

# NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

**UMI**<sup>®</sup>



USING THE LEARNERS' FIRST LANGUAGE IN  
THE SECOND LANGUAGE CLASSROOM:  
BELIEFS AND PRACTICES OF  
QUEBEC SECONDARY-LEVEL ESL TEACHERS

Loretta Gillis

A Thesis

in

The Department of Education

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Arts at  
Concordia University  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

March 2007

©Loretta Gillis, 2007



Library and  
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et  
Archives Canada

Published Heritage  
Branch

Direction du  
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file* *Votre référence*  
*ISBN: 978-0-494-28829-0*  
*Our file* *Notre référence*  
*ISBN: 978-0-494-28829-0*

**NOTICE:**

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

**AVIS:**

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

---

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

  
**Canada**

## ABSTRACT

Using the learners' first language in the second language classroom:

Beliefs and practices of Quebec secondary-level ESL teachers

Loretta Gillis

In the second language classroom, the teacher's speech constitutes a critical source of second language (L2) input for learners. Previous research has supported the judicious use of the learners' first language (L1) in teachers' speech to increase the comprehensibility of the input; however, L2 teacher training programs and educational policies often discourage their use of the learners' L1. The present study was conducted in Quebec. It investigated the relationship between secondary school English second language (ESL) teachers' reported amount of in-class use of the learners' L1 (French) and the variables of teachers' proficiency in English, confidence with English, beliefs about language use, learners' age, learners' ability level, school setting, and compliance with the 'English only' recommendation from Quebec's ministry of education.

Sixty-six teachers completed a questionnaire, and 6 also participated in interviews. The results indicate that there is a significant relationship between the reported amount of French used in class (0-80%) and the language use beliefs of the teachers. There was some evidence of learners' age and learners' ability level influencing teachers' use of French. Neither teachers' English language proficiency nor confidence with English was strongly related to the reported amount of French used. The findings from this research have implications for language teaching and language teacher training in Quebec and elsewhere.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my advisor, Dr. Joanna White, for her unwavering support. Her encouragement during the process of researching and writing this thesis was paired with a deep understanding of my roles as a parent and a graduate student. Joanna is an exceptional woman who has successfully blended her passion for research and teaching with her compassion for the people in her life. I thank her for help in nurturing a research idea that germinated in her classroom. I also express my gratitude to my thesis committee members, Dr. Laura Collins and Dr. Elizabeth Gatbonton, for their assistance with this research project and for their examples as motivated scholars and researchers. For all things statistical, I relied on the knowledge and endless patience of Randall Halter. I appreciate his help with the data analysis and formatting of tables. I must express my appreciation for the support of fellow Applied Linguistics graduate students, the faculty members of Concordia University's Applied Linguistics program, and faculty members of Concordia University's Bachelor of Education TESL program. To my family members who have been encouraging and understanding in my quest to deepen my knowledge and feed my soul, I thank you all.

## **DEDICATION**

This thesis is dedicated to my daughters, Lily and Evelyn Hansen-Gillis, intelligent young women who will one day walk this path.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	xi
CHAPTER 1 THE INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW .....	3
Introduction.....	3
Factors Influencing Teachers' Language Use Patterns .....	4
Teaching Methodology and L1 Use .....	4
Language Acquisition Theories and Input .....	5
Quantity of L1 and L2 in Input .....	6
Quality of Input.....	8
Cognitive Issues with Target Language Input .....	10
Internal Factors .....	13
Teachers' Beliefs .....	13
Teachers' Target Language Proficiency .....	17
Teacher Confidence with Target Language.....	18
External Factors.....	19
Language Use Policies.....	19
Teaching Context.....	19
Factors Relating to Students .....	20
Functions of L1 Use in Classrooms .....	21
Summary .....	22
Motivations for the Research .....	22



Local Motivations for the Research.....	24
Language Demographics for Quebec .....	25
Defining the Context in Quebec .....	26
Quebec Secondary Schools.....	27
Research Questions.....	29
<b>CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>31</b>
Context of the Study .....	31
Participants.....	31
Instruments.....	32
Development of the Questionnaire .....	33
Contents of the Questionnaire.....	34
Data Collection for the Questionnaire .....	36
Data Collection for the Interviews.....	37
<b>CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>39</b>
Introduction.....	39
Questionnaire Data.....	39
Analysis Procedures for Quantitative Data.....	39
Results for Quantitative Data .....	40
Research Questions 1 and 2.....	40
Research Questions 3 and 4.....	43
Research Questions 5 and 6.....	45
Research Question 7 .....	49
Research Question 7 a.....	49

Research Question 7 b .....	52
Research Question 7 c.....	53
Research Question 7 d, e, and f .....	54
Research Question 7 g .....	55
Research Question 7 a, b, c, g.....	56
Analysis Procedures for Qualitative data .....	59
Results for Qualitative Data .....	60
Interview Data.....	61
Analysis Procedure for Interview Data .....	61
Examples of Coded Statements from Interview Transcripts .....	62
Results for Interview Data.....	66
Analysis of L2 Exclusivity Belief Group Interview Participants .....	67
Analysis of Maximal L2 Belief Group Interview Participants .....	70
Analysis of Optimal L2 Belief Group Interview Participants .....	72
Results for Qualitative Data from Interviews .....	75
Summary of Interview Findings.....	76
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION.....	78
Introduction.....	78
Effect of Location .....	78
Function of Reported French Use.....	79
Classification of Participants by Belief Position .....	80
Proficiency and Confidence in English.....	81
Impact of MELS' Recommendation.....	84

Influence of Student Age, Student Ability and School Setting .....	84
Sentence-completion Item .....	86
Limitations of the Research .....	87
Future Studies .....	90
Pedagogical Implications .....	90
Implication for Language Teacher Training .....	91
REFERENCES .....	93
APPENDIX A .....	98
APPENDIX B .....	103
APPENDIX C .....	104
APPENDIX D .....	106

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Reported Percentage of French Spoken by Teachers in Class.....	41
Table 2	Reported Percentage of French Used in Class.....	42
Table 3	Descriptors of Quantity of French: Item #4.....	43
Table 4	Regrouped Functions of French in ESL Classrooms.....	44
Table 5	Functions of French in ESL Classrooms .....	45
Table 6	Language Use Belief Position Representatives .....	48
Table 7	Belief Position Representative Distribution According to Reported Percentage of French Use.....	104
Table 8	Belief Position Representative Distribution According to Beliefs Mean Score .....	106
Table 9	First Language of Secondary-Level ESL Teachers .....	50
Table 10	Language Ability Proficiency Subcategories.....	51
Table 11	Teacher English Language Proficiency .....	52
Table 12	Teacher Confidence with English .....	53
Table 13	Compliance with MELS' 'English only' recommendation .....	56
Table 14	Correlation Coefficients for the Reported Amount of French Spoken and Beliefs, English Proficiency, Confidence with English, and Compliance with MELS' 'English only' recommendation .....	58
Table 15	Regression Analysis for Beliefs as a Predictor of Reported Amount of French spoken in ESL Classes.....	59
Table 16	View of L1 Use: Sentence Completion Item #24 .....	61
Table 17	Qualitative Data for Interview Participants .....	67

## APPENDICES

Appendix A.....	98
Appendix B.....	103
Appendix C.....	104
Appendix D.....	106

## CHAPTER 1

“Studying the effects of input/interaction on L2 acquisition provides a way of approaching teaching from an internal as opposed to external perspective – to see teaching not just as a matter of methods or techniques but as the provision of opportunities for learning through the interaction that occurs in the classroom.”

(Ellis, 1999, p. 247)

Research focused on the use of the learners’ first language (L1) in the second language (L2) classroom explores the notion that there are opportunities for learning through interactions with input in the L1 and L2, and that these opportunities for learning can positively influence L2 comprehension and acquisition. Situated in the area of language education, the study reported in this thesis investigated reported language use patterns in second language classrooms; more specifically, it investigated the beliefs and practices of secondary-school ESL teachers in Quebec.

The issue of whether or not to use the learners’ first language is a fundamental concern for all language teachers; therefore, an investigation which informs this research area has a broad potential application. This study sought to expand the current body of knowledge about the role of teacher speech in the L2 classroom by exploring patterns in ESL teachers’ reported in-class L1 use and their language use beliefs, as well as the functions served by L1 use in secondary classrooms. Although Quebec’s ministry of education (Ministère de l’Éducation, du Loisirs, et du Sport de Quebec, or MELS) and the current language teacher training programs in Quebec support the exclusive use of English in ESL classrooms, some secondary-level ESL teachers opt to use the learners’

L1 (French) in class. By documenting the variety of ESL teacher practices and beliefs concerning L1 use, and examining the complex internal and external forces that shape them, the study contributes to a understanding of how ESL teachers view the relationship between the input provided to the learners through teacher speech and the learners' acquisition of the second language. The ESL teaching context of Quebec is a fertile research site for an investigation of teacher language use patterns and beliefs as it offers a variety of teacher profiles, differing student ability levels, and teaching settings in regions with differing linguistic demographics.

With a survey and semi-structured interviews, this study used a correlational research design to examine the relationship of Quebec secondary-level ESL teachers' self-reported L1 use (French) with the variables of teachers' proficiency in English, teachers' confidence with English, teachers' beliefs about language use, student age, student ability level, school setting, and compliance with MELS' English-only recommendation. The study examined differences between two participant groups, namely teachers from the greater Montreal region and teachers from the rest of Quebec. The findings from this research have implications for language teaching and language teacher training in Quebec and elsewhere.

## CHAPTER 2

### Literature Review

Secondary-level ESL teachers differ greatly with respect to the amount of English they use in class. The following examples from three different (hypothetical) teachers illustrate the range.

“You’re going to make a poster for your group’s new product.”

“Les filles en arrière, ça suffit! Is your role-play finished?”

“En équipes de quatre, dessinez un ‘dream house’ en utilisant les mots ‘bedroom, bathroom, living room, and kitchen’”.

The teachers’ language use choices reflect the interaction of a number of underlying factors concerning their understanding of the role that the students’ first language (L1) and second language (L2) should play in the classroom. These factors include knowledge of research in the areas of second language acquisition and pedagogy, teacher internal factors such as beliefs, language proficiency, and confidence in the second language, and teacher external factors such as students’ age and ability level, the school setting, and language use policies. In the above examples of classroom speech, the L1 (French) and L2 (English) have differing roles for the teachers. For some students in Quebec’s French secondary schools, French is not their L1. However, French is the language of the school where ESL is taught and everyone speaks French. The use of the term L1 in the subsequent discussion reflects this.

In the following pages, research related to the factors influencing teachers’ language choice will be discussed. The next research to be reviewed examines the functions for which the L1 has been used in language classrooms in recent studies. After



a description of the contexts in which Quebec secondary-level ESL teachers operate, the motivations for a study examining the L1 and L2 use of these teachers will be outlined. The chapter ends with the research questions for the study.

### Factors Influencing Teachers' Language Use Patterns

#### *Teaching Methodology and L1 Use*

The twentieth century was a period of frequent change for language teaching methodology in North America. The popularity of different language teaching methods waxed and waned as theory and opinions from the fields of education, behavioral psychology, and sociology combined with other forces of each era to shape the mindsets of teacher educators. Along with the movement from the form-based grammar-translation language teaching method, which featured the teaching of grammar points and rules, to the meaning-based focus of communicative language teaching, there was also a shift in attitudes concerning teacher use of the students' first language. As a result of this pendulum swing of teaching methodologies, the use of the students' first language in class, once common and uncontroversial within the grammar translation language teaching method, was shunned by proponents of meaning-based communicative language teaching. Currently, however, there is interest in the judicious use of the learners' L1 as a manner of promoting L2 comprehension and acquisition. As will be shown below, this is an ongoing research issue within the larger area of theory and research related to input, interaction and language acquisition.

### *Language Acquisition Theories and Input*

Underlying the discussion of the role of L1 use in teacher's speech, there is the assumption that teacher speech is a central source of learners' target language (TL) input. Input has differing roles in theories of language learning, as not all theories recognize that input in both the L1 and L2 may contribute to the comprehension and acquisition of the L2.

Krashen's (1988) comprehensible input hypothesis theorized that comprehensible target language is both necessary and sufficient for language learning. The learner is not required to interact verbally with the input; rather, simple exposure to messages containing rich, comprehensible input while the learners' "affective filter" is low is deemed sufficient to ensure acquisition of the L2. This theoretical position rejects the use of the L1, relying instead on comprehensible L2 input.

Long (1985, 1996) adapted the input hypothesis to include interaction. His modified Interaction Hypothesis (1996) focuses on the negotiation of meaning that occurs when communication breaks down. It proposes that oral input that is simplified through interactional modification is more successful than non-interactionally modified input in promoting learner comprehension, which in turn facilitates language acquisition. This hypothesis claims that the modified output produced by learners who are interacting in order to negotiate meaning can also aid acquisition. In this view, which gives importance to input that has been simplified through interaction, there is a possible role for the use of the learner's L1 in the interactive input. Modified input must give the learner information

related to the linguistic forms that were problematic and the use of the L1 is a potential source of this critical information.

The socio-cultural theory of social interaction (Vygotsky, 1981) views language acquisition as a social process in which learning results from the joint mediation of problems, potentially through the use of psychological tools such as words. This theory identifies interpersonal interaction as a tool that is used for development, including the development of L2 abilities. Interpersonal interaction as illustrated by a dialogue constructed by two language learners can result in interpersonal input modification that allows each learner to experience linguistic development. Intrapersonal input modification is also possible with the use of inner speech by a learner for problem solving during a cognitively demanding task such as language learning. There is a role for L1 use within this theory's view of language acquisition, both in the interpersonal interaction such as that possible in a classroom, or in the intrapersonal interaction of a learner's mental speech.

#### *Quantity of L1 and L2 in Input*

Krashen's hypothesis and its L2 exclusivity stance have had a strong influence on recent language teaching, even in the absence of evidence to suggest that some L1 use would be detrimental. With L2-only in the second language classroom at one end of the spectrum (Krashen, 1988), versus an extensive or expansive role for students' L1 in the second language classroom at the other (Cook, 2001, 2005), there is a broad range of opinions concerning the ideal quantity of target language input. Cook (2001) is a prominent advocate for an expanded role of L1 in second language classrooms. He

provides extensive lists of possible classroom uses for the L1 and is in favour of L1 use by teachers when TL use is too time-consuming or difficult for students. Critics of his enthusiastic calls for increased L1 use (Turnbull, 1999a, Levine, 2003) have suggested that by using the students' L1 for the many functions suggested by Cook, teachers would have little need for the TL in their language classes. Macaro (2005) has suggested that researchers have yet to establish a solid relationship between an increase in student proficiency in the second language and a teaching context that is exclusively in the TL. Turnbull (1999a) documented higher scores on some components of students' French proficiency and achievement tests in core French classrooms where teacher speech had a higher percentage of TL use. However, he declined to draw a straight line from the teachers' increased TL use to higher student proficiency levels due to the small sample (four teachers). Turnbull described teacher TL use as an important element among others which influences student proficiency.

Observational studies of teacher language use patterns have documented varied quantities of L1 use in foreign and second language classrooms. Both Macaro (2001), in a study of secondary-level teachers in FL classes, and Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002), in a study of experienced teachers of university-level FL classes, observed L1 use ranging from 0 – 30% of teachers' in-class speech. Four experienced teachers of core French classes in Turnbull's (1999a) study had varied TL use which ranged from 24 – 72%. In a study of 13 EFL teachers in South Korea, Liu, Ahn, Baek, and Han (2004) recorded an average of 32% TL use. Kharma and Hajjaj (1989)'s large scale study of secondary-level EFL teachers in Kuwait documented L1 use averaging 20% of teachers' classroom

speech. For these five studies in varied settings, teachers' in-class L1 use ranged dramatically between 0 – 76% of teacher speech.

Based on studies of novice and experienced teachers' decision-making concerning L1 use, Macaro (2001, 2000) observed that student use of the L1 did not appear to rise in these FL classrooms until the teacher's L1 use exceeded 15% of the lesson time. Macaro suggested that by keeping L1 use below a critical threshold of 10-15% of total lesson time, and using L1 for purposes that potentially aid second language acquisition, the L2 teacher has a structured approach to L1 use which also offers optimal exposure to the TL.

