Target Language Use in Teaching from the Perspective of English Teachers and Student Teachers in Finland

Emma Rantala

MA Thesis

English, Degree Programme for Language Learning and Teaching
School of Languages and Translation Studies
Faculty of Humanities
University of Turku

August 2021

The originality of this thesis has been checked in accordance with the University of Turku quality assurance system using the Turnitin Originality Check service.

UNIVERSITY OF TURKU

School of Languages and Translation Studies / Faculty of Humanities

RANTALA, EMMA: Target language use in teaching from the perspective of English teachers and student teachers in Finland

MA Thesis, 54 p., appendices 11 p.

English, Degree Programme in Language Learning and Teaching

August 2021

This thesis examines English teachers and student teachers' views on TL use in Finland. Target language (TL) is widely studied in the field of second language acquisition as teachers' TL use is considered essential for students' language learning. However, researchers do not have a consensus on whether the students' first language (L1) should be used in foreign language teaching. In spite of the extensive research on TL, there is a gap in research on how English teachers and student teachers in Finland view their own TL use.

The main research question of this thesis is: How do teachers and student teachers view target language use in a classroom? The supporting research questions are: What kinds of possible challenges there are in target language use for teachers and student teachers? In what kinds of functions do teachers and student teachers use target language in the classroom? How do teachers and student teachers' views on target language use in a classroom differ from each other? The background theory consists of discussion of TL and L1, the language of classroom management, code-switching, and distinctive characteristics of teachers and student teachers' TL use.

The data were collected by interviewing four English teachers and three student teachers and the interviews were based on the themes that emerge in the background research for the topic. The data were analyzed using Schmidt's (2004) strategy for analysis of semi-structured interviews. The results showed that the teachers and student teachers view their own TL use as important for students' learning. The main challenges that the participants identify in their TL use are the significant differences in students' understanding of the TL, adapting their own TL use to these differences, and determining the amounts of TL and L1 use during a lesson. The functions in which the TL is used include giving basic instructions and greeting, whereas L1 is used for teaching grammar and giving complex instructions. The teachers and student teachers' views on TL use differ in the aspects that are viewed as challenges in TL use. Furthermore, in relation to the challenges in TL use, the teachers are more focused on the students' perspective on TL use, whereas the student teachers' answers emphasize their own abilities as users of the TL.

The results suggest that participants view teachers' TL use as an important source of input for students and in spite of the challenging aspects of TL use, they have a positive attitude towards their own TL use. In the future, research could be conducted on whether new language teachers' abilities to use the TL in their teaching could be improved by increasing the instruction of TL use in teacher training and university studies.

Key words: target language, English as a foreign language, foreign language learning

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

TL	Target Language
L1	First Language
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
EFL	English as a foreign language
FLT	Foreign Language Teaching

1 Introduction

The general assumption is that in order to learn a language, one should hear, read, speak and write as much as possible in the foreign language, in other words surround themselves with the language. The importance of using the *target language* (TL) in foreign language teaching has been emphasized by researchers for a long time, whereas the use of the students' *first language* (L1) in language teaching is seen as a controversial issue (Cook 2001, 402–403). In spite of the ideal in foreign language teaching (FLT) being using as much TL as possible, studies show that teachers actually employ the L1 extensively in teaching situations (Littlewood and Yu 2011, 64).

Research on teacher-talk reveals that in general, teachers occupy two-thirds of the total talking time during a lesson (Ellis 2012, 117), which highlights that a significant part of teaching happens through the teacher's speech. In FLT, the language that the teacher chooses to speak affects the students considerably. In spite of the conflicting research on the ratio of use between the TL and the L1 in a foreign language classroom, researchers agree that teachers' TL use is of great significance to students: "In foreign language learning, the language that the teacher uses is an important source for students' learning and forms an important part of the language that the learner hears in a classroom (input)." (Maijala 2018, 18; my translation). However, Polio and Duff (1994, 320) point out that "there seems to be a lack of awareness on the part of the teachers as to how, when, and the extent to which they actually use English in the classroom". This discrepancy between the requirement of using the TL in order to provide students with enough input and the lack of guidelines for how to use the TL creates a dilemma for teachers, especially novice teachers.

Teaching through the medium of the TL seems to be an ideal in most countries, yet for example in Scotland, there is debate among teachers about TL use and especially the amount of TL use in a classroom (Crichton 2009, 20). In Finland, teachers' TL use has not been studied extensively. There are a few Finnish studies that have examined the use of TL and L1 in foreign language learning from the learner's perspective, but there is a distinctive gap in research regarding the teacher's point of view, which the current study attempts to shed light on. In my personal opinion, there is not a lot of discussion around the topic of TL use in Finland and it was not emphasized in my own university studies or teacher training either.

As a future foreign language teacher, I became interested in the optimal manner of using the TL and L1 during Teacher's Pedagogical Studies. After following teachers and student teachers giving lessons in several languages as a part of my teacher training, I noticed that the use of TL varies both in quantity and quality depending on the teacher. A study by De La Campa and Nassaji (2009, 757) compared the use of L1 by novice and experienced teachers and found out that novice teachers may not be aware of all the purposes in which the L1 can be used in FLT. For this reason, De La Campa and Nassaji (ibid.) suggest that the uses of the L1 that facilitate the learning of the target language should be taught more extensively in teacher education in order to increase student teachers' awareness of them. As more instruction for TL use is required in Teacher's Pedagogical Studies in Finland and the topic is not extensively studied, in Finland nor internationally, Finnish teachers and student teachers' TL use in an important area of study.

The present study attempts to shed light on the TL use in teaching in Finland from the perspective of English teachers and student teachers. The hypothesis behind this study is that teachers and student teachers' views on TL use differ from each other because their experiences in using TL in teaching are at different levels. The purpose of this study is to describe and compare these views in order to facilitate teachers, especially novice teachers, TL use in the future. In this thesis, the aim is to find out how teachers and student teachers in Finland view TL use in a classroom, what kinds of challenges there may be in TL use for them, in what kinds of functions they use the TL during a lesson, and how the views of these two groups differ from each other. Four research questions were formulated for studying this topic, one being the main research question and three supporting research questions that specify the main question:

Main research question:

- How do teachers and student teachers view target language use in a classroom?

Supporting research questions:

- What kinds of possible challenges there are in target language use for teachers and student teachers?
- In what kinds of functions do teachers and student teachers use target language in the classroom?
- How do teachers and student teachers' views on target language use in a classroom differ from each other?

The data for this study were gathered using a semi-structured interview, which was formulated based on the themes that emerge in the research on teachers' TL use. A narrative approach on interviewing was chosen to obtain reliable information on the participants' own experiences and thoughts on using TL in teaching. The data were analyzed with the help of Schmidt's (2004) strategy for analysis of semi-structured interviews and all research questions were answered using qualitative methods of analysis.

