

Use of Mother Tongue in English-as-a-Foreign-Language Speech by Japanese University Students

Tomoko Kaneko

Abstract

This study investigates to what extent and why some mother-tongue (L1) words were used in Japanese students' speech in English, using the Louvain International Database of Spoken English Interlanguage Japanese Sub-Corpus. So far, the reason for direct mother tongue use in the second and foreign language (L2) speech by English learners is explained solely as being the lack of knowledge of the English expressions. The data shows that there are some examples of L1 use which cannot be explained only by this reason, as well as of some differences of L1 use according to the speakers' proficiency levels. By analyzing the functions of the L1 use in the speech, this study also aims to shed light on how to improve L2 English speech by Japanese learners of English.

Introduction

It is natural for Japanese learners of English to be puzzled about how to express what they have in mind in English especially when they can't find the exact words or expressions in their foreign language (L2) and when the direct translation from their mother tongue (L1) does not fit into the slot of the English structure. The systems of their L1 and L2 do not match well enough so that a slot to slot translation from L1 to L2 makes communication possible. Things would be much easier if the learners could construct sentences only by translating the equivalent L1 word into L2. However, as Mackey (1965: 107) states, "The learning of one language in childhood is an inevitable process; the learning of a second language is a special accomplishment." It is encouraging for both teachers and learners to know how much effort the learners put on trying to communicate. And this phenomenon is worth researching in order to find out a more effective way to improve their speaking proficiency as well.

A typical strategy learners take when they have trouble communicating their message is the use of L1. And so far, the reason for L1 use in L2 speech is explained solely as being the lack of knowledge of the English expressions. By investigating to what extent and in which functions and context L1 words are used in Japanese students' speech in English, this study serves to gain some insights into the ways to improve English speaking proficiency of Japanese learners.

Former Studies on L1 Use

L1 use in English has long been an interesting topic for language teachers.

Historically in Japan, as a reaction to the L1 based Grammar-Translation Method, the Audio-Lingual Method was introduced, the principle of which totally abandoned the use of L1. However, what actually happened in classrooms in Japan was that although the teachers used only L2 in doing pattern practices, when they did other types of activities, for example, explanation of the content, or presentation of the activities and so forth, it was their tradition to use L1, which also led the students to use L1 in most of their class hours. After the introduction of the Natural Method as well as reliance on Communicative Language Teaching, the use of L1 was not supposed to be allowed at all in the classroom for a while. However, recently, more attention is being given to L1 use in the classroom. Atkinson (1993: 2) recommends a limited use of L1 and states that “L1 can be a valuable resource if it is used at appropriate times and in appropriate ways.”

Mother tongue support has also been studied as one of the teaching strategies in L2 classrooms. Meyer (2008) refers to the students’ use of L1 and states that it works to lower the students’ affective filters. In the classroom, there are several ways for teachers to allow their students to use L1, for example, in requesting clarification questions of teacher’s explanation on grammar. Or teachers are able to support their own L2 utterances in communication activities by using L1. Meyer further states that the L1 use by students allow them to attain greater fluency especially when engaging in storytelling activities. He states that the use of L1 makes learning meaningful and accessible by allowing them to engage in code-switching. It has now become a presumption among SLA researchers and language teachers that the primary medium of instruction should surely be in L2, while there is definitely a place for L1, especially for beginning and lower level learners.

The second field of SLA where the L1 use is often studied is in reading comprehension. In L2 reading, translation is a frequently cited cognitive strategy (O’Malley and Chamot, 1990). Seng and Hashim (2006) refer to Cook (1992) and remind us that the L1 is ever present in the mind of learners whether they want it to be there or not. Cook (1992: 557) further states that “people with multicompetence” (the compound state of a mind with two grammars) “are not simply equivalent to two monolinguals but are a unique combination.”

The last area where L1 use has been studied is in the use of communication strategies. The study on communication strategies started in searching for the ones used by good L2 learners (Bialystok, 1978). Although, there have not been many studies that show the positive effect of all kinds of strategy use on the learners’ oral L2 proficiency, many teachers and researchers expect that the use of specific strategies plays an important role even in learning L2. Dornyei (1995) categorizes strategies for communication into achievement and reduction strategies. Nakatani (2005: 81) explains that “the former present learners’

active behavior in repairing and maintaining interaction, and the latter reflect learners' negative behavior as they try to avoid solving communication difficulties." Nakatani further subcategorizes these two strategies and the use of L1 is labeled as the first-language-based strategy under reduction strategies as follows:

These strategies consisted of interjections in Japanese for a lexical item when the learner experienced communication difficulties. The students occasionally used Japanese either intentionally or unintentionally. (p. 82)

By Nakatani's definition, "interjections" include content words like *minato* (harbor) or *yotto* (yacht) as shown in his excerpt "How can I go... [pause] *minato*...*yotto*..." from a participant of his study. Although it has not been demonstrated whether the use of L1 is useful or not in L2 acquisition yet, studies in this area clearly show that the learners often use L1 in their L2 speech when they have some difficulties in communicating their messages and when they would like to avoid the somewhat challenging use of L2.