#### *Quality of Input*

Other researchers have gone beyond the singular aspect of quantity of TL use by examining the quality of TL used by the second language teacher. Research into input quality (Macaro, 1997; Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie, 2002; van Lier, 1995) and the manipulation of input ( Ellis 1999; Swain, 1985) has added dimensions to the issue of target language input. van Lier (1995) argued that input must be salient for it to be useful. He suggested that the teacher's use of the students' L1 can render input salient, thereby causing input to become intake. Supporting van Lier's view, Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002) proposed that teachers' use of the L1 with translation of words and expressions, and comparison or contrast of forms, was a type of input modification. In their study of four FL teachers, the researchers suggested that teachers who used L1 for the purposes of translation and contrast exposed their students to higher quality input which helped them to develop a conscious knowledge of the L2. TL input is a significant

factor for Macaro (1997) in his position concerning the role of L1 and TL in FL classrooms. While recognizing the value and primacy of a rich TL input environment in the classroom, Macaro noted that the L2 exclusivity position effectively limits teacher decision making. This may hinder the development of teachers' evaluative abilities. Rather than encouraging the development of reflective practices concerning the principled use of L1, the position of L2 exclusivity pushes language teachers to evaluate all potential classroom tasks with the over-simplified measure of whether or not the task can be presented and completed solely with the use of the TL. The commitment to L2 exclusivity also maintains a highly teacher-centered classroom, thereby limiting learner interaction and learner autonomy. With learner independence as the end goal of a language learning process, Macaro concluded that L2 exclusivity is pedagogically not justifiable, yet he also emphasized the need for extensive TL exposure in the language classroom.

Swain (1985, 1993, 1995) proposed that the learner must interact with TL input in order to develop TL proficiency. She suggested that the provision of rich, TL input is not sufficient for language acquisition to take place, and that the learner must also manipulate the input in order to promote intake. By creating and producing the linguistic forms in the output, Swain contended that the learner engages in syntactic processing which promotes language acquisition. Ellis (1992) supported the need for learner interaction with input and suggested that there may be legitimate uses for the L1 during this interaction, yet he also stated that teacher's use of L1 deprives learners of important TL input. Ellis noted Wong-Fillmore's (1985) study of young students of limited English proficiency in a bilingual education program in which Wong-Fillmore decried the use of the L1, including

translation, in the classroom. She suggested that high amounts of L1 use removed the need for the students to attend to the TL message. For both Ellis and Wong-Fillmore, the issue of L1 quantity is an important element that may affect the potential benefits available when using L1 to improve input quality.

Research related to input in language learning has highlighted the need to maximize input, thereby providing rich exposure to the TL, as well as the need for quality input that promotes acquisition. The judicious use of L1 has been seen to promote saliency in TL input. Swain, Ellis, Rolin- Ianziti and Brownlie, and Macaro stress that the learner's role cannot be a passive one, with the learner afloat in a sea of rich TL input. These researchers propose that manipulating input and increasing learner-centered activities can aid in transforming input into intake, in transforming learners from passive receptacles to autonomous second language users.

#### *Cognitive Issues with Target Language Input*

Teachers' use of L1 and TL in L2 classrooms can also be examined from the viewpoint of cognitive issues related to comprehension and acquisition of the L2 by learners. Skinner (1985) proposed that L2 exclusivity in the second language classroom may form a barrier to learners attempting to connect thoughts, thereby harming the process of concept development. This limitation may become more apparent as the learner moves to TL environments that lack contextual cues from which to obtain meaning. Skinner suggests that teacher or learner use of the L1 to link thoughts with the L2 can promote higher level cognitive abilities for the learner, encourage comprehension of the L2, and lessen learner dependence on context for meaning.

In a reading comprehension task for L2 students, Kern (1994, in Macaro, 2005) examined the language of thought used by language learners. With a think-aloud procedure, Kern discerned that the students were using their L1 to reduce working memory limitations, to retain the meaning of the text, to aid in shifting meaning to long-term memory, to increase confidence by converting the input to familiar terms, and to help in understanding the syntactic roles of L2 words or expressions. Macaro extends Kern's research with L1 use during reading tasks to oral L1 use by the second language teacher. He suggests that teacher use of the L1 may also reduce the constraints on working memory for students and prove to be cognitively beneficial as it frees up the students' mental resources to process larger chunks of input, thereby encouraging L2 comprehension and acquisition.

In their examination of language use in elementary-level immersion classes, Swain and Lapkin (2000) commented on how the use of the L1 by students served as an important social and cognitive tool which supported L2 learning. While completing a text-based L2 task, student pairs relied on their L1 to develop an understanding of the text and task, to target specific language forms in the L2, and to organize their performance. In their examination of language use by low-proficiency adult learners in FL elementary-level immersion classes, Anton and Dica-milla (1998) also label L1 use by students as a critical psychological tool. The researchers recorded the speech of student pairs who were co-creating a written text. They noted that the students used their L1 to collaboratively generate content for the written task, to reflect on the task, and to create a cognitive and social space in which they could aid each other. Students were also observed engaging in self-talk in their L1 to deal with the cognitively challenging task. Based in the socio-



cultural theory of language and thought being bound together, these researchers believe that by banning the use of L1, second language teachers eliminate a powerful tool and impair collaboration among students. Looking at both teacher and student use of the L1 in second language classrooms, Skinner, Swain and Lapkin, Kern, and Anton and Dica-milla conclude that L1 use can assist with cognitive processing in L2 classrooms, which in turn encourages comprehension and acquisition of the L2.

In an observational study of teacher use of L1 in university-level FL classrooms, Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002) documented low levels of L1 use by all four teachers profiled. The researchers noted that the L1 was used by teachers for three main functions: translation, metalinguistic uses, and communication uses. Translation and metalinguistic uses such as commenting on FL form and contrasting L1 and FL structures accounted for more than half of the teachers' L1 use. The researchers found that the use of the L1 for translation and contrast, in particular, exposed learners to quality input and helped to develop a conscious knowledge of the L2. Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie suggest that strategic use of modified input through translation and contrast can aid cognitive processes which encourage acquisition.

Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie's study involved teachers' use of L1 words embedded in a TL sentence. Although L1 use for the purpose of translation or contrast was limited in quantity, it contributed to speech redundancy and may have introduced a focus on form in the second language classroom. Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie suggested that limited use of L1 by teachers was an effective means of enhancing input quality and aiding the cognitive processes of the students. In contrast, Wong-Fillmore (1985) emphasized the need for economy of L1 use in L2 classrooms. She suggested that language learning

resulted from learners trying to figure out the L2 in a supportive learning environment through high levels of L2 input coupled with context-related cues. With high levels of L1 use, the learners had no need to attend to the L2 input, which was detrimental overall to L2 comprehension and acquisition. The use of the L1 played a very small role in Wong-Fillmore's conception of language learning, which may also be related to the age of her young participants.

### *Internal Factors*

Teachers' use of the L1 in L2 classrooms is also motivated by influences that vary for each teacher. Internal factors such as teacher beliefs concerning L1 use in class, proficiency in the target language, and confidence in using the TL must also be examined in a thorough discussion of L1 and TL use for both native speaker teachers (NSTs) and non-native speaker teachers (NNSTs).

*Teacher beliefs.* Teacher use of the TL and L1 is influenced by the beliefs that teachers hold about language learning and language teaching. Richards (1998) described the personal beliefs of teachers as forces that drive behavior, which are informed by personal experiences, instruction, experience as a student, and formal training. Flores (2001) surveyed 176 experienced bilingual education teachers in the U.S. in order to examine the relationship between the teachers' self-reported teaching practices and their beliefs. Survey and interview results both indicated that teaching experience and teacher preparation courses significantly influenced teacher beliefs and that these beliefs were important indicators of teacher behavior in classrooms. Flores also noted that teachers'

beliefs were dynamic, with teachers reporting that their teaching experience exerted an ongoing influence on their beliefs about teaching.

Research suggests that teachers' beliefs may change over time and that teacher training may be an important factor. In a longitudinal study of 146 Chinese teacher trainees who were students in a Bachelor of Arts TESL program at a Hong Kong university, Peacock (2001) examined change in the beliefs of pre-service teachers. He began by identifying detrimental beliefs about language learning held by student teachers and then attempted to change these beliefs over a three year training period. He concluded that the beliefs of these pre-service teachers were resistant to change and noted a correlation between two harmful beliefs about language learning and the ESL proficiency of the non-native speaker student teachers. After completing the three year program, several teacher trainees continued to believe that people who speak more than one language well are very intelligent, and they also associated learning a second language with learning a lot of grammar and vocabulary. Some success was achieved in the transformation of the student teachers' language learning beliefs after Peacock developed and implemented an instructional package that specifically focused on the two beliefs areas deemed to be detrimental to language learning.

More support for the influence of teaching experience and teacher training on language use patterns was offered by Richards, Gallo, and Renandya (1999). They examined teacher beliefs about language learning, changes in teaching, and the sources of change in a survey-based study of 112 ESL teachers from South East Asia and Australia. The researchers concluded that teacher beliefs about successful language teaching and language learning were the guiding influence determining the reported teaching behavior.

They also noted that changes in teaching practices were preceded by changes in teaching beliefs. The changes in beliefs were reported to be the result of in-service teacher training and reflective practices that encouraged the language teachers to examine their teaching experience and make their language teaching and learning beliefs explicit.

Although influenced by teacher training, teachers' beliefs about in-class L1 use may be suppressed in order to favor another influence. Macaro (2001) examined the decision-making of student teachers concerning L1 use in FL secondary-level classes. He focused on three influences: the student teachers' personal beliefs, knowledge acquired during the teacher training program, and government recommendations. The student teachers profiled in the study all had high levels of TL use in the FL classrooms, yet Macaro found that the impact of their personal beliefs varied. For one student teacher, personal beliefs influenced her in-class practice regarding L1 use while another student teacher, ignoring her personal beliefs regarding L1 use, gave higher importance to government recommendations when making decisions in the classroom. One can speculate that the lack of teaching experience may have played a role in determining the connection of teacher beliefs with language use patterns.

Macaro (1997) proposed a three position framework for language teacher beliefs concerning L1 and TL use in the second language classroom. He suggested that teachers adopt one of the following belief positions: the optimal L2 position in which some use of the L1 is viewed as a positive factor in language acquisition, the maximal L2 position in which L1 use is viewed as distasteful but necessary, and finally, the L2 exclusivity position with no use of the L1. Macaro also labels the L2 exclusivity position as the virtual position, named for the teacher who creates a virtual L2 country in the classroom

by banishing the students' L1. In this discussion, the term 'L2 exclusivity' is used for this belief position.

In summarizing his findings from a review of studies of teacher beliefs concerning L1 use in the classroom, Macaro (2000) noted that a large majority of bilingual teachers view use of the students' L1 as an unfortunate necessity. He concluded that language teachers generally have a negative view of in-class L1 use, yet teacher training programs may be a significant influence in the formation of these beliefs. The majority of the thirteen studies featured in his review of studies were based in the U.K. or North America in contexts where teacher training is not generally supportive of L1 use in the classroom. An exception is the study carried out by Kharma and Hajjaj (1989). Using a survey, interviews, and in-class observations, these researchers studied teacher and student attitudes toward mother tongue use in Kuwait where students and teachers shared Arabic as the L1 and English was learned as a foreign language. Noting first that both teacher supervisors and course books advocate the purposeful, limited use of the L1, the researchers documented high levels of support by teachers for the in-class use of the L1.

Teacher beliefs concerning language learning and the use of the L1 in the language classroom may exert an influence on the reporting of personal estimations of classroom language use patterns. Those teachers who have a positive view of L1 use (optimal L2 beliefs position) may be more comfortable reporting higher L1 use than that which is sanctioned by the language use policies of their teaching institution or teacher training program. In contrast, teachers with a negative view of L1 use may underestimate their actual language use patterns as their teaching practices do not mirror their language use beliefs. Severe discrepancies between teachers' reported and actual use of

the TL in FL classes have been documented. Duff and Polio (1990) observed teachers who dramatically under-reported their use of the students' L1. It is also possible that self-awareness of language use patterns is available only with effort and reflective teaching practices. In a longitudinal study of her own language use patterns in the FL classroom, Edstrom (2006) found that she had under-estimated her own use of the students' L1, yet she held a positive view of limited, purposeful in-class L1 use.

*Teacher TL proficiency.* Peacock (2001) found a relationship between student teachers' detrimental language learning beliefs and low ESL proficiency. That is, those ESL student teachers who had language learning beliefs that were potentially detrimental to their future students (e.g. People who speak more than one language are very intelligent) also had low English language proficiency levels. This finding is echoed in the research of Liu, Ahn, Baek, and Han (2004) who documented a connection between teacher beliefs, ESL proficiency, and L1 use by teachers. Using classroom observation and a survey, Liu et al. conducted a study of South Korean high school ESL teachers' use of L1 and L2. Both teacher beliefs and low English proficiency levels were noted to be strong contributors to the low levels of L2 use (32% of total words used) by the teachers. In her survey of British FL teachers, Mitchell (1988) also noted that lack of fluency in the TL was reported by teachers as a factor influencing higher levels of L1 use in classrooms.

Although proficiency in the TL would appear to be an issue of concern for only NNSTs, a NST who lacks language teacher training may not have an explicit knowledge of the language's grammatical system (Borg, 1998), which may affect the in-class pattern of language use. For NNSTs, language proficiency in the TL is a potential factor

affecting TL and L1 use patterns. In their study of L1 and TL use by two NSTs and two NNSTs in Australia, Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2003) reported similarly low L1 use by all four teachers, but these NNSTs had a high level of TL proficiency.

*Teacher confidence with TL.* In addition to, or perhaps interacting with, TL proficiency, confidence with the TL for NNST is another factor influencing teacher's language use patterns. Studies by Turnbull (1999a, 2000) noted lower levels of TL use by two NNSTs who rated themselves as "somewhat confident of French skills" and higher levels of TL use by two NNSTs who were "very confident of French skills". Horwitz (1996) and MacIntyre, Noels and Clement (1997) confirmed biases in self-rating of second language proficiency due to language anxiety. Therefore, the variables of self-rated second language proficiency and confidence in second language abilities may be difficult to examine independent of each other. That these variables can be confounded is illustrated in a study by Duff and Polio (1990) which featured 13 native speaker FL teachers. The researchers suggested that they measured teacher proficiency in the students' L1, English, by asking questions such as "How do you feel about your proficiency in spoken English?" and "Do you feel as comfortable speaking English as you do your native language when you teach?" However, these interview questions appear to be probing both teacher confidence in English as well as teacher proficiency in English.

### *External Factors*

External factors in second language teaching that have an impact on teacher use of L1 and TL in classrooms range from the broad application of government or institutional language policies to the selective focus of learner characteristics in a specific L2 class.

*Language use policies.* Commenting on teacher decision-making regarding L1 and TL use in class, Macaro (1997, 2001) suggested that the British educational directives that mandated TL exclusivity cause the elimination of reflective practices by some teachers. Teachers who adopt the TL exclusivity position forego the need for any decision-making regarding the merit of L1 use in class. The combination of national directives supporting L2 exclusivity and teacher supervisors who highlighted L2 exclusivity as a measure of FL teacher competence has been cited as a reason for L1 avoidance by both novice and experienced teachers. A small group of teachers in Duff and Polio's study (1990) of university FL instructors noted the strong influence of department policies that banned the students' L1 in class. Liu et al. (2004) observed that educational policy and curriculum guidelines toward higher TL use had a reduced impact on teachers whose beliefs and low English proficiency prompted higher levels of in-class L1 use.

*Teaching context.* Duff and Polio (1990) characterize English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings as those where English is spoken by a minority of people and is not used as the language of communication locally or nationally. The quantity of out-of-



class contact with the TL is another factor that can influence language teachers' choice of L1 or TL (Duff & Polio, 1990; Levine, 2003; Macaro, 1997; Turnbull, 1999a, 2006). Language teachers have reacted to FL teaching contexts by increasing TL use, maximizing the TL exposure time to compensate for lack of out-of-class opportunities. Conversely, teachers have also reported increased L1 use in FL teaching contexts to compensate for reduced student ability, which was seen to be related to minimal opportunities for language use beyond the classroom.

*Factors relating to students.* Student age and student ability are two additional external factors that are often cited as critical in teacher decision-making regarding language use (Levine, 2003; Lui et al., 2004; Macaro, 1997; Mitchell, 1988; Turnbull, 1999). Across these studies, teachers reported more L1 use with younger or lower-level learners who lacked inferencing skills and exposure to TL input, and therefore experienced more frustration in the TL-rich classroom. Teachers also reported higher levels of L1 use with adolescent learners than with younger learners as the adolescent learners were less likely to maintain motivation at low ability levels with little L1 use. In a summary of 13 studies, Macaro (2001) observed that student ability was the primary factor that most teachers reported as determining the amount of TL used in class. The pedagogical focus of a second language program can also alter the teacher's language use. While championing the value of learner collaboration and learner autonomy, Macaro (1997) noted that the L2 exclusivity stance mandated by British government directives necessitated a highly teacher-centered classroom, especially for lower-level or younger learners.

### *Functions of L1 Use in Classrooms*

Studies of L1 use in the L2 classroom vary in perspectives when describing the function of the L1 used by teachers in the L2 classroom. Turnbull (1999) classifies L1 use by teacher in the core French program as English used for managerial purposes, academic function, and social-oriented discourse. Other researchers such as Duff and Polio (1990; Polio & Duff 1994) sort L1 use by categories such as L1 use to explain grammar, aid understanding, translate vocabulary, manage the class, and address student anxiety. Unaddressed by previous research is the possibility that these categories may not accurately classify the nuances in multipurpose discourse used by teachers. By using the L1 for an utterance, the teacher may simultaneously intend to build relationships with students, address anxiety, translate vocabulary, aid understanding, manage the class by focusing attention, and provide tools to encourage learner collaboration. Common categories that reoccur in studies (Duff & Polio, 1990; Levine, 2003; Macaro, 1997, 2001; Mitchell, 1988; Polio & Duff, 1994; Turnbull, 1999a, 2000) are L1 used for the purpose of classroom management, disciplining students, translating vocabulary, efficiency and expediency, addressing student anxiety and explaining grammar.