The sections of the paper will proceed in the following manner. In the first theory section (section 2), an overall view on previous research on TL and L1 is provided and the key terms and areas of study are presented. The second theory section (section 3), will focus more closely to the research on teachers and student teachers' TL use. After that, in section 4, Schmidt's (2004) strategy for analysis of semi-structured interviews will be presented. After introducing the theoretical background, the data gathering methods of the study, the participants and the interviews are discussed in detail in section 5. The analysis and discussion section (section 6) is divided into six subsections that will each cover a theme that emerged in the in the results. The findings are discussed in relation to the theoretical background and previous studies already in section 6, and the conclusion, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research are provided in section 7. The last section of the paper concludes the study and will be followed by references and appendices.

2 Previous research on target language use in teaching

In sections 2, 3 and 4 I will cover the theoretical background related to target language use. I will begin by discussing the previous research on TL and first language use in teaching in section 2. The language of classroom management and code-switching will also be discussed here, as these themes have a clear relation to the topic of this study. Next, in section 3, the focus will be on teachers and student teachers' TL use. Lastly, in section 4, Schmidt's (2004) strategy for analysis of semi-structured interviews will be presented, as it is used as the methodological basis of the data analysis in this study.

The TL has a strong position in different language teaching approaches, many of which declare that the learners' L1 should be excluded from the foreign language classroom altogether in favor of the TL (Cook 2001, 403–404). However, the policy that the TL should be used as much as possible in foreign language teaching has met a shift in recent years as more studies supporting the use of the L1 have emerged (ibid.). The use of the TL as an important source of input for the students cannot be denied, but it appears that both the TL and the L1 have their respective positions in foreign language classrooms, however the determination of their purposes and amounts of use require further guidelines. Riordan (2018, 165–166) notes that: "Language teaching practice is informed by language teaching theory and policy as well as myriad influences that the teacher must contend with in the classroom, the school and the wider language teaching and learning landscape." These external theories and policies create a challenge for the teachers' TL use and are difficult to navigate, especially for novice teachers, as a common guideline for teachers' TL use does not exist and the research on the topic is conflicting.

Vold and Brkan (2020, 2) state that researchers have a consensus on that the use of the teacher's TL during a lesson should be maximized, but there is disagreement about the appropriate amount of L1 use. According to Vold and Brkan, previous research on the topic has focused on three aspects: the proportion between the use of target language and the L1, the purposes for which the L1 is used, and the factors that influence language choice (2020, 2–3). These are themes that will be covered in this thesis as well.

In spite of the position of the teacher's TL use as an important source of input for students, some researchers also vouch for the benefits of using the students' L1 in foreign language teaching. Littlewood and Yu (2011, 64) describe the views on the use of the L1 ranging "from insistence on total exclusion of the L1, towards varying degrees of recognition that it may provide valuable support for learning.", Hall and Cook (2012,

277) explain that there is overwhelming evidence of the L1 being used in language classrooms, which is echoed by Ellis (2012, 177) who points out that teachers make use of the learners' L1 in their teaching. Even though the topic of this study is TL, these studies on the use of L1 reveal that the TL and the L1 are both used in teaching, which produces a demand for this study to discuss the role of L1 in FLT as well (section 2.2).

Before moving on to discuss the TL further, the terminology of this study will be clarified. Hall and Cook have established definitions to the terminology related to foreign language learning:

> All learners of an additional language are by definition speakers of at least one language and aspire to know at least one new one. At least two languages are therefore involved, and there are established terms to refer to each. Most widespread are 'first language' (abbreviated to 'L1'), 'mother tongue' and 'native language' for the existing language and 'second language' (abbreviated to 'L2'), 'foreign language' or 'target language' for the new one.
> (Hall and Cook 2012, 274)

In this study, the terms *target language* and *first language* will be used as they are the most commonly used ones in previous research on the topic. As this study focuses on English teaching in Finland, in the analysis and discussion section of this study (section 6), the term *target language* will be used to refer to English and the term *first language* will refer to Finnish, even though it is not the 'first' language of all students in the contexts of this study but rather the common shared language.

2.1 Target language use in foreign language teaching

In foreign language teaching, the target language that the teacher uses comprises a significant amount of the students' input (Maijala 2018, 118). Since the late 1970s and early 1980s, following the work of Stephen Krashen, the role of comprehensible input and interaction have been emphasized in FLT (ibid.). In the 1970s and 1980s, the leading idea in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) approach was that a natural order of acquisition through exposure should be followed in foreign language learning and that first language interference and attention to differences between TL and L1 were to avoid (Hall and Cook 2012, 276–277). Since the 1970s, a TL-only approach has been implemented in FLT in many countries as a consequence of the rise of communicative language teaching and immersion techniques (Vold and Brkan 2020, 1). It has been an ideal especially in many English-speaking countries (ibid.). The importance of the TL in

FLT has been further justified with the remark that if the teacher speaks the L1 to the students, it sends them the message to use the L1 when discussing something real, whereas the use of the TL is limited to the exercises done in the classroom (Franklin 1990, 20).

Based on their review of studies in several countries, Turnbull and Arnett (2002, 211) argue that "there is near consensus that teachers should aim to make maximum use of the TL." This conception of maximizing the TL use is echoed by Vold and Brkan (2020, 2) who write that exposing students to the TL is essential for the development of communicative language abilities. Maximal exposure to the TL in teaching is particularly important in foreign language settings with a limited amount of exposure to the TL outside of school (ibid.) In Finland, the students are exposed to English outside of school as well, but in the teaching of other foreign languages, such as French or German, the importance of the teacher's TL use is emphasized, as the students do not often hear these languages in their immediate surroundings. However, if the approach to using TL-only is followed too dogmatically, a reverse effect can happen when teachers are unable to maintain the use of the TL and revert to using their L1 (Butzkamm 2003, 29–30).

In spite of the significant role of TL use in foreign language learning, in many countries the TL is still taught primarily through the L1 (Hall and Cook 2012, 277), even though the suggested policy in these countries is based on communicative language teaching. According to Vold and Brkan (2020, 2) these countries are under-represented in the current research literature on TL use, and hence it is difficult to find research in these contexts that do not follow the TL-only approach to FLT. In Finland, the objectives of the National Curriculum for Basic Education related to foreign language working methods state that "the target language is used whenever possible" (Finnish National Agency for Education 2014, 358; my translation). In the course contents of the National Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Education, the students' TL use is described as follows: "The module familiarizes the student with studying languages in upper secondary school, where the target language is used as much as possible" (Finnish National Agency for Education 2019, 185; my translation). In spite of these being official policies in FLT in Finland, they concentrate on describing the students' TL use and consequently there is no further guideline on how teachers should use the TL in practice in Finnish schools. A TL-only approach is not implemented in Finnish schools, but the means in which the TL and L1 are actually used in Finnish language classroom are a mystery, as there is a deficiency of research on how TL is used by teachers in Finnish

schools. In the Netherlands, there exists a similar situation to Finland's regarding TL use. In the Netherlands, various pedagogues consider TL use as a requisite of quality in FLT and student teachers are encouraged to enhance their TL in teacher training (Tammenga-Helmantel et al. 2020, 2). However, based on different studies, Dutch foreign language teachers predominantly use Dutch in teaching, which leads to a discrepancy between teacher training and the reality of schools when student teachers began working as teachers (ibid.).

