

氏名（本籍）	エレノア カーソン ELEANOR CARSON（カナダ）
学位の種類	博士（学術）
学位記番号	甲第 131 号
学位授与年月日	平成 30 年 9 月 25 日
学位授与の要件	広島市立大学大学院学則第 36 条第 3 項及び広島市立大学学位規程第 3 条第 3 項の規定による
学位論文題目	Japanese Student Preferences for Medium of Instruction (MOI) in EFL Classes and Teacher Belief in MOI: A Cross-sectional Longitudinal Investigation
論文審査委員	主 査 教 授 岩井 千秋 委 員 教 授 青木 信之 委 員 教 授 横山 知幸 委 員 教 授 Laskowski Terry

論文内容の要旨

1. Abstract and Research Objectives

This doctoral dissertation deals with a controversial issue that has been repeatedly argued in applied linguistics with respect to teachers' use and/or selection of a linguistic medium of instruction (MOI) in teaching a second language (L2). With the advent and pervasion of communicative language teaching, maximizing L2 use in classroom gained tacit consent among many L2 researchers and practitioners; thus, intervention through learners' L1 has long been considered obstructive, counterproductive, and even corruptive. More recently, however, L1 use for instruction has been reappraised empirically, and many researchers are in favor of the view that its judicious use is not only beneficial but also necessary for certain types of L2 learners.

Prior to her doctoral study, the author also conducted an empirical MOI investigation and recognized some methodological inadequacies in previous MOI studies, which motivated her to engage in this doctoral study. Thus, the initial objective of her study was to obtain a methodical and replicable means to compensate for the deficits of the past MOI studies. This objective was achieved by developing a unique survey instrument called Student Preferences for Instructional Language (SPIL, explained later). The successful development of SPIL led her to the primary objective of the doctoral study; that is, to clarify L2 learners' preferences for teachers' L1 use in class (simply learners' or students' L1 preference, hereafter), teachers' beliefs in their selection of an MOI, and gaps between students' L1 preferences and teachers' beliefs, and also to find plausible factors attributable to these preferences and beliefs and their dynamic changes from one stage of L2

learning/teaching to another. To attain these research aims, the author also indicates the danger of a heavy reliance on a single data collection method as most MOI researchers have done in the past, and she proposed to triangulate data by mixing data collected by a quantitative method (SPIL) and a qualitative method. Regarding the latter, the author conducted a sizable number of oral interviews with students and teachers to make her findings persuasive.

Findings from the study are various, but the most important is that teachers' selection of an MOI would have a psychological impact on learners' willingness to study and use English, but in reality there is a large gap between what teachers believe to be beneficial and what students actually prefer.

This study contributes remarkably to MOI studies, particularly in the following three points. First, SPIL constructed by the author is the first systematic data collection battery in this research area, and this feature distinguishes this study from the past MOI studies. Second, the author's longitudinal observations should not be overlooked since MOI studies using this method are rare. This research method was adopted by the author since she considers that MOI preferences and beliefs are unstable and dynamically change from time to time. The findings of this study suggest the inadequacy of cross-sectional studies to account for dynamic changes. Third, the findings from this study can be extended and applied to current MOI arguments, especially in EFL contexts like Japan, where the introduction of the "teaching English in English" policy into the high school Course of Study has been debated by many people, even including ordinary people.

2. Chapter Outlines

To achieve the above-stated goals, this dissertation is constructed with eight chapters. In the first introductory chapter, the author outlines the basis for the MOI dispute, tries to rationalize the necessity of investigations in this study, and states its objectives.

Chapter 2 presents an extensive literature review. The author first attempts to locate her research within the existing theoretical frameworks of L2 pedagogy, acquisition, and communication. Following this, she refers to the traditional and current pro and con arguments on whether L2 teachers should use learners' L1 in class. Apart from century-old MOI views (e.g., Direct Method), a recent MOI argument was initiated by strong supporters of non-L1 interventionists in the early 1980s, but their strong claims were theoretically and intuitively derived with little confirmatory evidence. Thus, researchers started empirical investigations and found objective evidence to reject non-L1 interventionist views. Such evidence is highly valuable, but the author's meta-analysis of previous studies shows that findings of the past studies are not monolithic since MOI influences are context-sensitive and, furthermore, they were elicited through methodologically naive ways. In addition to the literature on empirical MOI studies, the author reviews some key concepts of her study in this chapter, including student

preferences, teacher beliefs, willingness to communicate, and linguistic multi-competence.

Chapter 3 is about how SPIL was created. The intended data collection tool was to be used for quantitative cross-sectional and longitudinal investigations. From the literature review of the past MOI studies mentioned above, the author adapted 66 question items and formulated them within a 5-point Likert scale. For the sake of respondents' temporal and comprehension ease, the total number of questions need to be reduced without sacrificing their reliability and validity. The original questionnaire was administered to 349 university English learners at several universities in western Japan, and the responses were subjected to an Exploratory Factor Analysis. Through this process, 40 items that were compiled within underlying constructs for seven factors were identified. Its high reliability was statistically tested, and its validity was explicitly mentioned by the author. Once the student version of SPIL was produced, the author converted it into a teachers' version.