Levine (2003) conducted a survey of 163 university-level FL instructors and 600 FL students. Students were asked to estimate the level of anxiety experienced in the language classroom and the level of L2 use by the instructor. Levine noted a negative correlation between high levels of TL use in classrooms and student anxiety. However, surveyed university-level instructors reported using L1 in class in response to perceived

student anxiety. Levine concludes that second language teachers may be using the L1 in class in response to an unsupported student need.

### *Summary*

Influenced by language acquisition theory and research, teachers' practices in the second language classroom range from L2 exclusivity to the valued, judicious use of L1. Research in teachers' language use patterns has examined input factors such as quantity and quality of input and cognitive factors in second language acquisition. Classroom language practices are also swayed by external factors such as government language policies or the age and ability level of the learner. In addition, teachers' beliefs, language proficiency and target language confidence figure as some of the internal factors that motivate language choices for teachers. The pooled impact of these influences may generate a distinctive use of the L2 and/or the L1 for each teacher, and in each teaching setting.

### *Motivations for the Research*

Previous studies have noted relationships between the quantity of L2 used by teachers and the following internal factors for teachers: beliefs, L2 proficiency, and confidence with the L2 (Liu et al., 2004; Peacock, 2001; Turnbull, 1999a). These studies were all conducted with non-native speaker teachers who shared the students' L1. Currently unexamined is the relationship between L1 use and the above internal factors in a context such as Quebec that includes second language teachers who share the learners' L1, non-native speaker teachers who have a different L1 from the students, and native speaker teachers.

External factors such as student ability level, language use policies, and the language learning context have also been noted to influence the quantity of L1 use (Duff & Polio, 1990; Liu et al., 2004; Macaro, 1997, 2001). Previous examinations of these influences have been limited to settings with stable opportunities for use of English outside of the classroom. However, research is lacking in settings with a range of opportunities for use of English, as is found in the varied communities of the province of Quebec.

Recent research with L1 use in the L2 classroom supports the argument that L1 use can positively influence L2 comprehension and acquisition. In Quebec, this research has not been recognized by the MELS, whose language use policy specifies that English is to be the sole language of instruction in the ESL classroom. As a result, the MELS secondary-level ESL curriculum in Quebec has incorporated the L2 exclusivity position. Echoing the MELS 'English only' position, teacher training programs in Quebec also fail to recognize research in support of L1 use in second language classrooms.

Within this context, it is likely that Quebec ESL teachers experience pressure to adopt the L2 exclusivity position; however, anecdotal evidence of L1 use by Quebec's ESL teachers abounds. The opposing forces of research supporting L1 use by language teachers, and the MELS and teacher training programs rejecting use of the L1 may be a source of tension for Quebec's ESL teachers. Additional influences such as teachers' beliefs, language proficiency, student factors and school setting may complicate the decision-making process for in-class language use. Research is needed that examines how Quebec ESL teachers are resolving these potential conflicting influences in their daily practices.

An examination of these factors and their effect on the in-class language use of Quebec's secondary-level ESL teachers contributes to an understanding of the role of L1 in the input available in second language classrooms, and the in-class decision-making process of second language teachers.

*Local motivations for the research.* Research into the attitudes and practices of teachers in Quebec secondary schools is especially relevant because secondary schools have just begun to implement educational reforms from the MELS. Knowledge of teacher beliefs and practices concerning L1 and TL use at the outset may be useful in assessing the ease of implementing educational reform at the secondary level.

The MELS has also changed the age of onset of ESL instruction for French elementary schools. In 2006, ESL instruction began in grade one rather than grade three, thereby creating an increased demand for ESL teachers in Quebec. With the potential for a heightened demand for professional development for in-service teachers and more pre-service ESL teacher training, teacher educators in Quebec universities may also benefit from research concerning L1 and TL use in ESL classrooms.

Awareness of current classroom practices and their connection to research may also be beneficial in fashioning better learning environments. The MELS requires all elementary and secondary schools to formulate success plans that target specific areas of learning and achievement for improvement. Many secondary schools have responded to the demands of success plans by identifying end-of-cycle English language competency requirements as a goal. Research into current practices and beliefs of ESL teachers may identify successful patterns of L1 and L2 use which aid comprehension and acquisition.

Echoing a concern of educators, parents and secondary students, recent media attention (Petit, 2006), has also underscored the problem of Quebec's French secondary students graduating with low English proficiency. Examining the practices and beliefs of secondary level ESL teachers as one facet of a complete language instruction program may help in addressing this concern.

*Language demographics for Quebec.* Studies involving language use patterns for the province of Quebec must take into account the dramatic difference in language demographics between the greater Montreal area and the rest of Quebec. In 2001, 83.1% of Quebec residents overall reported that their mother tongue (first language learned at home in childhood and still understood at time of census) was French, 8.3% claimed English as a mother tongue and 8.6% reported that they spoke another language as a mother tongue (Statistic Canada, 2001). The 2001 Canada census statistics for the greater Montreal area in particular revealed a very different language use pattern; as 53.2% of greater Montreal area residents claimed French as a mother tongue, 17.7% reported that their mother tongue was English and 29.1% claimed another mother tongue.

However, a contrast of the linguistic contexts for greater Montreal area and that of the rest of the province of Quebec is an over-simplification of the actual linguistic situation. Smaller communities with concentrations of English speakers such as Hull-Gatineau, the Eastern townships, the Lower North Shore, and Gaspé are ignored with the creation of a crude Montreal – rest of Quebec dichotomy. Likewise, residency within the greater Montreal area does not guarantee high levels of exposure to English outside of the home or school. Indeed, a wide spectrum of language use patterns currently exist in

Quebec, ranging from suburban Montreal communities in which English is heard frequently on the streets, in shops, and on buses to smaller Quebec towns in which there are few speakers of English and public life is conducted entirely in French.

*Defining the context in Quebec.* Murphy and Byrd (p. 21, 2001, in Mattioli, 2004) define ESL as “the teaching of English...in countries where English is the major language of commerce and education”, where students “are likely to hear English being spoken on a regular basis in settings beyond the classroom”. Mattioli concludes that EFL settings are all the teaching contexts that are not covered by the above definition, in which students have either very limited or no opportunities to speak English outside of their classroom.

Nayar (1997) argues that this ESL/EFL dichotomy lacks the nuances of current world-wide English language learning contexts. Instead, Nayar suggests that the terms English as a second language (ESL), English as an associate language (EAL), and English as a foreign language (EFL) would more accurately cover the many varieties of language learning settings. Whereas in ESL contexts, the learners have a goal of acculturation and assimilation into the English speaking society, learners of English in EAL contexts never have an assimilative goal, yet may chose to identify with the native English culture. Unlike ESL settings where all public domains require the use of English, EAL contexts offer some possibilities for communicative English use. Nayar’s EFL settings are in countries with no internal communicative function for English and where English has no part of the cultural identity. Within this three definition framework, Quebec as a whole would be defined as an EAL context, with domains for communicative English use varying from community to community. The greater

Montreal area is composed of many sectors, each with a unique linguistic and socio-economic profile. Since opportunities to hear and use English vary considerably among communities within the greater Montreal area, the language learning contexts for this area cover a full spectrum of EAL settings. In spite of pockets of English speaker concentration, much of the rest of Quebec features EAL contexts with few public domains for communicative English use

With this variety of teaching contexts, there are several implications for the English language classrooms of Quebec's secondary schools. First, student ability levels within the contexts of the greater Montreal area may be at a higher level and exhibit more intra-group variety than those of students in the rest of Quebec, as students in the greater Montreal area may have more but unequally distributed opportunities for English language use. Additionally, a large number of students in the greater Montreal area experience French as a language of instruction, English as a second language, and a third language at home. This intensifies the linguistic diversity of this region. In contrast, much of the rest of Quebec has a predominantly monolingual francophone student body coupled with limited opportunities for public use of English. Research related to language acquisition in Quebec must acknowledge the potential influence of these linguistic differences

*Quebec secondary schools.* Quebec's ministry of education (MELS) has addressed the issue of teacher use of L1 and TL in ESL classrooms within its programs for instruction for elementary and secondary schools. These documents clearly specify that the language of instruction and communication in the ESL classroom is to be English



(Programme de formation de l'école québécoise, enseignement primaire, 2003, p. 98; Programme de formation de l'école québécoise, enseignement secondaire, premier cycle, p. 180). In these documents, no support is given to the in-class use of the students' L1, either by teacher or students. The MELS documents do not address the possibility of varied practices by ESL teachers who teach regular, enriched, or alternative ESL programs. Each secondary school is able to adapt the regular ESL program to suit the needs of its students. Alternative ESL programs in Quebec secondary schools typically feature students with learning or behavioral challenges. Enriched ESL programs are offered to students who have either completed an intensive English program at the elementary level or have had exposure to English outside of the school. Research is needed that would illustrate whether this recommendation of L2 exclusivity is an additional source of tension in ESL teachers' decision-making process.

Secondary school ESL teachers in Quebec have varied levels of qualifications, as some ESL teachers do not have language teacher training. In the 2005-2006 academic year, the MELS granted 114 letters of tolerance to Quebec secondary schools in order to permit the hiring of unqualified (i.e. without Quebec teacher certification) personnel for full-time ESL teacher positions. (Martini, 2006, ¶ 1) This number does not account for many part-time ESL teachers who are also not qualified as language specialists. ESL teachers in Quebec also have varied beliefs concerning L1 and TL use, and differing levels of English language proficiency and confidence using English as the group includes both native and non-native speakers of English. The influences of teacher beliefs about L1 use, teacher training, English language proficiency, and confidence in English have not been unexplored in the Quebec ESL teaching context.

French secondary schools in Quebec typically feature adolescent learners with low English proficiency levels as their prior exposure to English in elementary school has generally been limited to a total of less than 160 hours of instruction. However, about 10% of the students across the province have had intensive ESL instruction, typically in grade 5 or 6, amounting to 350-400 hours of additional instruction. Research is also needed in order to understand how the teaching setting and student factors influence the teaching beliefs and practices for ESL teachers in Quebec.

To develop an understanding of the language use practices and beliefs of Quebec ESL teachers, it is necessary to investigate the quantity of L1 used in ESL classrooms, the function for which teachers use the L1, and the language use beliefs of the teachers. It is also necessary to examine the extent to which teachers may be adapting their practices due to the influence of additional factors such as language proficiency in English, student age or ability level, school setting, and government language use policies. The following research questions were developed in order to investigate this research concern.

### Research Questions

Research Question 1: How much French (L1) do teachers report speaking in secondary-level ESL classrooms in the Montreal area?

Research Question 2: How much French (L1) do teachers report speaking in secondary-level ESL classrooms in the rest of Quebec?

Research Question 3: What is the function of French (L1) when used by teachers in secondary-level ESL classrooms in the Montreal area?

Research Question 4: What is the function of French (L1) when used by teachers in secondary-level ESL classrooms in the rest of Quebec?

Research Question 5: What are teachers' beliefs concerning French (L1) use in secondary level ESL classrooms in the Montreal area?

Research Question 6: What are teachers' beliefs concerning French (L1) use in secondary level ESL classrooms in the rest of Quebec?

Research Question 7: What is the relationship between the reported amount of French (L1) spoken by teachers in secondary-level ESL classrooms and the following variables?

- a. ESL teachers' English language proficiency
- b. ESL teachers' confidence with English
- c. ESL teachers' beliefs concerning French (L1) use in secondary level ESL classrooms
- d. student age
- e. student ability level
- f. the school/community setting
- g. the MELS' recommendation to use only English as the language of instruction for ESL

The next chapter presents the methodology used to investigate the research questions in this study.

## CHAPTER 3

### Research Methodology

#### *Context of the Study*

To answer the research questions, a sample of 66 secondary school ESL teachers were surveyed using a questionnaire and a set of interview questions developed for this study. Conducted in the province of Quebec in 2006, the study focused on ESL teachers' perceptions of their own in-class use of students' L1 (French), and their beliefs concerning in-class language use. It also examined the relationship between these ESL teachers' reported in-class French use and their English language proficiency, confidence with English, beliefs about language use, students' age, students' ability, school setting, and the MELS' 'English only' recommendation. Data were summarized in terms of the main variables in the research questions, and then relationships between the variables were studied.

#### *Participants*

The participants for this study are 66 secondary school ESL teachers, of whom 23 teach in the greater Montreal area and 43 teach elsewhere in Quebec. The teaching experience of the participants varied from one to 36 years. All of the teachers spoke two languages (English and French), with 30 participants reporting abilities in a third language, as well. Sixty-two of the 66 participants had formal language teacher training. Based on the reported location of the secondary school where the participant teaches, each participant was assigned to the 'greater Montreal area' group or to the 'rest of Quebec' group in order to respond to the research questions.

Participants for the cued interview were a subset ( $N=6$ ) of the 66 secondary level ESL teachers. The interview participants included three teachers working in communities in the greater Montreal area (Dorval, Outremont, and Montreal North) and three teachers working in communities elsewhere in Quebec (Trois Rivières, Plessisville, Gaspé). All six teachers had agreed to participate in an interview by completing a section of the questionnaire described below.

### *Instruments*

The instruments used in this study consisted of a questionnaire designed to probe ESL teachers' beliefs and practices concerning in-class language use, a question frame for the cued interviews and interview stimuli consisting of video clips of an ESL teacher speaking English and French during an ESL lesson.

The questionnaire included items concerning biographical data, a self-rated English language proficiency rating, and three multi-item scales which probed beliefs about the language used for instruction, confidence with English, and attitude toward the Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisirs, et du Sport de Québec (MELS) 'English only' recommendation. The three multi-item scales followed a six-point Likert agreement-disagreement format. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

The questions used during the semi-structured interview explored the teachers' language use beliefs, language learning preferences and history, language teacher training, and changes over time in their teaching practices concerning language use. See Appendix B for the questions used during the interview.

The five short video clips were selected from a video recording of an ESL lesson in which a teacher used the students' L1 (French) for a variety of purposes. The ESL teacher's first language was also French. The video recording was created for this study. From the recording of the complete lesson, five short video segments were selected for viewing by the interview participants in order to explore their language use beliefs.

The first video clip featured the teacher using the students' L1, French, for the purpose of contrasting L1 and L2 grammar systems. The teacher compared the simple past tense and 'used to' in English with the French imperfect tense. In the second video clip, the teacher used French to explain grammar and manage the class. She discussed the verb form required after 'used to' and also instructed a student to allow others to provide answers to a grammar activity. The third video clip, in which French was used for affective purposes, featured the teacher praising a student in French. The teacher explained vocabulary in the fourth video segment by translating the verbs 'to pick up' and 'to drop off'. In response to time pressures at the lesson's end, the teacher gave instructions in French in the fifth video clip.

*Development of the questionnaire.* Research that had examined teacher use of L1 and TL (Levine, 2003; Macaro 1997; Polio & Duff, 1994), non-native speaker teacher confidence (Horwitz, 1996), and self-rating of language proficiency (MacIntyre et al., 1997) was consulted in order to create an item pool to address the research questions of this study. The phrasing and presentation of the items was modified according to guidelines presented by Dörnyei (2003). The questionnaire was piloted twice. After an initial piloting with two ESL teachers and a teacher educator, the item pool was reduced,

items were created for areas that had not been addressed, and the instructions were clarified.

A second piloting stage involved the group administration of the questionnaire to Concordia University Bachelor of Education TESL degree program year 3 and 4 student teachers ( $N= 50$ ). An item analysis was performed in order to identify items that were unclear (e.g. with missing responses) or items with a limited range of responses. For the three multi-item scales which probe beliefs about the language being taught, that is, English; confidence with English; and compliance with the MELS 'English only' recommendation, the internal consistency reliability was measured with the Cronbach's alpha coefficient.

The reliability analysis yielded the following: for the four items concerning compliance with the MELS' recommendation, the coefficient was 0.66; for the six beliefs items, the coefficient was 0.79; and for the five confidence items, it was 0.78. These are considered to be high.

*Contents of the questionnaire.* The first section of the questionnaire asked participants to identify the length (in minutes) of their ESL classes and to estimate the percentage of class time devoted to teacher talk, student talk, and independent student work. Participants were then asked to estimate the percentage of speaking time in class during which they used French to communicate with students. In addition to the percentage estimation of French speech, participants selected a description of quantity to correspond with the percentage estimate (e.g. most of the time, some of the time, very

little, never). Participants were also asked if they were aware of the MELS 'English only' recommendation.

