learner. English was viewed mostly from the point of view of language learning. The importance of target language input was emphasized. It was seen to contribute to language learning. For instance, it was said that if the teacher uses the target language and provides input, the pupils learn vocabulary and comprehension skills, familiarize themselves with the language, have the opportunity to use the target language and are encouraged to do so. Furthermore, authentic language use was seen as valuable. As one of the participants suggested, if English is used for real communication in the classroom (that is, apart from exercises proper), the pupils get the impression that the target language is a means of communication. In addition, target language use was seen beneficial in relation to the affective factors involved in learning. It was said that by using the target language the teacher can create feelings of success and relieve anxiety. English use was also attached to attending to the needs of the talented learners by providing them with challenges.

Learner-related uses of Finnish, on the other hand, were linked to ensuring comprehension and clearing misunderstandings. Furthermore, it was said that the teacher can enable pupil participation by speaking Finnish. The teacher can grant the pupils the permission and opportunity to speak in Finnish and thus enable their participation, regardless of the degree of their target language competence. To put it briefly, speaking English in the classroom was seen as one of the means of teaching the language to the pupils and as a way of making the pupils feel confident about themselves and their efforts to use the target language. Employing Finnish, on the other hand, was linked to pupil comprehension and the pupils' ability to participate in discussions.

English and Finnish were each linked to certain types of speech situations. This kind of language use was categorized as discourse-related. English use was connected to exercises proper, while Finnish use was attached to reprimanding and to addressing matters belonging outside the lesson. Unfortunately, the latter speech situation linked to Finnish was not clarified. It is possible that the participant was referring to classroom management or administration, or to informal communication.

Finnish use was also discussed in relation to teacher trainers. According to the participants, some of their teacher trainers had instructed them to use Finnish when teaching grammar. In addition to this, one participant mentioned that, apart from grammar teaching, English use had been advocated.

The participants considered also the disadvantages of using each language. The danger in English use was said to be that the input may be too difficult for the pupils to understand. In addition, speaking only English was seen as possibly discouraging pupil participation. According to one of the participants, if the teacher speaks only English, the pupils may get the impression that English is the only language they are allowed to use in the classroom. If the pupils feel that they are not able to express themselves in the target language, they may choose not to participate at all. As for Finnish, excessive L1 use was seen to deprive the pupils of opportunities to learn language use and to challenge themselves. In addition, language alternation was viewed in negative light. It was said to confuse the pupils and to diminish the communicative role of the target language.

Now I shall discuss what kind of motives the participants found for their language choices i.e. the findings made on the basis of the stimulated recall sessions. The teacher-related motives found for target language use included following one's personal principles. That is to say, English was used because there was no reason to speak the L1 and because English was seen as the default classroom language. Another teacher-related motive for speaking English was of a psycholinguistic kind. Code-switching from Finnish to English occurred as some expressions were more readily available in the target language rather than in the L1. This was an interesting case because one might think that it is the L1 that is more automatized. Sometimes English use manifested itself as unconscious continuity: the participant continued to speak the TL after code-switching from Finnish to English in order to provide a linguistic example. In other words, the participant sometimes forgot to switch back to the base language after code-switching to the other language. These two psycholinguistic motives were found also in relation to L1 use. In addition, a third psycholinguistic motive was found for speaking Finnish. The L1 was resorted to when the teacher faced difficulties in expressing oneself: when the teacher did not know the needed target language expression or was not able to express oneself fluently in the target language. L1 was used also when the teacher felt confused. As one can see, psycholinguistic motives were attached to both languages.

The learner-related motives for target language use included gaining attention by code-switching from Finnish to English. Secondly, English was used in order to encourage the pupils to speak the target language. Finnish, on the other hand, was used for the sake of pupil comprehension. In addition, code-switching from English to Finnish was found in situations where the teacher wanted the pupils to pay more

attention to the message being conveyed. It is worth noting that the attention catching characteristic of the language itself was emphasized. This differs from what was said above about gaining attention by code-switching from one language to another. The third learner-related motive for L1 use was accommodating: the teacher code-switched from English to Finnish and thus accommodated one's speech according to the language used by the pupil. In relation to English this kind of motive was not found. This was due to the fact that the pupils spoke mostly Finnish when communicating in the classroom. To conclude, there is one similarity in the learner-related motives for L1 and TL use: gaining attention (although in slightly different forms) was found in relation to both languages.