The use of the TL is seen as an important part of foreign language teaching and learning, but previous research on the topic suggests that there are also challenges in the use of the TL from the teachers' perspective. Franklin (1990) has studied the problems related to TL use in Scotland. She describes the responses of a survey for French teachers in Scotland by writing that although most teachers recognize the importance of teaching in the TL, they nevertheless identify different challenges in TL use in classroom management (Franklin 1990, 20). These challenges are divided into three categories by difficulty: 1. tasks which are relatively easy to perform in French, 2. tasks which are relatively difficult to perform in French, and 3. tasks which are extremely difficult to perform in French (ibid.). The first category includes tasks such as giving activity instructions and chatting with students, the second includes for example disciplining and explaining meanings, and in the third and most difficult category to perform in French fall tasks such as discussing language objectives and teaching grammar (ibid.). In addition to the categorization of difficulties in different tasks, Franklin's research has also identified problems related to the students, the teacher's confidence in TL use, and external factors. The categorization of these problems is as follows:

1. The nature of the class (number of pupils, ability mix, grouping, whether taught in French last year, etc.)
2. The reaction of the class (behavior)
3. The teacher's confidence in using the target language (tiredness may contribute to this)
4. External factors (departmental ethos, type of examination)
   (Franklin 1990, 20-21)

Franklin's research indicates that there are factors in several areas of TL use that can prove to be challenging for teachers' use of TL in teaching. In this subsection, I have discussed previous research on TL use in FLT. However, whenever the TL is discussed, the students' L1 has to be included as well. Cook (2001, 404), notes that the TL-only use, which bans the L1 from the classroom entirely, is only achievable in situations where

teachers and students do not share an L1 or where the students have multiple L1s. This makes one question whether a TL-only approach to FLT is even possible, as the students' L1s always have an impact on their language learning. In the next section, I will focus on the role of the L1 in FLT and discuss the relationship between the TL and L1 further.

2.2 First language use in foreign language teaching

When the teacher shares their first language with the students, there is a temptation to change into that language in order to deal with the management of the classroom (Franklin 1990, 20). However, the use of the L1 does not always have a negative impact on learning. In spite of the position of the teacher's target language use as an important source of input for students, some researchers vouch for the benefits of using the students' L1 in foreign language teaching. Furthermore, in some situations it is necessary to use the L1: "There is no point in using the TL if the pupils do not understand what the teacher is saying." (Crichton 2009, 20).

Franklin's research (1990, 20) has revealed that even though teachers acknowledge that they should use the TL in teaching, only a very small percentage of teachers believe that it can be the only language used in a foreign language classroom and most feel that a mix of the TL and L1 is adequate. This indicates that there is a clear distinction between what researchers consider a 'right' amount of L1 use in FLT and what is the teachers' standpoint. Some researchers have attempted to quantify this 'right' amount of L1 use in a foreign language classroom (Vold and Brkan 2020, 2). Ellis and Shintani (2014, 233–235) have stated that more than 50% of the L1 is not acceptable, and Macaro (2005, 82) agrees with them by suggesting that 10–15% of L1 use could be a relatively close estimate of the right amount. However, even though these kinds of recommendations for the optimal use of the L1 might guide teachers in TL and L1 use, the language use of a classroom is always context-dependent and cannot be generalized (Vold and Brkan 2020, 2). As stated earlier by Littlewood and Yu (2011, 64), studies have found as much as 90% use of the L1 in a foreign language classroom, even when the teachers are native speakers of the TL, so there is significant variation in L1 use in individual classrooms.

Teachers' TL use naturally proceeds with students' age and proficiency in the TL (Tammenga-Helmantel et al. 2020, 3). However, research has identified several pedagogical reasons to use the L1 in FLT instead of the TL. Polio and Duff's (1994, 317) research describes several functions for which teachers use the L1. These include teaching

grammar, vocabulary instruction and classroom management (ibid.). Cook (2001, 413–416) includes conveying meanings, giving grammar explanations, organizing tasks, maintaining discipline, and teacher gaining contact with students as functions where the L1 can be more useful that the TL. Cook describes the use of such functions of the L1 as positive and argues that explaining grammar and organizing the classroom using the L1 is more efficient and assists students' understanding (ibid.). Conversely, Cook claims that disciplining students through the L1 makes the act of disciplining seem more serious to the students, thus making it more effective (ibid.) Teacher's use of the students' L1 can also result from affective factors: "It has been demonstrated that teachers use the L1 to build rapport with their students, and to express empathy and solidarity." (Riordan 2015, 167). In these situations, the teacher has to consider whether the pedagogical advantage of using the TL outweighs the value that the L1 has in providing security and support to the students (Littlewood and Yu 2011, 72). According to Crichton (2009, 19), learners understand grammar and vocabulary definitions more quickly if they are taught in their L1. Lesson organization and supervising students have also been found to be more effective in the L1 (ibid.). On the other hand, Crichton points out that some researchers consider this kind of controlled use of the TL in a learning situation detrimental to learners' need to respond to real-life situations where exposure to the TL cannot be predicted (ibid.).

Vold ja Brkan (2020, 3) have found that there is less variation in the situations where the L1 is used than in its amount of use. The teaching of grammar and culture-related topics in the L1 are established practices, and the L1 is also often used in classroom management, complex instructions and building rapport (ibid.). Regarding the language choice for the teaching of grammar, there appears to be a near consensus on that grammar should be taught in the students' L1, except in teaching contexts where there is a strict TL-only policy. Edstrom (2006) tries to challenge this view in her study where she observed her own teaching practices. Edstrom describes how she tries to explain grammar to the students both in the L1 and the TL, and justifies this by stating that the teacher must evaluate the efficacy of an explanation in the TL in contrast to the comprehensibility of an explanation given in the L1 (Edstrom 2006, 285). Nevertheless, the respective uses of the TL and the L1 in certain functions in a classroom are quite established for both teachers and student teachers according to research on the topic (Bateman 2008, 25–26).

