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ABSTRACT

The debate surrounding the use of the first language in the English classroom continues to be a contentious issue. Recent research has noted that the first language does have a part to play in the acquisition process of the second language. In relation to an adult intermediate South Korean EFL context, this study explores how students within this context use their first language as a learning tool, to help them produce the second language, during collaboration on oral pair-work tasks. To observe and analyse first language use in these circumstances the study employs a socio-cultural framework. The outcomes of this study indicate that the first language gives rise to several different cognitive processes during the interaction, which catalyse acquisition of the second language. However, in conclusion it is posited that without proper guidance from the teacher students may have a tendency to overuse their first language tool at the expense of challenging themselves to produce the second language. In this respect, suggestions are made into how teachers can guide their students to be less reliant on their first language tool as they collaborate on oral pair-work tasks.
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INTRODUCTION

Current practices in pedagogical methodology in most Eastern EFL contexts have been derived from Western ideals (Holliday 1994:13). These ideals promote that the first language (L1) in the English language classroom should be minimised, in order to give students maximum exposure to the second language (L2). Contemporary research has questioned this minimisation, as it is acknowledged that learners rely on the use of their first language within the acquisition process (Ellis 1997:51). This is due to an interaction which exists, on an individual level, between the first language, cognitive processes and the presented target language during the acquisition of the second language (Lightbown and Spada 2006:93-96).

On the social level, interaction is also of vital importance in second language acquisition (Guerrero and Villamil 1994:484), as it "is the sine qua non of classroom pedagogy" (Allwright 1984:159). When learners collaborate on oral pair-work tasks this interaction occurs within a socio-cultural setting, which blends speaking with cognition (Swain 2000:97); thus language use and language learning are in symbiosis.

In the L2 classroom, learners who share the same L1 have a tendency to use their L1 during social interaction with each other. In my years of teaching monolingual university students in South Korea I have noticed that during oral pair-work tasks, my students rely on it to help them complete the tasks. In observing this in my classroom I have questioned if use of L1 should be viewed negatively in light of what actually occurs in my practice.

Accordingly, this dissertation aims to unravel and discover the role that students' L1 plays in the language learning process. I aim to research what L1 use enables students to do as they collaborate on oral tasks.

To research this issue I analyse the cognitive processes which occur during pair-work on oral collaborative tasks and how students utilise L1 within these cognitive processes. I
also research how students feel about the use of L1 during collaborative oral tasks.

To gather data which generate insights into my research, student dyads were recorded and filmed during their interaction on two collaborative tasks. A follow up open-ended questionnaire was also used. The discoveries of the data analysis are described and discussed.

The dissertation will take the following structure:

Chapter one begins by discussing the genesis of 'the English only' approach. This is then looked at more specifically within the context of the current English education in Korea with regard to my history with 'the English only’ approach. Additionally, the case for and against 'the English only' approach in a monolingual TESOL context will be presented. The chapter closes with a presentation of the research questions which I endeavour to answer in this dissertation.

Chapter two aims to contextualise the research by exploring specific aspects of L1 use which have been studied and more specifically studies which have been undertaken on researching L1 use in collaborative tasks. In addition, the socio-cultural setting in which this collaboration occurs is presented and explored in greater depth.

Chapter three describes the methodological approach adopted in this research. It presents the planning and the implementation undertaken and the rationale for choices made during the project.

Chapter four presents the results of the analysis of the data. It presents the cognitive processes which have been observed and it gives examples of how students utilised their L1 within these cognitive processes. The participants personal feelings about the use of L1 during collaborative oral tasks are also discussed.

Chapter five returns to the research questions that were presented in chapter one. An exploration and discussion will ensue of what insights have been gleaned into the
questions from the analysis of this research.

Chapter six explores the pedagogical implications that this project denotes, as well as the strengths and limitations of the research. Suggestions will also be made for future research in this area.
CHAPTER 1

L1 USE IN EFL EDUCATION

In this chapter I present the genesis of 'the English only' approach. I then discuss the current context in which I teach, by a brief introduction into the history of English education in Korea and my history, of L1 use, as a teacher. Furthermore, I present the case for and against 'the English only' approach in a monolingual EFL context. The chapter closes with a presentation of the research questions which I explore in this dissertation.

1.1. The genesis of 'the English only' approach

Maximum exposure to the second language (L2) has previously been referred to as the ideal in EFL education. L1 use has been considered a taboo in the past as it is contrary to 'the English only' approach which some have viewed as 'the ideological L2 methodology'; as L1 use appears to have "detrimental effects on L2 acquisition" (Belz 2003:213). To see why this is so, we turn to look at what gave rise to this 'ideological L2 methodology'.

Auerbach (1993) provides a succinct account of the roots of 'the English only' approach, which stem from political as opposed to pedagogical influences (ibid:12). In the U.S. following World War 1 an influx of immigrants into the labour market was blamed for the economic downturn (ibid). To counter this xenophobia the Americanisation movement was promoted by various companies as they encouraged employees to attend Americanisation classes (ibid). In the early twentieth century this led to the growth of ESL instruction which used direct methods of instruction and accordingly relied on 'the English only' approach (ibid:13).

Phillipson (1992a cited in Auerbach 1993: 13-14) traces the roots of the approach to British neocolonial policies, which were again politically motivated. This culminated in
a conference which was held in 1961 at Makere University in Uganda. The aim of this conference was to establish standard principles for ELT methodology that could also be adopted by developing countries. Three of the principles established, which are pertinent to this research, were that English is taught best monolingually, the more English taught the better the results and the third: if other languages are used too much English standards will drop (ibid:14).

These imperialistic principles came to be accepted as the norm and subsequently, dominated EFL methodology. However, over the years as English has developed as a world language it has struggled against these principles (Brutt-Griffler 2002.ix). Thus, in this day and age of World Englishes whereby ownership is no longer in the hands of the mother tongue native speakers (Llurda 2004), does the methodology that we use in the classroom still need to be rooted in what appears to be dated ideological principles? To explore this issue further we need to look at it in light of the context in which I currently teach.

1.2. English education in South Korea

I currently teach adults at university level in South Korea. I have been in this position for five years. This study concerns students of intermediate level. They are in their early twenties.

Prior to entering university, since the age of nine, the elementary school system in Korea has provided students with one hour of English learning each week. Each class had two teachers: one L1, non native English speaker (NNS) and the other L2, native English speaker (NS).

In middle school, students were taught for three to four hours per week with a NNS and for one hour with a NS. This continued into their high school, however in high school students were not exposed to NS contact. This is because the focus in high school was on passing the Sung neong (university entrance exam). Because of this the focus in high
school was on the grammar translation approach.

In addition to what was provided by the Korean Department of Education, over the last twenty years in Korea, *hagwon* education has been popular. *Hagwon* education refers to private academy education which is viewed as supplying needs that are not met by the public school system. Only some students have been educated in these academies because of the financial implications involved.

Upon entering university, in the first term students have to take a mandatory *Freshman English* course. They are taught on this course with a NS for three hours a week. Following, this the students have a variety of elective courses in which they can choose to enrol in. One of the elective courses which I teach is *Living Beginning English 2*. I teach three classes of this same course. This is an intermediate level course and the main focus is on speaking. The classes have a mixture of different year students.

From the above, it is evident that in the past students have been learning in a monolingual context whereby they share the same L1. Because of this its use has been very prevalent in their acquisition of the L2.

1.3. *My history with 'the English only' approach*

I have been teaching in Korea for nine years. In my first few years of teaching here I taught in *hagwon* education. During this time I taught young learners and I insisted that they spoke English at all times in the class, mainly because this is what my employer required.

While studying for my CELTA certificate about five years ago, in the British Council in Korea; in my training it was implied that the most effective way to teach English was to follow the imperialistic principles previously mentioned. Yet, this did very little to prepare me for dealing with the reality of students' use of the L1 in the English language classroom.
For example, after I started teaching university students. I began to notice that students relied on their L1 constantly during pair-work tasks. Whenever, I noticed this I would always remind the students to revert to the L2. Furthermore, at the beginning of each term I would ensure that the students were aware that the L2 should be used at all times in the class. In addition, I also worked at some vacation camps. Young learners and adults were enrolled in these camps. The 'golden rule' of these camps was that the L1 should not be used whatsoever for the duration of the camps. There was even a penalty system used whereby the students would be penalised if they spoke the L1. Even though the students continued to use the L1 when told not to, I started to question what they used their L1 for while acquiring the L2.

Almost two years ago I took the opportunity as part of my Psychology of Education paper for my MA degree to enquire into why students use L1 in the L2 classroom (see Williams 2009). The primary focus in this study was on how students used L1 during pair-work tasks. This study gave me some interesting insights and I now wish to investigate this matter further in this research.

1.4. The case for and against 'the English only' approach

Amongst the teaching profession the use of L1 in the classroom is a very controversial and moot issue. Opinions amongst the teachers at my University are varied, however, the majority believe that L2 should be used in the classroom and that L1 use should be minimised. All thirty three of them are NS teachers (apart from one); and like me, they do not share the same L1 as the students they teach. Additionally, they have received training in similar circumstances to myself.

Furthermore, most second language theorists also believe that the L1 should be minimised. In Krashen's comprehensible theory of second language acquisition, he claims that there will be no acquisition unless the acquirer understands the conveyed message (1982:63). His theory claims that a learner of a foreign language should learn the language in the same way that a child learns her mother tongue; thus L1 use in the
L2 acquisition process should be minimised. Moreover, Duff and Polio (1990) believe that in the FL classroom students should be exposed to a high quantity of L2 input because this is not available for them outside the classroom (see also Turnbull 2001). In addition, Polio (1994) believes that teachers tend to rely upon the L1 in the classroom because they fail to make input comprehensible.

Nevertheless, the case against 'the English only' approach has also been questioned in recent years and some researchers have also started to question the term 'native speaker' (see Phillipson, 1992b; Holliday, 2006). Cook (2001) indicates that L1 is a useful resource, both for teachers to use to explain grammar points and also to organise the class and for students to use as a strategic learning tool and also in collaborative interaction (ibid:402). Even though I do not share the same L1 as my students, I do use their L1 to organise my class via a webpage that I have created which accompanies the class (see http://living-beginning-english-2.wikispaces.com/Assignment+Rules).

Moreover, Auerbach (1994) asserts that:

minimizing L1 use in EFL settings is a reasonable goal but that excluding it on principle is not. In any situation, ESL or EFL, teachers need to make conscious choices based on critical inquiry and reflection, rather than taking for granted that "one size fits all".

(ibid:158)

Cook (1999) seconds Auerbach's view by stating that L2 learners should be viewed as "multicompetent language users" (ibid:185) and as "speakers in their own right" (ibid). As Cook further augments, if L2 learners are viewed as multicompetent, then their minds differ considerably from the mind of monolingual native speakers (ibid:191). Furthermore, Atkinson (1987) notes that allowing L1 use in the acquisition process can assist the acquirer to understand a conveyed message. Yet at the same time he notes that L1 should be used judiciously in the classroom (see also Harbord, 1992; Swain and Lapkin, 2000a; Tang, 2002; Edstrom, 2006 and Meyer, 2008).

Accordingly, the question is: when can L1 use be justified? The simple answer to this is when it is needed. However, who should decide this issue? In my observation of pair-
work tasks students have been making this decision autonomously, as and when they need it, to help them with the task. Nevertheless, I wish to research in this study: what exactly do they need it for at certain points in tasks?

1.5. Research questions

Antón and Dicamilla (1999) espouse the use of L1 in the FL classroom "since it acts as a critical psychological tool" (ibid:245) in the process of the acquisition. This is especially so in the case of the collaborative dialogue which ensues as learners interact on oral tasks (ibid). I gleaned some insights into this when I conducted the small scale study for my Psychology of Education paper previously mentioned. However, I want to take the opportunity to conduct additional research in this project to further explore the issues and the pedagogical implications involved.

Accordingly, my research questions will be:

1. Does use of Korean, enable adult intermediate Korean English language learners to produce the English language in collaborative oral tasks?

2. What cognitive processes are triggered by the use of L1 in collaborative oral tasks?

3. How do the learners feel about L1 use during collaborative oral tasks in the English language classroom?

In this chapter it is clear that L1 use is prevalent during L2 acquisition by South Korean students. We have also seen the ideological and political roots of 'the English only approach' and that even in present day the debate surrounding L1 use in the classroom is a contentious issue. I have also closed this chapter by showing the questions I research in this project, which in part have been prompted by a previous study which I conducted. The next chapter will discuss the relevant literature in this area to contextualise my research.
CHAPTER 2

THE LITERATURE ON L1 USE

In this chapter I contextualise my research by showing how my thought process developed as I interacted with the literature in my research area. I begin by presenting a brief overview of different aspects of L1 use in EFL settings that have been researched. I then introduce the theoretical framework which underlines the way in which my research will be conducted and analysed. I conclude by looking specifically at studies which have been undertaken into L1 use in collaborative tasks which explore the psychological components that are prevalent in the theoretical framework.