As for the discourse-related motives, similarities were found in the motives. Both languages were used in order to create and maintain coherence in the discourse. Secondly, English as well as Finnish were used for conveying the teacher's stance toward what is said. English conveyed a warm and positive stance when reprimanding/seeking attention verbally. Finnish, on the other hand, conveyed seriousness (when reprimanding) and sincerity (when praising). It is worth mentioning that in the latter case reiteration and code-switching from English to Finnish were also used as a means of emphasizing the message. In addition, one motive for speaking Finnish, or more precisely for code-switching from English to Finnish, was marking the boundary of two different speech situations. Finnish use was also linked to certain speech situations: the L1 was used when the situation involved reprimanding and when having an informal conversation.

Like in the case of the semi-structured interviews, the influence of teacher training was mentioned also during the stimulated recall sessions. The participants employed Finnish sometimes simply because the teacher trainers had instructed them to do so. English use, on the other hand, was not once attributed to instructions received in the teacher training.

As the roles of the two languages have now been compared, it is time to compare the language-specific findings made on the basis of the semi-structured interviews to those made on the basis of the stimulated recall sessions. First I shall discuss the uses of English as reported in the semi-structured and the stimulated recall interviews. After this a discussion on the uses of Finnish will be provided.

Regarding the teacher-related uses of English, the participants' personal principles were mentioned in both interviews. English use with psycholinguistic origins was brought up only in the stimulated recall sessions. This may be due to the unconscious

nature of such language use and the fact that it is born in the dynamic interactional situations in which the teacher finds her/himself in the classroom.

As for the learner-related use of the target language, one motive for employing English was mentioned in both interviews: by speaking English the teacher can encourage the pupils to employ the target language. Using English because it contributes to language learning and has positive effects regarding the affective factors involved in learning was mentioned only in the semi-structured interviews. The reason for this may be that such broad pedagogic goals were perhaps hidden in the participants' language choices which they made when teaching, but they did not recognize their choices as being influenced by these views. Instead they interpreted their choices on the basis of the immediate interactional circumstances. Gaining attention by code-switching to English was reported only in the stimulated recall session. This may be due to the fact that the function which the code-switching was to perform was not acknowledged consciously.

No clear similarities can be found in the discourse-related uses of English. In the semi-structured interview English was linked to certain kind of speech situation. Such a connection was not made in the stimulated recall sessions. Furthermore, neither coherence nor conveying the teacher's stance were linked to English use in the semi-structured interviews. Again the reason for this difference may lie in the fact that pursuing textual coherence and conveying one's stance may be unconscious, situation-dependent actions.

Finnish use was attached to psycholinguistic difficulties in expressing oneself during both the semi-structured interviews and the stimulated recall sessions. However, automaticity of Finnish use, unconscious continuity and confusion were mentioned only in the stimulated recall sessions. Of the learner-related uses of Finnish ensuring pupil comprehension was mentioned in both interviews. Enabling pupil participation, on the other hand, was referred to only in the semi-structured interviews, while gaining attention and accommodating were brought up only in the stimulated recall interviews.

As for the discourse-related uses, reprimanding was linked to speaking Finnish in both interviews. In the stimulated recall interviews informal conversation was also connected to speaking Finnish. Furthermore, pursuing coherence, conveying the teacher's stance and marking the boundary between speech situations by code-switching from English to Finnish were mentioned only in the stimulated recall sessions.

The explanation for the differences between the Finnish uses described in the semi-structured interviews and the motives found during the stimulated recall sessions

is the same as before. Some language choices were made unconsciously; in a sense they were born from the surrounding interactional circumstances. Because the participants could not foretell such language use, they did not mention those uses during the semi-structured interviews.