Three multi-item scales constituted the second section of the questionnaire. Six items were related to beliefs concerning in-class language use by ESL teachers (e.g. I believe that I should speak English at all times in class), five items related to teacher confidence with English language use (e.g. When I use English in class, I'm afraid that I'll make a mistake), and four items addressed the MELS recommendation to use English only in ESL classrooms (e.g. The MELS 'English only' recommendation influences my language in class). After consulting research related to scale measurement (DeVellis, 2003), a six point Likert agreement-disagreement scale was used, and scoring was reversed for items within each grouping; therefore, a score of 1 could represent 'strongly agree' for one item and 'strongly disagree' for another item.

The questionnaire then addressed factors that influenced French use in the classroom (e.g. student age, student ability) and functions for which French was used in the classroom (e.g. for classroom management and discipline, to talk about grammar). One open-ended sentence completion item, #24 (I feel that ESL teachers who speak French in class \_\_\_\_\_), was also included to offer the participants an opportunity to give input on a dimension of language use beliefs.

Finally, participants were asked to rate their own English language proficiency in each of four areas: listening comprehension, reading ability, writing ability and speaking ability. The participants rated the four proficiency areas using a scale of 0 to 6, with 0 representing no competence and 6 representing fluency. The last section of the



questionnaire was composed of eight items involving biographical data such as years of teaching experience, first language, and other languages spoken.

#### *Data Collection for the Questionnaire*

Participants were self-selecting and were not paid for completing the questionnaire. Many participants (31) were attendees at the 2006 SPEAQ (La Société pour la promotion de l'anglais, langue seconde au Québec) convention for ESL teachers in Quebec City. Twenty-seven of these participants completed a paper version of the questionnaire on-site, while four requested an electronic document which they completed and emailed at a later date. The response rate for paper copies of the questionnaire at the convention was 65% (27 of 42 questionnaires), whereas the emailed questionnaires that had been requested by teachers had a response rate of 100% (4 questionnaires).

Participants were also contacted through faculty members in the Bachelor of Education TESL degree program at Concordia University in Montreal. Two teachers were given questionnaires in their schools. These contact teachers distributed a paper version of the questionnaires to all ESL teachers in the same school. Questionnaires were self-administered, and returned in sealed envelopes to the contact teacher from whom the questionnaires were collected at a later date. This process resulted in a response rate of 83.5% (5 of 6 questionnaires) in the first school and 37.5% (3 of 8 questionnaires) in the second. Five questionnaires were completed by ESL teachers at a Concordia University conference for cooperating teachers, which was a response rate of 42% (5 of 11 questionnaires).

Finally, participants who were contacted through a Quebec network of ESL pedagogical counselors received the questionnaire as an electronic document by email.

Twenty-two teachers completed and returned the questionnaire either electronically by email or fax, or as a paper copy by mail. The response rate for this distribution system cannot be determined.

#### *Data Collection for the Interviews*

Participants for the cued interview were taken from the group of questionnaire participants who had indicated their willingness to take part in an interview by completing a section on the questionnaire. A subset of ten teachers was selected, based on their responses to the six beliefs items and the percentage of French that they reported using in class. Only participants who had provided answers to all the beliefs items and who were clearly classifiable as supporting the L2 exclusivity position, the maximal L2 position, or the optimal L2 position were selected. Interview candidates were contacted by email and were asked to participate in a short telephone interview during which they would answer questions and view five short video clips that had been posted to an online video hosting site. Six of these candidates consented to do the interview. The interview participants included two representatives for each of the three belief positions regarding L1 language use in L2 classrooms: L2 exclusivity, the maximal L2 position, and the optimal L2 position. In addition, each belief position pair was composed of one teacher who works in the greater Montreal area and one teacher who teaches elsewhere in Quebec.

Once the candidates had agreed to the interview, a time and date was set to contact them by telephone. Several days before the interview, the contact information for the video clips was provided to ensure that the clips could be accessed by the interview

participants. Participants were asked not to discuss the video clips with any colleagues before the interview took place. With the participants' permission, the six telephone interviews were recorded. Participants were asked to answer questions and comment on the language use of the ESL teacher featured in the video clips. The audio-recordings of the interviews were transcribed.

The quantitative analysis procedures and findings from the questionnaire, as well as the qualitative analysis procedures and findings from one item (#24) on the questionnaire and the interview are reported in Chapter 4.

## CHAPTER 4

### Data Analysis

The analysis procedure and results for the questionnaire data are followed by the analysis procedure and findings for the interview data. The questionnaire's quantitative measures included the teachers' self-reported estimate of French used in class, self-rated English language proficiency, and three multi-item scales concerning teachers' language use beliefs, teachers' confidence with English, and compliance with the MELS 'English only' recommendation. The sole qualitative measure from the questionnaire was a sentence completion item concerning teacher beliefs, item #24. The interviews were a source of qualitative data.

As a preface to the report of the analysis and results, it is important to note that in this discussion, the term L1 may refer to the learners' first language or, as is the case for some students in French secondary schools, L1 may refer to the language of the school where ESL is taught.

#### Questionnaire Data

The analysis procedures and results for the quantitative data on the questionnaire are followed by the analysis and results for its qualitative data. Results are reported in the order of the research questions for this study.

#### *Analysis Procedures for Quantitative Data*

The internal consistency of the multi-item scales (language use beliefs, English language proficiency, confidence with English, and compliance with MELS) was

examined using Cronbach's alpha; data on the main variables were summarized using mean scores, standard deviations and frequency distribution; the relationships between the main variables were investigated using correlation and regression techniques; and differences between the groups were examined using Mann-Whitney *U* tests, *t* tests and analysis of variance.

### *Results for the Quantitative Data*

Research questions 1 and 2 related to the reported amount of French spoken, research questions 3 and 4 addressed the functions for which French is used in class, and research questions 5 and 6 examined teacher beliefs. Research question 7 probed the relationship between the reported amount of French used in class and the variables of teachers' English proficiency, teachers' confidence with English, teachers' beliefs, student age, student ability level, school/community setting, and compliance with the MELS' 'English only' recommendation. Each variable was defined and then the correlation between variables was examined.

Research Question 1: How much French (L1) do teachers report speaking in secondary-level ESL classrooms in the greater Montreal area?

Research Question 2: How much French (L1) do teachers report speaking in secondary-level ESL classrooms in the rest of Quebec?

Both the Montreal and rest of Quebec groups had a wide range of participant responses concerning the reported amount of French spoken by teachers in class. The

reported amount of French for the Montreal group ranged from 0 to 80%, while the rest of Quebec group ranged from 0 to 50%. (Table 1)

Table 1

*Reported Percentage of French Spoken by Teachers in Class*

	Mean score	Standard deviation	Minimum percentage	Maximum percentage
Montreal (n=23)	8.71	17.56	0.00	80.00
Rest of Quebec (n=42)	8.53	11.89	0.00	50.00

Five participants who teach ESL classes for more than one program (alternative, regular, and enriched) within the same grade level reported that they vary their practices depending on the program taught, with little or no French used in class with enriched program students, more French with regular program students, and even more French with alternative program students. For the participants who teach ESL classes for several programs, the midpoint of the reported range of French use was recorded. For example, 0 - 40% was recorded as 20%, and 2 - 75% was recorded as 39%.

Table 2

*Reported Percentage of French Used in Class*

Percentage of French	Montreal (n= 23)	Rest of Quebec (n=42) 1 missing	Total (n=65) 1 missing
.00	9	14	23
.50	1	1	2
1.00	2		2
2.00		4	4
3.00	1	1	2
5.00	3	6	9
8.00		1	1
10.00	3	5	8
15.00	1	3	4
20.00		3	3
25.00	1	1	2
30.00	1		1
39.00		1	1
40.00		1	1
50.00		1	1
80.00	1		1

In addition to their estimated percentage of in-class use of French, participants were asked to select a descriptor (*never, very little, some of the time, most of the time*) to describe their in-class French use.

Table 3

*Descriptors of Quantity of French: Item #4*

I usually use _____ French in class.	Montreal (n=23)		Rest of Quebec (n=38: 5 missing)	
	N	% French	N	% French
1. No (never)	9	0	13	0
	1	1	1	0.5
2. Very little			1	2
	1	0.5	1	0
	1	1	3	2
	1	3	6	5
	4	5	1	8
	2	10	5	10
3. Some (some of the time)	1	15	1	15
			2	20
	1	25	1	-- <sup>a</sup>
	1	30	1	25
4. A lot of (most of the time)			1	50
	1	80	1	2-75 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>participant chose *some* but did not report percentage of French

<sup>b</sup>depending on program (alternative, regular, enriched) taught

Research Question 3: What is the function of French (L1) when used by teachers in secondary-level ESL classrooms in the greater Montreal area?

Research Question 4: What is the function of French (L1) when used by teachers in secondary-level ESL classrooms in the rest of Quebec?

To report the function of French used in class, participants were given ten options for questionnaire item #23. In addition to selecting from eight functions for French (e.g. to talk about grammar), participants were able to provide other functions or indicate that they did not speak French in class (Table 5). The questionnaire's eight functions for in-



class French use and the *other* functions provided by participants were regrouped into three main function categories: affective purposes, information about language, and management of instruction (Table 4).

Table 4

*Regrouped Functions of French in ESL Classrooms*

Functions of French in ESL Classrooms	Montreal (n=23)		Rest of Quebec (n =42) 1 missing	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Affective purposes	5	21.74	11	26.19
Information about language	13	56.52	23	54.76
Management of instruction	19	86.61	39	89.29

When the participants' responses for the functions of in-class French use were grouped in this way, both the Montreal and the rest of Quebec participant groups had similar distribution patterns, with management of instruction emerging as the most often cited function. The complete listing of the functions reported (Table 5) reveals some differences between the groups, especially concerning the functions *to talk about tests and assignments* and the *other* functions provided by participants. In the rest of Quebec group, there was a greater reliance on the use of the L1 for talking about tests and assignments (26.19% of participants), while only 8.69% of participants in the Montreal group reported using French for this purpose. Six participants from the Montreal group provided examples of *other* functions for in-class French use, with four examples related to information about language, one example for management of instruction, and one example of L1 use for affective purposes. The sole example provided by a participant from the rest of Quebec group concerned L1 use for management of instruction.

Table 5

*Functions of French in ESL Classrooms*

Functions of French in ESL Classrooms	Montreal (n=23)		Rest of Quebec (n=42) 1 missing	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
To explain words or complicated phrases	6	26.08	13	30.96
To make students feel more comfortable	3	13.04	5	11.90
To give instructions	4	17.39	5	11.90
For classroom management, discipline	11	47.83	19	45.24
To talk about tests and assignments	2	8.69	11	26.19
To talk about grammar	4	17.39	10	23.80
To build a good rapport with my students	1	4.35	5	11.90
To deal with time pressures	4	17.39	4	9.52
Other	6	26.08	1	2.38
Does not apply – no French used in class	9	39.13	12	28.57

Research Question 5: What are teachers' beliefs concerning French (L1) use in secondary-level ESL classrooms in the greater Montreal area?

Research Question 6: What are teachers' beliefs concerning French (L1) use in secondary-level ESL classrooms in the rest of Quebec?

To assign participants to a particular language use belief position, it was necessary to define the three language use belief positions of language teachers as described by Macaro (1997).

1. L2 exclusivity belief position: The teacher uses only the L2 in the L2 class. The teacher believes that L1 use is unnecessary and not helpful for L2 acquisition.
2. Maximal L2 belief position: The teacher uses a limited amount of L1. The teacher prefers the L2 exclusivity position but is unable to avoid L1 use. The teacher believes that L1 use in the language classroom delays L2 acquisition.

3. Optimal L2 belief position: Some L1 is used by the teacher. L1 use in the language classroom is seen as enhancing L2 acquisition.

To identify representatives of these three belief positions, the participants' responses to the individual beliefs items in the questionnaire were examined, as well as their reported percent of in-class French use. While most participants' responses in these two categories were closely related, some participants (18 or 32%) had language use beliefs that were not in harmony with their reported classroom practices. Participants whose beliefs item responses did not match their reported language use practices were not identified as representatives of one of the three language use belief positions.

#### Questionnaire Beliefs Items:

7. *I believe that I should speak English at all times in class.*

Participants who scored 5 (agree) or 6 (strongly agree) for item #7 were coded as supporting either the L2 exclusivity belief position (L2E) or the maximal L2 use belief position (ML2). Participants who scored 1 (strongly disagree) or 2 (disagree) were coded as supporting the optimal L2 use belief position (OL2)

11. *I believe that there are situations for which I should use French in class.*

Participants who scored 5 (disagree) or 6 (strongly disagree) for item #11 were coded as supporting the ML2. Participants who scored 1 (strongly agree) or 2 (agree) were coded as supporting the OL2.

14. *I believe that I should speak English at all times in class, but sometimes I use French.*

Participants who scored 1 (strongly agree) or 2 (agree) for item #14 were coded as supporting the ML2.

17. *ESL teachers in French secondary schools should use some French in class.*

Participants who scored 5 (disagree) or 6 (strongly disagree) for item #17 were coded as supporting either the L2E or the ML2. Participants who scored 1 (strongly disagree) or 2 (disagree) were coded as supporting the OL2.

20. *I believe that I should speak French and English in class.*

Participants who scored 5 (disagree) or 6 (strongly disagree) for item #20 were coded as supporting either the L2E or the ML2. Participants who scored 1 (strongly agree) or 2 (agree) were coded as supporting the OL2.

21. *ESL teachers who use French in class delay the English language learning process.*

Participants who scored 5 (agree) or 6 (strongly agree) for item #21 were coded as supporting either the L2E or the ML2. Participants who scored 1 (strongly disagree) or 2 (disagree) were coded as supporting the OL2.

By using the coded responses to each of the five beliefs items and the reported amount of French used in class, representatives of the L2 exclusivity language use belief position, the maximal L2 use belief position, and the optimal L2 use belief position were identified in both the Montreal and rest of Quebec group (Table 6). Of the total of 56 participants, 67.9% were clearly identified with one belief position. Eighteen participants

(32.15% of the total number of participants) could not be classified in this manner because their responses had characteristics of two or more belief positions, or their responses exhibited weak support for a belief position.

Table 6

*Language Use Belief Position Representatives*

Language Use Belief Position	Montreal (n= 17; 6 missing)		Rest of Quebec (n=39: 4 missing)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
L2 Exclusivity belief position	4	23.53	12	30.77
Maximal L2 use belief position	6	35.29	11	28.21
Optimal L2 use belief position	2	11.76	3	7.69
Unclassifiable	5	29.41	13	33.33

Reliance on the single measure of the participants' reported use of French was most accurate in identifying those representatives of the L2 exclusivity belief position as these teachers reported 0% French use. For representatives of the other two belief positions, the fit was not so tight, as can be seen in Table 7 in Appendix C.

For the 56 participants, the 18 L2 exclusivity representatives all reported 0% French use, the 17 maximal L2 use representatives reported from 0.5 - 15% French use, and the 5 optimal L2 use representatives had in-class French use of 25 – 80% of teacher speech. There were 18 participants who were unclassifiable with respect to language use beliefs positions.

Another approach to identifying members of a language use beliefs group was to use the mean score for the six belief items as a grouping measure (Table 8 in Appendix D). This approach was most successful in grouping the 5 representatives of the optimal L2 use belief position. Participants whose mean score was between 2.00 and 2.67 were

all those who had been identified as representatives of the optimal L2 use group. The mean scores of the 17 representatives of the maximal L2 use beliefs position, which were between 3.50 and 5.83, had the widest range. The 18 representatives of the L2 exclusivity beliefs position group had mean scores between 5.17 and 6.0.

Research Question 7: What is the relationship between the reported amount of French (L1) spoken by teachers in secondary-level ESL classrooms and the following variables?

- c. ESL teachers' English language proficiency
- d. ESL teachers' confidence with English
- c. ESL teachers' beliefs concerning French (L1) use in secondary level ESL classrooms
- d. student age
- e. student ability level
- f. the school/community setting
- g. the MELS' recommendation to use only English as the language of instruction for ESL

In order to answer this research question, it was necessary to define each of the variables separately and then investigate the relationships between the variables using correlation and regression techniques. Due to low response rates to questionnaire items related to variables d, e, and f (student age, student ability level, and school/community setting), the data for these three variables will be discussed but will not be included in the correlation analysis.

7. a. ESL teachers' English language proficiency

RQ: What is the relationship between the reported amount of French (L1) spoken by teachers in secondary-level ESL classrooms and ESL teachers' English language proficiency?

Questionnaire item #25 asked participants to rate their own English language proficiency on a scale of 0 to 6, where 0 represented no competence and 6 represented fluency, using the following ability sub-categories: English speaking, English listening comprehension, English reading, and English writing. Both native and non-native speakers of English were represented in the Montreal and rest of Quebec participant groups (Table 9).