Based on this research on the L1, the supportive role of the L1 in FLT is acknowledged, but the TL is still considered essential for the development of students' communicative language abilities. Macaro (2005, 80–81) summarizes the use of the TL and L1 by stating that teachers should use the TL as much as is useful and equally use the L1 when there is pedagogical validity for it. If the TL is used exclusively in FLT, it may create an artificial atmosphere, especially if the teachers and students share the same first language (Riordan 2015, 168). This complexity around the language choices of the classroom suggests that clear guidance for teachers' TL use is required so that they can more easily employ research-supported practices in their teaching.

2.3 Classroom management

Classroom management is a central part of teaching regardless of the subject. It is an aspect of teaching that can prove to be difficult for novice teachers (Macías 2018, 154), which makes it an interest of this study as well. Furthermore, in foreign language teaching, the language choice of classroom management creates an interesting standpoint to the topic. There is extensive research on classroom management from a general educational perspective but the topic has not been studied much on the context of FLT (Macías 2018, 154).

In a study by Macías (2018), the importance of viewing classroom management in the context of FLT is emphasized. Macías (2018, 54) states that certain features of foreign language instruction, such as target language use, interaction patterns, and communicative competence, ought to be examined as they may either hinder or facilitate the development of a teacher's classroom management skills. This examination is important from future foreign language teachers' point of view as they have to promote these features while simultaneously maintaining classroom management (ibid.). Macías summarizes the definition of *classroom management* as follows: "[M]ost of the previous conceptions of classroom management highlight the construction of an appropriate atmosphere in the classroom so that teaching and, consequently, learning can occur." (Macías 2018, 54). Concrete examples of aspects related to classroom management are: discipline, dealing with individual differences and mixed-ability classes, organization of class work, sitting arrangement, and noise (ibid.).

Previous studies on the language choice of classroom management in FLT have found that the students' L1 is often used to discipline, dealing with behavioral issues and

building relations between the teacher and the students (Franklin 1990, 20; Vold and Brkan 2020, 3), whereas TL is used in instructions related to classroom organization (Franklin 1990, 20). In a study conducted to examine English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' language choice for classroom discipline more closely, Kang (2013, 160) observed and interviewed two Korean EFL teachers. The results of this study revealed that one of the teachers preferred using the TL for classroom management because of their high proficiency in the TL, whereas the other teacher's low proficiency and lack of confidence in their own TL use drove them to revert to L1 use. Bateman (2018, 18–19) has focused on the language of classroom management from student teachers' perspective, and has found that when student teachers had to manage the classroom, they avoided using the TL because they felt that they would lose control of the class unless they used the L1 in classroom management. Interestingly, one of the participants in Bateman's study indicated that her teacher educator had asked her to focus on classroom management instead of using the TL (Bateman 2008, 19). This finding contributes to the significance of classroom management abilities in teachers' work, as in this particular case they were valued as more important than TL use in the teaching situation.

Based on this brief review on the roles of TL and L1 in classroom management, the factors that seem to affect teachers' language choice in classroom management are related to the teacher's own proficiency and confidence in using the TL. The functions in classroom management that are considered easier to perform in the L1 are maintaining discipline, dealing with behavioral issues and building relations. As the teacher's own abilities and qualities are emphasized in the language use of classroom management, Macías (2018, 164) suggests more education in the topic for new teachers, so that they are prepared to cope with classroom management issues in their future work.

2.4 Code-switching

In this section, the term *code-switching* will be discussed as it is a linguistic phenomenon that appears in multilingual contexts, which an English lesson in a Finnish school can be considered as. As the present study focuses on teachers' target language use, code-switching will be discussed here from teachers' perspective, although code-switching can equally occur in students' speech. A significant part of foreign language teaching is the communication between students who speak their first language and a teacher who (for the most part) speaks the TL. In order to make this communication easier, teachers can

occasionally change the language they speak from the TL to students' L1 so that students understand the meanings the teacher is trying to convey (Cook 2001, 407). This changing of languages between students' L1 and the TL is called code-switching. Cook (2001, 407) justifies the use of code-switching as a pedagogical approach by stating that meanings in the TL and in L1 are not separate in the students' minds but rather intertwined, and for this reason, using both TL and L1 in teaching benefits students.

As discussed earlier**,** there is research to support the use of the L1 in language teaching, in spite of the previous views in the field of SLA supporting solely the use of the TL in FLT. Butzkamm (2003) points out that code-switching is normal in communication between bilinguals, whereupon its use in FLT should be normalized as well. Teachers have a considerable role in normalizing code-switching as a teaching practice. Macaro (2018, 38–39) has created a working definition for optimal use of codeswitching to assist the process of normalizing code-switching in FLT: "*[O]ptimal use* is where codeswitching in broadly communicative classrooms can enhance second language acquisition and/or proficiency better than second language exclusivity." Similar to the arguments presented earlier for making the L1 a resource to language learning instead of a threat, Macaro's optimal use of code-switching recommends the use of code-switching in situations where it can enhance learning.

Translanguaging is a concept related to code-switching. Translanguaging was developed in bilingual teaching in Wales, where the conscious changing of the language of teaching between the TL and the students' L1 was first utilized in FLT (Park 2015, 50). Translanguaging resembles code-switching in that both terms refer to changing the language in speech in a natural manner similar to bilinguals' speech (ibid.) According to Park (2015, 50–51), the aim of translanguaging as a pedagogical approach in FLT is to broaden the students' linguistic capacity and possibilities to communicate. In Wang's (2019, 138) study on translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms, students were found to benefit from the use of the translanguaging approach, however some teachers saw incorporating multilingualism into teaching as difficult. When applying code-switching and translanguaging in FLT, it is important to consider whether there is a aspiration for the teaching environment to be multilingual or purely focused on the TL. In SLA, code-switching has been viewed as a problematic phenomenon when it is used by a student in order to resort to their L1 while using the TL because their proficiency in the TL is insufficient (Söderberg Arnfast and Jørgensen 2003, 25). As a contrast to this

view is Cook's (2001) idea of both the TL and the L1 being beneficial for a student's foreign language learning as they support each other in the learner's mind.

In their research, Hall and Cook (2012, 279) give an example from English-medium primary classrooms in Botswana, where code-switching from English into the students' own language helped to create a 'safe space', in which learners were found to participate more to a lesson. Other researchers have also come to the conclusion that a safe environment in a foreign language classroom establishes a fruitful starting point for the use of TL. Maijala (2018, 117; my translation) writes that: "A permissive atmosphere and good interaction between the students and the teacher creates a feeling of safety for the students. In this manner, a trust develops between the students and the teacher." However, the classroom might not always be the most encouraging environment for creating a safe space for the purposes of TL use. The classroom is often viewed as artificial compared to the environment where the L1 is acquired (Crichton 2009, 20). However, for the students it usually is a familiar and real environment, and the atmosphere that the teacher creates to the classroom has a significant influence on the students feeling of a 'safe space'. As the use of code-switching is proven to assist in creating a safe environment for students' TL use, its use should be encouraged more. Based on this research on code-switching and translanguaging, these approaches can aid in creating a safe environment for TL use in a classroom, however the manner in which they are incorporated into teaching is left for each individual teacher to decide.

