Language Instructors' Use of Learners' L1 and L2 in Classroom: Perceptions by Students and Teachers of Korean

Author:
Shin, Seong-Chul

Publication details:
Journal of Korean Language Education
v. 24
pp. 165-195
1227-8823 (ISSN)

Publication Date:
2009

Language Instructors' Use of Learners' L1 and L2 in Classroom: Perceptions by Students and Teachers of Korean

 Journal of Korean Language Education, Vol. 24: 165-195 (31p). 2009. Seoul National University Korean Language Education Research Institute. ISSN: 1227-8823.

Language Instructors' Use of Learners' L1 and L2 in Classroom: Perceptions by Students and Teachers of Korean*

Shin, Seong-Chul**

< contents >

I. Introduction

This paper aims to provide useful information in choosing an instructional language to be used in a KFL/KSL classroom by analysing and comparing the findings of investigations into perceptions by both instructors and students of the teacher's use of learner's L1 and L2 in classroom settings.

* This paper is a revised version of a paper presented at the 2009 International Conference on Korean Language Education at the Korean Language Education Research Institute, Seoul National University, on October 31, 2009.

** Professor of School of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of New South Wales, Australia

In the teaching and learning of a foreign or second language, 'teacher talk' and teacher-student interaction is very important not just for classroom management but also as a procedure for second language acquisition (Jin 2002, 2004). Through teacher talk, teachers[1] implement their teaching plans and manage their class, while learners utilise the teacher talk as a major learning resource for activities such as listening comprehension and speaking. The function of this teacher talk is mainly to use the learner's target (or second) language in the usual settings for language learning, and what becomes an issue here is the appropriateness of the teacher talk. As deciding factors for the appropriateness, Nunan(1991: 190) suggests four points to be taken into account: at what point of the class the teacher talk should occur; whether the talk is intentional or spontaneous; whether the talk is useful as a resource for language acquisition; and what impacts code-switching between learner's L1 and L2 or bilingual talk has on the learner's learning.

Among the issues of teacher talk, this paper focuses on the issue of the use of L1 or L2 as instructional languages in class. In a foreign or second language classroom, teachers sometimes (or often) use the learner's L1 to conduct the lesson, and by utilising the factors of appropriateness suggested above, it will be useful to examine the use of the learner's L1 in KFL or KSL class with such research questions as: why it is necessary to use the learner's L1 instead of L2; at what point of time or in what situation the learner's L1 should be used; how often it can be used; what type of L1 use is desirable and what impact the use of the L1 would have on the second

1) 'Teacher' in this paper refers to the whole teaching profession such as professors, instructors and teachers.

language learning of Korean learners. In fact there are a number of studies (e.g. Knight, 1996; Cook, 2001; Rinvolucri, 2001) that regard the use of the learner's L1 in foreign language education as a positive rather than negative factor.

The reason or situation in which the learner's L1 is used is closely related to the language competence of learners and the type of classroom activities. Such situations arise when teachers feel it necessary to explain, for instance, difficult grammar or cultural aspects, or warn students who disrupt the class or do not pay attention to it. The use of the L1 could be a strategy for effective class management in a time-restricted teaching and learning setting, but at the same time it also brings issues such as whether the frequent use of the learner's L1 is desirable for the goal of language courses and whether the learner is deprived of the opportunity to improve their Korean. Choi(2008) argues that the learner's L1 should be used to increase their communicative competence and can be used in a creative way to produce competent bilinguals. Choi finds advantages of using the learner's L1 in an L2 (i.e. KFL) teaching environment for example, it can incorporate the learner's existing cognitive competence in L2 learning and strengthen the learner's motivation as well as cooperative learning among learners.

From another aspect, even when the learner's target (or second) language is used for classroom instruction, there is a question about whether the 'simplified' instructional L2 would have more educational benefits compared with repeating or paraphrasing the instruction in an elaborated form of language.[2] Parker and Chaudron(1987:6 in Nunan 1991) indicate that simplified

2) 'Simplified' input implies a reduced cognitive and linguistic load on the learner whereas 'elaborated' input indicates repeated and paraphrased information modified to enhance

linguistic modifications such as simpler syntax and simpler vocabulary do not have any significant effect on L2 comprehension over elaborated modifications but research still needs to confirm this. In addition, there are content-based non-language courses such as linguistics, educational methodologies and society and culture in the Korean studies major program. The issue in such a program is whether it is desirable to teach those courses and lead the class in the learner's target language, Korean, and its positive or negative impact on the students' learning process. After all, there could be a collision between the efficiency of class management and the value of learning.