2.1. A brief overview

Thus far we have seen that the use of L1 in the L2 classroom has been debated and continues to be debated amongst the profession. Because of this much of the methodological literature prior to Atkinson (1987) gave little attention to its use as a potential resource in the EFL classroom (ibid). A seminal study which debated 'the English only' approach in the classroom is Auerbach (1993), which provides socio-political grounds for allowing L1 use in the classroom. Auerbach's paper is seminal as it provoked a fresh impetus into the debate surrounding L1 use (see Polio, 1994; Auerbach, 1994; Cook, 1999; Cook, 2001; Turnbull, 2001) and led researchers to conduct in depth examinations of how teachers use it as part of their methodology.

Tang (2002) finds that teachers use L1 as a comprehension aid as it is "more effective" (ibid:40) and "less time-consuming" (ibid; see also Atkinson, 1987; Turnbull, 2001; Ševick, 2007) than relying only on the L2. Schweers (1999) recorded four colleagues' classes in a monolingual EFL Spanish context to see how and why the teachers used the
L1 in their classes. All four believe that L1 use has a role to play in the classroom, but they range in how they use it. One allows only student use to answer questions in Spanish; whereas the most experienced teacher uses L1 regularly during instruction. Additionally, in a university level Spanish course, Edstrom (2006) uses herself as the subject of her study to self-evaluate her use of L1 in her classroom. She identifies a motivation for using L1 stemming from a sense of "moral obligation" (ibid: 286) she has to her students to "create a pleasant atmosphere" (ibid: 287). Yet, in the same breath one of her other motivations for using it is due to her laziness, which she identifies as an easy trap to fall into. To overcome this trap, she states that careful lesson planning is needed and that is why she advocates that L1 use should be judicious.

Liu et al (2004) recorded and surveyed thirteen NNS high school teachers to see the challenges they faced in classroom code-switching practices, following the insistence of the Korean Ministry of Education in 2000 that L2 use in South Korean schools be maximised in the English language classroom. Code-switching refers to the "the alternation between two (or more) languages" (Eldridge 1996:303). Liu et al (2004) establish a lack of confidence (see also Dash 2002) in the teachers' oral proficiency is one reason for their low use (32%) of L2 in the classroom and because of this they often rely on their L1 when its need is not justified. This gives an indication to the type of L2 exposure (or lack of) my students have been subjected to, prior to entering university, which perhaps has negatively influenced the overuse of their L1. For example, Tarone and Swain's (1995) research into L2 use in immersion classrooms in the U.S. and Canada ascertains that their students have a tendency to use L1 in task related dyadic social interactions because they lack the necessary L2 vernacular for these types of interactions. This issue is further explored in chapters five and six.

Code-switching practices have been further explored in other research. In a study of Japanese university EFL students, Fotos (2001) identifies students using them as a strategy:

\[\text{to enhance important L2 input and to focus on and correct their own L2 output during group performance of interactive tasks.} \]

(ibid:348)
Similarly, Hancock (1997) conducted recordings of learner dyads aged from fourteen to seventeen, who were on a summer program at a private English language school in Madrid, and identifies that L1 has a purpose as a communication strategy in collaborative interactions; for as Moore (2002) states it is part of "a total communicative resource" (ibid:290).

Additionally, Eldridge (1996) identifies code-switching as "a highly purposeful activity" (ibid:303; see also Meyer 2008). Eldridge recorded and observed Turkish secondary school learners aged eleven to thirteen, who were at a lower intermediate level. After data analysis he discovered that 77% of code-switching related to classroom tasks; thus showing that as a strategy it has a pedagogical function. Yet, he further maintains that overuse can negatively affect the long term acquisition process (see also Carless 2002 and 2008). Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2005) posit that fear of overuse can be overcome provided that both teachers and students acknowledge that the main goal in permitting code-switching as a learning strategy is L2 use. To ensure this understanding, students (see Levine 2003) and teachers (see Macaro 2001) need to be trained in how code-switching can be used as a resource.

In the research literature, in addition to students and teachers being observed, they have also been surveyed and interviewed to identify their beliefs and attitudes about L1 use. In a study of a Japanese context, Critchley (1999) identifies that 91% of the students surveyed want to have a form of bilingual facilitation in the L2 classroom. In Liu et al (2004) Korean high school students, as well as their teachers, believe that L2 should be used 50 - 60% of the time. Correspondingly, in Tang (2002) at a Beijing University, 70% of students and 72% of teachers surveyed believe that their L1 should be used in the classroom. The students believe it should be sometimes used as it helps them understand difficult concepts and new vocabulary items. Similarly in Șevick (2007), 69% of the students believe that their L1 (Turkish) should be used in their language class. Yet, the findings of the study show its use needs to be "logical and limited" (ibid:101), with 91.8% of the students believing it should be used to explain complex grammar. Students' beliefs illustrate that as a pedagogical function L1 use is needed, but
the question as to when this need should be met is still a contentious issue (see Chavez 2003).

From the overview of L1 use it is clear that recent research has focused upon: how teachers make use of it in their methodology, how students use L1 within the classroom, and the beliefs of both students and teachers about how L1 should be used.

On the whole, L1 use has been viewed positively by both teachers and students in recent research. Yet, at the same time they acknowledge that it is a tool that assists them to acquire the L2 and that there are factors to consider in implementing its use (see Manara 2007).

Cook (2001) maintains that permitting L1 use allows students to learn with a dual language system rather than trying to be "imitation natives" (ibid:419). Yet, he notes that L1 needs to be used judiciously and one of the suggestions he gives for its use is to perform oral pair-work tasks with peers (ibid:418). The framework in which this can be achieved is what we now turn to examine.

2.2. A Vygotskian perspective

Vygotsky, a psychologist who studied child development in the Soviet Union in the 1920s and 30s observed the social interaction of children in order to theorise how language contributes to the development of human consciousness. He posited that language develops through social practices, as it is a mediated interaction which:

> cannot be separated from the milieu in which it is carried out.
> (Wertsch 1991:18)

From his research, Vygotsky developed several theories which have stood the test of time and can be applied to different pedagogical environments (Fredericks 1974: 290). One of his theories which I use in my study is his socio-cultural theory.
2.2.1. The socio-cultural theory

The socio-cultural theory (SCT) states that our cognitive development processes are products of the society, or culture in which we interact (Lantolf and Thorne 2007). Thus, in order to understand human cognition we need to analyse the social structures from which it derives (Wertsch 1980:161).

Unlike the socio-cognitive approach which focuses:

- on individual development in the context of social interaction, the socio-cultural approach focuses on the causal relationship between social interaction and individual cognitive change.

(Dillenbourg et al 1996:5)

This facet of SCT allows a deeper insight into the collaborative nature of the interaction because the theory argues that cognitive development is a mediated process (Lantolf 2000:1), as it is a product of societal and cultural interactions.

In recent years, there have been several studies undertaken into collaborative interaction from a socio-cultural perspective (see McCafferty, 1992; Brooks and Donato, 1994; Donato, 1994; Guerrero and Villamil, 1994 and 2000; Villamil and Guerrero, 1996; Brooks et al, 1997; Swain and Lapkin, 1998 and 2000a; Antón and Dicamilla, 1999; Buckwalter, 2001; Gánem Gutiérrez, 2007). These studies provide evidence that both communication and cognition are products of social interactions. For as Swain and Lapkin (1998) state:

> language use is both communication and cognitive activity. Language is simultaneously a means of communication and a tool for thinking. Dialogue provides both the occasion for language learning and the evidence for it. Language is both process and product.

(ibid: 320)

This is because one of the central tenets of SCT is that thought and speech are intertwined (Fredericks 1974:283; Lighbown and Spada, 2006:47). It is also evidenced that L1 has a function to play in SCT because it facilitates cognitive and social functions in the interaction of L2 learners (Antón and Dicamilla 1999:240). This is the reason
why I decided to use SCT as a framework in my study as it enables me to observe the cognitive and social processes L1 plays in the collaborative learning dynamic. We now turn to examine the intricacies which the theory involves.

2.2.2. The zone of proximal development

According to Vygotsky's SCT a child's development through social interaction occurs within a zone of proximal development (ZPD). Vygotsky (1978) defines the ZPD as:

the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers.

(ibid:86; emphasis in original)

This concept is not only applicable to a child's acquisition, but also has relevance to all aspects of pedagogy, as throughout our lives we are all social beings as our learning path is continuous (Frawley and Lantolf 1985:40). Accordingly, the ZPD is also of relevance to second language acquisition and in this respect Ohta (2005) defines it as:

the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by individual linguistic production, and the level of potential development as determined through language produced collaboratively with a teacher or peer.

(ibid:506)

Thus, social interaction allows development to materialise within a learner's ZPD. L2 learners collaborating on a task can mutually assist each other within their ZPD. In this regard one could argue that they help each other develop with both their L1 and their L2. The processes by which they do this is what we now turn to examine.

2.2.3. Outer and inner development

Vygotsky (1978:57) states that each function in a child's development appears on two psychological planes. First it appears between people on the social level, which he terms the interpsychological plane; and then it appears inside the child on the individual level, which he refers to as the intrapsychological plane (ibid).
This development occurs within the ZPD and it is the result of mediation (Frawley and Lantolf 1985:21). Vygotsky argued that in the process of mediation we use signs, or symbolic tools to influence the interaction (Lantolf 2000:1). Thus, within SCT, language is viewed as "the primary mediating tool" (Belz 2002:75).

Language has two functions within this process: it is viewed as social speech and private speech. When children develop, social speech becomes private speech, as they use this speech to control their own development (Dicamilla and Antón 2004:37). Children speak aloud at first and then internally, thus private speech becomes inner speech. Vygotsky (1962) defines inner speech as "thought connected with words" (ibid:149). In other words, it is how we think internally. In SCT analysing private speech is imperative to understand how our cognition operates (Dicamilla and Antón 2004:38). When adults are faced with demanding tasks inner speech materialises as private speech (Antón and Dicamilla, 1999:243; McCafferty, 1992:179), thus allowing an insight into the cognitive processes present in a socio-cultural framework.

By explaining Vygotsky's SCT which I utilise in this study, to conduct and analyse my research, I have attempted to provide a clear framework which enables me to observe L1 use as my students collaborate on oral tasks. We now turn to explore specific studies which have been conducted into L1 use by use of the same theory. I use them to highlight that within such a framework L1 is a mediating tool which facilitates the development of L2.

2.3. Research from a Vygotskian perspective into L1 use

Antón and Dicamilla (1999) adopt a Vygotskian framework to explore L1 use within the collaborative interaction of adult beginner learners of Spanish, while they engage in a writing task. In their research they find that on the interpsychological plane, L1 allows students to create intersubjectivity (i.e. create a shared understanding of the task) and to scaffold (i.e. help each other produce the L2) each other. Additionally, on the intrapsychological plane, they observe that through collaborative dialogue learners
externalise their inner speech as private speech. They posit that a Vygotskian framework is appropriate to research collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom as:

> it is based on the premise that higher cognitive development originates in social interaction. (ibid:245)

They further stipulate that within this dynamic, L1 use creates:

> a social and cognitive space in which learners are able to provide each other and themselves with help throughout the task. (ibid)

In the challenges of acquiring a second language they further state that L1 use gives a psychological advantage and that without it interaction would be ineffective.

In a study of discourse produced by adult native Spanish learners as they engage in a collaborative dialogue to revise their English writing, Villamil and Guerrero (1996) also utilise a Vygotskian perspective. Their students use L1 in similar ways to those identified in Antón and Dicamilla's study, as Villamil and Guerrero state that:

> the L1 was an essential tool for making meaning of text, retrieving language from memory, exploring and expanding content, guiding their action through the task, and maintaining dialogue. (ibid:60)

There have been various other studies which have explored the nature of collaborative dialogue within a socio-cultural perspective. Brooks and Donato (1994) reanalysed data of a previous study which was taken from eight dyads of third year high school learners of Spanish as they engaged in a two-way information-gap task. The authors utilise a Vygotskian framework in order to observe how collaborative dialogue generated in this type of interaction contributes to a "shared social reality" (ibid:4) amongst those participating. They identify in the observed interaction that language is used metacognitively to create intersubjectivity. Even though the observation of students' L1 was not an aim of the study, they acknowledge that L1 use is "a normal psycholinguistic process" (ibid:7) as it enables students to control interactive discourse
with one another which supports L2 production.

In a subsequent study, which also adopts a socio-cultural framework, Brooks et al. (1997) explore how the metacognitive strategies used by students to establish intersubjectivity change as they are exposed to similar two-way information-gap tasks over a period of time. This study was conducted with adult intermediate learners of Spanish, who were exposed to five similar information-gap tasks. It was noted that the dyads relied less on their L1 as a strategy to establish intersubjectivity as they became more familiar with the nature of the tasks. The authors argue that as completion of a collaborative oral task is mediated by language it is natural for the learners to use L1 as a metacognitive strategy in the first few tasks; as, at this stage they don't yet have the ability to use their L2 in this way.

In the same context, Buckwalter (2001) used Vygotsky's framework to research what social and cognitive difficulties adult learners of Spanish faced when using the L2. She observes that learners use L1 for quick explanations and as private speech to process their cognition, when faced with a challenge in a given task. Similarly, Gánem Gutiérrez (2007) used the framework with adult intermediate learners of Spanish as they interacted on three different problem-solving tasks. In her study she analyses the intricacies of collaborative dialogue and finds that learners use L1 as a semiotic resource; as they use it for private speech and also as a metacognitive strategy to help them contextualise certain words and to collectively scaffold each other (see also Donato 1994).