3 Teachers and student teachers' target language use

This section will focus on the previous research on teachers and student teachers' target language use and discuss the distinctive characteristics of these two groups' TL use. As mentioned earlier, research on teacher-talk reveals that teachers' speech form the majority of the duration of a lesson (Ellis 2012, 117), and thus it has a considerable influence on students. Crichton (2009, 32) points out that in a foreign language classroom, students have to focus even more on the language the teacher uses and the meanings it carries as opposed to teaching where the instruction is entirely in their first language. Studies have shown that most language teachers adapt their use of the TL according to the level of the students (Ellis 2012, 117). This adaptation can be carried out for example by taking longer breaks, adapting vocabulary, or repeating more (ibid.) Maijala (2018, 118) also discusses the manner in which teachers adapt their TL use to students' proficiency by writing that teachers try to use the TL so that they take into account what learners already know and aiming their speech to an average students' level. It is also common that the teacher adapts their language of instruction in the midst of teaching, for example in order to teach grammar in the students' L1 (ibid.). According to Maijala (2018, 118), the manner in which the teacher adapts their language in teaching depends on the difficulty of the task, the target group, the teacher's conception of the TL and the students' conception of the TL.

At the same time, from the student's perspective, the use of the L1 during a lesson is also an important means of gathering explicit information about the TL, although students also often know that they also need to be exposed to the TL in order to learn a foreign language (Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney 2008, 269). Crichton (2009, 20) echoes this by claiming that teachers need to make students aware of grammar systems in the L1 in order to ensure that they understand grammatical explanations in an exam situation. For the purposes of learning pronunciation and intonation, students have to be exposed to the TL (ibid.) As students have to hear the TL in order to learn it, but also study some aspects, such as grammar, in the L1, exposing students to the optimal amount of TL and L1 is largely left to the teacher to determine. This in turn leads to significant variation in TL use depending on the teacher, as different amounts and different manners of the TL are used (Vold and Brkan 2020, 3). Bateman (2008, 12) agrees on the variation of teachers' TL use by stating that "the actual proportion of class time in which the target language is spoken varies greatly from instructor to instructor." Vold and Brkan (2020, 13)

summarize the teachers' significant role in determining the TL input by stating: "Ultimately, it is the teacher who is responsible for how the TL is used in class. Teachers should familiarize themselves with strategies to enhance TL use, [. . .] and try them out in their own classrooms."

Tammenga-Helmantel, Mossing Holsteijn and Bloemert (2020, 4) have listed factors that influence the teachers' use of TL and grouped these factors into three categories: personal, teaching practice-related and external. According to Tammenga-Helmantel et al., personal factors include for example uncertainty about pedagogical skills and insufficient knowledge of the TL. An example of a factor related to teaching practices could be learners' refusal to use the TL, whereas an example of an external factor could be administrative practices related to TL use (ibid.). According to Tammenga-Helmantel et al. (2020, 2) experienced foreign language teachers find especially personal and teaching practice-related factors challenging in TL use.

Riordan's (2015, 177) study conducted on teaching of German in Ireland revealed that there is a clear discrepancy in the amount of TL that the policy of TL use expects and the actual TL use by teachers. In this study, the teachers had estimated that they use TL 58% of the time, however in reality it was used only 43% of time (ibid.). Hall and Cook (2012, 285) have also remarked this discrepancy between teachers' estimate of TL use and the actual use of the TL, and point out that teachers tend to underestimate the extent to which they use the L1, which might be a result of their "underlying negative attitudes and beliefs about bilingual teaching." Littlewood and Yu (2011, 64) claim that some teachers may consider their use of the L1 as acceptable and some feel guilty for "not using the TL enough." These studies indicate that teachers' attitudes and anxiety towards TL use seem to be factors that can affect TL use significantly.

Student teachers' TL use has been significantly less studied than that of teachers. As stated in the preceding section, the teacher's TL use has a significant role in students' exposure to the TL and thus to their learning of the TL. In the beginning of their teaching career, novice teachers have to divide their focus between multiple things at the same time, and the optimal use of the TL might not be the first thing on their mind. However, novice teachers should consider at least to some level how they will use TL in teaching, as it is a key component in FLT.

According to Crichton (2009), in language teacher education in Scotland, student teachers are encouraged to use the TL, but they are given little concrete advice on how to use the target language in teaching. Bateman (2008, 12) notes that even if student teachers

receive instruction to TL use in their studies, it might still be difficult for them to apply the theoretical knowledge to practice without sufficient guidance from a teacher educator or colleague. As mentioned above, the use of the TL in teaching in Finland is guided by the National Curriculum, but there is little research on the guidance on TL use that student teachers receive in their training.

Previous research on student teachers' use of TL and its challenges has been conducted by Bateman (2008), who has studied the attitudes and beliefs of student teachers regarding the use of TL. In her research, Bateman lists several factors that influence student teachers' choice to either use or avoid TL in their teaching. Bateman's research reveals that, for example lack of time, lack of confidence in their own teaching skills and inability to speak English well enough are factors that student teachers find challenging in TL use (2008, 25–26). These challenges cause student teachers to avoid teaching culture or grammar in the TL, use frequent code-switching, and immediately translate TL statements to the L1 (ibid.). As a reason for student teachers' avoidance of TL use in a classroom, Bateman suggests student teachers' lack of skills in making their target language speech comprehensible to students (ibid.). One of the more recent studies in student teachers' TL use is Tammenga-Helmantel, Mossing Holsteijn and Bloemert's (2020) research on how EFL student teachers develop in their TL use. The results of this study revealed that student teachers' TL use is similar to that of experienced teachers (Tammenga-Helmantel et al. 2020, 23). Furthermore, this study emphasizes teacher educators' role in supporting novice teachers in their TL use (ibid.)

Student teachers have a great deal of experiential knowledge of teachers' TL use from their own school years and this knowledge can be useful in the beginning of their own teaching career. In addition to this, theoretical knowledge is naturally needed. Unfortunately, it seems that university education cannot always guarantee that student teachers receive an adequate basis for their TL use, as Riordan (2015, 172–173) points out: "Teacher trainers note that the conflicting message regarding target language use from the syllabus and examination structure make it difficult to give student teachers clear guidance on target language use."

This review of previous studies on TL and the use of the TL by teachers and student teachers shows that researchers' views on the relationship between the TL and the L1 in a foreign language classroom range from the L1 being an obstacle in TL learning, to the L1 supporting the students' learning of the TL (Cook 2001, 403–404). Some researchers encourage teachers to maximize the use of TL in foreign language classrooms, whereas

others put emphasis on the beneficial use of L1 in certain functions (cf. Turnbull and Arnett 2002, 211; Macaro 2005, 80–81; Ellis 2012, 77). In the midst of these opposing views, teachers and student teachers are expected to be able to determine the optimal amount and manner of TL use in their teaching, as there is no united policy or guideline to assist them.