Table 9

*First Language of Secondary-Level ESL Teachers*

First Language of Secondary-Level ESL Teachers	<i>Montreal</i> (n=23)		Rest of Quebec (n=42; 1 missing)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
English	10	43.48	7	16.67
French	6	26.09	31	73.81
Italian	3	13.04	1	2.38
Croatian	1	4.35		
Portuguese	1	4.35		
Lao	1	4.35		
Bilingual	1 <sup>a</sup>	4.35	3 <sup>b</sup>	7.14

<sup>a</sup> English-Lithuanian

<sup>b</sup> French-English

The distribution of responses for each language proficiency sub-category was similar for both the Montreal and rest of Quebec group (Table 10). Participants'

responses ranged from 4 to 6 for English speaking, English listening comprehension, and English writing ability, while responses for English reading ability had a narrower range, from 5 to 6. Mean scores for all four language proficiency sub-categories were lower for the rest of Quebec group than the mean scores of the Montreal group.

Table 10

*Language Ability Proficiency Sub-Categories*

Proficiency sub-category	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min. score	Max. score
English Speaking				
Montreal (n=23)	5.86	0.46	4.00	6.00
Rest of Quebec (n=42)	5.46	0.67	4.00	6.00
English Listening Comprehension				
Montreal (n=23)	5.96	0.21	5.00	6.00
Rest of Quebec (n=42)	5.80	0.46	4.00	6.00
English Writing				
Montreal (n=23)	5.83	0.50	4.00	6.00
Rest of Quebec (n=42)	5.49	0.63	4.00	6.00
English Reading				
Montreal (n=23)	5.96	0.21	5.00	6.00
Rest of Quebec (n=42)	5.80	0.40	5.00	6.00

A Mann-Whitney *U* test performed to compare the mean scores for the English language proficiency sub-categories for the Montreal group with those of the rest of Quebec group revealed significant differences for the productive skills of speaking ( $U = 324.00, p < .01$ ) and writing ( $U = 333.50, p < .01$ ), but not for the receptive skills of listening and reading.

To reduce the scores from the four proficiency sub-categories to a single composite English language proficiency variable, a reliability analysis was performed to verify the internal consistency of the subscales. This produced a coefficient alpha of 0.89. For the variable of English language proficiency, the range of scores for the Montreal



group and the rest of Quebec group was the same, but there is a lower mean score and higher standard deviation in the rest of Quebec group (Table 11).

Table 11

*Teacher English Language Proficiency*

Teacher English Language Proficiency	Mean score	Standard deviation	Minimum score	Maximum score
Montreal (n=23)	5.90	0.33	4.50	6.00
Rest of Quebec (n=42)	5.64	0.47	4.50	6.00

A *t*-test performed to compare the English language proficiency mean scores for the Montreal group with that of the rest of Quebec group revealed that there was a significant difference,  $t(63) = 2.40$ ,  $p = .02$ .

To examine the relationship between reported amount of French used and teacher English language proficiency, the English language proficiency mean score was used in the correlation analysis.

7. b. ESL teachers' confidence with English

RQ: What is the relationship between the reported amount of French (L1) spoken by teachers in secondary-level ESL classrooms and ESL teachers' confidence with English?

ESL teachers' confidence with English was examined on the questionnaire with a multi-item scale of five items:

8. I am confident when I use English in class.
10. I feel anxious speaking English in front of other language teachers.

- 12. I worry that students will ask me how to say something that I don't know in English.
- 15. When I use English in class, I'm afraid I'll make a mistake.
- 18. I feel anxious speaking to native speakers of English.

The reliability analysis for the five confidence items had a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.66. To determine a mean score for teachers' confidence with English, the scores from the five confidence items were combined. The mean scores for the five confidence items ranged from 4.60 to 6.00(table 12), with no Montreal participants scoring below a mean score of 5.00. Confidence mean scores for participants from the rest of Quebec group were slightly lower, with two participants scoring 4.60, and two scoring 4.80. To examine the relationship between the reported amount of French used and teacher confidence with English, the confidence mean score was used in the correlation analysis.

Table 12

*Teacher Confidence with English*

Teacher Confidence with English	Mean score	Standard deviation	Minimum score	Maximum score
Montreal (n=22)	5.75	0.39	5.00	6.00
Rest of Quebec (n=41)	5.66	0.48	4.60	6.00

7. c. ESL teachers' beliefs concerning French (L1) use in secondary level ESL classrooms

RQ: What is the relationship between the reported amount of French (L1) spoken by teachers in secondary-level ESL classrooms and the ESL teachers' beliefs concerning French (L1) use in secondary level ESL classrooms?

The variable of participants' beliefs concerning French (L1) use in secondary ESL classrooms was discussed for research questions 5 and 6. For the measure of the beliefs mean score, optimal L2 beliefs position representatives scored between 2 – 2.67, maximal L2 representatives were generally clustered between 3.50 – 5, and the scores for representatives of the L2 exclusivity position ranged from 5.17 – 6. To examine the relationship between the reported amount of French used and beliefs, the beliefs mean score was used in the correlation analysis.

- 7. d. student age
- e. student ability level
- f. school/community setting

RQ: What is the relationship between the reported amount of French (L1) spoken by teachers in secondary-level ESL classrooms and student age, student ability level, and the school/community setting?

Due to low response rates for the questionnaire item that examined the influence of student age, student ability and the school/community setting on teachers' in-class use of French (item #22), these factors were not included in the correlation analysis. The following description of the responses for item #22 offers some limited insight into the relationship examined by the research question.

Of the 65 participants responding to this item, 19 participants indicated that they do not speak French in class. Of the remaining 46 participants, 14 indicated that they used more French in class with younger students. One participant simply noted that student age was a factor. Student ability was a factor that influenced the reported amount of French used by 35 participants, and 33 of the 35 specified that they used more French with students of low proficiency. School or community setting was selected as a factor influencing language use by eight of the 65 participants. Twelve participants listed other factors that influenced their in-class language; classroom management was a critical factor, with discipline and class composition mentioned in 11 of the 13 suggested factors. For the factors of student age, student ability level, and school setting, the highest number of responses for item #22 was related to student ability level.

7. g. The MELS' recommendation to use only English as the language of instruction for ESL

RQ: What is the relationship between the reported amount of French (L1) spoken by teachers in secondary-level ESL classrooms and the MELS' recommendation to use only English as the language of instruction for ESL?

Compliance with the MELS' recommendation to use only English as the language of instruction for ESL was addressed with a multi-item scale of four items:

- 9. I speak only English in class because of the MELS 'English only' recommendation.
- 13. ESL teachers feel pressure to conform to the MELS 'English only' recommendation.
- 16. I avoid speaking French in class because of the MELS 'English only'

recommendation.

19. The MELS 'English only' recommendation influences my language in class.

A comparison of participants in the Montreal group with the participant group from the rest of Quebec shows similar patterns for mean scores, standard deviation, minimum scores and maximum scores (Table 13). To examine the relationship between reported amount of French used and compliance with the MELS recommendation, the MELS mean score was used in the correlation analysis.

Table 13

*Compliance with MELS' 'English only' recommendations*

Compliance with MELS' 'English only' recommendations	Mean score	Standard deviation	Minimum score	Maximum score
Montreal (n=21)	2.40	0.99	1.00	4.75
Rest of Quebec (n=39)	2.12	0.90	1.00	4.75

Research Question 7:

What is the relationship between the reported amount of French (L1) spoken by teachers in secondary-level ESL classrooms and the following variables?

- a. ESL teachers' English language proficiency
- b. ESL teachers' confidence with English
- c. ESL teachers' beliefs concerning French (L1) use in secondary level ESL classrooms
- g. the MELS' recommendation to use only English as the language of instruction for ESL

Once the mean scores of the variables of reported amount of French spoken, English language proficiency, confidence with English, teacher beliefs concerning language use, and compliance with MELS' 'English only' recommendation were determined, the relationship between these variables was examined using correlation and regression techniques.

The correlations between the amount of French spoken by teachers and the independent variables of English language proficiency, confidence with English, and compliance with MELS' recommendation were not significant (Table 14).

There was a significant negative correlation between the reported amount of French spoken by teachers and the independent variable of teacher beliefs concerning in-class French use. This indicates that the more a teacher speaks French in class, the lower the teacher's belief score will be. The reader is reminded that scores of 2 - 2.67 were found for optimal L2 beliefs position representatives, 3.50 - 5 for maximal L2 representatives and 5.17 - 6 for representatives of the L2 exclusivity position.

Table 14

*Correlation Coefficients for the Reported Amount of French Spoken and Beliefs, English Proficiency, Confidence with English, and Compliance with MELS' Recommendation*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. Amount of French	---	-.676*	.056	-.21	.083
2. Beliefs		---	-.040	-.149	-.212
3. Confidence			---	-.005	.443
4. MELS				---	.087
5. English Proficiency					---

\* $p < .01$ .

Further examination of the data by way of a regression analysis was limited to the statistically significant relationship of reported amount of French used and beliefs concerning in-class French use. To explore the relationship between the reported amount of French used in class and teachers' beliefs concerning French (L1) use in ESL classrooms, a simple regression analysis was performed, with the reported amount of in-class French use as the dependent variable. The independent variable was teachers' beliefs concerning French use in secondary level ESL classrooms. The variable of beliefs was a significant predictor, with a lower amount of French use associated with a higher beliefs score (Table 15).

Table 15

*Regression Analysis for Beliefs as Predictor of Reported Amount of French Spoken in ESL Classes*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>t</i>
Beliefs	-8.95	1.34	-.67	-6.70*

Note.  $R^2 = .45$  ( $p < .01$ ).

\* $p < .01$ .

*Analysis Procedures for Qualitative Data*

The only source of qualitative data from the questionnaire was the open-ended sentence completion item, #24 (I feel that ESL teachers who speak French in class \_\_\_\_). Based on a theoretically motivated coding system (Ryan & Bernard, 2003; Thomas, 2004), the responses to this item were coded using concepts from the research questions. The following concepts were identified as pertinent to responses to item #24: a) positive view of L1 use by teacher in ESL classrooms (optimal L2 use belief position), b) neutral view of L1 use by teacher in ESL classrooms (optimal L2 use belief position), c) negative view of L1 use by teacher in ESL classrooms (maximal L2 use belief position, L2 exclusivity belief position, MELS 'English only' recommendation)

The codes of *positive*, *neutral*, and *negative* were used to systematically group responses to item #24. The codes of *positive* and *neutral* were collapsed into one code, *positive/neutral*, as several of the responses mixed both positive and neutral views of L1 use. The code *abstain* was created in order to code responses by participants who stated that they were abstaining from offering an opinion on the practices of other teachers.



By applying these codes to the responses to item #24, the qualitative data were converted to quantitative data. The intra-rater reliability was 100% when coding was repeated 8 weeks after first coding. Inter-rater reliability of 96.55% was achieved when the responses were coded by a second coder. 100% reliability was attained after discussion concerning two differing items. The second coder is a graduate student and an ESL teacher.

*Results for Qualitative Data.*

For sentence completion item #24, both the Montreal group and the rest of Quebec group had more participants who supported the negative view of L1 use in the ESL classroom than a neutral or positive view of L1 use (Table 16). Only the rest of Quebec group had participants who stated that they were abstaining from offering an opinion on the practices of other teachers.

Table 16

*View of L1 Use: Sentence Completion Item #24*

I feel that ESL teachers who speak French in class _____	Montreal (n= 20; 3 missing)		Rest of Quebec (n=38; 5 missing)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Neutral or positive view of L1 use	6	30.00	10	26.30
Negative view of L1 use	14	70.00	24	63.16
Abstain from judgment	0	0.00	4	10.53

## Interview Data

The interviews with six participants were a source of qualitative data.

*Analysis Procedures for Interview Data*

The qualitative data collected during the interviews with six participants have been quantified with the development of a theoretical coding system (Ryan and Bernard, 2003; Thomas 2004). The coding system is based on concepts from the research questions. A code-book was developed and the theory-based codes were applied to the interview transcripts. After the responses from the six interview transcripts were systematically grouped, it was possible to identify intra- and inter- language use belief group patterns of the interview participants

The following concepts from the research questions were identified as related to the quantity of French reported to be used in ESL classes: *quantity of French used in Montreal; quantity of French used in rest of Quebec; change in French use over time.* The following codes were created to identify functions for in-class French use: *management and discipline; relating to students; explaining grammar; explaining*

*instructions; explaining words, expressions; dealing with time pressures.* The research question examines the relation of in-class French use to six variables, and the following codes were developed to identify these variables: *teacher English language proficiency; teacher confidence with English; student age; student ability level; school/community setting; MELS 'English only' recommendation.* Three codes were created to identify the language use belief positions discussed in the research questions: *L2 exclusivity, maximal L2 use, and optimal L2 use.* The following codes were created for sources of teacher beliefs: *language learning history; teacher training; teaching experience.*

*Examples of coded statements from interview transcripts.* Participant names given here are pseudonyms.

*Quantity of French used in rest of Quebec:* “There’s a great effort on the part of the school board to get more English in class, especially as (CITY NAME) is almost more EFL than ESL.” – Marc , who teaches in a small city in Eastern Quebec

*Quantity of French reported to be used - change in French use over time:* “I would actually say that my use of French has decreased enormously to the point that it’s down to 10% now.” – Steven

*Functions for in-class French use- management and discipline:* “Mostly in discipline and classroom management, I use French.” – Steven

*Functions for in-class French use- explaining grammar:* “The only time where I use French is sometimes with the grammar explanations.” – Claire

*Functions for in-class French use- relating to students:* “...for more affective purposes, to have a sense of true communication with the students, speaking to the heart.” - Marc

*Functions for in-class French use- explaining words, expressions:* “...she can say the word in French if the students are really not sure.” – Solange (in response to teaching practices viewed in a video clip)

*Functions for in-class French use-dealing with time pressures:* “Sometimes, the time that I start to use French is when I think that I have only three minutes left and I need to explain it quickly...” – Steven

*Teacher English language proficiency:* “I think she speaks a lot of French because she is a native speaker of French.” – Claire (in response to teaching practices viewed in a video clip)

*Teacher confidence with English:* “This should never be in French... she seems insecure and unsure of herself.” – Amanda (in response to teaching practices viewed in a video clip)

*Student age:* "...with the younger ones, Secondary I, (I use) more visual support and I speak slower..." – Claire

*Student ability level:* "...just from what she is teaching, the students should be able to understand what she says when she just addresses them." – Cecilia (in response to teaching practices viewed in a video clip)

*School/community setting:* "My school has the greatest impact. All ESL teachers and the principal who used to be an ESL teacher have the same practices."- Steven

*MELS 'English only' recommendation:* "We go with the MELS recommendation." – Claire

*L2 exclusivity:* "I never use French. I speak English in all settings regardless of school policy."- Amanda

*Maximal L2 use:* "It helps to keep French to a small quantity, just resort to it when it is really, really impossible." – Claire

*Optimal L2 use:* "...it's very much a question of adapting to classes each year, you can't come up with a general rule like 20% of the time." –Marc

*Sources of teacher beliefs-language learning history:* “The teacher spoke only Italian. It was excellent but it was also very hard.” –Amanda

*Sources of teacher beliefs-teacher training:* “They didn’t want us to use French at all.”  
–Solange

*Sources of teacher beliefs-teaching experience:* “Perhaps it took experience to figure out what was the best way to do it. Coming straight out of university with my ideals, I guess I didn’t know enough yet to do it right.” –Steven

The complete transcripts for the six interviews were coded. Each response to an interview question was treated as a unit for the purposes of coding (see Appendix B for the interview questions). If a participant mentioned a coding concept more than one time within the boundaries of a response, the relevant code was entered only one time. To verify the reliability of the coding process for the interview transcripts, a second coder independently coded the six interviews after receiving instruction concerning the meaning of each code and an explanation of the three language use belief groups. Inter-rater reliability was high. The coders agreed on 88% of the coded concepts. The second coder is a graduate student and an ESL teacher.

### *Results for Interview Data*

By coding the interview transcripts, it was possible to quantify and summarize the data gathered during the interviews. It was also possible to discern patterns that developed within belief groups and between belief groups.

The coding summary for the interview transcripts revealed the subject areas of prominence for the participants, and it also highlighted concepts that were not commented on by participants during the interviews. For the category of quantity of French used, *change in French use over time* was the concept that was most often cited, with five of the six participants commenting on the evolution of their teaching practices. The functions *management, discipline, and explaining words, expressions* were most often mentioned. Both of the categories *teacher English language proficiency* and *confidence with English* were mentioned only once by the six participants. *Student age, ability level, and school/community setting* were all prominent categories that evoked comments from most participants. All participants commented on their language use beliefs and the sources of these beliefs.

A table (Table 17) summarizing the questionnaire responses collected from the interview participants has been included in order to facilitate a comparison with the data gathered during the interviews. The reader is reminded that for the variables of beliefs, English proficiency, confidence with English, and compliance with MELS, the minimum score possible was 1 and the maximum score possible was 6.