With regard to these issues, teachers and students as key participants in either teaching or learning would have particular perceptions about the use of learner's L1 or L2 (or the target language) in the classroom. This paper aims to investigate perceptions of both teachers and students on such issues as the roles of the L1 and L2 in the language classroom; the instructional language in class activities, the instructional language in non-language courses; the appropriate point of time and frequency of the use of the L1, and its educational value and effect. The analysis and comparison of the findings from such an investigation should provide useful information for the better use of the instructional language, which will help enhance the class management and educational effect of KFL class. In addition, the nature of instructional language used in teacher-student interaction is related to the various classroom roles of teachers (cf. Keblowska, 2002) so this paper also intends to present and compare the roles of teachers as perceived by the two groups.

comprehension(Nunan, 1991: 191).

II. Research Method and Survey Construction

This study has adopted a survey method and is based on a survey conducted from June to August, 2009 at two tertiary institutions in Korea and one technical college in Sydney, with assistance and support from fellow researchers and teachers. The data was collected from 27 teachers working in two Korean institutions and 38 students studying Korean in a Sydney college.[3)]

The survey questionnaire consists of two sections: 1) the use of the L1 by the teacher in a second or foreign language class; 2) classroom roles of language instructors. In section 1, questions were constructed to seek opinions about 1) the frequency of L1 use according to the learners' proficiency, instructional purposes and language skills; 2) the importance of L1 or L2 use in both language-focused and content-based non-language courses; 3) the extent of the impact or significance of code-switching between L1 and L2 or bilingual interaction on the learner's learning; the teacher's use of L2 and the impact of speed of utterance, pronunciation, vocabulary, complexity of sentences and topics on the learner's comprehension, and the significance of simplified L2 and elaborated L2. For the questions relating to the roles of the teacher in section 2, the study selected 16 common and appropriate roles that suit this investigation from previous studies in this area (e.g. Nunan, 1988, 1991; Keblowska, 2002; Min, 2005;

3) I thank the teachers and students who responded to the survey, and those colleagues who helped data collection, especially to Professors Kim Seonjung(Kyemyung), Kang Hyunhwa(Yonsei) and Jung Heejung(Yonsei), and Mr Gene Baik(Ultimo TAFE College, Sydney).

Arafat, 2005) and the respondents were asked to choose five roles in order of importance. Multiple choice answers were used for all the questions so that the survey would not only be simple for the respondents to answer, but also to simplify the analysis of the answers for the investigators.

III. Background of Respondents

Amongst the twenty-seven teacher-respondents, twenty-four respondents (88.9%) were teachers of Korean and two were teachers of English, with one respondent not indicating. Twenty-four of the respondents were female teachers, one was a male teacher, and two of the teachers did not specify their gender. The thirty-eight student-respondents were in their early 20s to late 30s and had been studying Korean for a year on an average. Twenty-two (57.9%) of them were female students, while fifteen were male students and 1 did not indicate his/her gender.

〈Table 1〉 Subjects

	Instructors (n=27)	Number	%
Status	Korean Instructors	24	88.9
	English Instructors	2	7.4
	Not answered	1	3.7
Gender	Female	24	88.9
	Male	1	3.7
	Not answered	2	7.4
	Students (n=38)	Number	%
Status	Students of Korean	38	100
Gender	Female	22	57.9
	Male	15	39.5
	Not answered	1	2.6

The reason why these two somewhat 'mismatched' pair of respondents was chosen for the comparison of the responses was motivated by the fact that in recent years more trained teachers from Korea are seeking opportunities to teach Korean in foreign countries including Australia, and that one of the issues often raised in this course and in classroom practice concerns a considerable gap between the teacher and students in terms of expectations, pedagogical approach and classroom management. The comparison of perceptions can be highlighted by the responses from teachers trained and working in Korea and students studying in another country (i.e. Australia) where socio-cultural context as well as educational goals or enthusiasm are very different.

IV. Results

1. Perceptions of the Frequency of Learners' L1 Use

The respondents were asked how frequently the learners' L1 should be used by the teacher in L2 classes from different perspectives such as course levels, class-related purposes, language macro-skill areas and content-based non-language courses. The results are as follows.

1) By Course Levels

51.9% of teacher-respondents answered that in a beginner's course the learner's first language should be used occasionally and 25.9% answered that there should be very minimal use. In an intermediate course 44.4% of the respondents answered that there should be very minimal use of the first language whereas 29.6% have said there should be no use at all. Furthermore 66% of the respondents said that at an advanced level there should be no use of the first language at all while 33.3% said there should be very minimal use.

〈Table 2〉 Use of Learners' L1 in Different Courses - Perceptions by Teachers

	All the time	Very often	Occasionally	Minimally	Not at all
Beginner	1(3.7)	4(14.8)	14(51.9)	7(25.9)	1(3.7)
Intermediate	0	1(3.7)	6(22.2)	12(44.4)	8(29.6)
Advanced	0	1(3.7)	0	9(33.3)	17(63.0)

On the other hand, students answered that in a beginner's class the learner's L1 should be used very often (60.5%) or all the time (23.7%) and that in an intermediate class, it should be used occasionally or very often. The use of L1 in an advanced class was not supported, though less negative than the teacher group, indicating very minimal or occasional use only.