In a study of two, grade eight French immersion students completing a jigsaw task, Swain and Lapkin (1998) adopt a socio-cultural approach and note that within collaborative dialogue L1 is used as a mediating tool to regulate cognitive activity. They also posit that within the mediating process the participants collectively scaffold each other as they provide learning spheres for one another. In a later study of the same context, Swain and Lapkin (2000a) record twenty two dyads as they complete a jigsaw and a dictogloss task. They identify that each task requires use of the L1 in different
ways. From a socio-cultural perspective they assert that:

L1 serves as a tool that helps students as follows: to understand and make sense of the requirements and content of the task; to focus attention on language form, vocabulary use, and overall organization; and to establish the tone and nature of their collaboration. 

(ibid: 268)

Leeming (2008) used the Vygotskian framework in a Japanese context to explore L1 use of Japanese high school students during pair-work tasks. Even though his research was undertaken in the Asian context I did not embark upon any research which used Vygotsky's framework to research collaborative interaction of L2 adult learners in a monolingual South Korean EFL context as they engage on oral pair-work tasks. Accordingly, I hope that the findings generated from my study will contribute to the current corpus of research.

This chapter has presented a brief overview of the studies undertaken into L1 use. Main research areas were teacher methodology, student utilisation and the attitude of both to its use. In introducing a Vygotskian perspective I have presented the case as to why it is a suitable framework for my study to adopt, to explore interactions amongst my students, as they collaborate on oral pair-work tasks. The specific studies referred to in my conclusion have also highlighted why the approach is beneficial to explore L1 use in a socio-cultural dynamic.

In chapter three I return to my research questions and present the methodological considerations which were taken into account in order to generate insights into them.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

This chapter describes the considerations which were taken into account in order to design a suitable methodology to gain some insights into my research questions. I begin by detailing the context in which the research is undertaken and then I detail the specific choices which were made to different elements of the methodological approach.

3.1. The context

At the University where I work I teach two different courses. The first course is a Freshman English course, which is mandatory for all the new freshman students to enrol in. The other course is called Living Beginning English 2. As previously mentioned this is an elective course and it is catered for intermediate language students. Thus, all of the students who are enrolled on this elective course have already completed the mandatory Freshman English course.

Primarily the Living Beginning English 2 course encompasses all of the four language skills, but the main focus is on improving speaking, thus student interaction plays a prominent role through pair-work, group-work, presentations etc. In this regard part of my methodology incorporates oral communicative tasks such as two-way information-gap tasks which encourage students to focus on language meaning and form. The enrolled students are motivated in their English acquisition because they have chosen to take the course and have not been coerced to do so. Their motivation is noticeable in the class as they show enthusiasm during classroom interaction as they try hard to acquire and utilise the target language.

I specifically chose to do my research with this course because I have flexibility and autonomy in the syllabus which enables me to accommodate the research requirements during the term. Furthermore, unlike the freshman students, the intermediate level
students have already been taught by NS teachers for at least a minimum of one term; therefore, perhaps they are more prepared to challenge themselves in the acquisition process, by relying less on L1 during collaborative interaction. This factor is explored in the analysis of the data in chapter four.

I teach three classes of *Living Beginning English 2*. Each class is taught in exactly the same way and the levels of the students in each class are the same. The course is divided according to the University's policy for each class to have a maximum enrolment of twelve students, so that the teacher can be more attentive to each student's individual needs. In each class I teach nine, ten and nine students respectively. All the students are in their early twenties and are from different academic years of their university studies. Each class meets for two consecutive fifty minute classes a week and the course lasts for the duration of one term, which accounts for thirty two classes in total. The course is assessed by way of two written examinations, two oral examinations, completion of given assignments and students' participation throughout the term.

Currently, I have a flexible L1 policy with my students. I do not specifically say to the students at the beginning of term that this is the case as I feel that this would actively encourage them to rely on their L1 too often. Instead I allow them to use it as and when the need to do so arises. Normally, their L1 is used by me for class management and for simple translation of vocabulary items; and by the students for peer translation: for example, when one student faces difficulty in articulating her thoughts, or understanding difficult concepts. They also utilise it as a linguistic tool during oral pair-work tasks.

### 3.2. Ethical requirements

As my research involves the generation of new knowledge about how my students interact on collaborative tasks it is deemed to be primary research. Accordingly, prior to embarking on my research I had to ensure that my methodology met the ethical
standards of Manchester University. In line with their ethical practice committee I obtained their approval prior to implementing any aspect of my research proposal to meet the "touchstone of acceptable practice" (Cohen et al 2000:47). The details that were outlined in my proposal are evident in what follows.

3.3. Methodological considerations

To unravel how my students normally interact on a collaborative task in the classroom it was important that I created an unobtrusive setting in which this could be observed. By doing this I could glean new insights into my research questions, which are:

1. Does use of Korean, enable adult intermediate Korean English language learners to produce the English language in collaborative oral tasks?

2. What cognitive processes are triggered by the use of L1 in collaborative oral tasks?

3. How do the learners feel about L1 use during collaborative oral tasks in the English language classroom?

To observe student interactions, in the past, other studies have used various approaches. Leeming (2008) used a naturalistic approach by recording his students during a standard lesson (see also Swain and Lapkin 2000a). Other studies have used language laboratories to record their students (see Brooks, 1992; Antón and DiCamilla, 1999; DiCamilla and Antón, 2004). I opted for the latter in my approach.

From previous research I have witnessed anxiety being caused to research participants when they have been recorded in the presence of their peers and their teacher. Furthermore, in previous research, the quality of the data has been compromised by recording in the classroom because of background noise. Recording in an empty closed classroom, without teacher presence, would alleviate these concerns.
Buckwalter (2001) notes that when video-recording participants it is important to place the camera at some distance from the students in order to "reduce their affective responses to being videotaped" (ibid:384) as it is a more intrusive approach than being audio-recorded (Swann 2001:326). The recording of the participants by video is important as in analysis it enables one to notice "nonverbal forms of expression" (McCafferty 1998:73) such as "gesticulation and facial expressions" (Makarova and Zhou 2006:1). Additionally, it enables me to repeatedly observe the interaction after it occurs thus enabling a more expansive grasp of its meaning (Rosenstein 2000:382), thereby preventing "premature interpretation of the data" (DuFon 2002:44).

I used a small digital camera on a tripod to video-record my participants. However, at some distance from the interaction, from past experience, it is difficult to hear the audio (see also Swann 2001:326). To overcome this problem, in addition to video-recording, I placed a small audio recorder on the participants' table during their interaction (Richards 2003:177). By using both methods I could guarantee the accuracy of my data. Recording is commonly used during the term for assessment of oral exams and presentations, this familiarity would help reduce student anxiety. Using strategically placed small recording devices and having no teacher presence during the recording were unobtrusive methods which I employed to observe student collaboration on oral pair-work tasks. These methods would provide me with the closest way of attaining an observation into the normal interaction of the students during pair-work tasks, which after analysis would provide insights into my first two research questions.

McDonough & McDonough (1997) state that:

\[ \text{[a]ny form of observation is going to introduce some distortion from normality.} \]
\[ (ibid: 110) \]

This is clear during regular classes when students make a conscious effort to revert to L2 as I monitor oral pair-work activities. Richards (2003) refers to this predicament as the "observer's paradox" (ibid:178; emphasis in original). It was a concern that the reliability of the data would be compromised because of this paradox. However, by
utilising the above factors in my methodology I tried to minimise this quandary.

Research question three aims to unravel the current beliefs that adult South Korean intermediate language learners have about their use of L1 in oral pair-work tasks. Do they believe that they currently overuse L1, or that they challenge themselves to produce L2 during such tasks? To glean their beliefs open-ended questionnaires, in L1 via email, were conducted with each participant. This research method enabled me to overcome constraints that I would encounter in face-to-face interviews (James, 2007:8; Meho, 2006:1293) such as student anxiety and a language barrier.

In chapter four use will be made of the analysis of their interaction to corroborate their beliefs, or provide evidence to the contrary. Insights generated will enable me to adapt my methodology when conducting oral pair-work tasks in the future.

I will now explain the specifics involved in the planning of the research and how each stage was implemented.

3.3.1. The participants

To avoid putting undue pressure on students to partake, convenience sampling (Cohen et al 2000:102) was used to recruit participants on a voluntary basis. The participants were made aware of the research two weeks prior to its commencement (see Appendix one), yet they were not informed of the details of my research as this could jeopardise their interaction (McDonough and McDonough 1997:168). Furthermore, they were aware that their involvement was purely voluntary and in no way affected the final outcome of their grade. I informed them that I would use pseudonyms to refer to them in this research (see Appendix two).

Following the recruitment process a pair of volunteers from two of my Living Beginning English 2 classes gave their consent for me to record their interaction as they collaborated on two identical oral pair-work tasks. Each pair consisted of one male and
one female. The first pair will be referred to as Mi-na (female) and Moon-jin (male) and the second pair will be referred to as Sae-hee (female) and Sang-min (male). Each individual pair who volunteered were good friends and knew each other well as they normally chose each other to collaborate when given the opportunity to do so in pair-work tasks. Additionally, their test scores show that they are similar in terms of ability. The above two factors were important because it would ensure that they had "a collective orientation to problem solving" (Donato 1994:40).

I recruited a small sample because my research is a qualitative inquiry, thus I'm exploring a deep understanding of student interactions (Richards 2003:249). Conducting research with only two dyads would provide me the opportunity to do this within the scope of this project. Additionally, using two dyads as the sample would provide triangulation for my methodology (Cohen et al 2000:113). This would also give a holistic dimension to the generation of the data and thus make it more reliable.

3.3.2. The interactive tasks

In jigsaw tasks students have different information which they need to exchange so that they each have all the details. This type of task is very successful in promoting collective social interaction (Pica 1987:18). In a dictogloss task students listen to a dictated text, which is read twice at a normal pace, they then have to collaborate to reproduce the text. This type of task has a "built-in heterogeneity" (Thornbury 1997:332). Swain and Lapkin (2000a) state that jigsaw tasks provide visual stimulus whereas dictogloss tasks provide oral text stimulus (ibid:256). I used both type of tasks to generate my data.

In the recorded jigsaw task each student had four random pictures which together formed a visual cartoon strip (see Appendix three). After instruction, they sat facing each other with a folder blocking the view of each other's paper. Alternately, they described each picture while the other student made a simple drawing of each description. This encouraged them to negotiate the meaning of certain lexical items.
When finished both placed the original pictures on the desk and sequenced the order of the pictures. After confirming the correct sequence, they then wrote the story as they negotiated the form of the language.

The dictogloss (see Appendix four) also had a written component which encouraged students to negotiate the form in addition to the meaning of the language (Wajnryb, 1990:19; Jacobs, 2003:2). To facilitate this, the students were pre-taught some challenging vocabulary items; then after listening, the students used their two sets of notes to reconstruct the passage. Both task were undertaken in two consecutive lessons. The recoding of the jigsaw tasks took twenty to twenty five minutes and the dictogloss took fifteen to twenty minutes with each dyad. Their written work was collected by myself and then they were given feedback on each task in plenary with their peers.

Unlike previous research (see Swain and Lapkin 2000a) the tasks selected were not a visual representation and an oral text representation of the same task. This is because in my study the same dyads undertook both tasks and I felt interrelated input from a previous task would negatively influence the setting of the interaction. However, both tasks did focus on the same language forms which included passives and the form of have / get something done when talking about appearances. These forms had previously been taught in the classroom, thus I used my chosen tasks as an opportunity to review preceding target language.

I began my research with my students after ten weeks into the term. Delaying the commencement would I hope alleviate student anxiety, as by this stage students were familiar with each other, thus making the data more reliable.

Prior to undertaking the recorded tasks, both tasks were piloted to familiarise students with the task type (see Appendix five and six). They were also given feedback on both tasks and shown model examples thus giving them a benchmark for the recorded tasks.

I selected tasks with two different stimuli as they are indicative of the tasks normally
used for pair-work tasks in the classroom and they would highlight different ways (Nabei, 1996: 61; Swain and Lapkin, 2000a:251) in which the L1 is used as a tool during collaborative interaction.

3.3.3. Transcription and translation of the first data set

The transcription and translation process of the dyadic interactions on both tasks took approximately sixty hours over an eight week period, as it was worked upon intermittently due to other responsibilities. The total of all the recorded interaction lasted eighty five minutes. Transcription conventions were based on Richards (2003:173-4). These conventions were utilised as I was familiar with them from preceding bilingual research which I undertook. The transcription key can be viewed in Appendix seven.

To comprehend the functions of Korean during the interactions, as I don't share the same L1 as my students I needed assistance from a translator. My wife, who has familiarity with the research topic and is also a native Korean, assisted me in this capacity. She began by transcribing verbatim what was said to represent the accuracy of the data set (Roberts 2009:18). To capture the reliability of the data set, analysis was first undertaken of the verbatim transcript (i.e. pre translation) which gave validity to the approach. Subsequently, in the translation process, by sharing the same L1 and culture as those participating my wife was able to capture the data "through the eyes of the observed" (Cohen et al 2000:313), thus further increasing the data set's reliability by giving the data an emic perspective (ibid; Richards 2003:15). This enabled use to be made of the translated transcript to triangulate our first analysis. Due to her expertise with the L1 my wife led the translating process; nevertheless, with my limited Korean and mastery of my L1, I was also involved; as together we ensured that the translated transcript was composed of etic concepts (ibid) which made the data cross culturally valid.

