Encouraging Incidental English Communication in Japanese English Classes, Part 2: Classroom Behavior

Anthony Sellick [a]

James Bury [b]

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to address the introduction of a new national curriculum by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture （MEXT）, which requires Japanese teachers of English to increase the amount of English used in their classes relative to the amount of Japanese used （MEXT, 2011）. Sellick et al. （2014） found that the implementation of a program to encourage JTEs to increase their use of incidental classroom English resulted in an overall general and persistent small to moderate improvement in the students' perceptions of, and their attitudes towards, learning and using English. Furthermore, the students reported greater satisfaction with their lessons and with their JTEs in the classes that encouraged greater use of incidental classroom English.

This paper will broaden the research on this topic by investigating whether there were real, identifiable, changes in classroom behavior among students or JTEs resulting from the introduction of greater incidental

classroom English, by reporting on actual language use in the classroom before and after the introduction of the new classroom language corpus.

Literature Review

Sellick et al.（2014）reported on an investigation that collected data about students' perceptions of, and attitudes towards, two factors:（i）their Japanese teachers of English（JTEs）and（ii）the importance of using English in the classroom. In that study, gathered from two first year junior high school intake groups, it was found that the implementation of a new language corpus increased JTEs use of incidental classroom English and resulted in a general improvement in the students' satisfaction with their lessons, their JTEs, and their attitudes towards learning and using English.

The approach of using the language being taught（L2）as the only means of communication in the classroom and avoiding interference from the students' first language（L1）has traditionally been well supported, especially in Japan（Shimizu, 2006）, as it has been thought to hamper L2 acquisition（Swan, 1985）. However, other research（Atkinson, 1987; Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001）challenges the monolingual approach, demonstrating the importance of the students' L1 and flexibility of teachers regarding its use. Nation（2003）argues that prohibiting the use of the students' L1 can negatively impact students and have a harmful psychological effect, and that this is especially relevant in culturally homogeneous environments（Cole, 1998）. Thus, the combination of mainly L2 with some L1 allowed has been promoted（Willis, 1981; Medgyes, 1994; Turnbull, 2001）.

The amount of L2 used in the classroom can be increased through further use of incidental classroom English, which provides students the opportunity to learn through functional input（Meyer, 2008）and

demonstrates that English is not only used in classroom activities, but it can also be an effective tool for communication（Burden, 2001）. In view of this, a corpus of classroom English that JTEs could use with first year students was introduced. As the students in the first year progress, the same set of language will continue to be used and expanded upon in each successive academic year.

　A large change to teaching practice, such as that introduced by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture, can be viewed as a potential threat to the 'key meanings' of teachers' lives, such as their perceptions of their status and their group allegiances（Blacker & Shimmin, 1984）. Consequently, teachers can feel that their existing approaches are being implicitly criticized by the introduction of new practices（Craig, 2012）. As a result, the implementation of any intervention must involve the affected teachers at all stages and be approached sensitively if it is to be successful. Research conducted on the factors that affect the various responses and attitudes towards change identifies the perceived degree of effort required for success as a key element, where the higher the perceived effort required is, the less likely the change in behavior will be successfully achieved（Sparks, Guthrie & Shepherd, 1997）. In view of this, this investigation focused on developing the use of incidental classroom English as it would be viewed as encouraging and providing justification for the expansion of an already existing behavior. This decreased the perceived degree of effort required and meant that the JTEs would not interpret the intervention as being critical of their current approaches.

Research Questions

　In assessing this intervention, the following research questions will be addressed:

1. Does encouraging JTEs to use more incidental classroom English result in an increase in usage by JTEs?

2. Is there an increase in English usage by students in the form of teacher-to-student interaction?

3. Is there an increase in English usage by students in the form of inter-student interaction?

4. Are the lengths and complexity of utterances by the JTEs increased?

5. Are the lengths and complexity of utterances by the students increased?

6. Is there any detectable impact on student performance in English examinations as a result of encouraging JTEs to use more incidental classroom English?

Participants

The school: The participating school is a private junior high school located in the Kanto area of Japan. The school is a boarding school and the students come from families that are classified as A or B according to the NRS Social Classification system (Symbols of Success (A) via MOSAIC), i.e. they are primarily from middle and upper middle class families.

As with many schools, the students are grouped into homerooms, but are then subdivided and mixed into classes S, MA, MB, MC, GA, GB, and GC, based on ability as assessed from entry test scores obtained for each subject; class S represents the highest level, and class GC the lowest. After each round of regular testing (midterm and end-of-term tests), the students are reassessed and can be reassigned to a different class. Consequently, there can be considerable movement of students between classes. For first year students the first reassignment takes place after the midterm tests during their first term.