〈Table 3〉 Use of Learners' L1 in Different Courses - Perceptions by Students

	All the time	Very often	Occasionally	Minimally	Not at all
Beginner	9(23.7)	23(60.5)	5(13.2)	1(2.6)	0
Intermediate	0	12(33.4)	21(56.8)	4(10.8)	0
Advanced	1(2.7)	1(2.7)	13(35.1)	18(48.6)	4(10.8)

In summary, the teachers indicated that the learner's L1 could be used occasionally in a beginner's course but as the course proceeded to higher levels, the use of the learner's L1 should be minimized or in advanced levels there should even be no use of the L1 at all. The students, on the other hand answered differently that the use of the L1 should be more frequent in each level: very frequently in a beginner's class, occasionally in an intermediate class and minimally in an advanced class. The responses from the two groups can be seen as a reflection often expected in language classrooms as the level of learning gets higher the use of the L1 becomes less frequent but at the same time it shows that there is a considerable difference between the groups in their perceptions about the frequency of L1 use in each level of learning.

2) By Class-related Purposes

When asked how much the learner's L1 should be used when the teacher gives classroom instructions, 48.1% of the teacher group answered very minimal and 37% answered that the L1 could be used occasionally. 11.1% of respondents thought that the L1 should be used very often. When explaining grammar, 33.3% of the teacher-respondents agreed that the L1 could be used occasionally when needed, 25.9% responded that there should be very little usage and 25.9% said that it should not be used at all. No more than 14.8% of the respondents thought that the L1 should be used very frequently. In addition, when explaining cultural elements in a language

class, 44.4% of the teachers said that the learner's L1 can be used occasionally when needed but a relatively large amount of respondents (44.4%) stated that there should be only a little or no use at all. Furthermore, to give the meaning of vocabulary or an expression the teachers said that the learner's L1 should be used only occasionally or minimally.

〈Table 4〉 Use of Learners' L1 for Class-related Purposes - Perceptions by Teachers

	All the time	Very often	Occasionally	Minimally	Not at all
Instruction	0	3(11.1)	10(37.0)	13(48.1)	1(3.7)
Grammar	0	4(14.8)	9(33.3)	7(25.9)	7(25.9)
Culture	0	3(11.1)	12(44.4)	5(18.5)	7(25.9)
Vocabulary	1(3.7)	1(3.7)	11(40.7)	11(40.7)	3(11.1)

On the contrary, the majority of student-respondents answered that their L1 should be used occasionally when giving classroom instruction, but very frequently when explaining grammatical and cultural elements, as well as vocabulary and expressions. As seen in the above table 3, this indicates that the student group wants their L1 to be used more frequently - one step higher - than expressed by the teacher group in all areas of classroom instruction and explanations of grammar, culture and vocabulary.

〈Table 5〉 Use of Learners' L1 for Class-related Purposes - Perceptions by Students

	All the time	Very often	Occasionally	Minimally	Not at all
Instruction	1(2.7)	10(27.0)	14(37.8)	12(32.4)	0
Grammar	9(24.3)	20(54.1)	7(18.9)	1(3.7)	0
Culture	10(27.0)	18(49.6)	6(16.2)	3(8.1)	0

Vocabulary	6(17.7)	17(47.2)	8(22.2)	5(13.9)	0

Overall, the teacher-respondents were negative regarding the use of the learner's L1 in language classes and even when they felt it necessary they said that it should be only used occasionally. This is in considerable contrast with the student views that regarded the use of their L1 as positive and expected it to be used much more frequently than the extent expressed by the teacher group.

3) By Language Skills

In this area the respondents were asked how often the learner's first language should be used speaking, listening, reading and writing activities.

When speaking activity classes are held, 92% of the teacher-respondents thought that the learner's L1 should not be used at all (66.7%) or minimally (25.9%). Also regarding the listening activity, the respondents answered negatively for the use of the learner's L1 with the same percentage as speaking. For reading, 81.4% of the teacher group indicated that there should be only minimal or no usage of the learner's first language. A higher negative view is found for writing with 88.8% of the respondents having agreed that there should be only a little or no usage of the first language.

〈Table 6〉 Use of Learners' L1 for Four Skills Activities - Perceptions by Teachers

	All the time	Very often	Occasionally	Minimally	Not at all
Speaking	0	2(7.4)	0	7(25.9)	18(66.7)
Listening	0	1(3.7)	1(3.7)	7(25.9)	18(66.7)

Reading	0	2(7.4)	3(11.1)	10(37.0)	12(44.4)
Writing	0	0	3(11.1)	11(40.7)	13(48.1)

In the meantime, the largest majority of the student-respondents answered that the learner's L1 could be used occasionally in all classes for speaking, listening, reading and writing activities, and there were even students (25%) who thought that it could be used very frequently or all the time.