Based on what Cook (1992) pointed out, L1 use in L2 production seems to be a natural phenomenon. However, since the use of L1 seems to be gradually phased out as students become more proficient in the L2, there has been no focused study on the use of L1 in L2 production so far, except for the brief one by Shimizu (2007). Shimizu picked up all the Japanese vocabulary used in the Japanese English-as-a-Foreign-Language Learner (JEFL) corpus. JEFL is a writing corpus compiled by collecting over 10,000 compositions by Japanese junior and senior high school students under a limited number of topics. Shimizu (2007) classified the grammatical categories of the vocabulary and pointed out that Japanese junior and senior high school students use less and less L1, especially, function words (ex. prepositions and conjunctions), as they progress to the higher grades. The results give insight not only to some difficult words that high school students have trouble with in writing but also to the fact that L1 function words will be gradually replaced by L2 words as their proficiency develops. However, there are some differences between the use of spoken and written languages. The most noticeable one is that not much planning time is allowed in speaking, and thus, varieties of communication strategies are supposed to be used in spoken language. Also, in novice level English writing in JEFL, the focus of the writers was less on fluency but more on accuracy. In this point, it should be interesting to study the use of L1 in L2 speech in detail. At the same time, since learners seem to code-switch from L2 into L1 in speaking while they have not yet acquired sufficient knowledge of the L2, looking at the reasons for the use of L1 among the different proficiency-level speakers will be one promising way to find the process of their L2 development.

Based on the discussions above, the present study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent is L1 used in L2 speech by Japanese university students?

2. What are the functions of the L1 used in the speech?
3. What are the differences in the use of L1 according to the speakers' proficiency levels?

Procedures

Participants

The participants are all Japanese third or fourth year university students of English. Most of them had experienced a short period of stay (1 week-5 months) in an L1 English environment in order to study English language and culture.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data used for the present study is the Louvain International Database of Spoken English Interlanguage (LINDSEI) Japanese Sub-Corpus. LINDSEI is a corpus of spoken learner language, and a number of sub-corpora are currently being compiled for different mother tongue backgrounds. Although the present study does not seek this, the key objective of the LINDSEI project is to collect comparable data among the students of various L1 backgrounds. The data was collected by interviewing participants. The interview lasted about 15 minutes and there were two parts in it. In the beginning, subjects were requested to choose a topic and talk about it for a few minutes. Then, the researcher asked questions related to what the subject had spoken about, and also about more general topics, for example, life at university, hobbies, future jobs, etc. In the second half of the interview, the participant was asked to look at four pictures which made up a short story. Once the 51 interviews were recorded, they were transcribed and compiled into the Japanese Sub-Corpus.

In order to be used for the purpose of the present study, and to be analyzed using a computer analysis tool (WordSmith version 4), all the Japanese words were tagged in the files. L1 words used in the files were divided into three categories based on their functions: content words (nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs), interjections, and speakers' internal monologues. Frequency of the Japanese words in the files was also calculated.

At the same time, the 51 files in the corpus were divided into two groups based on the general fluency of the students judged by two native speakers of English. Any difference between the groups in the use of L1 in their L2 speech will hopefully work as a key to find the developmental process of their L2 acquisition.

Results

In order to answer the three research questions, a list of all the Japanese words used in the files was made first [cf. Appendix (also includes all other data)]. Then, the frequency of the L1 was examined by looking at the ratio to the total number of words and turns. Next, L1 use was also examined based on the functions of the L1. And finally, the relationship between the use of L1 and the students' English proficiency levels was analyzed.

Frequency of L1

Table 1 shows the frequency of L1 among the total frequency of interviewee words in the data. It shows that the L1 used by the participants is less than 0.4%, which means that the students used one Japanese word out of approximately 267 words on average.