Table 17

*Quantitative Data for the Interview Participants*

Variable	L2 exclusivity		Maximal L2		Optimal L2	
	ROQ	MTL	ROQ	MTL	ROQ	MTL
	Solange	Amanda	Claire	Cecilia	Marc	Steven
Percentage French used	0	0	5	3	25	80
Beliefs	5.67	6 <sup>a</sup>	4	4.17	2	2.67
English Proficiency	4.50	6	6	6	6	6
Confidence with English	5.40	6	6	5.80	6	6
Compliance with MELS	1.75	-- <sup>b</sup>	4.50	3.75	1.25	2.50

Note. MTL = greater Montreal area group , ROQ = rest of Quebec group

<sup>a</sup>beliefs mean score based on 5/6 items as participant altered 1 item

<sup>b</sup>MELS mean score not available as participant altered 3 items

*Analysis of L2 exclusivity beliefs group interview participants.* Solange represents the L2 exclusivity belief position and is from the rest of Quebec group. She reported 0% in-class French use (Table 17), had a high mean score for beliefs, scored the lowest of the 6 interview participants for English proficiency and confidence, and had a low mean score for compliance with MELS 'English only' recommendation.

Solange has five years of experience teaching ESL and teaches secondary level II, IV, and V in a small city in Eastern Quebec. She grew up in a monolingual French household, learned English in school, and then mastered Spanish as an adult. She noted that extensive travel has helped her to improve her abilities in both English and Spanish. Emphasizing the value of maximizing student exposure to the L2, Solange maintains



100% English speech with her students in all settings in her almost exclusively Francophone community.

Although she has always agreed with the L2 exclusivity position of her teacher training program, in her first year of teaching, she did use the occasional word of French after five or six attempts at communicating an idea in English. Solange has since banished all French from her in-class speech and now depends on the strategies of using related words or expressions, movement, and gestures. Her teaching practices are supported by her ESL colleagues, all of whom eschew the use of French with secondary cycle 2 students (levels III, IV and V). Solange conforms to the MELS recommendation by speaking only English in class, but she noted that she had already adopted the L2 exclusivity belief position before accepting her teaching position. Her explanation is helpful when interpreting her low mean score (1.75) for compliance with MELS.

While viewing the video clips, Solange accepted the limited use of French by another ESL teacher for the purposes of explaining grammar, explaining words, and classroom management. Although she is committed to the L2 exclusivity belief position, she stated that she would change her own teaching practices and use some French if she ever had to deal with a behavioral or emotional crisis involving students.

Amanda is the second L2 exclusivity belief position interview participant and is from the greater Montreal area group. She reported 0% in-class French use (Table 17), had a score of 6 for beliefs (although she altered one item), and had top scores for English proficiency and confidence. She had no score for compliance with MELS 'English only' recommendation as she altered the wording for three of the four MELS questionnaire

items. Amanda, too, noted that although her practices are in line with the MELS' 'English only' recommendation, her L2 exclusivity beliefs predated the recommendation.

Unlike Solange, Amanda did not accept the use of French in class by another ESL teacher for any function. She was firm in her conviction that in-class use of French was unnecessary and was detrimental to the development of students' English competence. Amanda has 34 years of teaching experience and has always agreed with the L2 exclusivity position of her teacher training program. Her teaching practices have never included the use of French. She teaches secondary III and IV students in a suburb west of Montreal. The student population of the school has representatives of more than 50 nationalities, including many native speakers of English. Amanda noted that just as the teachers of the welcoming class (for non-native speakers of French) do not speak any of the students' languages while teaching French, she uses only English in her ESL teaching.

Raised in a bilingual English–French household, Amanda learned Italian as an adult in a classroom where only Italian was spoken. She supported the L2 exclusivity environment of her Italian class while noting that it was also very challenging for her as a learner. Amanda has never taught a beginning level ESL class but is convinced that by employing strategies such as repetition, gestures, and simplification, she would be able to do so without speaking French. While viewing the video clips of another ESL teacher who spoke French in class, Amanda frequently repeated that the use of French was unnecessary, the teacher seemed unprepared, and that the teacher was “taking the easy way out” by using French.

*Analysis of Maximal L2 Use belief group interview participants.* Claire is a maximal L2 belief position interview participant and is from the rest of Quebec group. She reported 5% in-class French use (Table 17), had a mean score of 4.0 for beliefs, scored 6 for English proficiency and confidence, and had a mean score of 4.5 for compliance with MELS 'English only' recommendation, which was the highest MELS score for the six interview participants.

Claire is an ESL teacher for secondary level II students in a small city in eastern Quebec. She initially found herself using French in class in order to aid student comprehension. With more teaching experience and by employing other strategies such as repetition, pictures or props, and simplification, Claire reduced her use of French to a lower level. In her tenth year of teaching ESL, she now estimates that 5% of her in-class speech is in French.

She cited the influence of the MELS 'English only' recommendation more often than the five other interview participants. This province-wide directive may have been more prominent in her discussion of language use because, in addition to her teaching position, she is also a pedagogical counselor for other ESL teachers in her region. Claire noted that student ability level influences the quantity of French that she employs, with more French used with lower level secondary school students. In class, she uses French for the purposes of explaining grammar, explaining words or expressions and, to a lesser degree, for relating to students. She cautioned that teachers who speak a lot of French to develop a relationship with students risk losing credibility with the students.

While commenting on the video clips featuring an ESL teacher who used French during a lesson, Claire used the phrase "resorting to French" five times in her discussion

of the teacher's language use pattern. Macaro (1997) identified this phrase as evidence of the user's negative view of L1 use in the language learning classroom, a view of L1 use which is integral to Claire's maximal L2 use belief position.

The two interview participants from the maximal L2 use belief group accepted the L2 exclusivity position of their teacher training programs in Quebec, yet in their first years of teaching, their in-class language use included some French. Cecilia is the second maximal L2 belief position interview participant and is from the greater Montreal area group. She reported 5% in-class French use (Table 17), had a mean score of 4.17 for beliefs, scored 6 for English proficiency and 5.8 for confidence with English. She had a mean score of 3.75 for compliance with MELS 'English only' recommendation.

Cecilia has four years of teaching experience. She identifies her own language learning history as well as her teaching experience as sources of her language use beliefs. Like Claire, Cecilia believes that the skills and insights gained with teaching experience have permitted her to move her teaching practices closer to her language use beliefs. She has reduced in-class French speech from a higher level during her first years of teaching to her current level of approximately 3%. When viewing the video clips, she repeatedly characterized the ESL teacher's in-class use of French as "preventable" or "not necessary at all".

Currently teaching secondary level I and V students in a private school with a strict behavioral code and high expectations for students, Cecilia has used some French in class for the purposes of management and discipline, explaining grammar, and explaining words and expressions. She noted that her in-class L1 language use patterns are very sensitive to the school and community setting. Cecilia believes that many discipline and

student motivation issues have been eliminated in the private school where she teaches, thereby permitting her to use English in class most of the time. She also limits her own in-class French use by occasionally prompting student use of French. She said that her ESL colleagues share the same maximal L2 beliefs position. She acknowledged that there would be a wider gap between her beliefs and her classroom practices in a less supportive teaching setting.

*Analysis of Optimal L2 use beliefs group interview participants.* Marc is an optimal L2 belief position interview participant and is from the rest of Quebec group. He reported 25% in-class French use (Table 17) and had the lowest mean score for beliefs (2.0) among the six interview participants. He had top scores for English proficiency and confidence, and had a mean score of 1.25 for compliance with MELS 'English only' recommendation, which was the lowest MELS score for the six interview participants.

Marc, who is both an ESL teacher for secondary level III students and a pedagogical counselor for other ESL teachers in the same school board, noted that his teacher training program had promoted an 'English only in the ESL classroom' position while simultaneously acknowledging the difficulty of achieving this pedagogical objective when teaching in a predominantly Francophone region. Marc himself supported the MELS 'English only' recommendation at the time of his teacher training.

Once he began teaching ESL at the secondary level, Marc abandoned the L2 exclusivity belief position. He started to use French in his classroom for the purposes of management and discipline, explaining words and expressions and, most importantly, relating to the students. With 12 years of teaching experience, Marc continues to place a

high value on the development of interpersonal relations with his students. He also stresses the parameters of his use of French in class. "I do see that there are situations where using the students' mother tongue is useful, it takes a lot of judgment and experience, and a great deal of will to switch back to English as soon as possible whenever the use of French is not necessary anymore." While viewing the video clips featuring an ESL teacher who uses some French in class, he returned to the notion of weighing each use of the students' L1 as helpful or not. In his discussion of the teacher's language use choices, he always referred to additional factors that may have influenced these choices.

Raised in a bilingual French-English household, Marc sought out a German language class as an adult in order to share the language learning experience of his students. He stated that his maturity and teacher training helped him deal with the frustration and difficulties encountered while learning German from a teacher who used very little French in the classroom.

On the questionnaire, Marc reported that he used French for 25% of his in-class speech, but during the interview, he noted that this figure most accurately represents his classroom practices with his lowest ability classes. He also teaches classes of a higher ability level in which he speaks almost 100% English. Marc targeted student ability level as well as the school and community setting as important influences on his use of French in class. Noting that his students have very limited out of class contact with English, he also cited the EFL nature of his region of Quebec as an additional reason to use more of the students' L1 in ESL classes. As the pedagogical counselor to his school board's ESL teachers, one of Marc's main responsibilities for 2006-2007 is the promotion of English

use in ESL classes. This has prompted much personal reflection concerning his beliefs and practices.

The two interview participants who were identified as representatives of the optimal L2 use beliefs group share a conviction that the students' L1 has an important function in the ESL classroom, but they differ in how they came to embrace this belief position. Steven is the second optimal belief position interview participant and is from the greater Montreal area group. He reported 80% in-class French use (Table 17), had a mean score of 2.67 for beliefs, had top scores for English proficiency and confidence, and had a mean score of 2.50 for compliance with MELS 'English only' recommendation.

Steven is an ESL teacher in a predominantly French sector of Montreal. Like Marc, he graduated from a teacher training program that espoused the L2 exclusivity position which he also agreed with at the time of his training. Steven rapidly changed his practices due to lack of motivation on the part of students in the exclusively English ESL classroom of his first teaching year. He gradually increased the percentage of French used in class to the point that in some of his classes, he estimated that he used French for 80% of his in-class speech.

After completing the questionnaire for this study, Steven experienced "self-realization". Recalling his language use beliefs at the time of his training, he decided to reduce his in-class French use. In his fourth year of teaching, he estimates that he now uses French for 10% of his in-class speech. Steven cited an additional influential element in his reflection on language use. As an undergraduate, he took a Spanish language class. His Spanish teacher used English for approximately 15% of in-class speech, which Steven believes reduced his anxiety and promoted his acquisition of Spanish.

“...sometimes I really do get the impression that it (speaking French in class) does help out, and I try to remember when I took my Spanish course that there were times where it really was useful...”.

While viewing the video clips of a teacher who uses some French during an ESL lesson, he compared his own choices with those of the teacher in the video clips. He stated that the complexity of an idea or concept often determined his own language choice, with more French used when difficulty increased. Although Steven initially experienced guilt over his inability to conduct his classes in English only, reflection on his own language learning history has permitted him to value the limited but purposeful use of French in class for explaining complex ideas, management and discipline, and dealing with time pressures. He noted that student age was a significant factor in determining the quantity of French that he would use in a class. Like Marc, he also stated that he has taught ESL to enriched program classes with high ability levels in which he spoke almost 100% English. Shifting to an optimal L2 belief position has aligned his teaching practices with his language use beliefs. Both Marc and Steven emphasized the value of their language learning history and teaching experience when changing their in-class language use beliefs from the L2 exclusivity position to the optimal L2 use position.

#### *Results of Qualitative Data from Interviews*

The language belief positions of the interview participants influenced their views of the teaching practices featured in the video clips, with reactions ranging from limited support to complete rejection of the recorded teacher's language use patterns. By probing the attitudes toward the recorded teacher's language use patterns as well as the



developmental process experienced by participants as language learners and language teachers, it was possible to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of each participant. For both the optimal L2 and maximal L2 belief position interview participants, interview responses were used to identify a pattern of change concerning in-class French language use as the participants acquired more teaching experience. The language use patterns of the L2 exclusivity belief group appear to have been largely unaltered by teaching experience.

### *Summary of Interview Findings*

The results presented above show that the reported amount of French used in class by ESL teachers varied from 0 – 80% of in-class speech. The rest of Quebec group was not found to have higher levels of reported French use. French was reported to be used by teachers in both groups for similar purposes. Representatives of the L2 exclusivity, maximal L2 and optimal L2 beliefs positions were found in both groups. There was a significant negative correlation between the reported amount of English spoken by teachers and teacher beliefs concerning French use. While all of the participants reported using English in their in-class speech, some reported that they did not use French in class. On a scale ranging from 100% English speech to 100% French speech, there were no participants whose reported practices placed them at the extreme *100% French* scale end. However, those teachers with high beliefs scores also had very high reported amounts of English in their in-class speech. Teachers with low beliefs scores had lower amounts of English in their in-class speech, and differences in English language proficiency and confidence were not found to be related to the reported amount of French used in class

although the self-assessed English speaking and writing skills for the rest of Quebec group were found to be lower than those of the Montreal group. The 'English only' recommendation from MELS was found to have minimal impact on teachers' reported use of French. Some support was found for the influence of student age and ability level on the reported amount of French used in class.

The findings from the interviews generally support those of the questionnaire. Additionally, the interview data provide more support for the impact of student age, ability, and school/community setting on ESL teachers' use of French, which may counterbalance the limitations of low responses rates for item #22 on the questionnaire. Item #22 was the only section in the questionnaire that examined the influences of student age, student ability, and school/community setting on teachers' use of French.

The interpretation of the results is discussed in the next chapter. Included is an examination of the limitations of the results and their implications for second language teaching and language teacher training.

## CHAPTER 5

### Discussion

#### *Introduction*

This thesis study examined the reported language use patterns and beliefs of two groups of secondary-level ESL teachers, those in the greater Montreal area and those in the rest of Quebec. Questionnaire and interview data confirm that a number of internal and external factors influence the amount of L1 that teachers use in the second language classroom and that their patterns of language use may vary in a systematic way.

The quantity of reported L1 (French) use was not found to be influenced by teachers' location within the province of Quebec. Teachers in both the greater Montreal area and the rest of Quebec reported using French for similar in-class functions. There was some evidence of student age and student ability level influencing teachers' use of French. Neither teachers' English language proficiency nor confidence with English was strongly related to the reported amount of French used even though self-rated English language proficiency was lower among the teachers of the rest of Quebec group, which had a smaller number of native speakers of English than the greater Montreal area group.

#### *Effect of Location*

The range of French use reported for the Montreal group was between 0 – 80%, with 20 participants (87%) below the predicted 20% French use and 3 participants (13%) reporting French use at levels above 20%. There was a similar range of French use reported for the rest of Quebec group, with 58 of the participants (89%) also reporting less than 20% French use for in-class speech. This suggests that location within the

province has little influence on teachers' language use patterns. However, a reorganization of the participants into two new groups, teachers in settings with high or low opportunities for students to use English outside of class, may reveal a relationship between geographical location and L1 use. Furthermore, the sample size ( $N = 66$ ) may also be too small to see the impact of location on the reported amount of French used.

### *Function of Reported French Use*

Although there were some differences in the functions for which French is reported to be used by teachers in the two groups, these differences were not apparent after the functions were regrouped into three categories. In the regrouped data, management of instruction (often related to discipline issues) was evident as the most common function for French in teachers' speech. This finding is supported by previous research in which management of instruction/discipline was found to be the most frequent function of L1 use.

When examining teachers' frequent use of the L1 for discipline-related issues, it may be helpful to refer to the ESL learning context in Quebec secondary schools. The students' L1 is most often used for management or discipline purposes in ESL classes that average 75 minutes in length. Students in ESL classes generally enter Quebec secondary schools with low English proficiency levels. In addition, teachers in ESL classes used the L1 on average for less than 9% of in-class speech in this study. Adolescent learners with low English proficiency have long periods of class time in which teachers use French sparingly, often for discipline. Secondary-level ESL teachers may be able to reduce discipline-related in-class French use by proactively orienting the

use of French to other functions that aid L2 comprehension. This is in line with Macaro's (1997, 2005) suggestion that purposeful, limited use of students' L1 to aid comprehension, explain complex procedural instructions, and reduce time needed for teacher-fronted activities may eliminate many of the discipline and student motivation issues in lower level secondary school FL classes. The quantity of in-class French use need not increase, yet by deploying the L1 for purposes other than managing student behavior, L1 use could assist with language acquisition.