In order to address research questions 1-5, two classes were investigated.

Class 1 consisted of 31 midlevel first year junior high school students（19 male, 12 female, modal age 13）from the April 2010 intake.

Class 2 consisted of 33 midlevel first year junior high school students（19 male, 14 female, modal age 13）from the April 2011 intake. This class was drawn from the intervention group described above.

In order to address research question 6, two groups were investigated. Group 1 consisted of 165 first year junior high school students（103 male, 62 female, modal age 13）from the April 2010 intake.

Group 2 consisted of 157 first year junior high school students（91 male, 66 female, modal age 13）from the April 2011 intake. This group was used as the intervention group.

As no students withdrew from the study, the participant groups represent the entirety of their respective intakes.

Methodology

A mixed methods approach was applied in order to ensure that the data collected was of sufficient breadth and depth. In the Japanese education community, research based on statistical evidence is highly valued and often holds precedence over more qualitative projects. However, quantitative and qualitative methods are not a dichotomy and do not need to be mutually exclusive（Freimuth, 2009）, often being employed in a complementary manner（Somekh and Lewin, 2005）. Bryman（2006）states that mixed methods research has increasingly been seen as a way to bridge the different paradigms, incorporate quantitative and qualitative methods and offer the best of both worlds.

In order to minimize variation between the participant groups and enable any effects of the intervention to be identified, the two participant groups used the same textbook（Columbus 21, Book 1, published by Mitsumura

Tosho）, followed the same syllabus, and were taught by the same JTEs.

The first stage of the research was to agree a corpus of classroom English that the Year One JTEs would adopt and encourage the use of with the intervention group through the academic year. An incidental classroom English corpus consisting of 56 classroom English items（Appendix A）was jointly developed by the authors and the JTEs. The intervention group students were issued with a worksheet providing this incidental classroom English corpus with Japanese translations. The necessity for the JTEs to use this corpus during lessons and for them to encourage the intervention group students to use this corpus was stressed.

Working with the JTEs in order to develop the classroom English corpus was essential. It ensured that the corpus was relevant to the English classroom, that the project was seen as being developed internally by the English department, rather than imposed from outside, and that all of the teachers were committed to seeing the implementation of the materials they had helped to prepare（e.g. Norton, 2009）. For the intervention to be successfully achieved, the teachers needed to feel valued, that they were supported, that they had an influence on the changes taking place, and that there was shared ownership of the changes. Hutchinson（1991）stated that, "In any social activity, such as education…[it is crucial] to develop sensitive and supportive environments in which people can adjust to changes that affect their working lives". The 'collegial' approach（Bush, 2011）adopted in this investigation aimed to create this environment, which would in turn motivate "others to do more than they intended or thought possible"（Bass & Riggio, cited in Hickman, 2010, p.75）and make a positive contribution to the school's program of "people building"（Greenleaf, cited in Hickman, 2010, p.77）.

The following data was collected:

1. A sample recording was made of a regular English lesson for Class 1 and Class 2. The recording was made during the third term of the academic year for both classes from lessons taught by the same JTE covering the same lesson point from the textbook. Attempts to minimize variation between the two classes were undertaken by matching them for ability level via comparison of the students' test performance profiles, and of student behavior and perceived enthusiasm via JTE reports.

The lesson recordings were analyzed by a count of utterances of incidental classroom English, a calculation of mean utterance length, and an examination of the linguistic register（field, tenor, and mode）of the utterances used was conducted（Halliday, 1985, p.12）.

2. A comparison was made of both groups' performance on an externally administered and scored English test, the STEP Eiken test. All students at the school are required to take this seven level test（with level five being the lowest level, and one the highest）, which has three test sessions during each calendar year. As entry into Oral Communication lessons from Year Three onwards is based on obtaining specific levels of this test, many students take multiple levels and/or make multiple attempts during an academic year.

It should be noted that the students in this school are surveyed each term on many areas of their school life, and that the school has an active policy of encouraging research that might be of benefit to the school and students. Furthermore, it is not unusual for lessons to be recorded or filmed for the purposes of teacher assessment, marketing, and so on. Consequently, the data collection methods should not have seemed out of place to either students or teachers who have been acculturated to the school.

All data collected was anonymous in nature and in order to ensure that

consent to participate in the research was fully informed, the authors explained the purpose of the research to the participating JTEs, the senior management of the school, the parents of the students and to the students in order to obtain their agreement to participate. Once the research had been completed, and the data analyzed, a feedback session was held with the participating JTEs to discuss the results and any implications they may have for teaching policy in the school. Subsequent to this, a feedback session was held with the students to feedback the results of their participation.