One last aspect of Finnish use is still to be addressed: the influence which teacher trainers have on language choice. This issue was brought up in both interviews. To be specific, a reference was made to teaching grammar in Finnish because the teacher trainers had instructed some of the student teachers to do so.

In conclusion it can be said that some similarities were found in the roles which Finnish and English were seen to have in the EFL classroom. However, most often the uses of the two languages differed from one another. Even though the participants advocated speaking solely or mainly English in the classroom, there seemed to be a need to employ both the L1 and the target language. Furthermore, differences were found between the uses appointed to each language in the semi-structured interviews and those attached to each language in the stimulated recall sessions. The reason for these differences may lie in the unconscious nature of some of the language choices. Some language choices are made without knowing and are reactions to the prevailing situation. Therefore they cannot be predicted. Furthermore, in the semi-structured interviews the participants concentrated mostly on language choices which serve a pedagogic purpose of some kind. However, the language choices which they made in the classroom did not always have such a purpose. These differences indicate also that stimulated recall interview was an effective technique for eliciting information. It complemented the semi-structured interview and elicited perhaps more detailed accounts than mere interviewing or questionnaires would have produced.

As was shown in the analysis, many of the findings regarding the uses of the L1 and the target language were in line with the trends found by other researchers. However, the participants described also such language use which has been rarely or not at all identified in previous studies. First of all, the teacher's target language use was seen to have a positive effect regarding the affective aspects involved in learning and to provide challenges to the language learners. Secondly, L1 use was seen to enable pupil participation. Furthermore, teachers' views on the disadvantages of L1 and TL use were not addressed in the previous studies to which I have referred. The influence which different official policies have on the teacher's language choice has been noted in previous studies. What is interesting is that those policies were said to promote TL use, while in the case of the present study the policy of teacher trainers concerned mostly L1



use. As for the motives found in the stimulated recall interviews, pursuing coherence and conveying the speaker's stance through language choice were issues which have not often been reported on. Lastly, L1 use has seldom been attributed to psycholinguistic issues, such as automaticity and unconscious continuity. As one can see, the present study offers new information on the teacher's language choice.

The last point I want to make on the basis of the findings relates to teacher training. As was revealed in the beginning of the analysis (section 5.1), teacher trainers seem to give differing advice regarding language choice in EFL teaching. Some give language-specific instructions, while others advocate consistency in language use. Some do not even mention this issue to their trainees. The participants asked for autonomy in making language choices, consciousness-raising and discussing language choice in the lectures which student teachers of languages attend. Teacher trainers could also find a shared principle which they would then promote to student teachers. Or, if teacher trainers are to continue to give varying instructions, they could emphasize that the advice they give reflect their personal views and that the student teacher is allowed to have his/her own opinion and, more importantly, is free to make decisions accordingly. Perhaps the most beneficial approach to guiding student teachers in making language choices would be to ask them to reflect on their language use and to consider the issue of language choice when making lessons plans. In addition, showing student teachers recordings of their own teaching would be worth considering. As one of the participants stated: "Tosi mielenkiintosta kyllä nähä toi, et miten just omat mielikuvat siitä on sit eri ku mitä todellisuus oli." This translates as "It's really interesting to see that, how your own impressions of it differ from how it was in reality." Observing one's teaching on video could be an effective tool when reflecting on one's language choices, or any aspect of teaching, for that matter.

In the Finnish context the present study offers new kind of information on the teacher's language choice. As was mentioned in the introduction, the majority of studies conducted in Finland on this topic have concerned code-switching of in-service teachers. Furthermore, the data has mostly consisted of recorded classroom interaction. In this respect the present study has brought forth new insights regarding language choice in foreign language teaching. Choosing to employ interviewing as the method for data collection produced results which could have been left undiscovered if the researcher had analyzed solely recorded classroom interaction. Furthermore, having student teachers as participants enabled studying language choice from the point of view of teacher training. Viewing the present study against the research conducted both in

Finland and abroad, it can be said that new kinds of uses of the L1 and the target language were located.