Additionally, as my wife did not have a relationship with the participants this provided
objectivity to the transcription of the data which further increased the data's reliability. Thus, her L1 tool gave the data an insider's perspective, yet because of her personal disassociation from the participants she could transcribe and translate the data as an objective outsider (McDonough and McDonough 1997:51).

### 3.3.4. Open-ended questionnaire

One week after the tasks were recorded I conducted an open-ended questionnaire, via email, with each participant to discover their views on L1 use in oral pair-work tasks. At this stage they were aware of the details of the study because the questions specifically asked them about L1 use during such tasks. The questions and their responses were in their L1. Initially each participant was given five open-ended statements (see Appendix eight) which they had to respond to via open-ended answers. Follow up questions, via email, were also asked based on their initial responses. In total the transcript of their responses comprised six pages which was naturally produced by the methodology employed. It took approximately six hours to analyse the data over a two week period.

The open-ended questionnaire utilised methodology synonymous with an asynchronous interviewing technique which reduced anxiety for the students. It seemed to me that anxiety might be a concern in face-to-face interviews, with Korean students, especially where _chae myon_ (saving face) is an inherent part of their culture (Scollon and Scollon 2001:44). Consequently, I believed that a face-to-face interview with presence of an unfamiliar Korean adult would not alleviate this concern.

Bampton and Cowton (2002) state that because of the asynchronous nature of an open-ended questionnaire:

> it is possible to interview in a foreign language even if the interviewer is insufficiently fluent for a face-to-face interview.  
>(*ibid*:19)

This factor was crucial in the methodology as it enabled the students to articulate
themselves coherently. Moreover, in being a semi-structured technique (ibid:5) this gave the respondents greater control as they had more time to reflect on their answers (Nunan 1992:150). Furthermore, the employed technique also gave me greater flexibility to construct follow up questions based on the respondents' initial responses (ibid). These facets contributed to the the reliability of the generated data set.

3.3.5. Approach to analysis of both data sets

My wife was in a research facilitator role throughout her involvement in this study, as she also assisted with data analysis. By involving her in this way the research process adopted a dual-focus approach (Erkut et al 1999:206). Adopting this approach would ensure the appropriate characterisation of the status of the data, with regards to the way the data was being generated (i.e. it involved the generation of first language data at certain times, where the language generated is the second language of the researcher). I made the decision to use this approach as it is “a concept-driven rather than a translation-driven approach” (ibid:207), which gave the analysis of the data an etic perspective, as the research facilitator and myself were involved with the subtleties of the languages (see Williams 2010).

The original and translated transcripts and video and audio recordings were used in the analysis of the first data set (student interactions) in order to maintain consistency over the accuracy of the original data. To analyse the first data set we adopted an approach which was influenced by Villamil and Guerrero (1996), Antón and Dicamilla (1999), Swain and Lapkin (2000a, 2000b) and Leeming (2008).

To analyse the second data set, as this was all generated in the students' L1, it was important to first undertake this in the language in which the data had been generated, as opposed to a translated version (Twinn 1998:660). This was similar in nature to the approach that we took in analysis of the first data set. In doing this, compromising the quality of the data could be avoided. Use was also made of the translated transcript to triangulate our first analysis. As I could not transcribe the data by myself, the dual focus
approach was also used to process, prepare and analyse this data set.

In this chapter I have detailed the methodological considerations which were undertaken in this study to generate, process and analyse the data sets which would provide insights into my research questions. In the next chapter I present the outcomes of the analysis.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF BOTH DATA SETS

In this chapter I present the analysis of the data to provide some insights into my research questions. I begin by presenting the analysis of the first data set by explaining the framework used for analysis. I then highlight the extent to which L1 was used by both dyads with an analysis of the cognitive processes present during the dyadic interactions. In the analysis of the second data set I present the participants’ current views on L1 use during oral pair-work tasks.

4.1. A framework for analysis of the first data set

The previous research that I had undertaken into L1 use for my Psychology of Education paper primarily focused on how learners scaffold (support) each other by using their L1 as they collaborate on oral pair-work tasks. This was a matter that I wanted to further research in this study. As seen in chapter two, when students collaborate on oral pair-work tasks they scaffold each other within their ZPDs which occurs within the *interpsychological plane*. Additionally, within this *plane* students use their L1 to create a shared social and cognitive space by establishing intersubjectivity.

Scaffolding and social and cognitive intersubjectivity were used as a framework for analysing the *interpsychological plane* by Antón and Dicamilla (1999) and then subsequently, as part of a framework, by Leeming (2008). To analyse the *intrapsychological plane* they both highlighted examples of private speech.

Thus, the analysis of the first data set was literature influenced. By way of the *dual focus approach* my wife and I identified all utterances in Korean, or including Korean. Similarly to the aforementioned authors I used a coding scheme which comprised of the categories of scaffolding, social and cognitive intersubjectivity and private speech to classify the different uses of L1 by the participants.
In the case of scaffolding, based on my previous research and the literature, I identified twelve different sub-categories (see figure 3). Regarding the other categories I provided definitions, based on my understanding of the literature, for the type of utterance which could be classified in the relevant category. I decided that analysis should be made of utterances as opposed to turns, as in some cases one turn from a participant could be composed of more than one utterance which belonged in a different coding category.

Even though my wife had familiarity with the research topic it took time to fully instruct her in all of the different terminology and definitions involved. Her awareness was raised through in-depth discussions with myself, as I illustrated and we discussed examples from other research papers of the definitions and terminology in practice.

Coding of the verbatim transcript was first undertaken solely by my wife. By myself, I coded the translated transcript. Then, I asked my wife to also code the translated version by herself. We then compared our coding of the three transcripts and subsequently collectively coded a new copy of the verbatim transcript through discussion of each utterance. To achieve full consensus we reached agreement on the function of each L1 utterance, thus ensuring that the data set was reliable.

4.2. Use of L1 in interactions

Korean was used extensively by both dyads during their interactions and also they used it in similar measures. In figure 1 we see that the first dyad, Mi-na and Moon-jin, produced 299 utterances in total of which 87 and 64 were produced in their L1 in the jigsaw and dictogloss task respectively. These L1 utterances comprised 51% of their total utterances. Similarly, the second dyad, Sae-hee and Sang-min, produced utterances comprising of 48% of their total utterances. I was encouraged when I saw these results because the similarity and consistency between the two separate data samples suggested that in my research methodology I had minimised the quandary of the observer's paradox. However, I am very surprised by the results because I did not expect intermediate language students to use L1 in such an extensive way during oral
There was a noted difference between the amount of L1 used between the jigsaw and dictogloss task. In figure 2 we see that a total of 482 utterances were produced in the jigsaw task. 214 of these were in L1 accounting for 44% of the total utterances. However, in the dictogloss L1 use accounted for 56% of the total utterances. More use of the L1 in the dictogloss task is not surprising, as in the later open-ended questionnaire conducted with the participants all four of them categorically identified the dictogloss as being the hardest of the two tasks. For as Mi-na stated:

*The second task [dictogloss] was about listening. If we miss the line once .... there is nothing we can do about it. On the other hand, there were big differences in the first task [jigsaw] ... I made the sentences by myself as I saw the pictures and I could ask my partner to repeat when I couldn't understand his sentences.*

Perhaps the negotiation of form associated with the dictogloss, in comparison to the
more open-ended nature of negotiation in a jigsaw task, required students to rely more on their L1 during the dictogloss, as a focus on form can restrict L2 output (Swain and Lapkin 2000b:110). I shall explore this in more depth at a later stage.

These results clearly demonstrate that my students do use (or possibly overuse) L1 during collaborative interaction on oral pair-work tasks. However, from these results it is not ascertainable if L1 use facilitates production of L2 in collaborative oral tasks. Thus, I present analysis of the cognitive processes involved.

4.3. The cognitive processes at play

Several instances were noted whereby students used L1 within the interpsychological plane to scaffold each other and also to establish intersubjectivity. A few instances of private speech in L1 were also noted within the intrapsychological plane. I begin by presenting examples which were noted on the former plane.
4.3.1. Scaffolding within the ZPD

As learners interacted through the mediated learning process they provided opportunities to mutually scaffold one another to achieve certain goals of the task. In total 264 such utterances, in the L1, were highlighted in the data. The students varied in how they scaffolded each other within their ZPD.

Villamil and Guerrero (1996:62) identified that their learners used fourteen different sub-strategies to scaffold each other during oral collaborative interaction. I adapted the definition of each sub-strategy to suit the nature of my research. By applying them to the coding scheme I discovered that my learners used nine of them to scaffold each other within the ZPD. These sub-strategies become apparent in figure 3.

Figure 3: A breakdown of sub-strategies used for providing scaffolding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-strategy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Number of utterances</th>
<th>% of category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Requesting advice</td>
<td>An attempt to seek assistance or suggestions</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advising</td>
<td>Giving assistance or recommending alterations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Responding to advice</td>
<td>Accepting, questioning or rejecting the assistance or suggestions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Responding to elicitation</td>
<td>Confirming or providing more information to an elicited request</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Requesting clarification</td>
<td>Seeking clarification about the intended meaning behind an unclear utterance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clarifying</td>
<td>Giving more information, or to help clarify a previous statement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Announcing</td>
<td>Showing certainty / confidence in the interaction</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Giving directives</td>
<td>An order requiring peer to take action</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Making phatic comments</td>
<td>Stating utterances which are content-free and are only used to maintain social contact</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Negotiation of meaning</td>
<td>Negotiating the correct lexical item, or defining the task's content</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Negotiation of language form</td>
<td>Negotiating the correct grammar tense, or syntax structure</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Management of the task</td>
<td>An utterance such as 'Next' or 'Wait' to move the task along, or to control a certain stage of the task</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, due to the interaction involving focus on two different tasks I created other sub-categories which related to scaffolded interaction within the ZPD. Primarily these sub-categories were created to see if there were any differences between the way learners used *meta-talk* (i.e. talk relating to language - see Chavez 2003:170) to negotiate form and meaning within each task. Thus, the additional sub-categories were the negotiation of meaning (e.g. of a lexical item) and the negotiation of language form (e.g. of a grammar tense). Additionally, management of the task (e.g. an utterance to control a certain stage of the task) was another sub-category which I created. These additional sub-categories, which can also be viewed in figure 3, were adapted from the coding scheme used by Swain and Lapkin (2000a and 2000b). Due to space limitations I only comment on some of these to show the scaffolding cognitive processes at play; further discussion ensues in chapter five.

In the following excerpt the dyad are constructing the story which matches each picture in the jigsaw task *(see Appendix three).*

(Excerpt 1: Dyad 2 - Jigsaw task)

227 S-h:  “Sweaty” (...) there are 3 sheeps which are sweaty
228 S-m:  Ah...((writes down previous utterance))
229 S-h:  *Mab na? Sweating e dong sa mat jo?*  
(Right? Sweating it is a verb right?)
230 S-m:  *Ddameul heulida* on the field (...) of the field?  
(Dripping sweat)
231 S-h:  On the field?
232 S-m:  *Taeyangeul seolmyoung hae joya ha na?*  
((points to the picture))  
(Do we need to explain the sun?)
233 S-h:  Sweating *hamyoun deo un jul algeotji.*  
(No from the sweating we can tell that it's hot)

In line 229 Sae-hee uses her L1 to request Sang-min's advice in relation to which grammatical form to use. Having uttered her intended meaning in line 227 she is not too
sure whether to use the adjective 'sweaty', or verb 'sweating' in the present continuous form. In line 230, Sang-min does not answer her directly; instead he code-switches his utterance by use of the verb and noun clause 'dripping sweat'. By explaining the extent to which the sheep are sweating he uses the L1 to clarify what is indicated in the picture.

In line 232, this time Sang-min requests Sae-hee's advice as to whether or not they need to explain how hot it is in the story. She responds to this request in line 233 by stating that this is not required since their sweat indicates that the weather is hot. It seems to me that she is encouraged to answer in this way according to the clarification that Sang-min gave in line 230 to describe the extent to which the sheep are sweating.

From the above it is evident that the use of L1 within the ZPD provides natural opportunities for learning to co-occur in both participants, as it enables learners to collectively scaffold each other (see Donato, 1994; Guerrero and Villamil, 2000).

4.3.2. Establishing intersubjectivity

Guerrero and Villamil (ibid) define intersubjectivity as:

> the intermental point of fusion at which separate minds come to share a common perspective and an equal degree of commitment to the task. (ibid:53)

Antón and Dicamilla (1999:241) posit that intersubjectivity can be evidenced in the sharing of ideas on a cognitive plane and on the social plane with the exchange of polite utterances which encourage one another in the tasks, by providing a positive learning environment.

4.3.2.1. The cognitive plane

On the cognitive plane a total of 65 utterances were identified which enabled the
students to reach a shared understanding regarding certain aspects of the tasks:

(Excerpt 2: Dyad 1 - Jigsaw task)
217 M-j: *Egeol geundae han cutul moysa hanun geoya* (↑)
218 animyon storyreul suneun geoya? Jikum.
(Do we describe one cut or write a story about all of them now?)
219 M-n: Story (.) story
220 M-j: Ah (...) Ah (...) *geurum they rago haedo deogotneo.*
(then we can use they)
221 M-n: *Beolseo ssoetso.*
(I already did)

Here we see Mi-na and Moon-jin arriving at a shared understanding regarding how to proceed with a stage of the task. In the above exchange they are discussing the last picture of the sequence in the jigsaw task which results with three sheep having gotten three different makeover styles (*see Appendix three*).