It is important to note that the data collected compares the two groups close to the end of the academic year. Ideally, the students would have been randomly allocated to different classes, some having the intervention, and others having no change to their teaching style, thus providing a control group. These groups would have then been sampled early in the academic year, then at a mid-point, and finally at the end, allowing comparisons to have been made between groups over time, and also within groups over time.

However, as students are regularly re-organized across classes in this school, this was deemed impractical. Also, the forthcoming introduction of a new textbook, prevented the study from being conducted over two years with different groups. Consequently, it was decided that data would be collected by sampling a lesson from the 2010-2011 Year One intake (Class 1), in order to provide a comparison group for the intervention group, the 2011-2012 Year One intake (Class 2). This investigation can be thus viewed as a comparative instrumental case study (Stake, 1995) with the class as the unit of study (Yin, 1994), and which, by controlling for as much variation as possible, seeks to evaluate any potential variation (Guba and Lincoln, 1981) between the two cases via theoretical replication (Lee,

2006）.

Results

1. Lesson Recordings: Data recorded for the audio recordings of Class 1 and 2（the intervention group）taught by the same JTE during the final first-year term for each Class（Appendices B and C）included total counts of incidental classroom English occurring during each lesson, incidental classroom English taking place between JTE and students, and incidental classroom English occurring between students. The counts for each Class were then analyzed using the t-test statistic.

Table 1. Classroom English counts and p-values for Class 1 and 2 lessons

	Class 1	Class 2	p-value
Total classroom English	44	116	0
Classroom English between JTE and students	36	103	0
Classroom English between students	9	13	0.197

Significantly more incidental classroom English was recorded during the Class 2 lesson than during the Class 1 lesson, and significantly more communication via incidental classroom English took place between JTE and students during the Class 2 lesson than during the Class 1 lesson. However, while incidence of incidental classroom English between students was higher during the Class 2 lesson than during the Class 1 lesson, this difference did not reach significance.

Mean incidental classroom English utterance lengths were calculated for each Class and then compared using t-tests to ascertain if there was any significant variance between them.

Table 2. Mean Classroom English utterance lengths and p-values for Class 1 and 2 lessons

	Class 1	Class 2	p-value
Average classroom English utterance length overall	2.75	3.06	0.3962
Average classroom English utterance length for JTE	2.75	2.38	0.2250
Average classroom English utterance length for students	2.75	3.29	0.3237

Analysis of utterance length revealed that there was no significant variation between the two Classes.

An analysis of the register of the incidental classroom English used by each Class during the sampled lessons was also conducted, and is presented below, divided into the areas of field, tenor, and mode.

i. Field: Field gives us information about the social activity that is occurring, the topic of the text, the degree of specialization of language, and the angle of representation.

Field	Linguistic Evidence
The social activity taking place Sampled English lessons.	In both samples, the JTE primarily uses language in the imperative and interrogative moods, indicating that the students are expected to obey her commands and answer her questions, e.g. *Be quiet, How do you spell it? Stand up, please.* The students in both Classes primarily use language in the declarative and interrogative moods. Interestingly, they also sometimes use the imperative mood amongst themselves, especially when mimicking the JTE, e.g. *Be quiet, Try again.*

The degree of specialization of lexis Although a language lesson, the lexis used in incidental classroom English is relatively unspecialized. It predominantly uses simple syntax and everyday vocabulary. However, the range and specialization of items of lexis are greater in the classroom English used by the JTE in the Class 2 lesson.	Class 1: JTE: *Listen, please, Do you have the resume I gave you yesterday?, Let's start, You are so noisy, [⋯]number three.* Students: *Yesterday?, I have, I'm happy, I don't speak English, What is it in Japanese?, You are crazy!, Oh, my god!* Class 2: JTE: *Okay, stand up, Whatever you like, Do you have a partner?, What kind of dog do you have?, Number three, And how do you spell it?, Could you spell it?, I think you made a mistake.* Students: *I'm tired, Who are you?, Stand up?, She is Martian!, I am a genius, Are you okay?, We study English.*
The angle of representation The JTE is indirect and impersonal when addressing imperatives to the class, but direct and personal when speaking to a specific student. Direct interaction of this type between JTE and students only occurs in English in the Class 2 lesson however. The students use mainly direct and personal angles of representation as they are either addressing the JTE or another student.	JTE: *Let's start, Number six, How do you spell it?, What kind of dog do you have?* Students: *You are crazy!, Teacher!, I don't understand.*

(——)

ii. Tenor: Tenor gives us information about the social roles and relative status of the participants.