#### *Classification of Participants by Belief Position*

By examining participants' reported French use in tandem with responses to belief items on the questionnaire, it was possible to identify representatives of three different language use belief positions from the Montreal and rest of Quebec groups. However, there were 18 participants (approximately 31%) whose reported pattern of French use and beliefs did not correspond with the optimal, maximal or L2 exclusivity belief position. One reason it was not possible to identify a language use belief position for these participants may be related to their attitude toward L1 use. If participants had a negative view of French use in class, they may have been less inclined to report practices that they perceived to reflect poor teaching; instead, they may have provided responses that did not accurately portray their actual language use practices. A participant may also be teaching in a setting where they feel pressure to conform to language use patterns of colleagues; therefore their practices and beliefs concerning French use may not be coordinated. Duff and Polio (1990) found that several of the 13 university-level language instructor interviewed cited the pressure of department policies banning the use of the

students' L1. Macaro (2001) also noted that the pressure of national guidelines and local inspectors prescribing exclusive TL use over-rode the personal beliefs of one student teacher profiled in his study of language use decision-making by novice teachers. Finally, the participants who were not assigned to a beliefs group may lack teaching experience. Five of the six interview participants in this study commented that they were not able to coordinate their teaching practices and their language use beliefs in their first years of teaching when they lacked classroom management skills, insight into student ability levels, and a clear idea of their own beliefs. Duff and Polio (1990) found in their cross-sectional study that teaching experience did not influence the amount of L1 or TL used by university level language instructors, but the researchers were comparing language use behaviors across a group of instructors, not the evolution of in-class L1 and TL use for each instructor.

Finally, based on the findings of this study, Macaro's (1997) language use beliefs framework may be incomplete. The L2 exclusivity, maximal L2, and optimal L2 positions only accounted for approximately 60% (46) of the participants. Within Macaro's framework, there is no beliefs position to describe the pattern of language use beliefs for 30% (18) of the participants.

### *Proficiency and Confidence in English*

For both the Montreal and the rest of Quebec groups, teachers with higher English language proficiency were not found to report lower levels of French use in class. The finding may be related to the composition of the sample group as the participants may not be typical of ESL teachers in the province of Quebec. The 66 participants for this study

were self-selecting; moreover, the majority of them were actively seeking professional development at ESL-related conferences. Additionally, 62 of the 66 participants had language teacher training, unlike a large number of ESL teachers currently working in Quebec. In the 2005-2006 school year, the Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (MELS) issued 114 Letters of Tolerance which allowed unqualified teachers to work as full time ESL specialists (Martini, 2006, ¶ 1). This figure does not include a significant number of unqualified ESL teachers who are teaching ESL as part of their teaching workload. A more representative sample of the province's ESL teachers, including those with a broader range of qualifications and English language abilities, and those who are teaching ESL as part of their teaching workload, may support a relationship between higher proficiency in English and lower L1 use.

ESL teachers with a higher level of confidence with English were not found to report lower levels of French use in class. This finding from the correlational analysis may be due to the difficulty of separating the variables of confidence and proficiency. The measures of teacher proficiency and teacher confidence appear to have been confounded by the researchers in several studies (Duff and Polio, 1990; Turnbull, 1999a, Turnbull 1999b). In a study featuring 13 native speaker FL teachers, Duff and Polio measured teacher proficiency in the students' L1, English, by asking the language instructors questions such as "How do you feel about your proficiency in spoken English?" and "Do you feel as comfortable speaking English as you do your native language when you teach?". Both of these questions are also related to teachers' confidence with the students' L1, English. In a study of four non-native speaker teachers of core French, Turnbull (1999a, 1999b) asked teachers to assess their proficiency in the

TL, French, by completing statements which included an assessment of their degree of confidence (e.g. very confident, somewhat confident) in their French skills. He noted that one teacher who rated her confidence in French skills as low had also rated her French proficiency lower than that of her colleagues, yet Turnbull independently assessed this teacher's French proficiency as higher than that of her colleagues. The variables of confidence and proficiency appear to have been combined, which may be inevitable when asking participants to self-rate these concepts.

Duff and Polio (1990) reported no relationship between 13 university level language instructors' proficiency in the students' L1 and the amount of L1 used in class. Their participants were all native speakers of the TL. Macaro (2001) also rated the global TL proficiency of the six non-native speaker student teachers in his study and did not consider it to be a significant influence on the in-class use of the L1 or TL. Unlike the teachers featured in the studies of Turnbull (1999a, 1999b), Duff and Polio (1990), and Macaro (2001), the 66 participants from Quebec were a mixed group of native speaker and non-native speaker language teachers, exhibiting a greater variation in both English proficiency and confidence. With a larger participant group composed of both native and non-native speaker teachers, and with a tool that accurately separates and measures both teacher proficiency with the TL and teacher confidence with the TL, it may be possible to find some evidence of the impact of proficiency in English and English confidence on the amount of French (L1) use by teachers in class.

Conversely, self-assessed language proficiency and confidence in language skills may simply be too closely related to be reliable independent variables in a survey. For the correlation analysis examining the relationship between the reported amount of French



used and the variables of English proficiency, confidence with English, beliefs and compliance with MELS' recommendation, there was some evidence of co linearity for the variables of confidence and proficiency which suggests the need to examine the overlap in these two variables.

### *Impact of MELS' Recommendation*

The MELS' 'English only' recommendation was found to have a minor impact on the reported amount of French that teachers used in class. While one interview participant did perceive the MELS recommendation as weighty, its effect on the participants as a whole was slight. Much like the posted speed limit on a Quebec highway, this regulation is not always respected, as elements in the driver's immediate surroundings may have a greater effect on behavior. Duff and Polio (1990) and Macaro (2001) noted that a small number of the total participants in their studies referred to the impact of a department language use policy on their in-class decision-making. For the majority of participants in these two studies, other factors were given priority when deciding on language use patterns. Liu et al. (2004) also found that language use policies did not have a strong influence on teachers' L2 use. Rather, it was a combination of teacher beliefs and low English proficiency levels that were noted to be strong contributors to low levels of in-class English use by South Korean secondary-level teachers

### *Influence of student age, ability, and school setting*

Due to limited responses on the questionnaire, it was not possible to examine the relationship between variables of student age, student ability, school/community setting,

and the reported amount of French used by ESL teachers in class with the correlation analysis. However, the interview participants did provide some insight concerning the influence of student age, ability, and school setting. Those participants who adopted the L2 exclusivity belief position did not alter their practices in response to student age, student ability, or school/community setting; therefore, the hypothesized influence was not found with these teachers. For the four remaining interview participants who were representatives of the maximal and optimal belief positions, the variables of student age, student ability, and, to a lesser degree, the school/community setting did affect their in-class L1 use. Macaro (2000), in a summary of 13 studies that focused on teacher's use of TL, concluded that learners' competence level was the most often cited factor influencing L1 use by teachers, followed closely by learner age.

The limited responses for the questionnaire item concerning the variables of student age, student ability, and school/community setting may have been related to the difficulty experienced by secondary school teachers in separating the variables of students' age, students' ability level, students' grade, and students' program within a grade (e.g. alternative, regular, enriched). Perhaps the variables of student age and student ability at the secondary level are too closely related for teachers to discriminate between them clearly in a survey. As the surveyed teachers were not teaching students at both the secondary and elementary level, nor were they teaching in several schools each, it may not have been appropriate to ask them to respond to questions that asked for a distinction between practices with younger and older students, higher and lower ability students or students in setting with more or fewer opportunities to speak English. These

questions assumed that all surveyed teachers had had experience with students of a variety of ages, abilities, and had worked in different teaching settings.

### *Sentence-completion Item*

Finally, the findings from the sentence-completion item on the questionnaire which offered participants an opportunity to comment on the in-class use of French by ESL teachers show that the majority of participants (approximately 66%) have a negative view of L1 use in the ESL classroom, which is supported by other finding in this study. Approximately 60% of participants were identified as representatives of the L2 exclusivity and maximal L2 belief positions, positions which support a negative view of L1 use. These results are similar to findings of teacher views in other research. In a summary of studies of teacher beliefs, Macaro (2000a) also found that the majority of language teachers viewed the use of the students' L1 in a negative light.

In the second piloting phase for this study, 50 ESL student teachers from Concordia University Bachelor of Education TESL degree program were asked to complete the questionnaire containing the same sentence ( I feel that ESL teachers who speak French in class\_\_ ). Approximately 71% of the year four student teachers ( $N= 38$ ) viewed L1 use negatively, echoing the findings of the present study. However, of the year three students ( $N= 13$ ) who had taken a pedagogy course with one faculty member who supported in-class use of the students' L1 for purposes of comparison and contrast with the L2, only 53% of them viewed L1 use negatively. This shift in attitude among the student teachers points to the role played by teacher training programs in shaping teacher beliefs. All of the interview participants cited the long-term influence of their language

teacher training programs on their views of in-class language use patterns, even those participants whose language use beliefs now differ from the position of their teacher training program. Clearly, training programs represent a powerful force in shaping beliefs. The long-term impact of training programs is also seen in contexts that are more open to the use of the students' L1. Kharma and Hajjaj (1989) conducted a study of teacher and student attitudes toward L1 use in Kuwait where EFL teachers and students shared Arabic as the L1. In this setting where systematic and purposeful L1 use was encouraged by course books and teacher trainers, the majority of teachers had a positive view of in-class L1 use.

#### *Limitations of the Research*

As with all research, there are some limitations which must be taken into account in interpreting the findings from this study. First, there are political, cultural, and professional issues in reporting language use in classrooms which may have proven to be threatening for the respondents and may have biased their answers. These issues were addressed by emphasizing the confidentiality of the questionnaire and interview responses, by using careful wording in the introduction of the questionnaire and interviews to convey neutrality regarding the issue of L1 use in ESL classrooms, and by informing participants that the research was not sponsored by the MELS or a school board. The participants who are non-native speakers of English may have had an additional conflict supplying English proficiency ratings and teaching practices to the researcher who is a native speaker of English. These participants may have over-rated proficiency levels or under-reported L1 use in order not to be judged incompetent.

The findings from this study must be generalized with caution. As noted above, the self-selecting participants are not necessarily representative of the full range of the province's ESL teachers. They are motivated educators who answered a call for involvement in research, many of whom were actively seeking professional development at conferences for ESL teachers. Most of the participants (62 of 66) were trained language specialists, which does not accurately characterize all ESL teachers in Quebec. Also, the participant group did not include teachers for whom ESL is only a part of their workload. Based on questionnaire responses, the six interview participants were selected as representatives of each belief group. These interview participants cannot be assumed to represent the full spectrum of language use beliefs found in Quebec's ESL teachers.

The small size of the sample group is another limitation to this research. With only 66 participants, this research cannot show how widespread a relationship is between the investigated variables; therefore, further research is needed with a larger sample to understand the in-class language use patterns for ESL teachers in Quebec.

Other limitations are related to the instruments that were used to collect the data for this study, the questionnaire and the interview stimuli. For the critical variable of amount of French used in class, the questionnaire did not allow the participants to report multiple language use patterns. The fact that the questionnaire items only permitted reporting on a single pattern of in-class language use was a problem as some participants were teachers of different grade and ability levels. Indeed, all participants taught more than one class of students; therefore, inter-class variations in their language use practices could not be reported without resorting to jotting notes in the margins of the questionnaire. Happily, many participants did add notes to qualify their responses as

appropriate for only one ability level or one grade, or to offer a range rather than a specific estimate of French used. In future research, the questionnaire would benefit from modifications to those items related to reported in-class language use practices in order to allow participants to report on multiple patterns of L1 and L2 use.

For one part of the interviews, participants viewed short video clips featuring an ESL teacher who used the students' L1, French, and English for a variety of purposes during a lesson. The participants were then invited to comment on the teacher's pattern of language use. Support for the teaching practices featured in the video clips ranged from a limited acceptance for some of the teacher's language use patterns to a complete rejection of every use of French. All of the six interview participants were critical of aspects of the recorded teacher's use of French (L1), even the optimal L2 position participants who view purposeful L1 use in the ESL class as beneficial. These reactions suggest that the selected video clips did not portray teaching practices that were representative of the in-class language use of the interview participants, and therefore they may have generated more extreme responses to the language use practices in them. Perhaps video clips that feature a variety of teachers with language use practices shared by the interview participants would have elicited more comments concerning the participants' beliefs and in-class decision-making processes.

Finally, the results concerning teacher language use patterns are drawn from responses to a survey and from interviews with six participants. There was no observation of the participants' actual classroom behavior which would have increased the validity of participants' responses. On the subject of self-reporting for language use patterns, Polio and Duff (1990) documented severe discrepancies between teachers' reported and actual

use of the TL in FL classes, with many teachers under-reporting their use of the students' L1. The tendency to under-estimate self-reported L1 use was also acknowledged by Edstrom (2006) in a longitudinal study of her own language use patterns in the FL classroom. She estimated her own L1 use at 5 – 10% of her classroom speech, but audio recordings documented her daily levels of L1 use as ranging from 6 – 71%. Rather than discounting the value of any self-reported language use behavior, Levine (2003) noted that studies with unconfirmed estimations of teacher practices may prove useful in targeting areas that merit further observational or experimental research.

#### *Future Studies*

Based on the findings of this study, suggestions for further research include an observational study of one ESL teacher's L1 use with classes of varied ability levels. Several interview participants reported that their L1 use practices varied according to the abilities of each class. To explore the reported changes in practices and/or beliefs experienced by the interview participants in their first years of teaching, a longitudinal observational study of a novice teacher's use of the learners' L1 would be useful. Additional research with teachers' language use beliefs may help to broaden Macaro's framework of language use beliefs positions beyond the original three positions of optimal L2, maximal L2, and L2 exclusivity.

#### *Pedagogical implications*

The implementation of the MELS reforms at the secondary level has been accompanied by a review of teaching practices. Research which promotes reflective

thinking concerning teacher use of students' L1 in class may be viewed positively at this time of change. ESL teachers may be more open to suggestions concerning practices that promote language acquisition, such as the principled use of the students' first language, even though the MELS has recommended L2 exclusivity. In addition, those who do not accept the MELS' exclusivity position may be ready to approach their L1 use in a newly principled way.

Additionally, French elementary schools lowered the onset of ESL instruction from grade three to grade one in 2006. In response to the heightened demand for professional development and pre-service ESL teacher training, teacher educators in Quebec universities may also benefit from research concerning L1 and TL use in local ESL classrooms.

### *Implications for Language Teacher Training*

“Instead of trying to influence teachers' behavior by mandating L2 use, particularly when teachers' practices suggest that such a mandate is impractical, it may be more appropriate to create opportunities for teachers to study their own contexts and reach realistic, local conclusions. ‘Judicious’ L1 use will likely look different in different classrooms.” (Edstrom, 2006, p.289)

In recent years, language teacher training programs in Quebec have incorporated the use of reflective practices to promote the development of self-awareness concerning teaching beliefs and practices; however, student teachers are generally not encouraged to reflect on their beliefs or practices concerning the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom.



Teacher educators who themselves had been schooled in teaching methodologies which were heavily influenced by the L2 exclusivity position may be imposing their narrow definition of maximizing target language input on their student teachers. This study illustrates that the current L2 exclusivity position of Quebec's language teacher training programs may cause feelings of guilt and inadequacy in those teachers who see a place for limited L1 use in their teaching settings. In the drive to rightly promote maximal classroom exposure to the L2, teacher training programs have eliminated the use of a teacher strategy for promoting L2 acquisition – limited, purposeful use of the students' L1 in the classroom input. This study suggests that language teacher training programs should instead be encouraging reflection concerning teachers' beliefs about language use in the classroom, as well as encouraging honest self-evaluation of language use practices. By developing the student teachers' self-awareness through reflective practices and critical self-assessment, training programs can encourage student teachers to adopt a view of themselves as trained professionals with the ability to make sound judgments concerning the quality of input that they offer to ESL students.

## REFERENCES

- Anton, M., and DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54 (3), 314-42.
- Borg, S. (1998). Talking about grammar in the foreign language classroom. *Language Awareness*, 7(4), 159-175.
- Canada. Statistics Canada. Census of Canada, 2001: Mother tongue and home language of the population in the Montreal Urban Community, 1991, 1996, 2001, retrieved February 25, 2007, from [www12.statcan.ca/English/census01/Products/Analytic/companion/lng/tables/mother.cfm](http://www12.statcan.ca/English/census01/Products/Analytic/companion/lng/tables/mother.cfm).
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Cook, V. (2005). Basing teaching on the L2 User. in E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native teachers*, (pp.47-62).New York: Springer.
- DeVellis, R. (2003). *Scale development: theory and applications* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research: construction, administration and processing*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Duff, P. A., and Polio, C. G. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(2), 154-166.
- Edstrom, A. (2006). L1 use in the L2 classroom: One teacher's self-evaluation. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(2), 275-292.
- Ellis, R. (1992). *Second language acquisition and language pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (1992). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1996). SLA and language pedagogy. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 69-92.
- Ellis, R. (1999). *Learning a second language through interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Kharm, N. and Hajjaj, A. (1989). Use of the Mother Tongue in the ESL Classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 27, 223-235.
- Krashen, S. (1988). Providing input for acquisition. In Patricia A. Richard-Amato (Ed.), *Making it happen: Interaction in the second language classroom from theory to practice*. (pp. 330-342). White Plains, N.Y. : Longman.
- Horwitz, E.K. (1996). Even teachers get the blues: Recognizing and alleviating language teachers' feelings of foreign language anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals* 29, 365-372.
- Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(3), 343-364.
- Liu, D., Ahn, G., Baek, K. and Han, N. (2004). South Korean high school English teachers' code switching: Questions and challenges in the drive for maximal use of English in teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), 605-638.
- Long, M. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*.(pp.377-393). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Long, M. (1996).The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.) *Handbook of second language acquisition*. (pp.365-398). San Diego: Academic Press.
- MacIntyre, P. Noels, K, and Clement, R. (1997). Biases in self-ratings of second language proficiency: The role of language anxiety. *Language Learning*, 47 (2), 265-287.
- Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Macaro, E (2000). Issues in target language teaching. In K. Field (Ed.) *Issues in modern foreign language teaching*. (pp.171 –189). London: Routledge.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 531-548.
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.) *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession*.(pp.63-84). Boston, MA: Springer.