In line 217 and 218, Moon-jin is not too sure how to proceed, thus he requests Mi-na's advice. In line 219 she advises as to the action to take. Moon-jin and Mi-na arrive at a shared understanding in line 220 and 221 regarding how to proceed with this stage of the narrative; they *both* acknowledge that they will describe the whole event by using the plural subject pronoun 'they'.

On the *cognitive plane*, as well as establishing a shared perspective during stages of the tasks, intersubjectivity was used on two occasions at the beginning to establish 'ground rules' as to how the tasks would be conducted:

(Excerpt 3: Dyad 2 - Jigsaw task)
01 S-m: *Na meonjeo sijak halggeo.*
(I'll start first)
02 S-h: *Eung*
03 S-m: Keun gangaji ulgule gadoukcha inunda.  
(Yes)

04 S-h: Youngoro hae.  
(Speak in English) ((laughing))

05 S-m: Youngoro? Whe?  
(In English? Why?)

06 S-h: Youngoro hadaga an deneunge isumyon Korean euro haneungeo anya?  
(Try in English first and if you can't then don't we use Korean?)

In line 1 and 2 the dyad have established a shared perspective on the order in which each will take turns in the task. In line 4, Sae-hee establishes the language that they should use for their interaction and interestingly in line 6 she indicates when they can use their L1 tool during the interaction. She establishes intersubjectivity in this case by stating the 'ground rules' for conducting the task.

Furthermore, this excerpt provided more evidence that the observer's paradox had been minimised in my research as Sang-min had no qualms about using L1 to interact. He even questions this when told by Sae-hee to use L2 in line 5. On the other hand, perhaps this shows that I have been too flexible with my L1 approach in the classroom. This issue is explored further in the next chapter.

4.3.2.2. The social plane

On the social plane a total of 41 utterances were identified which enabled the students to establish intersubjectivity and thus create a positive learning environment. One such exchange is seen below:

(Excerpt 4: Dyad 2 - Jigsaw task)

298 S-m: E jom kwiyopda. ((laughing))  
(This is a little cute)
In this exchange Sang-min and Sae-hee are talking about one of the pictures which belonged to the sequence of the jigsaw task. The nature of this exchange acts as a social function which allows students to maintain positivity within their interaction. This positivity also materialised through social exchange about strategy use:

(Excerpt 5: Dyad 2 - Dictogloss task)

165 S-m: Eruke jeokeo(.) Nacheorum iruke:: Gibongekuro hankulro suyo itseo.
   (Write like this. Like my style. It's written in Korean basically)
   ((S-m points to paper and both laugh))

166 S-h: Jinjja grayaggeota.
   (I should do it really)

Prior to this exchange Sae-hee was having difficulty reading some of her notes, Sang-min tries to reduce her frustration in this excerpt by showing how he wrote his notes. He was showing her a strategy which she could use in future dictogloss tasks. In line 165 it becomes apparent that he used *hangeul* (Korean script) as a strategy to note down key words during the listening input of the dictogloss task (*see Appendix nine*). In line 166 she positively acknowledges that this would be an effective strategy to use.

Additionally this provides an insight into how students use their L1 as a multifaceted tool. In this case it allows Sang-min to scaffold himself within his own ZPD as he is able to use the *hangeul* script to note down what he phonetically heard during the input. This helps him to clarify what he heard and additionally save time, as one would presume that an L2 learner can write faster in his L1 than in his L2 in pressured circumstances. This is confirmed by him in one of his replies to the open-ended survey:

*I use Korean a lot when I feel frustrated as I can’t communicate faster and accurately.*

Thus, employing this strategy helps him to increase input. Upon reflection, I realise that
I have made copious use of this strategy in my acquisition of Korean.

Establishing intersubjectivity enabled the students to have a joint perspective on their tasks both cognitively and socially. L1 was an instrumental tool in this process as it enabled the students to articulate their thoughts with ease and to understand each other's subtle utterances. There were a small amount of examples of the students using L2 to establish intersubjectivity; however, overwhelmingly this shared perspective was established by use of L1. Thus it remains to be seen if intermediate language learners would be able to establish such intersubjectivity if they were restricted in L1 use.

4.3.3. Private speech

Dicamilla and Antón (2004) define private speech as:

speech directed to the self for the purpose of regulating one's self.

(ibid:36)

On the intrapsychological plane there were 24 examples of L1 use to produce speech privately. It was noted in chapter two that when faced with a challenge in a task inner speech materialises as private speech (Antón and Dicamilla 1999:243):

(Excerpt 6: Dyad 1 - Dictogloss task)
64 M-j: How should they do make up (2.0) Do their make up (2.0) Ani?..
   (No?)
   ((M-j shakes his head))
65 M-n: Uumm (2.0)
66 M-j: Aninde:: Make up e dongsa majeo(2.0)
   (No. Make up is a verb.)
67 Make up (2.0) Make it up (2.0) Make their face up?

Here we see evidence of private speech appearing in the guise of a focus on linguistic
form (McCafferty 1994:422) as Moon-jin challenges himself to produce the correct structure. The input provided in the listening was '...how they should have their hair done and what make up to use' (see Appendix four). The key words noted by Moon-jin were 'how should they' and 'what make up'. Mi-na only noted down 'make up' (see Appendix nine). Because they did not note down the to infinitive form of 'to use' they are struggling with the correct function of 'make up'.

Prior to this exchange Mi-na has advised Moon-jin that 'make up' is not a verb as she believes the verb form is 'do make up'. In line 64, Moon-jin produces his inner thought process as private speech as he attempts to follow Mi-na's suggestion.

By producing his inner speech externally he is able to think aloud. At the end of this utterance he is not convinced by her suggestion as he questions his own production. In line 66, he answers his own question. Having had time to reflect on his previous output (line 64), he is now convinced that 'make up' is a verb as he didn't feel he achieved success in his previous utterance. In the ensuing output, in line 66, he now believes 'make up' should be in the verb form and he attempts to again produce the correct form by talking aloud to himself as he directs his own thought process in line 67, thus displaying his inner speech externally.

In this example Moon-jin is using private speech to self-regulate his own production. In this case he uses L1 to question and provide information to himself and L2 when trying to produce the correct form. While doing this his private speech has the function of self-regulating Mi-na as this can also be classed as part of their exchange relating to whether 'make up' should function as a verb or a noun in their collaborative writing. Thus, the above excerpt illustrates that private speech has "an outer and inner orientation" (Wells 1999:251).

Private speech was also evidenced when students scaffolded themselves individually during the interactions:
Above Sang-min is using his L1 in the form of private speech to provide encouragement to himself to continue with the task. By using code-switching and uttering 'Yes' to himself he internally acknowledges that what he had previously stated is correct. The utterance 'Yes' in this case is a marker for him to continue describing what he sees.

This becomes apparent in a different guise later in the same task when he code-switches by using his private speech to control his output:

(Excerpt 8: Dyad 2 - Jigsaw task)
103 S-m : And one picture .. which(2.0) is robots (2.0)
104 Robot e guryojin sajine itneundae. He has (…) scissors and bit
(There is a robot drawn in the picture) (comb)
105 S-h : Robot?
106 S-m : Eung. ok and the (.) Ani (2.0) Sheeps are in front of this shop
(Yes) (No)

In line 106 Sang-min begins to produce an utterance, but his internal thought process appears as private speech when he code-switches by using the marker 'No'. It is not clear whether he intended to produce an utterance relating to the robot discussion that precedes line 106, but what is evident is that by using the marker 'No', internally he changes his mind regarding his intended output. Brief utterances such as 'yes' and 'no' can be classed as private speech as Dicamilla and Antón (2004:39) identify that this form of speech appears in a more abbreviated form in comparison to social speech.

From the above examples it is evident that L1 use enabled students to develop their internal cognition.
4.4 Analysis of the second data set

In the analysis of the second data set (the open-ended questionnaire) I decided to use inductive content analysis (Elo and Kyngäs 2007:109) which was a data-driven approach. This approach enabled my wife and I to use open coding (ibid) to identify commonalities between the participants responses which have shaped their beliefs about how L1 should be used in the L2 class. To achieve reliability in the coding process I followed a similar iterative process described in the coding of the first data set.

Following analysis of the open-ended survey there were three emerging themes. Firstly, the students believed that they should be allowed to use Korean as a scaffolding tool during their collaborative interactions, but that this use should be minimised. For as Mi-na stated:

\begin{quote}
I think we must use English unless we don't understand something in the English class. The reason is simple. We are here to learn English ... When we don't know the expression it is ok to ask each other [in Korean] and learn by ourselves and also it helps to make us fully understand something which is unclear.
\end{quote}

In addition they believe that they need some guidance in how to be selective in their use of Korean during such tasks. This was apparent by what Moon-jin stated:

\begin{quote}
We should challenge ourselves to communicate in English and not rely on speaking Korean even though we feel frustrated. If we don't we will get no improvement.
\end{quote}

The third theme which emerged is their belief that use of L1 in the L2 classroom emerges because they feel self-conscious about using the L2:

\begin{quote}
We are not used to speaking English and are shy with each other as we are all Koreans.
\end{quote}

The above was stated by Sang-min. This third theme provides an insight into a cultural trait which has an influence on the way they interact. As previously discussed chae myon (saving face) is an innate aspect of their psyche. Thus, speaking L2 can cause embarrassment to students when they don't feel fully confident in its production (Patel
2009) and within a social setting this factor can make them unwilling to use their L2 (MacDonald et al 2003:3). This is very noticeable during the term as I always reiterate that making mistakes is a part of the learning process as sometimes students can be fearful of this, especially while speaking in front of their peers, due to the concept of *chae myon*. This is discussed further in chapter five.

All four of them showed consensus on the above held views, thus showing why they naturally scaffolded each other in their L1. Yet at the same time their beliefs provide an insights into the roots behind their tendency to overly rely on their L1; these being: their innate cultural disposition, where *chae myon* becomes subconsciously important and also my current flexible L1 approach. This latter root appears to provide them with 'an easy option' to use L1 rather than encouraging them to challenge themselves to produce the L2.

Nevertheless, only two of the students (Sae-hee and Sang-min) believe that they currently overuse L1 in the L2 classroom. Mi-na and Moon-jin admitted to using L1 as a tool, but did not feel that their use of it in this capacity was overly relied upon. It seems to me they are not consciously aware of the use that they make of their L1 tool. In the jigsaw task while arranging the pictures in the correct sequence, for nearly three minutes their whole discussion was in L1 without a single L2 utterance. The possible reasons behind this belief of theirs are further discussed in the next chapter.

By presenting analysis of both data sets in this chapter I have revealed some insights into my research questions. In the next chapter I discuss these insights in greater depth.
CHAPTER 5

A DISCUSSION OF GENERATED INSIGHTS

In this chapter I further discuss the insights that were generated in analysis and suggest the reasoning behind some of these findings, with the aim of providing some plausible answers to the research questions that were presented in chapter one.

5.1. Korean as a learning tool

The referred to literature in chapter one states that L1 in the L2 classroom should be used judiciously. Having seen that students used Korean for almost 50% of their interactions implies that my students freely use L1 at their own will. I did not expect this to be the case with adult intermediate language learners, since it seems to me that this amount of dependence on their L1 tool during oral pair-work tasks can interfere with their true potential of acquiring the L2.

Consequently, this has made me question the flexible L1 approach which I have been currently using with my students, since in a Confucian society:

[t]he acceptance of authority and respect for teachers has led to a teacher-centred educational tradition in which teachers exercise strong leadership and control[.]

(Kwon 2002:155)

The above is indicative of how much influence the teacher can exert on students in my context. In chapter two Liu et al (2004) highlighted that the thirteen NNS Korean high school teachers surveyed by them used L2 for only 32% of the time in the classroom. Thus, in a Korean context it is plausible that with no enforcement and a free will, to use L1 as they wish, my students could revert to the way they have seen English used in their past schooling.
In my case, I use English for over 95% of the time in the class, thus as a NS English teacher I need to be a role model for my students, hence I need to raise my students' awareness of how they can challenge themselves to produce the L2 and rely less on their L1. Furthermore, the analysis of the second data set also indicates that the students are ready to be challenged in this way. The pedagogical implications of this insight are presented in the next chapter.

5.2. A comparison of the different L1 uses

In figure 4 it becomes apparent that students relied for the majority of the time upon L1 as a scaffolding tool during their interactions. This comprised 67% of the total use of L1.

It was identified in chapter two that students have a tendency to use L1 in task related dyadic social exchanges because they lack the necessary L2 vernacular for academic discussions in these types of interactions (Tarone and Swain 1995). I have trained my students in useful classroom language which they can use for general purposes, yet I have not trained my students in the specific L2 vernacular which they can use to mutually scaffold each other in oral pair-work interactions. Thus, without this training, and coupled with a free will, it is not surprising that they extensively rely upon their L1 in the processes of scaffolding. It seems to me that correct training in this matter would

![Figure 4: Different uses of L1](image)
reduce their dependability on their L1. Nevertheless, as scaffolding is something that students sharing the same L1 naturally do in their L1, doing so in their L2 might seem unnatural, or even difficult where some of the scaffolding sub-strategies are concerned, as language is the "main semiotic tool of mediation" (Guerrero and Villamil 2000:52).