Tenor	Linguistic Evidence
Social connectedness/distance Both transcripts convey the social distance expected between student and teacher/examiner.	There are a greater number of personal interrogatives, as well as an apology (see below), used by the JTE in the Class 2 sample, indicating that perhaps the perceived social distance in this Class is slightly lessened. JTE: *Is he cute?* Student: *She! She!* JTE: *Sorry. Is she cute?* Student: *Yes!*

iii. Mode: Mode gives us information about the degrees of interactivity and spontaneity of the text.

Mode	Linguistic Evidence
Spontaneity As the samples are recordings of English lessons, there is necessarily a degree of spontaneity in both. However, each sample shows different degrees of spontaneity.	On the whole, clauses in both samples are relatively short and are imperative, interrogative or declarative in nature. Class 1: The JTE shows little spontaneity in this sample beyond classroom management clauses. The majority of spontaneous language comes from the students, both in student-teacher and student-student interaction. Class 2: The JTE evidences greater spontaneity in this sample, including a relatively long off-topic exchange about names of planets based on a spontaneous student-produced prompt. As with Class 1, student-teacher and student-student interaction show a high degree of spontaneity.

Interactivity	
The degree of interactivity varies considerably between the two samples, with Class 1 showing considerably less interactivity than Class 2.	Class 1: While there are some instances of turn-taking activity (seven in total), they are generally short, with the longest student-teacher exchange consisting of seven turns, and the longest student-student exchange consisting of two turns. Class 2: There are more instances of turn-taking activity (14 in total), and they are of greater length, with the longest student-teacher exchange consisting of 14 turns, and the longest student-student exchange consisting of six turns.

2. STEP Eiken Scores: STEP Eiken pass rates for Group 1 and Group 2 students were collected. The data for the two Groups were then analyzed using the z test statistic. The null hypothesis for these comparisons was that there were no significant differences between the two Groups with regard to their pass rates for each level of the STEP Eiken test.

Table 3. STEP Eiken test pass rates and z test p-values for Group 1 and 2

STEP Eiken Level	Group 1	Group 2	z	p
Level 5	165	157	inf.	-
Level 4	112	128	2.68	0.0037
Level 3	38	48	1.40	0.08
Level Pre-2	6	9	0.63	0.26
Level 2	2	2	inf.	-
Level Pre-1	0	1	0.03	0.49
Level 1	0	0	inf.	-

The analysis showed that the two Groups did not vary significantly in their pass rates of the STEP Eiken test, with the exception of Level 4, where a difference was found significant to the 0.01 level.

Discussion

　Having analyzed the data collected, it is now possible to return to the research questions.

1. Does encouraging JTEs to use more incidental classroom English result in an increase in usage by JTEs? The analysis of the sample recordings indicated that encouraging JTEs results in a significant increase in the amount of incidental classroom English used by the JTEs. In the case of the recorded lessons, the JTE demonstrated a more than double increase in classroom English use.

2. Is there an increase in English usage by students in the form of teacher-to-student interaction?

The analysis strongly suggests that teacher-to-student interaction in English is significantly increased by encouraging the use of increased incidental classroom English. In the case of the recorded lessons, the Class 2 sample showed almost three times the number of interactions that the Class 1 sample showed. It was interesting to note that the number of instances of mimicry, students appropriating the classroom English for their own purposes, was also greater in the Class 2 lesson than in the Class 1 lesson（three and five instances, respectively）. Such mimicry aids in the construction of the learning community（Rogoff, 1993）, and serves to provide spontaneous entertainment（Duff, 2000; Cekaite & Aronsson, 2004）. Clearly, without a model, mimicry cannot occur, and use of classroom English by the JTE provides just such a model.

3. Is there an increase in English usage by students in the form of inter-student interaction?

While the amount of student-to-student interaction in English was greater in Class 2 than in Class 1, the difference was not significant, indicating that the encouragement of spontaneous English use by students was not

enhanced by the encouragement of classroom English use.

4. Are the lengths and complexity of utterances by the JTEs increased?
 and

5. Are the lengths and complexity of utterances by the students increased?

Surprisingly, the data indicated that there were no significant differences between the Classes with regards to utterance length, whether regarding utterances made by JTEs or those made by students. It would seem that the encouragement of the use of incidental classroom English results in the production of a greater number of clauses, but that these clauses are not longer in themselves. Possibly this is due to the prescribed nature of the lexis and the limited range and complexity of lexis the students have acquired.

6. Is there any detectable impact on student performance in English examinations as a result of encouraging JTEs to use more incidental classroom English?