Upon the production of SPILs for both students and teachers, the author initiated data collections of this study. After screening for invalid responses, a total of 752 students in 71 English classes at different universities and 30 English teachers (17 native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) and 13 Japanese teachers of English (JTEs)) participated in the quantitative SPIL survey. Then, their responses were analyzed according to the six research questions that were mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. In short, they asked the influence of learners' background variables on their preferences for their English teachers' use of L1 (RQ1), the influence of learners' proficiency levels on their L1 preferences (RQ2), their longitudinal changes (RQ3), matches and mismatches between students' preferences and teachers' beliefs (RQ4), the influence of teachers' background variables on their beliefs in MOI (RQ5), and teachers' longitudinal changes (RQ6).

The collected data were processed by applying inferential statistical measures to them. The author illustrates analysis outcomes in Chapter 5 for each RQ. To mention highlights of the findings, it was first found that learners' English learning backgrounds as well as their personal traits such as gender (RQ1) differentiated their L1 preferences, and a highly influential factor was their English proficiency (RQ2) as the author predicted from her past studies. The one-year longitudinal investigation (RQ3) revealed that the learners' L1 preferences slightly declined over time, but this tendency varied according to instruction contents and class activities. The student-teacher comparisons (RQ4) showed apparent mismatches between them, but the extent of such mismatches was larger between students and NESTs than between students and JTEs. The differences between NESTs and JTEs was further clarified by comparing their beliefs in their L1 use (RQ5). Interestingly, the longitudinal observations of the teachers (RQ6) showed that NESTs belief in L1 use was stable throughout the year; however, JTEs beliefs went from strong to weak as the first semester progressed (that is, they supported L1 use in class at the beginning of the semester,

but they thought less so at the end of the first semester), but their beliefs returned to the original levels by the end of the second semester.

The quantitative investigations brought the author massive and invaluable outcomes, but they are not enough to understand why such outcomes were brought. The explanatory “why” aspects of the quantitative outcomes were examined by using qualitative interviews with students ($n = 17$) and teachers ($n = 13$), who were chosen from the participants of the quantitative surveys by a stratified purposive sampling method. The interview results are presented in Chapter 6. The author elicited many excerpts from the interview transcripts to account for the findings from the quantitative data. At the same time, she also noticed limitations of the quantitative survey, which is suitable to collect a large amount of responses in a short time but does not necessarily help researchers find deep-rooted psychological mental processes. For example, in the quantitative survey, many respondents reported that teachers’ L1 use for emotional support is unnecessary. However, some of the students interviewed testified that this is true in ordinary cases, but it is not so when they are exposed to extremely anxiety-provoking or embarrassing situations in class.

Chapter 7 is a discussion chapter, and the author first tries to answer the research questions of this study. Following this, she discusses methodological problems in the past MOI studies and explains how she attempted to overcome these problems in this study. In addition to this methodological argument, the author draws pedagogical implications from this empirical study, claiming the importance of grasping learners’ apprehension levels in class, their willingness to communicate in English, their actual experience of using English as well as their linguistic knowledge of English. She also indicates L1 can be a useful scaffold to connect L2 and L1 for second language learners.

Chapter 8 is the concluding chapter. The author summarizes the main conclusions of the study, conducts a self-analysis of this study, and states limitations of the study and future needs for further studies.

論文審査の結果の要旨

A final oral defense (*Honshinsa*) of this doctoral dissertation was held on September 6th, 2018, by the above-listed four examiners that include one outside reviewer. Prior to this defense, Ms. Eleanor Carson presented her study at an open lecture session held at a Language Center classroom. Following a 70-minutes lecture, the attendants were invited to ask questions or give comments to her study. Ms. Carson confidently responded to all questions appropriately based on accumulated academic knowledge she obtained by reading many related references and the empirical data she collected in her study. Overall, her lecture was well-planned in an audience-friendly way as it could be understood even by the participants unfamiliar with her research topic.

After the open lecture, Ms. Carson attended a final oral defense that lasted for more than one hour. Questions from the committee members concentrated on the research methods and pedagogical implications from the study. One question on the methods was to confirm the production process of the SPIL from original questions to the final set of 40 questions. Ms. Carson explained how the original questions were elicited from other empirical MOI studies and reduced by applying a statistical measure to them. She was also asked why questions examining learners' attitudinal changes related to their motivation and willingness to communicate were not included. She mentioned the difficulty of including all these factors in one study as a main reason, but she showed her interest in examining them in her future study.

Questions on the pedagogical side were many. Of them, one important question was about scaffolding effects of teachers' L1 use, which Ms. Carson pointed out in the dissertation. Since her account for this was somewhat inadequate, the committee requested to illustrate this more fully and advised to deepen her discussion in her final submission draft. Another question was about the different patterns of longitudinal change between JTEs and NESTs. The qualitative data of her study has certain limitations to offer direct evidence to this question, but she was advised to give plausible reasons in the discussion. Additionally, Ms. Carson was asked about the pedagogical contributions of the study that she had in mind. Since this was a crucial question in her study that primarily deals with a pedagogical issue on L2 teaching, Ms. Carson and the four committee members spent a fairly long time to exchange opinions on this topic.

In the end, Ms. Carson was asked, in revising the dissertation draft, how she adopted the suggestions given to her through the preliminary outcome report by the defense committee members. She said these comments were helpful, and she tried to integrate them into the revised draft. She also stated that keeping them in mind she would like to continue her effort to complete a final submission draft.

Finally, the outside reviewer praised Ms. Carson's professional achievement with her arduous effort, and this was shared by all committee members. The committee unanimously judged that Ms. Eleanor Carson's dissertation satisfies the necessary conditions for a doctoral study and that she passed the oral defense successfully.

(xxvi + 364 pages and appendices 60 pages, 380 references)