Table 1: Frequency of L1 Use in the Corpus

N. of words used	N. of L1	Ratio
40250	151	0.38%

Table 2 shows the frequency of speaking turns taken by the interviewee with at least one L1 word among the total frequency of interviewee turns in the data. Turns with L1 here means turns with at least one L1 and in some turns, more than two L1s were used within the single turn. The ratio of turns with L1 to the total frequency of turns was about 2.7%, which means that the students used at least one Japanese word in every 36 turns in average.

Table 2: Frequency of L1 Use in Each Turn

N. of turns	N. of turns with L1	Ratio
2978	82	2.75%

Functions of L1

Table 3 shows the functions of L1 in the data. The category “content words” include L1 words which carried the content meaning, for example, *udonya* (n. noodle shop), *shijisareru* (v. be directed), *kyoutuuno* (adj. common), and so forth. The most common “interjection” was *eto* or *unto*, which are often used to show the speakers’ efforts for continuing their speech by looking for the appropriate word, phrase or sentence to express their thoughts. The definition of interjection is different from Nakatani’s (2005) cited before. The category “internal monologue” in the present study includes expressions like *nanndarou* (what should I say?), *ja-nakutte* (it’s not appropriate), *wakannai* (I don’t know), and so forth. The expressions in this category are different from the one in the above category “interjection” in that interjections are just sounds which show the speaker’s efforts to find an appropriate expression, while those words in “internal monologue” are often reduced sentences, which

Table 3: Frequencies of L1 Use According to the Three Functions

Content words				Interjections	Internal monologues	Total
noun	verb	adj.	adv.			
22 (14.6)	1 (0.7)	1 (0.7)	1 (0.7)	111 (73.5)	15 (9.9)	151 (100.0)
25 (16.6)						

*The numbers in the () show the % in the total frequency.

show the speaker's efforts to organize thoughts as well as to appeal for help from the interlocutor.

Not only the quantitative results but also qualitative ones will be useful to analyze the functions of L1. In the following section, the functions of the L1 words will be investigated according to their grammatical categories.

(1) Content words

1. Nouns

The Key Word in Context (KWIC) lines of L1 nouns illustrate several reasons why L1 was used in the slot.

A. The first group represents the cases where the speaker failed to find an appropriate L2 and decided to use L1 instead. In all the excerpts in the data, the word between <c> and </c> shows the target L1 use and the L1s are italicized.

1 I went to Seattle.. as a ... <c>*gakuryo*</c> em ..to study English . and last year I went to

In excerpt 1, the speaker used the L1 *gakuryo* (school retreat facility stay) here to mean “training institute.” It shows that the speaker is really thinking how to express that meaning in L2 while using the L2 interjection *em*, and silence (...), as shown in the underlined parts.

2 to apartment is mm mm nandakke <c>*kanrinin-san*</c> mm . mm the women who rend me
3 .. I saw many ... mm nandakke .. <c>*shingo-mushi*</c> tres=trespassing people so I asked

In the excerpts 2 and 3, the L1 content words are used with another L1 word (underlined) which is an internal monologue in addition to interjection. *Nandakke* means “what should I say?”, *kanrinin-san*, “caretaker of an apartment” and *shingo-mushi*, “running a red light.”

4 I forgot the word in in English <c>*jibunkatte*</c> selfish and . so I so erm em America has
5 sauce my specialty is ... mm a ... *iya* <c>*charhan*</c> er yes fried rice a very different
6 he think he want to try to open .. a <c>*udonya*</c> noodle shop and he is .. fifty .. late of

In 3 cases (excerpts 4, 5, and 6) out of 22 cases, the speaker figured out the appropriate L2 word later and added those words (underlined) as shown above.

7 I don't know what what to say to <c>*ijime*</c> mm she . mm she has mm she worried about

The speakers of the excerpts 4 and 7 express in L2 that they are looking for an appropriate L2 word. *Ijime* in excerpt 7 means “bullying.”

B. The second group represents the cases where the L1 word before the target word triggered the use of L1.

8 .. but I'm going to ski . by *Yamagata* <c>Shinkansen</c> .. from Tokyo okay topic two
9 acquisition I take *XX-Sensei* <c>zemi</c> so my graduation thesis is maybe second language

The use of L1 here is rather natural, especially in the case of excerpt 8, since *Yamagata Shinkansen* (*Yamagata* Bullet Train) is considered a proper noun, adding to the fact that most non-natives who live in Japan, including the interviewer, know what a *shinkansen* is. *Zemi* in excerpt 9 means “seminar” in English.