It is tempting to conclude that the improved pass rates at Level 4 of the STEP Eiken test indicate that the increased use of incidental classroom English is not limited to the use of English in the classroom, but is also reflected in students' test performance. However, it would be premature to draw this conclusion. Level 5 is the established benchmark for this age group, and so the pass rates would not be expected to differ greatly. The improvement in level 4 pass rates is consistent with a small positive benefit to the students in Group 2, possibly by helping to improve their listening skills. Furthermore, the increased use of incidental classroom English would not be expected to have any impact in the test performance of the highest ability students, as reflected in the data. However, this is a single set of data, and there are many plausible explanations that can fit these results that do not involve the use of incidental classroom English.

Further research is necessary to fully examine any effect of increased use of incidental classroom English on test performance.

Conclusion

This study collected data from and compared the use of incidental classroom English in two groups. The results indicate that the implementation of a program to encourage JTEs to increase their use of incidental classroom English resulted in a significantly greater incidence of student-teacher communication in English during lessons. This is an additional positive result to the finding that students reported greater satisfaction with their lessons and with their JTEs in the classes that encouraged greater use of incidental classroom English (Sellick et al., 2014).

Perhaps more importantly, the results show that not only is the amount of communication in English greater when JTEs use more incidental classroom English, but that its quality is also different. The analysis of the register of these utterances demonstrates that the communication in English between JTE and students was both more conversational and more naturalistic when the JTE used more incidental classroom English.

During a post-study debriefing session with the JTEs involved in the studies, a general improvement in the Group 2 students' English listening comprehension skill was indicated. The JTEs expressed the opinion that the increased use of incidental classroom English during regular lessons had helped to quickly familiarize the students with English in a communicative manner, and improved their ability to deal with a (limited) range of spoken English. This would be in line with work showing the importance of such ear training in the development of skilled listening in L2 learning (Field, 2008, p.140), but more research will be needed to properly elucidate any

real effect.

When asked how the presentation of incidental classroom English to the students could be improved in the following academic year, the consensus response was that, rather than the introduction of a single large corpus of classroom English to reference, a smaller initial corpus should be used, with additional language added during lessons throughout each term of the academic year. It was felt that a single large corpus could be somewhat overwhelming for students new to English, and that it would also be relatively easy to ignore and forget, whereas a regular infusion of new items, perhaps to be recorded in a personal reference for that purpose, would ensure that using incidental classroom English would remain at the forefront of all participants' minds.

The results of this study imply that the project was successful; it achieved its key aims. However, the project can only really be declared a success if the intervention moves from being a one-off project to becoming a standard part of the teaching process in the school, something that will be maintained by current teachers and encultured into new teachers arriving at the school. In this, it was heartening that the JTEs were so keen to consider revisions to the classroom English corpus for the forthcoming intake, indicating that they were willing to follow the model advocated by Richardson（1990）, among others, that "empirical premises derived from research be considered as warranted practice, which, in combination with teachers' practical knowledge, become the content of reflective teacher change"（p.10）.

References

Atkinson, D.（1987）. 'The mother tongue in the classroom - A neglected resource?', *ELT Journal, 44*（4）, pp. 241-247.

Auerbach, E.（1993）. 'Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom', *TESOL Quarterly, 27*（1）, pp. 9-32.

Blacker, F. & Shimmin, S.（1984）. *Applying Psychology in Organizations,* London, Metheun.

Bryman, A.（2006）*'Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Research: Prospects and Limits',* ESRC, Methods Briefing 11, <http://www.ccsr.ac.uk/methods/publications/documents/Bryman.pdf>（Accessed 12 January 2013）.

Burden, P.（2001）. *When do native English speaking teachers and Japanese college students disagree about the use of Japanese in the English conversation classroom?,* <http://langue.hyper.chubu.ac.jp/pub/tlt/01/apr/burden.html>（Accessed 8 May, 2008）.

Bush, T.（2011）. *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management*, 4th ed, London, Sage.

Cekaite, A. & Aronsson, K.（2004）. 'Repetition and Joking in Children's Second Language Conversations: Playful Recyclings in an Immersion Classroom', *Discourse Studies 6*（3）, pp. 373-392.

Cole, S.（1998）. 'The use of L1 in communicative English classrooms' *The Language Teacher 22*（12）, pp. 11-13.

Cook, V.（2001）. *Second language learning and language teaching.* London: Arnold.

Craig, C. J.（2012）. '"Butterfly Under a Pin": An Emergent Teacher Image amid Mandated Curriculum Reform', *Journal of Educational Research, 105*（2）, pp. 90.

Duff, P. A., & Polio, C. G.（1990）. 'How Much Foreign Language Is There in the Foreign Language Classroom?', *Modern Language Journal, 74*（2）, pp. 154.