〈Table 7〉 Use of Learners' L1 for Four Skills Activities - Perceptions by Students

	All the time	Very often	Occasionally	Minimally	Not at all
Speaking	2(5.4)	7(18.9)	12(32.4)	11(29.7)	5(13.5)
Listening	1(2.8)	9(25.0)	12(33.3)	7(19.4)	7(19.4)
Reading	2(2.7)	8(21.6)	17(46.0)	11(29.7)	4(10.8)
Writing	0	10(27.0)	18(48.6)	6(16.2)	3(8.1)

As a whole, the respondents had a fairly negative opinion about the use of the learner's first language during language skills activities, especially during speaking and listening activities. This negative view is much stronger compared to the use of the L1 in class-related situations indicated in table 4.1.2 above. This is no surprise as the language activities involving the four macro-skills are essential in any second language class. For the skill-based classes, however, the student-respondents had a positive view of the use of the learner's L1 saying that it could be used occasionally or even very frequently, showing a significantly different perception from that of teachers.

4) Content-based Non-Language Courses

The respondents were then asked how frequently the learner's L1 should be used in content-based non-language courses such as linguistics, methodology, history and more. 33.3% of the teacher-respondents indicated that there should be minimal usage of the learner's first language whereas 29.6% indicated that it should be used very frequently or occasionally when needed. Compared to other categories presented above the teachers took a more positive position in this category on the use of the learner's L1.

〈Table 8〉 Use of Learners' L1 in Non-Language Courses - Perceptions by Teachers

	All the time	Very often	Occasionally	Minimally	Not at all
Non-language Courses	1(3.7)	8(29.6)	8(29.6)	9(33.3)	1(3.7)

The students' view was much more supportive, as expected, than the teachers of the use of the learner's L1 in non-language courses, with 77.8% of the students supporting very frequent or entire use of L1 in those classes as shown in Table 9 below.

〈Table 9〉 Use of Learners' L1 in Non-Language Courses - Perceptions by Students

	All the time	Very often	Occasionally	Minimally	Not at all
Non-language Courses	9(25)	19(52.8)	4(11.1)	4(11.1)	0

These relatively positive opinions given by the teachers are not based on language learning classes but are reflecting content-based non-language

courses. Even in these non-language courses 33.3% of the teachers stated that the use of the learner's L1 should be very minimal, dividing the opinions among the teachers on the use of the L1 in non-language courses approximately in half. This result offers a point for in-depth academic discussions from different perspectives ranging from language development and knowledge intake to educational philosophy and efficiency. In such discussions, it is surely necessary to take into account the students' strong view that the learner's L1 can or should be used in content-based classes as desired for explanations of grammar and culture presented earlier.

2. Importance of Teachers' Use of the Learner's L1 and L2

The next investigation was to examine the importance of the teacher's use of the learner's L2 in a language learning class, the importance of the learner's L1 in content-based non-language classes and what effects there are on a learner when the instructor switches between L1 and L2 or uses both the L1 and L2 to communicate.

Most of the teacher-respondents agreed that the teacher's use of the learner's L2 in a language learning class is either important (37.0%) or very important (29.6%). The teachers were negative regarding the idea of using the learner's L1 as they regarded the use of L1 in content-based non-language classes as not so significant (74%). Also the respondents were either against (36.0%) or did not agree at all (28.0%) with alternating between the learner's L1 and L2. 48% of the respondents thought that there was either no or very little positive effect on the use of the learner's L1.

〈Table 10〉 Importance and Effect of Teachers' Use of Learners' L1 and L2 - Perceptions by Teachers

	Extremely	Very much	More or less	Minimally	Not at all
L2 use in language class	8(29.6)	10(37.0)	7(25.9)	4(7.4)	0
L1 use in non-language class	1(3.7)	6(22.2)	11(40.7)	9(33.3)	0
Code-switching / bilingual: neg.	0	7(28.0)	9(36.0)	8(32.0)	1(4.0)
Code-switching / bilingual: pos.	0	7(28.0)	6(24.0)	10(40.0)	2(8.0)

The student group also agreed on the importance of L2 use by teachers in a language course but gave much stronger support for it with 83.7% regarding it as absolutely or very important for them. However, the majority of the students (75.7%) regarded the use of their L1 in a non-language course as very important and thought the code-switching between languages worked positively rather than negatively.

〈Table 11〉 Importance and Effect of Teachers' Use of Learners' L1 and L2 - Perceptions by Students

	Extremely	Very much	More or less	Minimally	Not at all
L2 use in language class	18(48.6)	13(35.1)	5(13.5)	1(2.7)	0
L1 use in non-language class	4(10.8)	24(64.9)	9(24.3)	0	0
Code-switching / bilingual: neg.	0	0	11(31.4)	16(45.7)	8(22.9)
Code-switching / bilingual: pos.	5(13.9)	23(63.9)	8(22.2)	0	0

From the teachers' perspectives, these results reinforce the findings shown previously in the perception of the frequency of the learners L1 use. In that the teachers have stated that the use of the learner's L2 is important, and that it is desirable even in content-based non-language classes, as they perceived that the use of the L1 or switching between the L1 and L2 would affect the learner in a negative manner. Such views are considerably distant from or in contrast with the perceptions by student-respondents in all the points, except the view regarding the importance of L2 use in a language class. It appears that students thought the use of L1 was very important for their understanding and acquisition of knowledge in non-language classes and they were positive and flexible about language switching from one to the other for similar reasons.