C. The last group also represents the cases where there seems to be no reservations in using L1. The speakers seem to have judged that it was natural to use these L1 words because of the language environment where the interview was administered.

10 topic one lesson means class or <c>kyokun</c> erm . eh . I choose topic two .. erm my
11 and now I have a part time job in <c>juku</c> and I'm teaching . at . elementary school
12 understand but in Japan there's <c>teloppu</c> like that mm .. eh .. Six Sense mm .. so

Interestingly, in excerpt 10, the speaker used L1 to explain the meaning of the English word. *Juku* in the excerpt 11 means “cram school,” and *teloppu* in 12 means “telop” respectively. Excerpt 11 is the case where the speaker thought to be understood in L1 by the interviewer since the speaker knows that the interviewer is very familiar with the speaker's L1. Example 12 is the case where the speaker used the word “telop” in a Japanese accent, because the speaker did not expect that the word is pronounced differently in English or simply didn't know how to pronounce “telop” in English, although she guessed that the word originated from English.

2. A Verb

There is only one example of the use of a verb.

13 they thought they they feel .. they are <c>shijisarerutte</c> *nanndeshitakke* mm yeah .. but

Here the L1 word *shijisarerutte* consist of two parts; verb *shijisareru* (be directed) plus noun marker *-tte*. In addition to this, the verb *shijisareru* itself consists of two parts: noun head

shiji plus verb suffix *sareru*. As Swan and Smith (2001: 301) point out, “Japanese has one-word verb forms with no auxiliary verbs, so that students find English verb phrases difficult to construct.” Since suffix *suru* is in active voice and *sareru*, in passive voice, when *sareru* is combined with *shiji* (n.) as shown in the excerpt, it means “being directed” in English. The speaker clearly knew that the meaning of “being directed” should be in passive voice in L2. Thus grammatically, there were only two possibilities to express the meaning in this context if the speaker had known that she was going to use L1 in the slot based on English sentence structure; “they are *shijisuru*” and “they *shijisareru*.” In the former phrase, the English verb “are” and the L1 active voice suffix *suru* mark passive voice and in the latter phrase, the L1 suffix *sareru* marks the passive voice. What actually happened was that the speaker chose the structure shown above. This suggests that the speaker had not expected that she would use L1 in the slot. It also suggests that the speaker had not analyzed the equivalent passive verb phrase in L1 as “*be V+past participle*” and that she had forgotten that she already uttered the “*be V*” part of the passive voice in L2 when she tried to express an appropriate meaning of the English verb in L1.

3. An Adjective

There was also only one example of the use of an adjective.

14 Japanese mm .. they have .. erm .. *kyoutuuno* .. common sense mm .. and it is from

The above is another example where the speaker found an appropriate L2 word (underlined) after the use of L1. The use of many interjections here shows that the speaker made lots of efforts in finding out the L2.

4. An Adverb

There were no L1 adverbs which modified verbs in the data.

15 holiday vacation yes many times *hai* mm ... a my mother said you are . a you

The L1 adverb in the above excerpt is used as a back channel.

Although the plot charts which show where the L1 content words were used in the data are not included in the present paper because of the space limit, they suggest that the students mainly used them in the first half of the interview. In the first half, the students talked about a selected topic and then the interviewer asked some questions about the students’ talk. On the other hand, in the latter half where the students made a story based on four pictures, there were only a few L1 content words. It is plausible that in the first

half, the students had to say something anyway in answer for the interviewer’s questions and suddenly they knew they were in trouble finding the appropriate words. In the second half one-way picture story task, the students were able to have more online planning time, and could avoid using ambiguous L2 and used some other expressions instead.

As a whole, in most cases, the students used L1 when they couldn’t find an appropriate L2 in the slot. In only two (excerpts 5 and 8) out of 25 cases, they added communication strategies in L2, where the flow of their speech was very natural. And in four out of 25 cases, they themselves found equivalent L2 words after expressing the meaning in L1, which led to natural communication even though they used L1 at first. Thus it is true that in over 75% of the cases where the students used L1 content words, the communication failure took place.