Field, J.（2008）. *Listening in the language classroom.* Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Freimuth, H.（2009）'Educational Research: An introduction to basic concepts and terminology', *UGRU Journal, 8* [online], <http://www.ugr.uaeu. ac.ae/acads/ugrujournal/docs/PEER.pdf>（Accessed 12 January 2013）.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S.（1981）. *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Halliday, M. A. K.（1985）. *Spoken and written language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hickman, G.（2010）. 'Concepts of leadership in organizational change', in Preedy, M., Bennet, N. & Wise, C.（eds）, *Educational Leadership: Context, Strategy and Collaboration*, London, SAGE Publications Ltd.

Hutchinson, T.（1991）. 'The management of Change', The Teacher Trainer, *35* [Online], <http://www.tttjournal.co.uk/uploads/File/back_ articles/The_management_of_change.pdf> （Accessed 14 July, 2012）.

Lee, W.S.（2006）. *Software Evaluation Research: Case Study Methodology Designed Research*, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Department of Software and Information Systems, <http://www.sis.uncc.edu/~seoklee/ Projects/CSM.htm>（Accessed 12 November, 2014）.

Medgyes, P.（1994）. *The non-native teacher*. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

MEXT.（2011）. 'Outline of the revision of courses of study', *Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan（MEXT）*, <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/elsec/1303755.htm>（Accessed 30 March, 2012）.

Meyer, H.（2008）. *The pedagogical implications of L1 use in The L2 classroom*, Retrieved on May 4, 2010, <http://www.kyoai.ac.jp/college/ ronshuu/no-08/meyer1.pdf>（Accessed 24 December, 2012）.

Nation, P.（2003）. 'The role of the first language in foreign language

learning', *Asian EFL Journal, 5*, <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/june_2003_PN.html>（Accessed 31 July, 2013）.

Norton, M. I.（2009）. 'The IKEA Effect: When Labor Leads to Love', *Harvard Business Review 87*（2）, pp. 30.

Richardson, V.（1990）. 'Significant and Worthwhile Change in Teaching Practice', *Educational Researcher, 19*（7）, pp. 10-18.

Rogoff, B.（1993）. 'Children's guided participation and participatory appropriation in sociocultural activity'. in Woxniak, R. & Fischer, K.（Eds.）, *Development in context: Acting and thinking in specific environments*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sellick, A., Bury, J., Yamamoto, K. & Watanabe A.（2014）'Encouraging Incidental English Communication in Japanese English Classes, Part 1: Student Attitudes', *Shumei University Journal, 11*, pp. 167-190.

Shimizu, M.（2006）'Monolingual or bilingual policy in the classroom: Pedagogical implications of L1 use in the Japanese EFL classroom', *Maebashi Kyoai Gakuen College Ronsyu 6*, pp. 75-89.

Somekh, B. & Lewin, C.（eds）（2005）'*Research methods in the social sciences*', London, Sage.

Stake, R. E.（1995）. *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Swan, M.（1985）. 'A critical look at the communicative approach', *ELT Journal, 39*（2）, pp. 76-87.

Turnbull, M.（2001）. 'There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, But…', *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*（4）, pp. 531-540.

Willis, J.（1981）. *Teaching English through English*. Essex: Longman.

Yin, R. K.（1994）. *Case study research: Design and methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendix A: Classroom English Corpus