Even with vernacular training an area where students might be inclined to use their L1, when scaffolding each other, is when the task involves meta-talk (i.e. when they are negotiating language form and language meaning). It was noticeable in the analysis of the data that when collectively scaffolding each other these were the sub-categories in which the students produced the most utterances (see figure 3). In total 62 utterances were produced where learners negotiated meaning and 53 were produced where form was negotiated. However, as we see in figure 5, between tasks students relied on these sub-strategies in different measures.

![Figure 5: Differences between meta-talk in each task](image)

Clearly in the dictogloss task the dyads negotiated form more than meaning and this could account for why they used more L1 in this task, as seen in figure 2. In the dictogloss they had limited access to the input and they were trying to produce the correct form with the few key words which they had. The jigsaw task's input and output
were more open-ended in comparison to the determinate nature of the dictogloss; thus in this respect it seems to me that the dictogloss was more cognitively demanding (see also Nabei 1996:68).

This was seen in chapter four in excerpt six when the students didn't understand the form of the original input in the dictogloss. This misunderstanding led them to abandon the negotiation. Such misunderstandings and a lack of sufficient input led to other instances of abandonment. Thus in this respect the dyads' negotiation of form in the dictogloss was made harder by a restricted input and a desire to match the form of the original script, therefore it is not surprising that they made more use of their L1 to negotiate form in this task.

Similarly, the same can be said for the greater amount of L1 utterances produced in the negotiation of meaning in the jigsaw task. As input and output were more open-ended in this task, the students made use of L1 to negotiate the meaning of both. By using L1 to do so they made input and output more comprehensible to one another (see Foster, 1998:2; Foster and Ohta, 2005:405; Swain, 2000:98).

From the above distinction it is evident that L1 use served the negotiations of metalanguage in the interactions which varied between each task. Nevertheless, despite this variation, within the mediated processes of both tasks, use of L1 for these purposes did lead to cognitive development within the learners' ZPDs. When negotiating metalanguage in tasks, it seems that this development would not fully materialise if L1 use was denied.

There were not any significant differences between the ways in which students established social and cognitive intersubjectivity. They comprised 10% and 16% of total L1 utterances respectively (see figure 4). It was noticeable that the L1 language used for this was spontaneous and in some cases the participants shared emic nuances to create a positive learning environment and also to come to a shared understanding. For example, in many cases they used imperatives as part of the process of establishing
intersubjectivity. In excerpt three and five we saw some examples of this: 'Speak in English', 'Write like this'. Others included 'Do it like that', 'Finish it' and 'Write, write'.

These type of exchanges are common between participants who are of the same social status in Korea. However, additionally both dyads are close friends, thus imperatives are to be expected, irrespective of cultural considerations. Nevertheless, it would appear that asking them to use only the L2 to establish intersubjectivity would be a restraint, as the L1 used by my sample gave them opportunities to naturally establish it, thus showing why they tended to rely on Korean when doing so.

Private speech accounted for 6% of total L1 use. Centeno-Cortés (2004:25) conducted research into private speech and found that L1 use was a key factor in the process of reasoning with intermediate Spanish language students. I found this also to be the case in my research. This is a cognitive strategy which my students employed to self-regulate themselves when they faced a challenge in the tasks, or when they wanted to regain control of themselves in the task. Centeno-Cortés (2004) states that:

very often the L1 surfaces in the private speech of L2 learners, indicating the importance that the L1 has at the cognitive level for such learners[.]

( *ibid* :31)

Accordingly, in the case of my learners, L1 use enabled them to command their internal cognitive development as it was "the optimal tool for self-regulation" (Leeming 2008:53) and consequently served as a catalyst in the L2 acquisition process.

In relation to research question one, the above provides ample evidence to signify that L1 use does enable adult intermediate Korean English language learners to produce L2 in oral pair-work tasks. However, what is clear is that without proper guidance they have a tendency to overuse the L1 which can get in the way of their true potential.

In collaborative oral tasks L1 use enables students to mutually scaffold each other, establish social and cognitive intersubjectivity and self-regulate themselves privately.
during the interaction. Hence, regarding the second research question, it seems to me that these cognitive processes could not be accomplished successfully in oral pair-work tasks if L1 use was denied to the students; its denial would slow down development within the socio-cultural framework. L1 is a tool which facilitates adult Korean intermediate students' needs, yet they should be fully aware of what their L2 acquisition needs entail.

5.3. L1 use from the students' perspective

Regarding my third research question, it was identified in the last chapter that Mi-na and Moon-jin did not feel that they overused L1 in the L2 classroom. At first I felt that they were telling me what they thought I wanted to hear from them, rather than what they really thought. Cohen et al (2000:116) uses the term reactivity to refer to this concept. However, upon further email exchanges I discovered that I have affected their belief; for as Mi-na stated:

_I think it is reasonable to rely on Korean more often when you are paired in a comfortable environment with another Korean. If you told us 'Try to use Korean the least' before the task ... I would use only English and even I'd use my body language if the communication was hard._

Thus it would appear that they are aware of the use that they make of the L1, but do not feel that this is a negative factor as I have not persuaded them of this with proper guidance.

Sang-min and Sae-hee did feel that they overused the L1 in collaborative interactions yet they didn't seem to reduce their use. They used it as a tool in similar measures to Mi-na and Moon-jin (see figure 1) perhaps again because they have not received guidance from the teacher in how to challenge themselves to produce the L2. Thus, as is highlighted by the students' beliefs, the responsibility of making them aware of when to use L1 is mine to instil in them, as they are accustomed to a teacher-centred approach.

Related to the concept of _chae myon_ was the notion of conformity. Korean students
don't want to attract attention to themselves. This has also been observed in other collectivist societies (see Leeming 2008:48). Sae-hee asserted that:

*Koreans are afraid of making mistakes because public school education made us this way ... I had pressure before I spoke English because I'd have to think about how I'd get criticised by the teacher afterwards ... I would be made fun of when I tried to speak American English by rolling my tongue. That's why I'm sometimes reluctant to speak English.*

This emphasises the type of influence a teacher can exert on his students in a Confucian context. Even though this refers to a very negative experience it would appear that with the correct encouragement it is possible for teachers to also positively influence their students, as the context is teacher-centred.

In this chapter I have further discussed the insights that were generated into my research questions. L1 use did provide students with the opportunity to catalyse their development within the collaborative interactions because of the cognitive processes its use facilitated; yet my students overused L1 in their interactions because they lack sufficient training and an innate will to challenge themselves in the acquisition process. The pedagogical implications of these findings, the strengths and limitations of my research, as well as suggestions for future research are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6

IMPLICATIONS, EVALUATION AND FUTURE PROPOSALS

In this final chapter I present the pedagogical implications which are implied by my research. By reflecting on the outcomes and the methodological approach which I employed to conduct the research I also evaluate the strengths and limitations of my study and possible areas for future research.

6.1. Pedagogical implications

Permitting L1 use in the classroom continues to be a moot issue. Upon reflection I posit that each context needs to be considered on a case by case basis and decisions upon L1 use within each context should be made by the teacher after "critical inquiry and reflection" (Auerbach 1994:158 - see chapter one). With this in mind, I present what I have learned from this particular 'critical inquiry'.

6.1.1. A flexible approach?

In general, for all EFL contexts I do believe that L1 does have a role to play in oral-pair work tasks, as allowing its use is a catalyst in the acquisition process. However, there are some factors that need to be accounted for.

The flexible L1 approach which I had been using with my students, prior to the commencement of this research, did not specifically encourage, nor discourage the students to use Korean. In this regard it gave them free control. Nevertheless, my research has led to the finding that within a Korean context students do not know what to do when this free control is in their hands because they are accustomed to a teacher-centred approach. I have posited in preceding chapters that they need to have guidance in how to challenge themselves.
Rather than insisting that they use L2 at all times I need to raise their awareness of when they should try to challenge themselves to produce the L2. The students seem to also support this view:

*It’s not a good idea to force English in any cases. However, it’s possible to persuade us with the right reasons.*

The above was stated by Mi-na, but all four participants showed agreement on this view. In Appendix ten, I present a simple example of how awareness can be raised about language use prior to students embarking on any oral collaborative tasks.

The advantage of this kind of awareness framework is that it is easy to use and it also gives autonomy to the students; as the choice of whether or not to use L1 is theirs to make. By having autonomy on L1 use, the proposed approach still has a flexible dimension. However, this time they are guided in their choices, which in turn gives a teacher-centred element to the approach.

By raising their own awareness of L1 use they can push themselves to use and produce the L2 when faced with a challenge in the task, rather than being constantly coerced to do so by the teacher. The dynamic of autonomy in the approach also takes into account the cultural considerations of the context, as saving face is an integral part of interaction in a Confucianist society. Consequently, students do not feel pressured to use L2 and potentially lose face. In making a logical choice of using their L1 tool, they have a 'get out' if they really need it.

### 6.1.2. An early intervention

Having proposed an approach that raises students' awareness I feel that within my context this awareness can be raised prior to students entering university. We have previously seen that in a Korean context teachers influence their students perhaps more so than in other contexts. If we really need to make South Korean adult learners competent in using and producing the L2 I propose that the earlier this training is
undertaken then the better it would be for the students. Perhaps prior to awareness training a rudimentary introduction to the L2 vernacular to use for pair-work interactions is required. This can be achieved by using simple language chunks which can be drilled continuously (see Appendix eleven). An early intervention will lessen the likelihood that students will become fossilised in L1 use and consequently overdependent on its use in their interactions.

Of course for this to happen it would appear that the public education system in Korea needs a major overhaul (see Liu et al 2004:633). Despite the introduction of the communication approach requiring Korean NNS teachers to speak as much L2 as possible in the classroom, the teachers have not been meeting this expectation (ibid:632). It would appear that the teachers themselves lack confidence in this area because perhaps they also fear a loss of face in front of their students. Implied in my findings is the need for Korean NNS teachers to have training in this area, as they should also try and challenge themselves to speak English in their classrooms and consequently be an apt role model for the students to aspire to.

6.2. Strengths and limitations of research

In conducting bilingual studies some researchers may feel that it is a prerequisite to be proficient in the L1 of their students. However, I do not feel that my lack of proficiency in this area limited my research. If anything the research methodology I employed to overcome this factor, subsequently gave my research greater validity and reliability.

6.2.1. An evaluation of the employed methodology

By employing a dual focus approach this allowed me to overcome my lack of proficiency in my students' L1. Despite being a time consuming process it enabled me to not only deal with the bilingual nature of my study, but also the bicultural aspects. In other words, if I did have proficiency in my students' L1, being a NS English teacher does not necessarily mean that I would also have proficiency in their cultural traits.
In my wife and myself, we comprised a bilingual and bicultural research team. Her involvement functioned as:

a safeguard against the ethical concern about cultural hegemony when Western/Anglo theories drive the research questions posed in the study of other cultures.

(Erkut et al 1999:207)

By employing this methodology I have highlighted how it is possible for other teachers who lack L1 proficiency to conduct bilingual and bicultural research. Their lack of proficiency in their students' L1 should not be a limitation and I hope that my study will lead other NS teachers to employ a similar approach to study L1 use in their respective contexts.

The methods utilised for observation proved to be very effective. The audio and video recordings allowed me the opportunity to ensure the accuracy of my data. Additionally, conducting the interactions outside of the regular class reduced the observer's paradox: participants showed no indication of purposefully holding back on their L1 use due to being observed. Furthermore, I feel that being away from the direct gaze of their teacher and peers contributed positively to the concept of chae myon.

Employing an open-ended questionnaire via email had a dual function. It was a less intrusive process than face-to-face interviews. Secondly, the questionnaire allowed participants to fully articulate their thoughts. These two provisions led to a comprehensive understanding of their beliefs.

In preparing the data for analysis it was a challenge to classify each category as in some cases they could be classed in more than one category. However, the dual focus approach enabled us to achieve full consensus on each code which made the data reliable. To increase reliability it would have been beneficial to involve a third research facilitator who had bilingual and bicultural capabilities. However, due to time constraints and logistical considerations this was not feasible.
Even though I use task based learning activities when my students collaborate orally, I do not make a regular use of jigsaw and dictogloss tasks. Sae-hee remarked that:

*Dictation [the dictogloss task] is a hard format and we are not used to it. We need more practice in how to summarise key words to be more effective.*

Thus, it would appear that I had a lack of foresight in this area. I did pilot both tasks and provided students with model examples of the outcomes of each task. However, I did not provide them with effective coping strategies for successful task execution. In retrospect perhaps the students' limited exposure to the tasks led to over reliance on their L1 tool. However, if I used such tasks on a more regular basis, and strategic training was implemented (*see Appendix twelve*), this could possibly lead to a reduction in L1 use (Brooks *et al* 1997 - *see also chapter two*). The limitations on this aspect of my study could possibly be an area for further research in my context.

The sample used in this study included only four of my students. Observing a small sample provided a *thick description* (Geertz 1973) of the situation being researched as it provided in-depth insights into the different uses of L1. In this regard my research was conducted as a case study.