Like all studies, the present study is not without limitations. As Borg (2010:209-211) mentions, stimulated recall interview has been questioned for the validity of the data which it produces. The main concern is said to be that the participants may not be able to describe their interactive decision making. They may fabricate explanations at the time of the interview instead of recollecting the thought processes they underwent in the classroom. In the present study the focus was on the participants' interpretations. The main purpose was not to gain precise information on the actual mental processes which the participants engaged in the classroom. Instead the aim was to explore the student teachers' views regarding the language choice. The participants brought forth their own interpretations of classroom situations and their language choices, which is an account adequate enough for the purposes of the present study. The purpose of showing the videos to the participants in the stimulated recall sessions was first and foremost facilitating the discussion around the uses of the two languages. Another limitation is that the researcher did not have previous experience of interviewing. More information on certain issues could have been elicited if additional clarifying questions had been asked at the right moment. Thirdly, because the study was qualitative by nature, only a limited number of participants could be included. It follows that the results cannot be generalized. However, because of the small number of participants, it was possible to make in-depth analyses.

Considering future research, the findings of the present study could be compared to the uses of the L1 and the TL reported by Finnish teachers of other languages. It would be interesting to see whether there are any differences in the language use of teachers who teach languages which have smaller roles in Finnish people's everyday lives than English, the *Lingua Franca* of today has.

## 8 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allwright, D. and K. Bailey (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: an introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, P. (1992). Introduction: John Gumperz' approach to contextualization. In P. Auer and A. di Luzio (eds.), *The contextualization of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing company, 1-37.
- Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 115-135.
- Auer, P. (1998). Bilingual conversation revisited. In P. Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge, 1-24.
- Baker, C. and S. Prys Jones (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bateman, B. E. (2008). Student teachers' attitudes and beliefs about using the target language in the classroom. *Foreign Language Annals* 41(1), 11-28.
- Bell, R.T. (1981). *Introduction to Applied Linguistics: approaches and methods in language teaching*. London: Batsford Academic.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Prentice Hall Regents, New Jersey.
- Brown, H.D. (2007). *Teaching by principles. An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: Pearson Education.
- Borg, S. (2006.) *Teacher cognition and language education*. Norfolk: Biddles Ltd.
- Butzkamm, W. and J.A.W. Caldwell (2009). *The bilingual reform. A paradigm shift in foreign language teaching*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto Verlag
- Candlin, C.N. (1981). *The communicative teaching of English: principles and an exercise typology*. Harlow: Longman.
- Celce-Murcia, M. and C.H. Prator (1979). An outline of language teaching approaches. In M. Celce-Murcia and L. McIntosh (eds.), *Teaching English as a second or a foreign language*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, 3-5.
- Chambers, F. (1991). Promoting use of the target language in the classroom. *Language Learning Journal* 4, 27-31.
- Cook, V. (2001a). *Second language learning and language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, V. (2001b). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 57(3), 402-423.
- Crichton, H. (2009). 'Value added' modern languages teaching in the classroom: an investigation into how teachers' use of classroom language can aid pupils' communication skills. *The language learning journal* 31(1), 19-34.
- de la Campa, J.C. and H. Nassaji (2009). The amount, purpose, and reasons for using L1 in L2 classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals* 42(4), 742-759.
- Dey, I. (2007). Grounded theory. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J.B. Gubrium and D. Silverman (eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage, 80-93.
- Duff, P. and C.G. Polio (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *Modern Language Journal* 74, 154-166.
- Edmonson, W. (2004). Code-switching and world-switching in foreign language classroom discourse. In J. House and J. Rehbain (eds.), *Multilingual communication*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 155-178.