中学 Classroom English	英語の授業中は英語を一生懸命使うことが大切です。先生や友達と話す時には必ず下の文を使ってください。		
Good morning/afternoon.	おはようございます・こんにちは。	I'm sorry I'm late.	遅れてごめんなさい。
Goodbye.	さようなら。	I forgot my [book].	[教科書] を忘れました。
See you [next week].	また [来週]。	I left my [book] in the dormitory.	[教科書] を寮に忘れました。
How are you?	お元気ですか？	Once more, please.	もう一度お願いします。
Let's begin today's lesson.	では、今日の授業を始めましょう。	One more time, please.	
Sit down, please.	座ってください。	Pardon?	
Stand up, please.	立ってください。	I have a question.	質問があります。
Are you all right?	大丈夫ですか？	I don't understand.	分かりません。
Are you ready?	準備はいいですか？・始めます。	I don't know.	知りません。
Open [your books].	[教科書] を開けてください。	May I go to the restroom/toilet?	お手洗いに行っていいですか？
Close [your books].	[教科書] を閉じてください。	Thank you.	ありがとう。
Put your [books] away, please.	[教科書] をしまってください。	How do you say this word?	この単語はどう発音しますか？
Here you are.	はい、どうぞ。	How do you say [大] in English?	[大] は英語で何と言いますか？
Look at [page 10/ the board].	[10ページ・黒板] を見てください。	How do you say [dog] in Japanese?	[dog] は日本語で何と言いますか？
Open your books at page [10].	教科書の [10] ページを開いてください。	What does [dog] mean?	[dog] はどういう意味ですか？
Have you finished?	終わりましたか？	How do you spell [dog]?	[dog] はどう書きますか？
Put your pencils down, please.	筆記用具を置いてください。	Can I open/close the [window]?	窓を開けて・閉めていいですか？
Please practice in pairs/groups of 6.	二人ずつ・六人ずつのグループで練習してください。	What is the [past] of ["go"]?	["go"] の [過去形] は何ですか？
Any questions?	質問がありますか？	Is this right/correct/OK?	これは正しいですか？
Listen to [the CD], please.	[CD] を聴いてください。	What day is it today?	今日は何曜日ですか？
May I have [two books], please.	[二冊] ください。	What is today's date?	今日は何月何日ですか？
Answer the questions.	質問に答えてください。	Do you understand?	分かりますか？
Write the answers.	答えを書いてください。	Let's practice.	練習しましょう。
Ask your partner.	パートナーと一緒に練習してください。	Please give it to me.	出してください。
Listen carefully.	よく聞いてください。		
Raise your hand.	手を上げてください。		
Be quiet/Stop talking, please.	静かにしてください。		
Listen and repeat.	私に続いてくり返してください。		

Appendix B: Class 1 lesson transcript

This transcript records only the classroom English used during the lesson - instructional language and use of the L1 by JTE and students has been omitted.

Time	Classroom English	Direction of Utterance	Utterance Length
0:25	Good morning, everyone.	T>S	3
0:26	Good morning, Ms X.	S>T	4
0:28	Sit down, please.	T>S	3
0:43	Okay. Be quiet.	T>S	3
1:56	Listen please.	T>S	2
2:37	What?	T>S	1
4:10	Do you have the resume I gave you yesterday?	T>S	9
4:12	Yesterday?	S>T	1
4:14	Do you have the resume I gave you yesterday?	T>S	9
4:15	I have.	S>T	2
4:15	I'm happy.	S>T	2
4:18	I don't speak English.	S>T	4
5:16	I don't know.	S>S	3
7:48	Be quiet.	T>S	2
7:51	Be quiet.	S>S	2
7:53	Are you ready?	S>S	3
10:18	What is it in Japanese?	S>T	5
10:51	I don't know.	S>S	3
14:28	Teacher!	S>T	1
19:18	Be quiet, please.	T>S	3
19:22	Let's start.	T>S	2
22:53	I don't know.	S>S	3
23:07	You are so noisy!	T>S	4
23:09	You are so noisy!	T>S	4
23:10	You are crazy!	S>S	3
31:12	Better […].	T>S	1
31:40	You are […].	S>S	2
32:24	[…], number three.	T>S	2
32:31	Okay.	T>S	1
32:44	[…], number four.	T>S	2
32:50	Number five.	T>S	2
32:53	[…], number five.	T>S	2
34:04	Okay.	T>S	1
34:52	No, I don't.	S>T	3
35:02	Oh, my god!	S>S	3
36:11	[…], number six.	S>T	2
46:19	Try again.	S>S	2
46:40	Thank you.	T>S	2
46:49	Quiet.	T>S	1
47:03	Thank you.	T>S	2
47:05	[…] Thank you everyone.	T>S	3
47:06	Thank you, Ms Y.	S>T	4
47:15	Bye bye.	T>S	2

Note: […] represents instances of L1 use.

Appendix C: Class 2 lesson transcript

This transcript records only the classroom English used during the lesson - instructional language and use of the L1 by JTE and students has been omitted.