According to the research on TL use, challenging aspects for teachers include students' proficiency in the TL, students' behavior, teacher's confidence in their own TL use, and external factors such as departmental ethos (Franklin 1990). As for the respective functions of TL and L1, the TL used for simple instructions and chatting, whereas the L1 is used for classroom management, teaching grammar and complex instructions (Polio and Duff 1994; Cook 2001). The studies covered in section 2 also indicate that it is often easier for the teacher to use the L1 for the purposes of classroom management if they are insecure about their proficiency in the TL (Kang 2013; Bateman 2018). Furthermore, there is a request to normalize code-switching in FLT as its use promotes a safe environment in a classroom and benefits learners (Cook 2001; Wang 2019).

In section 3, the review on the previous research on teachers and student teachers' TL use revealed that a common ground for teachers' TL use appears to be the teachers' tendency to proportion their own TL use to students' proficiency in the TL (Ellis 2012). Experienced foreign language teachers find especially personal (i.e. lack of confidence in pedagogical skills) and teaching practice-related factors (i.e. student-related issues) challenging in TL use (Tammenga-Helmantel et al. 2020). Previous studies indicate that teachers' attitudes and anxiety towards TL use also have a significant influence on their TL use (Hall and Cook 2012; Littlewood and Yu 2011). As for student teachers, their TL use is studied less than that of teachers, but researchers have remarked that the principal issues in student teachers' TL use are lack of confidence in their own teaching skills and inability to speak English well enough, which are a result of lacking knowledge in how to make TL comprehensible to students (Bateman 2008). Based on the previous research on TL use, there is significant variation in teachers' TL use in the case of individual teachers but also in the TL use between different schools and different countries (Vold and Brkan 2020). According to the studies discussed here, student teachers are encouraged to use the TL, but they are given little concrete advice on how to use it in teaching, which indicates that this is an issue that has to be addressed in teacher education (Bateman 2008). Recurring themes that surfaced in this review of the research on teachers' TL use include: TL use in teaching, fluency of TL use, amounts of TL use,

challenges in TL use, TL use in classroom management, functions of TL use, and instruction of TL use in studies. These themes will be discussed on in the analysis section of this study.

In this study, I want to find out how Finnish teachers and student teachers use TL in teaching. The current study seeks answers to the following research questions:

Main research question:

- How do teachers and student teachers view target language use in a classroom?

Supporting research questions:

- What kinds of possible challenges there are in target language use for teachers and student teachers?
- In what kinds of contexts do teachers and student teachers use target language in the classroom?
- How do teachers and student teachers' views on target language use in a classroom differ from each other?

The main research question is quite straightforward in the sense that the aim of this study is to gain general information on how teachers and student teachers in Finland view their own TL use. With the main research question, I am trying to find out what kinds of effects for example teachers and student teachers' TL use in their free time or their planning of TL use has on their TL use during a lesson. Moreover, I will try to determine whether the participants feel that TL use in a classroom is natural to them. I will also ask the teachers to estimate the amount of their TL use during a lesson.

As for the supporting research questions, they were formulated based on themes that have Franklin (1990) has identified challenges so these aspects are of interest to the current study in order to expand the perspective of how TL is used by teachers and student teachers in Finland. As I have now discussed the previous studies on TL and L1 use in teaching and the research on TL use by teachers and student teachers, as well as presented the research questions of this study, in the following sections I will first shortly go through the theoretical background for my data analysis (section 4) and then move on to discuss the data gathering methods that I have chosen for this study.

4 Schmidt's strategy for analysis of semi-structured interviews

Christiane Schmidt's (2004) strategy for analysis of semi-structured interviews supports theoretical prior understanding without rejecting explicit pre-assumptions and it aims at aiding the researcher to respond to the conducted interviews. Schmidt's strategy has five stages:

1) material-oriented formation of analytical categories
2) assembly of the analytical categories into a guide for coding
3) coding of the material
4) quantifying surveys of the material
5) detailed case interpretations

In the first stage, categories for the analysis of the interviews are set up in response to the material. This can only be done after an intensive and repeated reading of the material (Schmidt 2004, 254). In this stage, prior knowledge of the theoretical background and the research questions are utilized when searching for recurring aspects in the material, however, the researcher should focus on the aspects the interviewees supplement or omit and whether they bring up any new aspects (ibid.). Schmidt points out that in this first stage, the interviews should not be compared with each other, but it is useful to look for similarities and differences in them. On the basis of the discovered aspects, the analytical categories are then formulated in response to existing theoretical concepts.

Secondly, Schmidt (2004, 255) explains that the categories formulated in the first stage will be assembled into an analytical guide so that they can be analyzed and coded in the third stage. The analytical categories are tested and evaluated and as a result of this process they may be refined, made more distinctive or completely omitted from the coding guide (ibid.). As mentioned above, in the third stage of Schmidt's strategy, all of the interviews are coded according to the analytical categories, which means relating particular parts of the interviews to these categories. Schmidt (2004, 256) points out that there should not be overlap within the categories, so they have to be formulated distinctively.

In the fourth stage, on the basis of coding, case overviews are produced and compiled in quantifying surveys, for example in the form of tables (Schmidt 2004, 257). The quantifying surveys consist of frequencies in the analytical categories and point to possible relationships that can be used in a qualitative analysis (ibid.). The case overviews form the basis for the fifth and final stage, in which detailed case interpretations are created (ibid.). Schmidt explains that the aims of this stage might include discovering new

hypotheses or revising existing theoretical frameworks. As a consequence of the interpretations, a motivated selection of cases is used for more detailed analysis and the results are recorded in written form (ibid). Schmidt summarizes the process for analyzing semi-structural interviews by stating:

> The guiding principle in this analytical strategy is the interchange between material and theoretical prior knowledge. This interchange process begins not only when the data are available in a transcribed form, but at the beginning of the data collection. [. . .] In the course of this interchange process the theoretical pre-assumptions may also be refined, questioned and altered.
> (Schmidt 2004, 253)

The methodological approach of this study follows Schmidt's guidelines by going back to the theoretical framework set in sections 2 and 3 and thus formulating the analysis of the results in section 6.

5 Data and methodology

The present study is a qualitative study that aims at examining target language use in a classroom from the perspective of English teachers and student teachers. The method used to gather data were interviews, more specifically *semi-structured interviews*, which can also be called *theme-centered interviews* (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008, 47; my translation). After the interviews, the analysis of the data was implemented using the strategy for analysis of semi-structured interviews by Christiane Schmidt (2004). In the following subsections, I will first discuss the participants of this study. Next, I will present the interview more profoundly and explain how it was conducted. Lastly, I will describe how data analysis was done.