3. Importance of Ecological Factors in Delivery for Learners' Understanding

To ascertain the factors that facilitate or hinder the learner's comprehension, the respondents were asked to answer to what extent L2 ecological factors such as the teacher's speed of utterance, pronunciation, use of vocabulary and complexity of sentence structures and topics have an affect on the learner's understanding.

70.4% of the teacher group stated that the teacher's speed of utterance has a high (59.3%) or extremely high (11.1%) effect on the learner's understanding, while 85.2% of them agreed that the clarity of the teacher's pronunciation has a significant effect on the learner's understanding. Almost all (92.5%) of the teacher-respondents agreed that the level of vocabulary used by the teacher in class has an effect on the learner's understanding,

and also 70.3% of the respondents stated that both the complexity of sentences and topics have an effect on the learner's understanding.

〈Table 12〉 Importance of Ecological Factors in Delivery for Learners' Understanding - Perceptions by Teachers

	Extremely	Very much	More or less	Minimally	Not at all
Speed of utterance	3(11.1)	16(59.3)	6(22.2)	2(7.4)	0
Pronunciation	9(33.3)	14(51.9)	2(7.4)	2(7.4)	0
Vocabulary	3(11.1)	22(81.4)	2(7.4)	0	0
Sentence	6(22.2)	13(48.1)	8(29.6)	0	0
Topic	7(25.9)	12(44.4)	6(22.2)	2(7.4)	0

Interestingly, the student-respondents rated the speed of the teacher's utterance and its effect on the learner's comprehension higher than the teachers, but rated the complexity of topics and the level of difficulty in vocabulary lower than their counterparts, while both groups agreed that the complexity of sentences and the teacher's pronunciation would work as major affecting factors.

〈Table 13〉 Importance of Ecological Factors in Delivery for Learners' Understanding - Perceptions by Students

	Extremely	Very much	More or less	Minimally	Not at all
Speed of utterance	13(35.1)	18(48.6)	4(10.8)	2(5.4)	0
Pronunciation	22(59.5)	11(29.7)	3(8.1)	1(2.7)	0
Vocabulary	13(35.1)	18(48.6)	6(16.2)	0	0
Sentence	7(18.9)	20(54.1)	10(27.0)	0	0
Topic	3(8.1)	15(40.5)	16(43.2)	3	0

Overall, the majority of both teachers and students have agreed that the ecological factors above have significant effects on the learners when lessons are delivered. Teachers in particular were more concerned about vocabulary used during classes while students thought that the teacher's pronunciation would have the biggest effect on their understanding of lessons.

4. Use of Simplified L2 vs. Elaborated L2

The form of the teacher's L2 used when speaking to class participants has been examined. The respondents were asked their opinion about the use of simplified L2 versus elaborated L2 and the significance this would have on the learner's language acquisition. Research still needs to confirm whether teachers should try to use elaborated language over simplified language but it is interesting to find out how teachers and students perceive the two types of modifications.

33.3% of the teacher-respondents answered saying that simplified L2 should be used and the slightly lower proportion (29.6%) of respondents said that an elaborated L2 should be used, so the opinions were almost evenly divided. However, only 41.7% of the respondents stated that the use of a simplified L2 has a very positive or extremely positive impact on a learner's language acquisition, whereas almost all the respondents (95.8%) agreed that the use of an elaborated L2 has a very positive or extremely positive impact on the learner's language acquisition. Therefore, the teachers perceived that the use of the elaborated L2 (EL2) is more valuable to the learner than the use of the simplified L2 (SL2).

<Table 14> Use of Simplified L2 vs. Use of Elaborated L2 - Perceptions by Teachers

	SL2	EL2	Doesn't matter	Don't know	
Preference	9(33.3)	8(29.6)	4(14.8)	6(22.2)	
	Extremely	Very much	More or less	Minimally	Not at all
Importance: SL2	1(4.2)	9(37.5)	14(58.3)	0	0
Importance: EL2	15(62.5)	8(33.3)	1(4.2)	0	0

The students also preferred the simplified L2 to the elaborated L2 but their preference was stronger than the teacher group. Also, the student-respondents rated the importance of the use of the simplified L2 higher than the teacher-respondents, which means that they rated the importance of the elaborated L2 lower than the teachers.