- Martini, D. (March 21, 2006). Serious shortage of English as a second language teachers. Blog entry, retrieved March 3, 2007, from Concordia University TESL Association website: <http://teslsa.blogspot.com>.
- Mattioli, G. (2004). On native language intrusions and making do with words: Linguistically homogenous classrooms and native language use. *English Teaching Forum*, 42(4), 20-25.
- Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec (2003). *Programme de formation de l'école Québécoise, enseignement secondaire, premier cycle*. Québec: Ministère de L'Éducation.
- Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec (2003). *Programme de formation de l'école Québécoise, enseignement primaire*. Québec: Ministère de l'Éducation.
- Mitchell, R. (1988). *Communicative language teaching in practice*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT).
- Nayar, P. B. (1997). ESL/EFL Dichotomy today: Language politics or pragmatics? *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 9-37.
- Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning: a longitudinal study. *System*, 29(3), 177-195.
- Petit, C. (Executive Producer), (January 24, 2006), *Enjeux* [Television broadcast] Montreal , Quebec, Radio Canada.
- Polio, C. and Duff, P. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 313-326.
- Richards, J.C. (1998). *Beyond training: Perspectives on language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C., Gallo, P., and Renandya, W. (2001) Exploring teacher beliefs and the process of change. *The PAC Journal*, 1(1), 41-58.
- Rolin-Ianziti, J. and Brownlie, S. (2002). Teacher use of learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58, 402-426.
- Ryan, G., and Bernard, H. (2003). Techniques to identify themes in qualitative data. *Field Methods*, 15(1), 85-109.

- Skinner, D. (1985). Access to meaning: The anatomy of the language/learning connection. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6(5), 369-389.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass and C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 235-253.
- Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50(1), 158-164.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson*. (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. and Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second-language learning: the uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 251-274.
- Thomas, D. (2004). *Qualitative data analysis: A general inductive approach for qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage.
- Turnbull, M. (1999a). Multidimensional project-based teaching in French second language. (FSL): A process-product case study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(4), 548-568.
- Turnbull, M. (1999b). Multidimensional project-based second language teaching: Observations of four grade 9 core French teachers. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56(1), 7-30.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but...*The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(4), 531-540.
- Turnbull, M. (2006, February). Investigating and understanding core French teachers' uses of English and French: Beliefs and Practices. Presentation to Second Language Research Group, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec.
- Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204-218.
- van Lier, L. (1995). The use of the L1 in L2 classes. *Babylonia*, 2, 37-43.
- Vygotsky, L. (1981) The genius of higher mental functions. In J. Wertsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology*. (pp.144-188). Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? In S. Gass & C.Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. (pp.17-50). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

## APPENDIX A

### Questionnaire

#### Teacher Talk in secondary-level ESL Classrooms Concordia University – Applied Linguistics program

I would like to ask you to help me by answering the following questions concerning ESL teachers in French secondary schools. This survey is conducted by Loretta Gillis, a graduate student in Concordia University's Applied Linguistics program. This is not a test so there are no "right" or "wrong" answers and you don't even have to write your name on it. I am interested in your personal opinion. Please answer sincerely as only this will guarantee the success of the investigation. Thank you very much for your help.

Please complete the following statements:

1. a) When I teach ESL, I usually talk for \_\_\_\_ % of total class time.  
b) When I teach ESL, my students usually talk for \_\_\_\_ % of total class time.  
c) When I teach ESL, my students usually work independently for \_\_\_\_ % of total class time.
2. My ESL classes are \_\_\_\_\_ minutes long.
3. I use French to communicate with my students about \_\_\_\_ % of my speaking time in class.
4. I usually use \_\_\_\_ French in class.  
a) a lot of (most of the time)      c) very little (occasionally)  
b) some (some of the time)      d) no (never)
5. Are you aware of MELS' recommendation that ESL teachers use only English in class? Yes No

Following are a number of statements with which some people agree and others disagree. I would like you to indicate your opinion after each statement by putting an 'X' in the box that best indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement. For example:

It's easier to use English in the ESL class with younger students, e.g. sec. I and II.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly agree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree

If you think, for example, that there is something true about this statement, but it is somewhat exaggerated, you can put an 'X' in the fourth (partly agree) or fifth (agree) box.

6. I believe that I should speak English at all times in class.

Strongly disagree       Disagree       Slightly agree       Partly agree       Agree       Strongly agree

7. I am confident when I use English in class.

Strongly disagree       Disagree       Slightly agree       Partly agree       Agree       Strongly agree

8. I speak only English in class because of the MELS 'English only' recommendation.

Strongly disagree       Disagree       Slightly agree       Partly agree       Agree       Strongly agree

9. I feel anxious speaking English in front of other language teachers.

Strongly disagree       Disagree       Slightly agree       Partly agree       Agree       Strongly agree

10. I believe that there are situations for which I should use French in class.

Strongly disagree       Disagree       Slightly agree       Partly agree       Agree       Strongly agree

11. I worry that students will ask me how to say something that I don't know in English.

Strongly disagree       Disagree       Slightly agree       Partly agree       Agree       Strongly agree

12. ESL teachers feel pressure to conform to the MELS 'English only' recommendation.

Strongly disagree       Disagree       Slightly agree       Partly agree       Agree       Strongly agree

13. I believe that I should speak English at all times in class but sometimes I use French.

Strongly disagree       Disagree       Slightly agree       Partly agree       Agree       Strongly agree

14. When I use English in class, I'm afraid I'll make a mistake.

Strongly disagree       Disagree       Slightly agree       Partly agree       Agree       Strongly agree



15. I avoid speaking French in class because of the MELS 'English only' recommendation.

- |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree        | Disagree                 | Slightly agree           | Partly agree             | Agree                    | Strongly agree           |

16. ESL teachers in French secondary schools should use some French in class.

- |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree        | Disagree                 | Slightly agree           | Partly agree             | Agree                    | Strongly agree           |

17. I feel anxious speaking to native speakers of English.

- |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree        | Disagree                 | Slightly agree           | Partly agree             | Agree                    | Strongly agree           |

18. The MELS 'English only' recommendation influences my language in class.

- |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree        | Disagree                 | Slightly agree           | Partly agree             | Agree                    | Strongly agree           |

19. I believe that I should speak French and English in class.

- |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree        | Disagree                 | Slightly agree           | Partly agree             | Agree                    | Strongly agree           |

20. ESL teachers who use French in class delay the English language learning process.

- |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree        | Disagree                 | Slightly agree           | Partly agree             | Agree                    | Strongly agree           |

Select the factor(s) that apply to you and put an 'X' in the box.

(You may select more than one)

21. Factors which influence how much French I use in the classroom:

- a) Student age  if yes→ I use more French with  younger students  
 older students
- b) Student ability level  if yes→ I use more French with  low proficiency students  
 high proficiency students
- c) School/community setting  if yes→ I use more French with students who live in a community with  
 few opportunities to use English  
 many opportunities to use

English

d) Other factor(s): \_\_\_\_\_

e) This does not apply to me because I don't speak French in class.

Select the response(s) that apply to you and put an 'X' in the box.  
(You may select more than one)

22. Reasons why I speak French in class:

- a) to explain words or complicated phrases
- b) to make students feel more comfortable
- c) to talk about tests and assignments
- d) to talk about grammar
- e) to build relationships with my students
- f) to deal with time pressures
- g) other: \_\_\_\_\_
- h) This does not apply to me because I don't speak French in class.

Please complete the statement:

23. I feel that ESL teachers who speak French in class \_\_\_\_\_

Finally, in order to better interpret and classify your responses, I am asking you to provide some information about yourself. Thank you very much for your help. Please be assured that the contents of this form are absolutely confidential. Information identifying the respondent will not be disclosed under any circumstances.

24. Please rate your own English language proficiency on a scale of 0 to 6

where 0 = no competence and 6 = fluency

- a) English speaking: \_\_\_\_\_ c) English reading ability: \_\_\_\_\_
- b) English listening comprehension: \_\_\_\_\_ d) English writing ability: \_\_\_\_\_

25. Grade/level that you are currently teaching: \_\_\_\_\_

26. Region in/around Montreal where the school is located: \_\_\_\_\_

27. Years of teaching experience: \_\_\_\_\_

28. Have you received formal training in language teaching? \_\_\_\_\_

29. First language: \_\_\_\_\_

30. Other languages spoken: \_\_\_\_\_

31. Did your second language teacher(s) use your first language in the classroom?

32. If English is not your first language, how did you learn English?

- a) in an ESL class
- b) in an English school
- c) informally in my neighborhood
- d) at home with family members
- e) other: \_\_\_\_\_

Are you interested in participating in a follow-up interview?  
Please provide your name and email address or phone number.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Would you like to receive a summary of the findings of this questionnaire?  
If so, please provide an email address

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

*Thank you very much for your participation*

## APPENDIX B

### Interview Questions

1. The teacher talk questionnaire that you completed had questions concerning the “English only in ESL classrooms” recommendation by MELS. Does this province-wide recommendation affect your practices in class? How about the language use policies of your school board, school or ESL department? Which has the greatest impact on you?
2. I’d like to follow up on what you said about teachers who use French in their class. You said... Can you explain why you believe this/tell me more?
3. You noted that X is your first language and listed Y as your second language. How did you learn Y? If you were to learn a new language now, would you want your teacher to use a language that you know in class?
4. When you were trained as a language teacher, what was the position of your teacher training program concerning the use of French in ESL classes? Did you agree with this position at the time of your training? Do you still agree?
5. Have your teaching practices concerning the use of French in class changed over time? If yes, why? Was this the result of teaching experience/something you read/learned at a workshop?

Now, I’d like you to view the video clips of a teacher in an ESL classroom. Please start with Clip #2. Please tell me your thoughts concerning her language use.

6. Clip 2: (for contrasting L1 and L2 grammar systems)
7. Clip 5: (explaining grammar and classroom management)
8. Clip 6: (establishing a relationship with student)
9. Clip 12: (explaining vocabulary)
10. Clip 13: (dealing with time pressures)
11. Can you imagine a teaching context in which you would change your current practices?

APPENDIX C

Table 7

*Belief Position Representative Distribution According to Reported Percentage of French*

*Use*

Belief Position	Participant	Group	Percentage French use	Beliefs Mean score
L2 exclusivity	1101	MTL	0	5.67
L2 exclusivity	1105	MTL	0	6.00
L2 exclusivity	1201	MTL	0	5.17
L2 exclusivity	1403	MTL	0	6.00
L2 exclusivity	1408	MTL	0	5.83
L2 exclusivity	1602	ROQ	0	5.67
L2 exclusivity	1605	ROQ	0	5.50
L2 exclusivity	1610	ROQ	0	5.67
L2 exclusivity	1612	ROQ	0	4.00
L2 exclusivity	1615	ROQ	0	5.67
L2 exclusivity	1622	ROQ	0	5.67
L2 exclusivity	1713	ROQ	0	5.17
L2 exclusivity	1715	ROQ	0	5.67
L2 exclusivity	1716	ROQ	0	5.17
L2 exclusivity	1717	ROQ	0	5.33
L2 exclusivity	1718	ROQ	0	5.67
L2 exclusivity	1720	ROQ	0	5.00
L2 exclusivity	1721	ROQ	0	5.17
Maximal L2 use	1303	MTL	0.5	4.33
	1702	ROQ	0.5	4.33
Maximal L2 use	1302	MTL	1	4.67
Maximal L2 use	1401	MTL	1	5.67
Maximal L2 use	1604	ROQ	2	5.83
	1618	ROQ	2	3.50
	1719	ROQ	2	3.33
Maximal L2 use	1501	ROQ	3	4.17
	1611	ROQ	3	4.50
	1102	MTL	5	4.00
	1305	MTL	5	3.83
Maximal L2 use	1607	ROQ	5	4.17
Maximal L2 use	1608	ROQ	5	4.00
Maximal L2 use	1613	ROQ	5	4.83
Maximal L2 use	1703	ROQ	5	4.00
Maximal L2 use	1705	ROQ	5	4.83
Maximal L2 use	1710	ROQ	5	3.67
	1712	ROQ	8	2.83

Continued

Belief Position	Participant	Group	Percentage French use	Beliefs Mean score
Maximal L2 use	1203	MTL	10	4.33
Maximal L2 use	1301	MTL	10	4.33
	1406	MTL	10	3.67
Maximal L2 use	1603	ROQ	10	4.50
	1609	ROQ	10	3.00
	1614	ROQ	10	3.83
	1616	ROQ	10	3.67
Maximal L2 use	1621	ROQ	10	5.00
Maximal L2 use	1202	MTL	15	3.50
Maximal L2 use	1701	ROQ	15	3.50
	1706	ROQ	15	3.50
	1707	ROQ	15	3.17
	1708	ROQ	20	3.33
	1711	ROQ	20	4.33
Optimal L2 use	1405	MTL	25	2.67
Optimal L2 use	1704	ROQ	25	2.00
	1404	MTL	30	3.33
Optimal L2 use	1714	ROQ	40	2.67
Optimal L2 use	1606	ROQ	50	2.17
Optimal L2 use	1402	MTL	80	2.67

*Note.* MTL = Montreal group, ROQ = rest of Quebec group

APPENDIX D

Table 8

*Belief Position Representative Distribution According to Beliefs Mean Score*

Belief Position	Participant	Group	Beliefs Mean Score	Percentage French Use
Optimal L2 use	1704	ROQ	2.00	25
Optimal L2 use	1606	ROQ	2.17	50
Optimal L2 use	1405	MTL	2.67	25
Optimal L2 use	1714	ROQ	2.67	40
Optimal L2 use	1402	MTL	2.67	80
	1712	ROQ	2.83	8
	1609	ROQ	3.00	10
	1707	ROQ	3.17	15
	1719	ROQ	3.33	2
	1708	ROQ	3.33	20
	1404	MTL	3.33	30
	1618	ROQ	3.50	2
Maximal L2 use	1202	MTL	3.50	15
Maximal L2 use	1701	ROQ	3.50	15
	1706	ROQ	3.50	15
Maximal L2 use	1710	ROQ	3.67	5
	1406	MTL	3.67	10
	1616	ROQ	3.67	10
	1305	MTL	3.83	5
	1614	ROQ	3.83	10
	1612	ROQ	4.00	0
	1102	MTL	4.00	5
Maximal L2 use	1608	ROQ	4.00	5
Maximal L2 use	1703	ROQ	4.00	5
Maximal L2 use	1501	ROQ	4.17	3
Maximal L2 use	1607	ROQ	4.17	5
Maximal L2 use	1303	MTL	4.33	0.5
	1702	ROQ	4.33	0.5
Maximal L2 use	1203	MTL	4.33	10
Maximal L2 use	1301	MTL	4.33	10
	1711	ROQ	4.33	20
	1611	ROQ	4.50	3
Maximal L2 use	1603	ROQ	4.50	10
Maximal L2 use	1302	MTL	4.67	1

Continued

Belief Position	Participant	Group	Beliefs Mean Score	Percentage French Use
Maximal L2 use	1613	ROQ	4.83	5
Maximal L2 use	1705	ROQ	4.83	5
L2 Exclusivity	1720	ROQ	5.00	0
Maximal L2 use	1621	ROQ	5.00	10
	1201	MTL	5.17	0
L2 Exclusivity	1713	ROQ	5.17	0
L2 Exclusivity	1716	ROQ	5.17	0
L2 Exclusivity	1721	ROQ	5.17	0
L2 Exclusivity	1717	ROQ	5.33	0
L2 Exclusivity	1605	ROQ	5.50	0
L2 Exclusivity	1101	MTL	5.67	0
L2 Exclusivity	1602	ROQ	5.67	0
L2 Exclusivity	1610	ROQ	5.67	0
L2 Exclusivity	1615	ROQ	5.67	0
L2 Exclusivity	1622	ROQ	5.67	0
L2 Exclusivity	1715	ROQ	5.67	0
L2 Exclusivity	1718	ROQ	5.67	0
Maximal L2 use	1401	MTL	5.67	1
L2 Exclusivity	1408	MTL	5.83	0
Maximal L2 use	1604	ROQ	5.83	2
L2 Exclusivity	1105	MTL	6.00	0
L2 Exclusivity	1403	MTL	6.00	0

*Note.* MTL = Montreal group, ROQ = rest of Quebec group