Time	Classroom English	Direction of Utterance	Utterance Length
0:02	OK. Stand up.	T>S	3
0:10	OK. Good afternoon, everyone.	T>S	4
0:13	Good Afternoon, Ms X.	S>T	3
0:16	Who am I?	T>S	3
0:18	Ms Y.	S>T	2
0:20	Alright. My name is⋯OK?	T>S	5
0:32	Good afternoon, everyone.	T>S	3
0:35	Good Afternoon, Ms Y.	S>T	4
0:36	Sit down, please.	T>S	3
0:45	Maybe⋯I haven't seen three of you, right? Because you have been to British teachers lessons so far.	T>S	18
1:04	Right?	T>S	1
3:18	Whatever you like. Okay? So, one minute.	T>S	7
3:21	Do you have a partner?	T>S	5
6:34	I'm tired!	S>S	2
6:37	OK. Stop!	T>S	2
6:39	OK. Who will start?	T>S	4
6:45	No!	T>S	1
7:31	OK!	T>S	1
7:41	Okay. Mr. A, stand up.	T>S	5
7:57	Okay. Let's start.	T>S	3
8:10	Okay. And⋯?	T>S	2
9:21	Thank you very much.	T>S	4
9:28	OK.	T>S	1
9:33	Stand up.	T>S	2
9:42	And⋯?	T>S	1
9:50	Okay. And⋯?	T>S	2
9:52	And?	T>S	1
10:15	Okay. Thank you very much.	T>S	5
10:25	Okay. Mr. Y stand up.	T>S	5
10:47	OK.	T>S	1
10:49	Who are you?	S>S	3
10:58	OK.	T>S	1
11:10	Did you make up the story?	T>S	6
11:14	OK. Ms O stand up.	T>S	5
12:09	What kind of dog do you have?	T>S	7
12:10	Toy poodle.	S>T	2
12:12	Is he cute?	T>S	3
12:13	She! She!	S>T	2
12:14	Sorry. Is she cute?	T>S	4
12:15	Yes!	S>T	1
12:22	Okay. Mr. I stand up.	T>S	5

12:39	OK. Stand up.	T>S	3
12:41	Stand up?	S>T	2
12:42	Yes, please.	T>S	2
12:56	She is Martian!	S>S	3
13:00	Crazy, crazy!	S>S	2
13:12	What's「地球」?	T>S	1
13:13	Earth.	S>T	1
13:15	And「彗星」?	T>S	1
13:17	Pluto.	S>T	1
13:18	Pluto?	T>S	1
13:19	Venus!	S>T	1
13:20	Yes, Venus.	T>S	2
13:22	What's「金星」?	T>S	1
13:25	Mercury?	S>T	1
13:27	Yes, Mercury.	T>S	2
13:31	And「木星」?	T>S	1
13:34	Jupiter!	S>T	1
14:42	Number 1 […].	T>S	2
14:45	Number 10 […].	S>T	2
14:55	Number 1 […], number 10 […].	S>S	4
15:03	Quiet please. Quiet.	T>S	3
15:05	Be quiet.	S>S	2
15:08	Genius.	S>S	1
15:10	I am a genius.	S>S	4
15:12	Little and space.	S>S	3
15:43	Are you okay?	S>S	3
16:32	We study English.	S>S	3
27:00	Number one.	T>S	2
27:06	How do you spell it?	T>S	5
27:10	OK.	T>S	1
27:14	Okay. Number two.	T>S	3
27:20	And how do you spell it?	T>S	6
27:30	OK	T>S	1
27:38	[…] number three.	T>S	2
27:47	Could you spell it?	T>S	4
27:56	Okay. Number four.	T>S	3
28:03	Very good.	T>S	2
28:07	Number five.	T>S	2
28:11	Okay. Could you spell it?	T>S	5
28:14	Alright. Very good.	T>S	3
28:17	Number six.	T>S	2
28:23	How do you spell it?	T>S	5
28:39	OK	T>S	1
28:42	[…] number seven.	T>S	2
28:45	And how do you spell it?	T>S	6
28:48	Very good. Very speedy.	T>S	4
28:53	Number eight.	T>S	2

28:58	How do you spell it?	T>S	5
29:06	Okay. Very good.	T>S	3
29:09	Now…number nine.	T>S	3
29:14	How do you spell it?	T>S	5
29:37	Okay. Number ten.	T>S	3
29:44	Alright. Very good.	T>S	3
29:48	Number eleven.	T>S	2
29:51	How do you spell it?	T>S	5
29:54	Very good.	T>S	2
30:00	Okay. Number twelve.	T>S	3
30:12	How do you spell it?	T>S	5
30:31	Thirteen.	T>S	1
30:35	How do you spell it?	T>S	5
30:43	Okay. Number fourteen. Last one.	T>S	5
30:46	How do you spell it?	T>S	5
30:49	OK	T>S	1
41:30	You are crazy!	S>S	3
42:14	I think you made a mistake. It's not present continuous.	T>S	10
42:22	Right.	T>S	1
49:38	[…] stand up.	T>S	2
49:41	Everyone, please stand up.	T>S	4
49:49	Stand up, please.	S>S	3
49:57	Right. Quiet!	T>S	2
50:00	Thank you everyone.	T>S	3
50:03	Thank you Ms. Y.	S>T	4
50:04	Bye bye. See you tomorrow.	T>S	5
50:14	Mr. W. Stand up!	S>S	4
50:55	Bye bye.	S>T	2

Note: […] represents instances of L1 use.

（アンソニー　セリック・講師、ジェームス　ベリー・講師）