Even though, case studies provide natural grounds for generalisations (Cohen *et al* 2000:184), there still exists a contentious issue amongst the research profession whether this should be so (Richards 2003:21). Some argue that the insights generated in a particular case should be the most important factor (*ibid*). This aspect would appear to limit the transferability and external validity of my research. However, this case study encourages potential future research, within my context, which could corroborate, or contradict my current findings. Consequently, insights generated from a collection of case studies could then lead to generalisations (McDonough and McDonough 1997:217).
6.2.2. An evaluation of the socio-cultural framework

Utilising Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory as a framework for my research was useful as it enabled me to identify the various mediating functions which the L1 tool facilitated during the interactions. This tool was a prominent feature in the framework. By using the categories of scaffolding, intersubjectivity and private speech, to analyse L1 use in the interpsychological and the intrapsychological planes, my hope is that my study contributes to the work achieved in this area by Antón and Dicamilla (1999) and Leeming (2008).

In support of their work I found that L1 played a vital role in my students' psychological development. Within their ZPDs my students collectively scaffolded each other by mediating through their L1 tool, especially when trying to negotiate form and meaning. Within the framework participants also used their L1 tool to exchange language nuances which enabled them to establish social and cognitive intersubjectivity. Also, there were instances whereby students materialised their inner speech as private speech, which provided examples of how students use their L1 in this cognitive process to self-regulate their development and output. Without employing such a framework I do not feel that I would have achieved these level of insights into the cognitive processes of the students triggered by the use of their L1.

6.3. Future research proposals

The findings of this study have highlighted avenues which could be undertaken in future research undertaken into L1 use. Below, with my context in mind, I outline specific proposals.

Firstly, it would be beneficial to identify what differences there are in L1 use before and after awareness raising instruction for both students and NNS teachers. In the case of student interactions in pair-work tasks it would be interesting to research what changes in L1 use there are in the different cognitive processes after this training. Also, would
this training have a positive impact on NNS teachers use of the L1 in the classroom? In the above would students and teachers naturally challenge themselves, or are there other considerations to account for?

Secondly, if learners were trained in appropriate L1 vernacular use for social interactions how would this impact upon their use of the L1 as a tool within the socio-cultural framework. Would they make use of this new vernacular, or would they revert to their old L1 habits?

Lastly, how would task familiarity and coping strategies, with both a jigsaw and a dictogloss task, affect students' use of the L1 overtime. Brooks et al (1997) discovered that their American students of Spanish reduced their L1 use to establish intersubjectivity as they became familiar with jigsaw tasks. It would be interesting to note how their findings compare with Korean students of English, particularly as I noted that their unfamiliarity with both the tasks in my research possibly led to a high dependency on L1 use. Given the differences of each task touched upon in this dissertation, future research could expand upon Brooks et al's (ibid) study by comparing how L1 use changes for both jigsaw and dictogloss tasks overtime, through task familiarity.

The implications from the above studies would add to the growing body of research into L1 use in the classroom, but from the perspective of a South Korean context. From my familiarity with the research literature there seems to be limited explorations into L1 use in my specific context.

In this final chapter I have identified the implications of my study: adult intermediate South Korean students should maximise exposure to the L2 by having guided autonomy in their choice to use their L1 during oral interactive tasks. The earlier they are exposed to this guidance the more beneficial it would be for them. I have also evaluated the strengths and limitations of my study and highlighted areas for potential future research which would contribute to a deeper understanding of L1 use within my context.
6.4. Conclusive remarks

As South Korean adult intermediate English language students encounter cognitively demanding aspects of a task within Vygotsky's socio-cultural framework, without their L1 tool, it would appear that they would not be proficient in collectively scaffolding each other within their respective ZPDs. Thus, insisting on an 'English only approach' would be a deterrent to their "intellectual growth" (Guerrero and Villamil 2000:52). They would not be able to take turns to be a 'more capable peer' for one another in the interaction as they lack the tool which makes them fully capable. Thus, they would not have the full potential to develop each other.

Without L1 use, neither would they be successful in developing themselves internally. Furthermore, they would lack success in creating a positive environment in which they can grasp a shared control of the task.

Thus, in this respect teachers should not feel that they are failing themselves, nor their students by permitting, or observing L1 use in oral pair-work tasks, as its use is an asset to the cognitive processes present during interaction. However, on a cautionary note the amount of L1 use within each context needs careful consideration by the teacher.

In my context's case, my students appear ready to be guided to make challenges in their own development; by guiding them, they can maximise their own exposure to the L2. As teachers we need to minimise the risk for our students to become overly reliant on L1 use. Raising their awareness to encourage less dependability on their L1 tool is a way in which this risk can be minimised.
NOTES:

1. The structural framework for this dissertation has been partly inspired by the work of Leeming (2008), who conducted very similar research to myself in a Japanese context. I hope that the insights generated in my research will provide a perspective on L1 use in another Asian context (i.e. South Korea).

2. I was inspired to represent some aspects of my data results in pie chart form by Leeming (*ibid*). By utilising this form it allowed me the opportunity to visually represent a comparison of how both dyads used L1 and L2 in both tasks (Figure 1), how L1 use varied between tasks (Figure 2), different cognitive process of L1 use (Figure 4) and differences between a negotiation of form and meaning in both tasks (Figure 5). Figures 1 and 4 were inspired by the work of Leeming (*ibid*).
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Appendix 1: Participant information sheet

PROJECT TITLE: EVALUATING THE L1 USE OF ADULT INTERMEDIATE KOREAN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS DURING COLLABORATIVE ORAL TASKS

You are being invited to take part in a study as part of my dissertation for the MA TESOL degree that I'm doing with Manchester University. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the study is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with me if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.

Who will conduct the study? (누가 이 연구를 수행하는가?)

Dylan Glyn Williams.

Title of the study (논문주제)

Evaluating the L1 use of Adult Intermediate Korean English language learners during collaborative oral tasks.

What is the aim of the study? (연구목적은 무엇인가?)

In previous research I have researched how students help each other to produce English
when they work together on collaborative oral tasks. I wish to use this study to further research this matter. I hope that the results from this study will help me to develop my teaching skills when students are working together on oral tasks in the future.

저번 제 연구조사는 학생들이 그룹으로 말하기 과제에서 영어를 구사하기 위해 어떻게 서로 도왔는가를 알아보는 것이었습니다. 저는 이 주제를 더 확장하여 이 연구 조사 결과가 앞으로 학생들이 그룹과제를 시행시 저의 교수 방법을 향상시키는데 도움이 되리라 희망합니다.

**Why have I been chosen? (왜 내가 선택되었는가?)**
I wish to conduct the research with intermediate language learners.
저는 이 연구조사를 중급 이상의 학생들과 하고 싶습니다.

**What would I be asked to do if I took part? (참여하게 되면 무엇을 하게 되는가?)**
If you decide to partake in this research, you will be grouped with a partner and then both of you will have to complete 2 different tasks together. While you are doing this you will be recorded (audio) and filmed. This will happen during the time of our regular class over a 2 hour period. You will not be recorded and filmed for the whole of the class time only when you are doing the task with your partner.
여러분이 참여한다면, 한 명의 파트너와 그룹이 되어 2개의 과제를 수행하게 됩니다. 여러분이 과제를 수행시 녹음이 되고 비디오 녹화가 됩니다. 또한 수업시간 안에 행해집니다. 여러분은 수업시간동안 계속 녹음, 녹화가 되는 것이 아니라 이 과제를 수행할때만 녹음, 녹화가 됩니다.

Everybody in the class will be doing the same tasks at the same time with a partner. I just need 2 students who will volunteer to allow me permission to record and film their discussion.
수업중 모든 학생들이 똑같은 과제를 수행합니다. 저는 단지 2명의 자원 학생만 원하며 제가 여러분의 과제를 녹음, 녹화할수 있도록 허락 해 주길 바랍니다.

You will be given the instructions of how to do the 2 tasks in our regular class then when you do the task with your partner I will ask you both to go to an empty class that
is next door. This is where you will discuss and do the activity after following my
instructions. The reason you are asked to move to a separate classroom for the recording
is because the echo and sound of other students in our classroom makes it really hard
for me when I listen to what I recorded. I lose a lot of what has been said.

d 지원자는 어떻게 우리 수업시간에 2 개의 과제를 수행할지 방법을 듣게 되며 파트
너와 함께 과제 수행시 옆 빈 교실로 이동합니다. 여기서 여러분은 저의 지시사항
을 듣은 후 과제를 어떻게 수행할지 의논합니다. 여러분이 다른 교실로 이동하는
이유는 제가 녹음할때 다른 학생들의 목소리나 울림으로 제가 녹음하는데 어려움
이 있기 때문이며 여러분의 대화를 놓치지 않기 위해서 입니다.

Following your recorded pair-work I will ask you follow up questions by email. The
questions will be in Korean and I expect your answers to be in Korean.

What happens to the data collected? (녹음, 녹화, 과제를 거둔 후 어떻게 되나?)
I will upload the data to my personal computer at my home, to which my wife also has
access. A transcript will be printed and used for analysis, which will be carried out at
my home with my wife (who will help me with the Korean translation). When I am not
working on them, all documents relating to my dissertation will be stored in a locked
file on my computer and paper material will be stored in a locked desk drawer.

How is confidentiality maintained? (어떻게 철저히 보관되나?)
No one will have access to the data except for me and my wife, and you if you request
it. Where data is directly quoted in the dissertation, names will be changed. Within 1
year of the dissertation being submitted, I will erase the data from my computer.
What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?

(만약에 내가 연구조사에 참여하지 않거나 혹은 했더라도 마음이 변하면 어떻게 되나?)

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason. 여러분이 참여 하든 안 하든 전적으로 여러분의 선택입니다. 여러분이 참여한다면 이 자료를 받아 읽을 것이며 동의한다는 싸인을 합니다. 참여 한다고 싸인을 한 후에도 마음이 변하면 언제든지 사유,변명 없이 제게 말하면 됩니다.

What is the duration of the study? (과제 수행시간은 얼마나 되나?)

Your part in it would take 40 minutes of recording during our regular class time (i.e. the recording is made over the duration of our 2 hour regular class time). The follow up open-ended questionnaire through email, in Korean, will happen immediately after the tasks that you did and also a few weeks later after your final exams. My dissertation will be submitted on September 1st.

여러분은 2개의 과제를 약 40여분동안 정규 수업과정 중에 수행할 것입니다. 그 다음 한국말로 된 인터뷰(설문조사)를 이메일로 받게 되며 기말고사가 끝난 후 2번째 인터뷰(설문조사)를 이메일로 받게 됩니다. 제 논문제출은 9월 1일입니다.

Where will the study be conducted? (연구조사는 어디에서 행해지나?)

At our University. (대학교 캠퍼스).

Will the outcomes of the study be published? (연구 조사가 출판이 되나?)

The dissertation may be published. It will also be publicly available in the University of Manchester library.

제 논문은 출판될 수도 있습니다. 또한 맨체스터 대학 박물관 열람시 볼 수 있습니다.
Contact for further information (연락처)
If you would like to discuss the project further or ask any questions, please email me at dylowinkorea@lycos.com.
이 연구 수행에 궁금한 점이 있다면 위 이메일 주소를 이용하시길 바랍니다.

What if something goes wrong? (혹시 잘못된다면?)
Please contact me at dylowinkorea@lycos.com.
If you want to make a formal complaint about the conduct of the study please contact the Head of the Research Office, Christie Building, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL.
제 이메일 주소로 연락을 주세요.
혹시 불만사항이 있다면 Head of the Research Office, Christie Building, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL.로 연락을 바랍니다.
Appendix 2: Participant consent form

CONSENT FORM

If you are happy to participate please complete and sign the consent form below.

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

3. I understand that my pair-work discussions will be audio and video-recorded.

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes and names.

5. I agree to take part in the above project.

Please Initial
(이름 첫 글자 서명)

Name of participant (참여자) Date (날짜) Signature (서명)

Name of person taking consent
(덜란 글린 윌리암즈) Date (날짜) Signature (서명)
Appendix 3: Jigsaw task materials

The pictures below are the pictures which the dyads were given for completion of the jigsaw task. Here they are arranged in the correct sequence (left to right). However, each dyad member were given only 4 random pictures to begin the task, which they had to describe to their partner. Upon listening to the description the other participant drew the picture.
The jigsaw task that each dyad were given had been created by myself to review and practice the target language which had been presented in previous lessons. Previously, we talked about gadgets and technology, passives and also we had talked about changing appearances - *have / get something done*.

After, the dyads had placed the pictures into the correct sequence this is an example of the target language which they could produce.

"Bob, Ben and Bet are sheep. It was summer time and it was very hot for them because of their thick woollen coats. They saw a road in the distance.

They went walking down the road and in the distance they could see a big city. They were still very hot and thirsty because of their thick coats.

They went to the city and they saw a hairdressers called 'Cheap Robocuts'. Inside there was a robot who gave haircuts. It was open, so they went in.

The three sheep were sat in chairs in the hairdressers and the robot was happily cutting their wool.

The 3 sheep felt very relaxed when they were having their hair cut, so they fell asleep. The robot was still cutting their hair, but its battery was low.

The three sheep were still sleeping, but the robot had no battery and there was a system error.

Suddenly, the sheep woke up and they were shocked when they saw themselves in the mirror.