<Table 15> Use of Simplified L2 vs. Use of Elaborated L2 - Perceptions by Students

	SL2	EL2	Doesn't matter	Don't know	
Preference	19(51.4)	14(37.8)	3(8.1)	1(2.7)	
	Extremely	Very much	More or less	Minimally	Not at all
Importance: SL2	7(18.9)	24(64.9)	6(16.2)	0	0
Importance: EL2	8(21.6)	19(51.4)	7(18.9)	3(8.1)	0

In general, the teacher-respondents did not have a clear-cut common perception about the use of simplified or elaborated L2 but thought that the elaborated L2 could be more valuable in terms of the learner's language acquisition, and this view corresponds to the theories of language education and language acquisition. In contrast, the students preferred the use of the simplified L2 to the elaborated L2 and rated it higher in terms of importance,

and this indicates the type of learning they would like to have and the level of commitment they would like to make.

5. Views on the Roles of the Teacher

The survey was also designed to investigate the perceptions of the teacher's classroom roles as they were seen as more or less related to the perceptions about the use of language discussed above. The respondents were asked to choose five roles in order of perceived importance among the sixteen common or relevant roles that were selected from previous studies for the purpose of this study. The sixteen roles are as follows: counsellor, expert or resource person, curriculum / material developer, classroom instructor, motivator, guide, researcher, assessor, controller, participant or study partner, facilitator, class organiser, friend, condition creator, learner, entertaining agent and others.

The five roles that the teacher-respondents chose in terms of importance are as follows (1 = most important; 5= least(?) important):

〈Table 16〉 Importance of Roles of Language Instructor - Perceptions by Teachers

	1	2	3	4	5	Total	%	Rank
Instructor	13	8	1	1	2	25	92.6	1
Expert	10	5	1	2	2	20	74.1	2
Motivator	0	2	6	3	2	13	48.1	3
Assessor	0	0	1	5	4	10	37.0	4
Study partner	0	1	1	7	1	10	37.0	4

As observed in table 16 above, the teacher-respondents perceived their roles as 1) classroom instructor, 2) expert / resource person; 3) motivator; and 4) assessor or study partner, while the students perceived the teacher's roles a little differently, as shown in table 17 below, thinking of the teacher as 1) expert; 2) motivator; 3) classroom instructor; 4) guide; and 5) resource developer. It is specially worth noting that the teachers perceived their principal role as a classroom instructor while the students strongly perceived the teacher as an expert in their area and a motivator who stimulates their learning.

〈Table 17〉 Importance of Roles of Language Instructor - Perceptions by Students

	1	2	3	4	5	Total	%	Rank
Expert	9	7	6	4	6	32	84.2	1
Motivator	5	8	10	3	4	30	78.9	2
Instructor	14	5	4	3	0	26	68.4	3
Guide	2	3	3	6	5	19	50.0	4
Developer	5	3	4	2	1	15	39.5	5

When we combine the number of responses in the first three ranks, both teachers and students have a shared view, placing the teacher as a classroom instructor in the first place but they had different opinions on the rest of roles. In particular it should be noted that the students place the role of motivator and guide relatively high.

〈Table 18〉 Importance of Roles of Language Instructor (aggregated)

Teachers	Roles	1	2	3	Total	%	Rank
	Instructor	13	8	1	22	81.5	1
	Expert	10	5	1	16	59.3	2

	Facilitator	1	4	5	10	37.0	3
	Motivator	0	2	6	8	29.6	4
	Developer	0	2	5	7	25.9	5
Students	Roles	1	2	3	Total	%	Rank
	Instructor	14	5	4	23	60.5	1
	Motivator	5	8	10	23	60.5	2
	Expert	9	7	6	22	57.9	3
	Developer	5	3	4	12	31.6	4
	Guide	2	3	3	8	21.1	5

What the above results imply is that both teachers and students share the view about the teacher's 'educational' role, but the students also place a high value on the mentoring role that provides motivation and guides the students' path towards success.

V. Summary and Discussion

The teachers who responded to this survey had a conservative or negative opinion on the use of the learner's L1 in class, while the student-respondents were positive or less negative and more flexible towards the use of the L1. Key findings are summarised below.

1) The teacher-respondents understood that the learner's L1 can be used occasionally when needed in beginner courses but as the course level gets higher the frequency should be less and eventually there should be completely no use or minimal use of the learner's L1. However, the students

perceived the extent of the use of the learner's L1 much higher than the teacher group in each proficiency level.

2) The teacher-respondents generally stated that the learner's L1 should not be used at all or should be used only occasionally when necessary in class-related functional situations, e.g. when giving learning instructions or explaining grammatical and cultural elements and when giving the meaning of vocabulary or expressions. But again the student group expected the L1 to be used more often or one step higher in the frequency scale than that desired by the teacher group.

3) The teachers agreed that the use of the learner's L1 was not desirable during speaking, listening, reading and writing activities. They were particularly negative about L1 use during speaking and listening activities. In contrast, the students indicated that the learner's L1 can be used occasionally to very frequently during each of the four macro-skills activities.

4) In content-based non-language classes, the largest proportion of teacher- respondents had a positive opinion of the use of the learner's L1, but, more than one third of the respondents said it was not desirable. As expected, this is compared with the response from the majority of the students who were positive about the learner's L1 indicating that the learner's L1 should be used frequently or all the time during the non-language classes.