5.1 Participants

The participants of the current study consist of four teachers and three student teachers. All of the other participants are females, except for one of the student teachers. In this study, references to the different teachers and student teachers will be made using their ages and titles (e.g. 38-year-old teacher, 24-year-old student teacher) in order to protect their privacy. Prior to collecting the data, the interviewees were informed that they will remain anonymous in the study.

All of the English teachers that participated in the study are qualified to teach both English and Swedish. Two of them graduated from Finnish universities as Masters of Education with English and Swedish as their minor subjects and are consequently qualified as both class teachers and language teachers. The 33-year-old teacher has seven years of teaching experience in primary education (grades 1-6) and currently works as a class teacher and language teacher in a Finnish elementary school. The 47-year-old teacher has 25 years of teaching experience in primary and lower secondary education (grades 1-9) and also currently works as a class teacher and language teacher in an elementary school. The other two teachers graduated as Masters of Arts. The 38-year-old teacher has seven years of teaching experience in lower secondary education (grades 7-9) and has also taught in a university language center. She currently works in a middle school in Finland where in some of the classes that she teaches the language of instruction is predominantly English. The 54-year-old teacher has 25 years of teaching experience, mostly in primary education (grades 1-6) but is currently teaching in a Finnish high school

in Spain. As the four teachers come from different educational backgrounds and all levels of the Finnish school system are represented, the results of this study will reflect target language use in Finnish schools from various viewpoints.

The student teachers that participated in the study are in the age range of 23-25. All of them started studying English in a Finnish university in 2016 and the 23-year-old student teacher had completed her Teacher's Pedagogical Studies, but the two others were still finishing these studies at the time of the interviews. All of the participating student teachers have another language in addition to English that they are qualified to teach: the 23-year-old student teacher has Swedish, the 24-year-old student teacher has French, and the 25-year-old student teacher has Spanish. The 25-year-old student teacher is also bilingual and has Finnish and Spanish as his native languages. The participating student teachers were not expected to have work experience as teachers but they had to be either currently completing their Teacher's Pedagogical Studies or having had completed them during the last two years. The 25-year-old student teacher has not worked as a teacher before. The 24-year-old student teacher has teaching experience as a tutor and the 23-year-old student teacher has worked both as a substitute teacher and a language teacher in a high school alongside her studies. The prerequisite about completing the Teacher's Pedagogical Studies a maximum of two years prior emphasizes the fact that the participating student teachers are still students and therefore do not have a lot of work experience as teachers. In this way, the results of the current study can be expected to represent student teachers' perspective on target language use in particular, and to highlight the differences between experienced teachers and student teachers.

5.2 Interview

The data for the current study were gathered by conducting interviews with the teachers and student teachers. The type of interviews used was a theme-centered and semi-structured interview because I wanted the interview to proceed along with the themes obtained in researching teachers' TL use. According to Hirsjärvi and Hurme (2008, 48), a semi-structured interview focalizes the interviewees' interpretations and the meanings behind these interpretations, which is a desired point of view in this study.

Semi-structured interviews have a flexible nature, which enables the researcher to change the order and wording of questions, depending on the direction of the conversation (Kvale 2007). Researchers using semi-structured interviews often prepare a set of themes

or questions to discuss during the interview, so that the interview will go along with the intended themes and have a structure, albeit not a strict one (ibid.). This in mind, I created a set of interview questions founded on the themes set by the research that I had done on the topic. These themes are listed in subsection 5.3. I wrote questions that would cover the topic broadly and leave room for the interviewees' own thoughts, but to also ensure that they stay in the topic. Apart from the beginning of the interview, which included questions about the teachers and student teachers' background and their TL use in free time, the interviews proceeded quite freely and the questions were not necessarily discussed in the order that they appear in the set. This way, participants were allowed to speak without restrictions or the researcher forcing them to give specific answers to specific issues. Also, I was allowed to ask follow-up questions and further discuss certain issues and interesting points that were raised during the interview. The interview questions used (not in a particular order and not necessarily discussed with each participant) can be found in Appendix 1.

The qualitative nature of the study is also visible in the method used, as a narrative approach of interviewing was chosen as an approach in order to obtain information on the participants' own experiences and thoughts on using TL. According to Wengraf (2000, 111), narrative interviewing could be described to "[. . .] convey[s] tacit and unconscious assumptions and norms of the individual or of a cultural group. At least in some respects, they are less subject to the individual's conscious control" (2000, 116). By using the narrative approach, the interviewees probably, consciously or subconsciously, emphasize the matters that are the most valuable to them and are more truthful in their answers (Wengraf 2000, 116). In other words, the narrative interviewing method gives an insight into the personal ideals and practices that the teachers and student teachers have towards TL use. In order to successfully conduct a narrative interview, the researcher should listen to the answers "in an unhurried, alerted state", process them, and not rush through the questions (Wengraf 2000, 198). Based on this, I begun the interviews by asking how the interviewees were doing and chatting with them before proceeding with the recording and formal interviewing. This was done in order to make the interviewees relaxed and the situation conversational and natural. Another thing that was done to make the situation more comfortable was to give the interviewees the questions before the interviews. One of the participants said that they had just quickly looked through the questions because they did not want to think their answers through before the interview. Some of the participants had contemplated on some of the answers and topics that they

wanted to bring up. As the interviewer, I felt that all of the interviews resembled a conversation, whether the interviewee had pondered over the questions beforehand or not.

The interviews were conducted in the video communications platform *Zoom* in the spring of 2021. The teachers and student teachers participated in the interviews remotely and the interviews were then recorded with the record function on Zoom, which records both video and audio. However, only the audiotapes were used as they provide enough data and there was no need to analyze for example the interviewees' body language. Notes were not taken during the interviews in order to make the interview situation as conversational as possible. The data that were gathered during the interviews consists of seven audiotapes of which the total length is around 230 minutes, and the lengths of individual interviews range from 30 minutes to 40 minutes. The interviews were conducted in Finnish since that is the native language of all of the interviewees and the interviewer. The motivation to conduct the interviews in Finnish was also due to more natural and conversational approach to the subject as opposed to interviews done in English. Based on the interviewees' reactions, both the unhurried atmosphere and the language choice made the interview situation natural, which leads to realistic and reliable answers.

5.3 Data analysis

After the interviews with the teachers and student teachers were conducted, I transcribed the audiotapes from the interviews. The interviews are not transcribed verbatim as the focus of the current study is in the content of the interviewees' answers instead of the linguistic traits of their speech. For this reason, unnecessary repetitions, sounds, intonation etc. are not included in the transcriptions. During the transcription process, I made some initial notes, but the principal analysis of the teachers and student teachers' answers was done after the transcriptions were complete. In the transcription, I used some of the transcription conventions by Gumperz and Berenz (1993) (see Appendix 2). Any information that could reveal the teachers and student teachers' identities has been modified.