When they left the hairdressers one sheep had gotten his hair straightened, the other had gotten a mohican and a manicure and had gotten his body shaved. The other had gotten her ears pierced and her hair dyed and also had gotten a makeover. The robot had crashed on the floor and the shop was closed".
Appendix 4: Dictogloss task materials

Below is the dictogloss script which was read to the dyads. It was read twice at normal speed. It had been adapted from Smart Choice 3 (Wilson 2007: 61). The focus of this task also related to have / get something done, but this task was more focused on passives. Prior to embarking on the task students were pre-taught the following vocabulary items: boho chic, hippie, bohemian and gypsy. Following the reading students were provided with labeled pictures of all the celebrities mentioned.

"Rachel Zoe is one of the most popular Hollywood stylists. Lindsay Lohan and Nicole Richie are some of her famous clients. Both of them have had their entire wardrobe styled by her. Zoe tells them what to wear, what jewellery they need, how they should have their hair done, and what makeup to use. She dresses them in her own style, which she calls 'boho chic'. Boho chic is not an original idea. British style queens like model Kate Moss and actress Sienna Miller created it. It's a combination of bohemian, hippie, and gypsy influences, which were very fashionable in the 1970s. This style is not appropriate for red carpet events. Zoe uses a more sophisticated style for these occasions".
Appendix 5: Piloted jigsaw task

The pictures below are the pictures which the dyads were given for completion of the piloted jigsaw task. Here they are arranged in the correct sequence. However, each dyad member were given only 3 random pictures to begin the task, which they had to describe to their partner. Upon listening to the description the other participant drew the picture. The following pictures were taken from: www.jockmackenzie.wordpress.com.
After attempting to sequence and write the piloted jigsaw task, the participants were provided with the following to give them a model example of the output of the task.

C. Santa shows his elves a plan for a chair.

E. Studying the plan as they go the elves head for the workshop.

A. The elves build Santa's chair.

D. The elves having assumed that Santa wanted 'elf sized' chairs, return with the finished product.

F. Santa, being Santa, thanks the elves for their hard work and waves good bye.

B. Unable to use the individual chairs Santa sits on the whole sack.

**Appendix 6: Piloted dictogloss**

Below is the piloted dictogloss script which was read to the dyads. It was read twice at normal speed. It had been adapted from Smart Choice 3 (Wilson 2007: 25).

“The Mona Lisa, which was painted by Leonardo da Vinci, is one of the most famous paintings in the world. It is currently exhibited at the Louvre Museum in Paris, France. Or is it? Some people think that the painting at the Louvre is actually fake. The painting was stolen from the Louvre in 1911, but it was later recovered by the police. Maybe the painting that was stolen was a copy. If this is so we still need to ask: where is the real Mona Lisa?”
Appendix 7: Transcription key

Transcription conventions were based on Richards (2007: 173-4).

Detailed examples of each symbol in use can be viewed in the above reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>questioning intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>exclamatory utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>pause of about 2 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(...)</td>
<td>pause of about 1 second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>micropause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[[ ]</td>
<td>speakers start at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>latched utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>sound stretching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xxx)</td>
<td>unable to transcribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>other details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>prominent rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>prominent falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>abrupt cut-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>hitch or stutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPS</td>
<td>louder than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hhh</td>
<td>aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.hhh</td>
<td>inhalations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>quieter than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; &lt;</td>
<td>quicker than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8: Open-ended survey questions

The following five questions were the initial questions which the participants were asked to respond to via email:

The research that I'm doing is into how Korean students use their first language to help them produce the second language during pair-work tasks.

이번 조사는 한국 학생들이 그룹 과제 수행시 영어를 구사하는데 있어 한국말이 어떻게 쓰이며 도움이 되는가 입니다.

In order to further understand how you feel about the use of Korean in the English language classroom can you explain in detail whether or not you agree with each of the following statements:

 좀 더 나아가 여러분들이 영어 시간에 한국말을 쓰는 것에 대해 어떻게 생각하는지 알고 싶습니다. 다음 각 문장에 대해 여러분이 동의 하는지 또는 반대 하는지 설명 해 보시오.

1. 'Korean students use too much Korean language in the English language classroom during pair-work tasks'.

한국 학생들은 영어 시간 그룹 과제시, 한국말을 너무 많이 한다.

2. 'Korean students should sometimes challenge themselves to produce English and not rely too much on their use of Korean during pair-work tasks'.

한국 학생들은 영어 시간 그룹 과제시, 가끔 한국말에 의존하지 않고 스스로 영어를 쓸려 고도전해야 한다.

3. 'Using Korean is a valuable tool that helps students produce the English language during pair-work tasks'.

영어 시간 그룹과제시, 한국말을 쓰는 것은 영어를 표현하는데 도움이 되는 중요한 요소이다.

4. 'I prefer it when the teacher forces me to speak only English during pair-work tasks'.

영어 시간 그룹 과제시, 나는 선생님이 내게 영어만을 쓸도록 강요 하기를 원한다.
5. Which task did you find easier to do when you were recorded? Why do you think this was so?
녹음이 되고 있을때 어떤 과제가 더 쉬웠나? 왜 그렇게 생각하는가?

Following analysis the participants were asked to respond to the questions below via email:

1. After analysing the data of both tasks together in your interaction you spoke Korean for 50% of the time. Does this result surprise you? Why? or, Why not?

2 개 과제의 데이터를 분석 후 여러분은 50% 정도 한국말을 사용 했습니다. 이 결과에 놀랐습니까? 왜 그렇습니까? 왜 그렇지 않습니까?

2. You used more Korean in the listening task than in the picture task. Does this result surprise you? Why do you think you used more Korean in the listening task?

여러분은 그림 과제보다 듣기 과제에서 한국말을 더 사용했습니다. 이 결과에 놀랐습니까? 왜 듣기 과제에서 한국말을 더 많이 사용했다고 생각하십니까?

3. I spoke Korean because I was worried about making mistakes when I spoke in English in front of my friend. Discuss.

'친구들 앞에서 영어로 말할 때 실수 할까봐 걱정이 되서 한국말을 썼다'에 대해 논하시오.

4. I spoke Korean because I was worried about making mistakes when I spoke in English, knowing that the teacher was going to see and listen to what I said. Discuss.

'선생님이 보고 듣기에 영어로 말할때 실수 할까봐 걱정이 되서 한국말을 썼다'에 대해 논하시오.

5. Have I been too flexible with you in the classroom in allowing you to use your Korean too often during pair-work speaking activities?

혹시라도 그룹 과제 말하기에서 달란선생님이 한국말을 많이 사용하는 것에 관대하고 허락한 적이 있는가?

6. Which do you think you use Korean for most often in the English class? To discuss a vocabulary item, or a grammar form?

영어 시간에 한국말을 더 많이 사용하는 경우는 어휘인가요? 아니면 문법인지 논하시오.
Appendix 9: Samples of dyads' produced written work

Below illustrates the pictures drawn by Moon-jin and Mi-na after listening to each other's descriptions. Then below is the output of their collaboration in writing the sequence:

B. Picture Task
Do not show your 4 pictures to each other. First explain each picture to each other. Draw the pictures in the 4 boxes below. After explaining your pictures to each other place all the cards in the correct order on the table and then help each other to write the story in the space below.

1. Three sheeps are exhausted from the hot weather and they are going to somewhere.
2. Finally they arrive to the city.
3. They stop in front of the robot's hair salon.
4. Robot start to curl sheep's fur.
5. While robot is cutting sheep's fur, they come to rest a sleep.
6. However, robot has no battery so his system doesn't work well.
7. One of sheeps is embarrassed and very surprising.
8. After they woke up, they come out from the shop and robot is dead.

Shop's appearance changed into rocker.
Below illustrates the separate key words which were identified by Moon-jin and Mi-na in the dictogloss task and then in green we see the output of their collaborative efforts:
Below illustrates the pictures drawn by Sang-min and Sae-hee after listening to each other's descriptions. Then below is the output of their collaboration in writing the sequence:

1. There are three sheeps which are sweating on a field.
2. They arrive at a town.
3. They feel so hot, so they decide to shave.
4. They are sitting on chairs, and a robot starts cutting.
5. While cutting their hair, they are sleeping, and the robot's battery is getting low.
6. The robot has a system error, but they are still sleeping.
7. When he wakes up, he is shocked.
8. They leave the shop, but they have strange hair style.
Below illustrates the separate key words which were identified by Sang-min and Sae-hee in the dictogloss task and then in red we see the output of their collaborative efforts. Also circled in red are the key words which Sang-min wrote in Hangeul script (Korean):
Appendix 10: Awareness raising framework of L1 use

Below is a framework that students can paste into their textbooks and quickly use to tally their score and assess how they will approach a collaborative task. This provides guided autonomy for them as it raises their awareness as to whether or not they need to use their L1 on task. Once students have been assigned a task they can take a minute or so to raise their own awareness about how difficult they feel the task will be for them. By reading each statement and then circling a number which corresponds with how they feel, students can then tally their total score and follow the corresponding advice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE ← 12345 → STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking English to do this task is going to be difficult</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't understand what I'm supposed to do in this task</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't have the necessary language skills to do this task</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't feel confident in my ability to do this task</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I might have to get some knowledge from my partner to do this exercise</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Range</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>I will need to speak Korean to my partner during the task. The task is going to be very difficult for me to do all of it by speaking in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 POINTS</td>
<td>I understand what I’m supposed to do but I think I will have to ask a lot of questions in Korean to my partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 POINTS</td>
<td>I think I can do this without speaking Korean. It might be difficult, but I will try to challenge myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 POINTS</td>
<td>I might need to ask my partner for a little assistance in Korean, but apart from this I can do most of the task by speaking English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 POINTS</td>
<td>I don’t need to speak any Korean at all for this task. I am confident in my ability and in the target language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above framework is fairly generic as it can be applied to any task; yet it is flexible as it can be adapted by making it more germane for specific tasks. This is accomplished simply by just altering the questions.

For example, for a dictogloss task one might ask:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I don't feel confident that I heard all the key words</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don't know what some of the key words mean</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't feel I know the grammar form we are practicing well enough</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know how to do this task</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to listen another time to the script</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, for a jigsaw task one might ask:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I don't understand what my pictures mean</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don't know the English names for all the vocabulary items</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know what part my pictures play in the puzzle</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know what I'm supposed to do in this task</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want my partner to re-explain the task to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11: Useful L2 vernacular for pair-work activities

Below is a list of possible language chunks which can be drilled on a regular basis with the students to give them more L2 vernacular training in how to socially manage their interactions. This is just a brief example which relate to some L1 chunks which were uttered by the participants in my data collection.

➢ How do you say / spell __________?
➢ What do call ________ in English?
➢ What shall we write?
➢ What do you think?
➢ Am I right?
➢ I'm not sure about ..... 
➢ Why don't we change _______ to _________
➢ This doesn't sound right.
➢ Why don't you try to speak more English.
➢ Why don't you try to speak less Korean.
➢ I think the grammar form is wrong here.
➢ Why don't we come back to this later.
➢ Let's move on to the next part.
➢ Do you agree with what I'm saying?
➢ I don't agree with you because ..... 
➢ Wait a minute .... / Just a second ...
➢ Sorry, can you repeat what you just said?
➢ Did you hear this key word _____?
➢ I didn't hear that.
➢ Where does this picture fit in the story?
➢ I can't explain something in my picture.
➢ Do you understand what I mean?
➢ Shall we finish here?
Appendix 12: Strategies to assist students manage dictogloss and jigsaw tasks

Below is a brief example of coping strategies which teachers can instruct students to use prior to embarking on jigsaw and dictogloss tasks. With such strategies there is a likelihood that L1 use will be reduced.

**Jigsaw coping strategies**

➢ The pictures that you have at the beginning relate to only half of the whole story which you will make with your partner. Look at the pictures which you have. Do they make any sense to you as part of a story at the beginning of the task?

➢ As you describe the pictures and write the sequence think about how best to relate the language that we have just studied in the class to this task.

➢ Remember you can change your mind about the meaning, or contents of a picture at any time. Similarly, if you disagree with what your partner has said about a picture it is ok to let your partner know about this.

➢ When arranging the pictures in the correct sequence, explain to one another (in English) why the picture belongs in this particular part of the story. This will help you later when it comes time to write the whole story. Disagreeing with your partner's opinion about the order in which to put each picture is also ok.

➢ Read the whole story aloud, once you have written it. This will help you to notice any errors in your written work and also it will help you to notice if some of your grammar structures sound strange, or incorrect.
Dictogloss coping strategies

➢ Don't feel that you have to try and remember everything exactly as it was said.

➢ When noting key words, focus should be on proper nouns, adjectives, verbs etc. Words such as conjunctions (and, so, but etc) and prepositions (in, on etc) can be used later when reconstructing the sentences. By only focusing on proper nouns etc, there is a greater chance that you will be able to increase the amount of keywords which you have.

➢ The aim of the task is for you to use your key words and together try to reconstruct sentences which are grammatically accurate. As mentioned above it does not have to be exactly like the original script.

➢ Before you start writing the text look at the keywords that both you and your partner have.

➢ Think about the structure of the grammar form that we are practising this will help you to recreate the sentences accurately.

Contact for further information

If you would like to discuss this dissertation further please email me at dylowinkorea@lycos.com