(2) Interjections

Interjections in L2 are usually categorized as one of the communication strategies, although the use of L1 interjections is rather disturbing to non-native listeners. There were 44 examples of *etto/eh* including *e:to*, *etto*, *ettoo*, *ettoo*, *eeto*, *eh*, *e:*, and *e* in the data. And there were 41 examples of *unto/mmtto* including *unto*, *untto*, *unnto*, *uuntoo*, *unntto*, *umm:*, *ummtto*, *nttoo*, *nto:*, *mtto*, and *mmtto*. In addition, there were 26 examples of *a:* including *aato*, *atto*, *a:*, and *a*. The typical context of the use of the above interjections was with other L2 interjections and silent pauses as shown in the underlined parts in excerpt 16 below.

16 but next mhm .. Milan Milan ... <u>erm</u> ... <i><i>etto</i></i> .. <u>..</u> Firenze’s hotel was very bad mhm lamp

One thing to be mentioned here is that to distinguish Japanese *a* or *a:* from L2 “ah” or “erm” and so on are not at all easy, and the decision was made solely by the transcriber of the data. For example, “erm” in excerpt 16 was judged as English interjection by the transcriber, while *eh* in 10 was judged as Japanese.

(3) Internal monologues

This category also belongs to the use of communication strategies, which works to show that the speaker needs help from the recipient. If they were expressed in English, as is categorized by Nakatani (2005: 81) as “an appeal for help (used when seeking an interlocutor’s assistance in solving problems caused by the lack of target language knowledge),” the flow of the speech should have been as natural as L2 talk. In the data, there were 15 examples of L1 under this category (*wakannai*, *nannteiittara*, *nandakke*, *nanndakke*, *nanndakkena*, *nanndeshitakke*, *nanntei*, *nanndaro*, *ja-nakutte*, *iiyaa*, and *chigau*) including the ones shown in excerpts 2 and 3.

Differences in the L1 Use According to Proficiency Levels

In this section, the use of L1 will be compared between the higher proficiency group and lower proficiency group. The overall proficiency of the speakers has been checked and grouped into 2 groups by 2 native speakers of English. The inter-rater reliability was .96.

Table 4 shows the summary of the use of L1 in two groups.

Table 4: Summary of L1 Use in Two Groups

Levels	N. of words used	N. of L1	Ratio	N. of turns used	N. of turns with at least one L1	Ratio	N. of words per turn
Upper G	20495	57	0.28%	1488	38	2.55%	13.77
Lower G	19755	94	0.48%	1490	44	2.95%	13.25

It is shown here that the upper group used more words in each turn and the frequency of L1 use was less than that by the lower group. At the same time, the ratio of turns with at least one L1 was also less in the upper proficiency group.

Tables 5 and 6 show the detailed use of L1 in each group.

Table 5: Frequencies of L1 Use According to the Three Functions (Upper Group)

Content words				Interjections	Internal monologues	Total
noun	verb	adj.	adv.			
12 (21.1)	1 (1.8)	1 (1.8)	1 (1.8)	33 (57.9)	9 (15.8)	57 (100.0)
15 (26.3)						

*The numbers in the () show the % in the total frequency.

Table 6: Frequencies of L1 Use According to the Three Functions (Lower Group)

Content words				Interjections	Internal monologues	Total
noun	verb	adj.	adv.			
10 (10.6)	0	0	0	78 (83.0)	6 (6.4)	94 (100.0)
10 (10.6)						

*The numbers in the () show the % in the total frequency.

In the lower group, lots of L1 interjections were used and nouns were the only L1 content words used. In the upper group, the use of interjections decreased more than 20% and more L1 content words were used with more varieties. As for the internal monologues, it is clearly shown that more L1 monologues were used in the upper group.

Discussion and Summary

The use of L1 in general shows that the students are struggling at communicating in L2. Although the total frequency of L1 in speech was less than 0.4%, the ratio of the turns with at least one L1 word among the total frequency of turns was almost 3%.

The functions L1 used for were divided into 3 groups in the present study. As a whole L1 content words were used when the speaker couldn't find any appropriate L2 word. However, in a few cases, the speaker succeeded in finding the target word after expressing the idea in L1 first. Although the frequency was less than those examples, there were a few cases where the speakers expressed in L2 that they were searching for appropriate words. This suggests a positive attitude toward communication by the speakers. A serious concern is in the case where the speaker didn't show any reservation about using L1. This phenomenon may have taken place because the interview was administered in an L1 environment. Somewhere in the participants' mind, the use of L1 must have been natural in this environment. In some cases, the talk by the interviewee even sounded like saying, "how come you (the interviewer) didn't know the meaning of this word?" The unnaturalness of L2 use in L1 environment is often an issue to be considered in teaching English as a foreign language. The second concern is the confusion of the concept of active and passive voice in L1 and L2. As Swan and Smith (2001) suggest, the use of passive voice is always one of the most difficult grammatical features for Japanese learners of English. They (2001: 302) state that "Japanese has a suffixed passive, but its range of use differs from English." It was possible to have used active voice instead in the case shown in excerpt 13, but the speaker just came to a deadlock there. As a whole, the use of L1 content words is problematic for communication. The students should at least try to explain the meaning of the L1 word in L2. Without this effort, a communication breakdown will take place.