- Ericsson, E. (1989). *Undervisa i språk: språkdidaktik och språkmetodik*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Fontana, A. and J.H. Frey (2010). The interview: from structured questions to negotiated text. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 645-672.
- Giles, H. and N. Coupland (1991). *Language: contexts and consequences*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Greggio, S. and G. Gil (2007). Teacher's and learners' use of code switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: a qualitative study. *Linguagem & Ensino* 10(2), 371-393.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: life and reality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gumperz, J. and E. Hernández-Chavez (1972). Bilingualism, bidialectism, and classroom interaction. In C.B. Cazden, V.P. John and D. Hymes (eds.) *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 84-108.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1992). Contextualization revisited. In P. Auer and A. di Luzio (eds.), *The contextualization of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing company, 39-52.
- Freeman, D.E. and Y.S. Freeman (1998). *ESL/EFL teaching: principles for success*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. Essex: Longman.
- Hartikainen, L.-M. (2009). *Pedagogical and social functions of code-switching in EFL classrooms*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis, University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.
- Krashen, S.D. (1986). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Longman.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lin, A.M.Y. (1990). *Teaching in two languages: Language alternation in foreign language classrooms*. Research Report No 3. Hong Kong City Polytechnic, Department of English.
- Littlewood, W. and B. Yu (2009). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching* 44(1), 64-77.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal* 85(4), 531-548.
- Marton, W. (1988). *Methods in English language teaching. Frameworks and options*. New York: Prentice Hall
- Meiring, L. and N. Norman (2002). Back on target: Repositioning the status of target language in MFL teaching and learning. *Language Learning Journal* 26, 27-35.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices. An introduction to bilingualism*. Blackwell Publishing: Oxford.
- Myyryläinen, K. and M. Pietikäinen (1988). *Teacher input and the use of the mother tongue in the foreign language classroom*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.
- Nikula, T. (2005). English as an object and tool of study in classrooms: interactional effects and pragmatic implications. *Linguistics and Education* 16(1), 27-58.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Understanding language classrooms. A guide for teacher-initiated action*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Reini, J. (2008). *Functions of teachers' language choice and code-switching in EFL classroom discourse*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.

- Richards J.C. and T.S. Rodgers (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rolin-Ianziti, J. and S. Brownlie (2002). Teacher use of learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 58(3), 402-426.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Strauss, A. and J. Corbin (1998). *Basics of qualitative research. Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Thompson, G. L. (2006). Teacher and student first language and target language use in the foreign language classroom: A qualitative and quantitative study of language choice. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*.
- Üstünel, E. and P. Seedhouse (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15(3), 302-325
- Valanides, N. (2010). Analysis of interview data using the constant comparative analysis method. In S. Rodrigues (ed.), *Using analytical frameworks for classroom research. Collecting data and analysing narrative*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Victor, E. (2009). Teachers' and students' perceptions of the use of the target or native language in the French foreign language classroom. *Masters Abstracts International*.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Wei, L. (1998). The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In P. Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge, 156-176.
- Wilkerson, C. (2008). Instructors' use of English in the modern language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals* 41(2), 310-320.
- Yletyinen, H. (2004). *Functions of codeswitching in EFL classroom discourse*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.

**9 APPENDIX**

## Puolistrukturoidun haastattelun runko

1. Mikä on ihanteellinen määrä kohdekieltä vieraan kielen tunnilla opettajan puheessa? Entä äidinkieltä?
2. Onko mielestäsi kohdekielen käytöstä hyötyä? Entä onko äidinkielen käytöstä?
3. Onko kohdekielen käytöstä haittaa? Entä onko äidinkielen käytöstä?
4. Onko olemassa tilanteita, joissa kohdekielen käyttö olisi erityisen suotavaa? Entä sellaisia, joissa äidinkielen käyttö olisi erityisen suotavaa?
5. Millainen on onnistunut kielivalinta? Entä epäonnistunut?
6. Onko opetusharjoittelussa annettu neuvoja kielenvalintaan? Jos kyllä, millaisia?
7. Suunnitteletko kielivalintojasi etukäteen? Jos kyllä, millä perusteella teet valinnat?

## Stimulated recall -haastattelun kysymykset

1. Miksi valitsit tässä tilanteessa kyseisen kielen?
2. Kuinka onnistuneeksi koet kyseisen kielivalinnan?