5) The teacher group thought that the use of the learner's L2 is important in L2 courses regardless of whether they are language skill-based or content-based. In addition, the teachers believed that the use of the learner's L1 and switching between the L1 and L2 have negative effects on the learner's learning process. In the meantime, the student group agreed with

the teachers about the positive effect of the use of the L2 on the learner's learning, but unlike teachers they were positive about the use of L1 in non-language classes and also the code-switching between L1 and L2 as being helpful for class management and understanding.

6) The majority of teachers agreed that their speed of utterance, pronunciation, use of appropriate vocabulary and the complexity of sentences and topics are all important ecological factors which would have an effect on the learner's understanding. The teacher's pronunciation and vocabulary in particular were considered to have more effect on learner's understanding. The students, however, perceived the speed of utterance, pronunciation and the complexity of sentences as bigger factors in the learner's comprehension ability.

7) The teacher group thought that the use of an elaborated L2 would be more useful than a simplified L2 for the learner's language acquisition although they did not have a clear cut common view regarding the form of classroom language. On the other hand, the student group preferred and regarded simplified conversational L2 more important than elaborated L2.

8) Both teachers and students had common views on the role of teacher as classroom instructor. However, the difference between them is that the teacher group were sticking to the stereotypical principal roles that are generally expected in formal educational settings, whereas the student group was strongly expecting roles as stimulator and adviser from the teacher as well.

When interpreting the findings there are a couple of important aspects that must be kept in mind regarding the respondents' personal background and educational environment factors. Firstly, the absolute majority of the

teacher-respondents who participated in this survey are teachers of Korean working in Korea so they answered the questions in educational environments where Korean was taught not as a foreign language but as a second language; teachers who are native speakers of Korean and also teachers who became language teachers probably through intensive educational and occupational competitions. On the other hand, the student-respondents answered the questions in settings that provide learning Korean as a foreign language in Australia and were studying in settings where pressures for educational attainment were not so severe. There is a possibility that the findings above could have resulted differently if teacher-respondents were teachers of Korean outside of Korea, non-Korean background teachers or even non-Korean language teachers. These results also could be varied if student-respondents were students from other countries such as those in South East Asia whose motivation to learn Korean is relatively higher or students studying Korean in Korea.

Secondly, the reason why the teacher-respondents in Korea insist on using the learner's L2 in nearly all situations in the survey may be related to external rather than educational factors. For example, it could be due to classroom settings where the class was formed with students with different L1 backgrounds so it was difficult to run and manage the class with one particular language or because of the teacher's limited language competence to run the class in the learner's L1.

The findings have a number of linguistic and educational implications. Four key implications are discussed. Firstly we have observed that there are relatively wide gaps between the perceptions of teachers and that of students about the use of L1 and L2 in L2 classes. The issue here is

whether it is more helpful for second language acquisition to minimise or totally ban the use of the learner's L1 in L2 learning settings as desired by the teachers in this survey, or whether it is more desirable to conduct classes with more flexible attitudes towards the use of the learner's L1 as preferred by the student-respondents, particularly if we are to support the current practice of language teaching based on 'learner-centred' methodology.

The second implication is on the educational philosophies (e.g. US Flagship Program) and the educational effects. As we have observed the teacher-respondents were divided in half and could not give a unified opinion on the questions about the content-based non-language classes, there is a question about whether the use of the L1 is desirable in non-language courses like linguistics or society, and such a question falls under the educational philosophy of a particular institution as to whether the priority should be placed on the acquisition of language skills or the intake of knowledge and understanding. In looking at this question, the learner's linguistic competence should also be examined along with the educational setting where the language is taught, but what is more important is to examine which method has more educational benefits for learners.

The third point to consider is which form of L2 will work better and be more beneficial for L2 acquisition. The teachers themselves in the survey were divided in half in their views on elaborated and simplified L2. As a reference, there are some studies in ESL (e.g. Parker and Chaudron, 1987) that show that the elaborated L2 was more effective to the acquisition of ESL but it appears that there has been no report on this topic in KFL or KSL thus far, and this is an area that requires a longitudinal classroom-based study. If such research proves that elaborated modifications are more

valuable in terms of language acquisition, teachers should try to provide redundant information by repeating and paraphrasing teacher speech rather than simplifying their expressions and sentence structures.

Lastly, the responses from the teachers in relation to the roles of teacher represent the typical perception about the traditional roles of teachers such as instructor and assessor. The question is whether this kind of typical perception is desirable in this global era where educational goals, settings and methodologies change, the conventional teacher-student relationship is being re-established and teachers can seek employment overseas. This question should be examined in relation to the relatively low value of such roles as researcher, learner, friend, controller and entertaining agent, and such roles as motivator and guide that the students in the survey strongly expected to see. The research was not designed to investigate a correlation between the perceptions of language use and teacher role but the findings seem to implicitly indicate that rigid or flexible positions work commonly in forming perceptions of the use of the learner's L1/L2 and the teacher's role.