Abundant use of L1 interjections and quite a few internal monologues caused some communication problems, too. At the same time, the use of interjections clearly shows the ceiling of the speakers' proficiency, where they could not even start any new sentence to express what they wanted to say. In this sense, the use of L1 expressions appealing for help is much better because the speakers are positive in continuing communication. Thus the results shown in the present study suggest that it is also important for L2 English learners to learn how to appeal for help to the interlocutors (an achievement strategy) in L2, which makes the conversation flow more natural.

The use of L1 also sheds light on the features of L2 proficiency levels. The use of L1 prepositions and conjunctions pointed out by Shimizu (2007) as a special feature of lower level learners was not seen in the present data. The participants of the LINDSEI are university students and we can estimate that their English proficiency is higher than the participants in Shimizu's study. In the present study, there were some differences in the

frequency of L1 content words, interjections and internal monologues between the groups. The lower group used more interjections than the upper group, which suggests that the students in the lower group focus more on constructing well-formed sentences. They tried hard to express what they wanted to say without much focus on communicating their message to the recipient. On the other hand, the students in the upper group became aware of the recipient. However, as is shown in more varieties in L1 content words, the topic they tried to communicate became more varied, and thus they needed more vocabulary and expressions than the lower group students. More use of communication strategies in L2 and even in L1 also shows more interest in communication rather than constructing a well-formed sentence alone among the upper level group.

To conclude the present study, I'd like to summarize the findings.

1. The extent of L1 used in L2 talk:

One L1 word was used every 267 words, and at least one L1 word was used in every 36 turns. These cause some communication breakdowns.

2. The functions of L1:

Japanese words were used as content words (nouns, a verb, an adjective, and an adverb), interjections as well as internal monologues. L1 nouns were mostly used for the unknown L2 slot sometimes without any reservation and for the unknown L2 slot triggered by another L1. The only use of an L1 verb shown in the data suggests that the speaker did not coincide the passive voice in L1 as being divided into “*be V*” plus “past participle” as is in English especially when they didn't have enough planning time. The use of L1 interjections definitely show that the speaker is struggling to find an appropriate L2 to be used, which usually shows the ceiling of the speaker's proficiency. The L1 internal monologues would be communication strategies if they were in L2, and the use of L2 in those cases should be highly encouraged.

3. The difference of L1 use according to the proficiency levels:

The upper group used L1 words and interjections less frequently than the lower group. The same group used more varieties of L1 content words and internal monologues than the lower group did. These differences clearly show one aspect of process of English acquisition.

More or less, the use of L1 in L2 speech by Japanese learners of English shows their effort to construct well-formed sentences and more detailed communication. The differences between L1 and L2 grammatical categorization and not well-developed communication strategies in L2, as well as not enough capacity to be used for showing more concern to the recipient of the conversation of the learners, often blocks their smooth communication flow for the interlocutors' better understanding. More attention should be paid to those aspects when English is taught in Japan.

References consulted

- Atkinson, D. (1993). *Teaching Monolingual Classes*. London: Longman.
- Bialystok, E. (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning. *Language Learning*, 28, 69–83.
- Cook, V. J. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning*, 42, 557–591.
- Dornyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 55–85.
- Mackey, W. F. (1965). *Language Teaching Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Meyer, H. (2008). The pedagogical implications of L1 use in the L2 classroom. *Maebashi Kyoai Gakuen College Papers*. Gunma: Maebashi Kyoai Gakuen.
- Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, 76–91.
- O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seng, G. H. & F. Hashim. (2006). Use of L1 in L2 reading comprehension among tertiary ESL learners. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 18, 1–17. University of Hawaii.
- Shimizu, S. (2007). 清水伸一「JEFLC Corpus に見る品詞別エラーの全体像」 in 投野由紀夫編著『日本人中高生一人の英語コーパス』東京: 小学館.
- Swan, M. (1985). A critical look at the communicative approach. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 39(2), 95–101.
- Swan, M. & B. Smith. (2001). *Learner English* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix

Levels	Data No.	Number of words	B turn frequency	Average # of words per turn	Frequency of Japanese	Turn No.	Japanese words	Functions
L	1	763	34	22.44	0			
H	2	223	69	3.23	0			
H	3	816	30	27.20	1	13	<i>gakuryo</i>	content (n.)
H	4	432	31	13.94	0			
H	5	885	22	40.23	3	6	<i>eeto</i>	interjection
						9	<i>unto</i>	interjection
						10	<i>untto</i>	interjection
H	6	510	35	14.57	3	12	<i>kyokun</i>	content (n.)
						14	<i>wakannai</i>	internal M.
						33	<i>wakannai</i>	internal M.
L	7	790	31	25.48	0			
L	8	810	46	17.61	3	23	<i>unnto</i>	interjection
						26	<i>nannteiittara</i>	internal M.
							<i>jibunkatte</i>	content (n.)
H	9	455	28	16.25	7	19	<i>eeto</i>	interjection
							<i>shinkansen</i>	content (n.)
						23	<i>ja-nakutte</i>	internal M.
						24	<i>etto</i>	interjection
						26	<i>etto</i>	interjection
							<i>eeto</i>	interjection
27	<i>aato</i>	interjection						

Levels	Data No.	Number of words	B turn frequency	Average # of words per turn	Frequency of Japanese	Turn No.	Japanese words	Functions
H	10	971	50	19.42	0			
H	11	655	82	7.99	3	20	<i>nandakke</i>	internal M.
							<i>kanrinin-san</i>	content (n.)
						49	<i>etto</i>	interjection
H	12	756	35	21.60	0			
H	13	564	15	37.60	2	11	<i>zemi</i>	content (n.)
						14	<i>uuntoo</i>	interjection
L	14	1044	114	9.16	0			
L	15	693	61	11.36	2	5	<i>etto</i>	interjection
						27	<i>eetto</i>	interjection
L	16	1214	87	13.95	1	12	<i>gosyusei</i>	content (n.)
H	17	1109	52	21.33	0			
L	18	425	24	17.71	29	4	<i>etto</i>	interjection
							<i>untto</i>	interjection
						5	<i>untto</i>	interjection
						9	<i>unto</i>	interjection
							<i>unto</i>	interjection
							<i>eeto</i>	interjection
							<i>eeto</i>	interjection
						10	<i>eeto</i>	interjection
						11	<i>untto</i>	interjection
						14	<i>untto</i>	interjection
							<i>untto</i>	interjection
							<i>unnto</i>	interjection
							<i>untto</i>	interjection
							<i>untto</i>	interjection
							<i>untto</i>	interjection
						16	<i>untto</i>	interjection
						17	<i>untto</i>	interjection
							<i>untto</i>	interjection
						18	<i>untto</i>	interjection
							<i>untto</i>	interjection
<i>untto</i>	interjection							
<i>untto</i>	interjection							
<i>untto</i>	interjection							
<i>etto</i>	interjection							
	<i>untto</i>	interjection						
20	<i>untto</i>	interjection						
L	19	762	84	9.07	1	34	<i>ettoo</i>	interjection

Levels	Data No.	Number of words	B turn frequency	Average # of words per turn	Frequency of Japanese	Turn No.	Japanese words	Functions
L	20	898	91	9.87	2	40	<i>nttoo</i>	interjection
						78	<i>nto:</i>	interjection
H	21	1013	40	25.33	0			
L	22	730	86	8.49	3	41	<i>mmto</i>	interjection
						49	<i>ijime</i>	content (n.)
						50	<i>ijime</i>	content (n.)
L	23	650	20	32.50	2	19	<i>eh</i>	interjection
							<i>nanndakke</i>	internal M.
L	24	861	56	15.38	0			
L	25	1030	82	12.56	0			
L	26	930	95	9.79	2	56	<i>seikatsu</i>	content (n.)
						64	<i>mmto</i>	interjection
H	27	1018	80	12.73	1	68	<i>mmto</i>	interjection
H	28	573	84	6.82	9	22	<i>e</i>	interjection
						26	<i>iiya</i>	internal M.
							<i>charhan</i>	content (n.)
						55	<i>hai</i>	content(adv.)
						59	<i>a</i>	interjection
						60	<i>a</i>	interjection
						62	<i>a</i>	interjection
						72	<i>a</i>	interjection
						83	<i>a</i>	interjection
L	29	687	74	9.28	2	10	<i>mto</i>	interjection
						22	<i>e:to</i>	interjection
H	30	730	60	12.17	2	28	<i>mmto</i>	interjection
						38	<i>mmto</i>	interjection
H	31	1204	29	41.52	4	6	<i>eh</i>	interjection
						8	<i>eh</i>	interjection
						13	<i>mmto</i>	interjection
						18	<i>juku</i>	content (n.)
L	32	774	63	12.29	21	6	<i>a</i>	interjection
						9	<i>a</i>	interjection
						10	<i>e:</i>	interjection
						14	<i>a</i>	interjection
						19	<i>a</i>	interjection
						29	<i>osenbei</i>	content (n.)
						31	<i>nori</i>	content (n.)
						38	<i>a</i>	interjection
							<i>a</i>	interjection
						42	<i>a</i>	interjection
						43	<i>a</i>	interjection
44	<i>a</i>	interjection						

Levels	Data No.	Number of words	B turn frequency	Average # of words per turn	Frequency of Japanese	Turn No.	Japanese words	Functions
						46	<i>a</i>	interjection
						47	<i>a</i>	interjection
							<i>a</i>	interjection
						54	<i>a</i>	interjection
							<i>a</i>	interjection
						56	<i>a</i>	interjection
						58	<i>a</i>	interjection
						59	<i>a</i>	interjection
						62	<i>a</i>	interjection
L	33	1002	68	14.74	0			
H	34	1100	82	13.41	10	6	<i>etto</i>	interjection
						14	<i>etto</i>	interjection
						16	<i>etto</i>	interjection
						36	<i>etto</i>	interjection
						49	<i>mtto</i>	interjection
						68	<i>etto</i>	interjection
						79	<i>mtto</i>	interjection
						80	<i>etto</i>	interjection
							<i>etto</i>	interjection
						82	<i>etto</i>	interjection
H	35	1224	16	76.50	1	2	<i>goshu-sei</i>	content (n.)
L	36	940	27	34.81	0			
L	37	972	47	20.68	6	2	<i>etto</i>	interjection
						7	<i>ummtto</i>	interjection
						14	<i>etto</i>	interjection
						20	<i>nannteiiu</i>	internal M.
							<i>nanndaro</i>	internal M.
							<i>nanndakke</i>	internal M.
H	38	1396	71	19.66	0			
L	39	878	20	43.90	2	7	<i>shyu</i>	content (n.)
							<i>kaikyo</i>	content (n.)
H	40	1142	21	54.38	2	2	<i>etto</i>	interjection
						17	<i>bokushi</i>	content (n.)
L	41	1065	28	38.04	17	2	<i>umm:</i>	interjection
						4	<i>eh</i>	interjection
							<i>eh</i>	interjection
							<i>eh</i>	interjection
							<i>eh</i>	interjection
							<i>eh</i>	interjection
						7	<i>eh</i>	interjection
							<i>eh</i>	interjection
							<i>eh</i>	interjection

Levels	Data No.	Number of words	B turn frequency	Average # of words per turn	Frequency of Japanese	Turn No.	Japanese words	Functions
						8	<i>atto</i>	interjection
							<i>chigau</i>	internal M.
						24	<i>eh</i>	interjection
						25	<i>eh</i>	interjection
							<i>eh</i>	interjection
						33	<i>eh</i>	interjection
						38	<i>eh</i>	interjection
							<i>a:</i>	interjection
L	42	574	33	17.39	0			
H	43	771	65	11.86	0			
L	44	757	100	7.57	1	70	<i>udonya</i>	content (n.)
H	45	701	111	6.32	8	33	<i>kyoutuuno</i>	content(aj.)
						37	<i>nandakke</i>	internal M.
							<i>shingo-mushi</i>	content (n.)
						42	<i>shingo</i>	content (n.)
							<i>nanneshitakke</i>	internal M.
						50	<i>shijisarerutte</i>	content (v.)
							<i>nanneshitakke</i>	internal M.
						60	<i>nandakke</i>	internal M.
H	46	842	110	7.65	1	90	<i>teloppu</i>	content (n.)
H	47	655	133	4.92	0			
L	48	224	52	4.31	0			
L	49	282	67	4.21	0			
H	50	405	71	5.70	0			
H	51	345	66	5.23	0			
Sum		40250	2978	(Ave. 13.52)	151			

Note) Italicized Japanese spellings follow the way the data was transcribed.

(金子 朝子 英語コミュニケーション学科)