VI. Conclusion

The evidence of this study indicates that there are considerable differences between the teacher group and the student group who participated in the survey on the use of the learners' L1 and L2 in classes, despite the fact that both groups had shared perceptions in some areas such as on the importance of the teacher's L2 use in L2 practice classes. On the issue of teacher role

also, there were some mismatched perceptions between the two groups and roles that teachers did not rate highly but are expected by students to play. These findings can be taken into account when delivering Korean language classes, presenting resource materials and providing training in pre-service or in-service programs. But a comparable analysis is needed through follow-up research regarding teachers and learners from different educational settings (e.g. Korean native-speaker teachers vs. L2 Korean teachers, teachers / learners in Korea vs. teachers / learners in other countries) and there should also be further research on topics such as the use of a language in non-language courses as well as the effectiveness of elaborated over simplified language.*

References

Arafat, S. A.(2005), "The roles of English language teachers as perceived by learners of English as a foreign language at ANNU. An-Najah University", *Journal for Research Humanities*(B) 19-2, pp.679-722. ISSN: 1727-8449.

Choi, G-J.(2008), "A research on methods of teaching and learning Korean language by using the learner's mother tongue", *Journal of Korean Language Education* 19-1, pp.299-319.

Cook, V.(2001), "Using the first language in the classroom", *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 57-3, pp.402-423.

Jin, J. H.(2002), "An analysis of the role of the teacher in classroom interaction based on the framework of scaffolding", *Journal of Korean Language Education* 13-1, pp.243-264.

Jin, J-H.(2004), "Types of communication problems that occur during teacher-student interactions in the Korean language classroom", *Journal of Korean Language Education* 15-3, pp.255-276.

Keblowska, M.(2002), "The role of the foreign language teacher in the classroom the teachers' beliefs and role behavior versus the students' expectations", Studia Anglica Posnaniensia: International Review of English Studies (Jan. 2002).

Knight, T.(1996), "Learning vocabulary through shared speaking tasks", *The Language Teacher* 20-1, pp.24-29.

Min, H-S.(2005), "Korean language teacher theory The role and proper characters of Korean language teachers in the 21st century", *Journal of Korean Language Education* 16-1, pp.131-168.

Nunan, D.(1988), *The learner-centered curriculum*. Cambridge: CUP.

Nunan, D.(1991), *Language teaching methodology A textbook for teachers*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Parker, K. and C. Chaudron(1987), *The effects of linguistic simplifications and elaborative modifications on L2 comprehension*, cited in Nunan(1991).

Rinvolucri, M.(2001), "Mother tongue in the foreign language classroom", *Modern English Teacher* 10, pp.41-44.

* 이 논문은 2009. 11. 30. 투고되었으며, 2009. 12. 14. 편집위원회의 심사를 거쳐 게재가 확정되었음.

■ 국문초록

교실 내에서 교사가 사용하는 학습자의 제1언어와 제2언어에 대한 인식: 한국어 학습자와 교사의 인식 조사

신성철

본 연구는 제2언어 교육 시 교사가 학습자의 제 1언어와 제2언어를 사용하게 되는 상황을 상정하여 이에 대한 교사와 학습자의 인식을 설문 조사하여 분석한 것으로, 한국어 교육 시 교실 언어를 선택하는 데 유용한 정보를 제공하려는 데 연구의 목적이 있다. 이를 위해, 교실 수업 시 학습자의 제 1언어와 제2언어의 역할과 사용 시점, 수업 활동별 교실 언어, 비언어 강좌의 수업 언어, 교육적 가치와 효과 등에 대한 인식도를 조사하여 비교 분석하였다. 이를 위해 한국어 교사 27명과 한국어 학습자 38명으로 부터 얻은 응답을 분석하였으며, 결과를 바탕으로 수업 운영과 교육적 효과라는 측면에서 몇 가지 시사점을 논의하였다.

[주제어] 한국어, 교수 언어, 교실 언어, 교사 발화, 교사 담화

■ Abstract

Language Instructors' Use of Learners' L1 and L2 in Classroom: Perceptions by Students and Teachers of Korean

Shin, Seong-Chul

This paper presents findings of the investigations into perceptions by both students and teachers of Korean about the teacher's use of learners' L1 and L2 in classroom settings and aims to provide useful information for a suitable instructional language for a KFL / KSL class. For this purpose, the study conducted a survey and compared perceptions on some key aspects such as roles of the learner's L1 and L2 in classroom, appropriate point of time or situations for them, languages for classroom activities and non-languages courses, and educational value and effect. Based on the analysis of responses from 27 teachers in Korea and 38 students in Australia, the study discusses a few implications with a particular focus on class management and educational effect.

[Key words] Korean, instructional language, classroom language, teacher speech, teacher talk