Some of the transcribed answers are used as examples in the analysis and discussion section (section 6). The original Finnish answers occurring in the examples of the analysis section are translated into English, italicized, and the originals are presented inside square brackets after the translations. When translating these parts of the interviews, I tried to

keep the translation as close to the original speech as possible by mimicking the interviewees' style of speaking and their register. The original meaning of the answers was preserved as closely as possible in the translation process. Additional information needed to clarify the context that the interviewee is referring to is inserted inside brackets to the answers. The transcribed data were then organized and defined in order to find the parts that are relevant to this study. That is, I searched the data for themes that emerge in the research I have done on the topic of this study. These themes include TL use in teaching, fluency of TL use, amounts of TL use, challenges in TL use, TL use in classroom management, functions of TL use, and instruction of TL use in studies.

I have analyzed the data using the strategy for analysis of semi-structured interviews by Christiane Schmidt (2004). Schmidt's strategy is presented in section 4 of this study. I chose to use Schmidt's strategy because it utilizes the dialogue between material and theoretical knowledge (2004, 253). Thus, it is convenient for the methodology used in this study, in which the theoretical pre-assumptions are altered and refined throughout the data collection and analysis. Schmidt's strategy is intended to be a guideline for the analysis of semi-structured interviews and I have applied it to the purposes of this study in accordance with the resources that I have.

According to Schmidt (2004, 254), "[t]he determination of the analytical categories begins with an intensive and repeated reading of the material". With this in mind, when beginning the analysis of the data, I read through the transcribed interviews several times and made notes each time. Following Schmidt's strategy, I first set up categories based on the theoretical background and research questions in this study. These categories closely follow the themes of the interviews and form the basis of the classification of the data in section 6. In the second stage of the data analysis, I created the coding guide by refining the categories based on the material from the interviews and then in accordance to the third stage, I started relating parts of the data in their respective categories. In the fourth stage of Schmidt's strategy, quantifying surveys are compiled, but as the sampling of this study is too small for quantitative purposes, I saw that compiling these surveys would not be profitable for the current study. In the fifth stage, based on the entity consisting of my notes, categorization of the data and knowledge of the theoretical framework, I compiled the results in a systematic way in order to answer the research questions set in the beginning of this study. In section 6, I will present the results and their detailed analysis in written form.

6 Analysis and discussion

In this section, I analyze the data conducted in the interviews with teachers and student teachers and answer the research questions set earlier. The aim is to establish a description of teachers and student teachers' views on target language use in teaching in Finland through their answers in the interviews. I will discuss the data taking into account themes that are based on the research done on this topic. The results and their analysis are grouped according to these themes, which include: TL use in teaching, fluency of TL use, amounts of TL use, challenges in TL use, TL use in classroom management, functions of TL use, and instruction of TL use in studies. Firstly, in subsection 6.1, I will examine how the teachers and student teachers use TL in their free time and describe the more general aspects of how they view TL use in teaching. Following that, in subsection (6.2), I will focus on the challenges in target language use that the teachers and student teachers voice in their interviews. Thirdly, in subsection 6.3, I will discuss the results related to the teachers and student teachers' use of TL in classroom management. In subsection 6.4, the different contexts of using TL during a lesson are examined, after which subsection 6.5 will cover the instruction of TL in the teachers and student teachers' studies and also shed light on their thoughts about using TL in the future. Lastly, in subsection 6.6 I will compare the teachers and student teachers' thoughts on TL use. Examples from the data will be provided throughout the analysis, and the findings will be discussed simultaneously.

6.1 General thoughts on target language use in a classroom

Before proceeding to describe the teachers and student teachers' general thoughts on target language use in a classroom, their TL use outside of teaching will be discussed shortly. In the beginning of the interviews, the teachers and student teachers were asked about their use of TL in their free time as this might give an insight to their TL use in the classroom as well. Furthermore, as the student teachers do not have a lot of experience in teaching yet, their thoughts on TL use in their free time elaborates the data conducted in their interviews.

Three out of the four teachers report that they use English extensively in their free time, usually when having conversations with friends from abroad. These teachers also voiced a fear of their language skills deteriorating if they do not use enough English at

work and in their free time. The 33-year-old teacher has conversations in English with foreign friends, which she finds enjoyable, as the language she uses with her friends is more varying that the one she uses with children while teaching. The 47-year-old teacher has taken several language courses aimed at teachers during her teaching career so that her target language skills stay up to date, which is especially important because she teaches English in primary school where the students' level of English is not very high. As for the 54-year-old teacher, she uses English on a daily basis in her free time because she lives abroad at the time of the interview. The 38-year-old teacher was the only teacher who reports that she does not use a lot of English outside of work. However, she feels that she gets to use enough English at work because in most of the classes that she teaches, the language of instruction is English.

As for the student teachers, they see speaking English in their free time as enjoyable and natural. They mention using English in their free time while talking with foreign friends, travelling or using social media. The 25-year-old student teacher plays videogames in English and has learned English by playing them. The 23-year-old student teacher says that she uses *Finglish,* a mixture between Finnish and English, to a great extent in her free time. Studying abroad has enhanced the 24-year-old student teacher's proficiency in spoken English.

After discussing the teachers and student teachers' TL use in their free time, the next section of the interview was concerned with using spoken English in teaching. All of the teachers and student teachers agree that using TL in teaching is important. The 54-year-old teacher thinks that her TL use is an example and motivation for the students. The 38-year-old teacher considers interaction in the TL in a classroom important so that students learn to use it outside of the classroom as well. In her opinion, the more TL students hear, the better. The 47-year-old teacher says that it is important that students also hear real-life TL use from other English-speakers than just herself and in order to enable this, she sometimes calls her foreign friends during a lesson and the students get to discuss with them. As for the 33-year-old teacher, she highlights the spoken aspect of the language as just as important as the written aspect:

(1) In my opinion, there doesn't even exist, like, an idea that the spoken side [of a language] wouldn't be important, but it's just as important as the written side.
(33-year-old teacher)

The 33-year-old teacher tries to emphasize the importance of speaking English to her students. In her opinion, a teacher has to systematically plan how both themselves and the students use the TL during a lesson. For this reason, she also takes the spoken language into account in exams as well.

The student teachers agree on the importance of teacher's TL use as well. They suggest that even though students hear English daily in their free time, it is also important for them to hear it during lessons in order to reinforce the input. The 25-year-old student teacher justifies the importance of teachers' TL use by saying that the input that students receive from the teacher prepares them for real-life language use situations where the other language user is not always a native speaker, contrary to the TL use by native speakers they hear on tapes. According to the 24-year-old student teacher, the teacher's TL use in a classroom, for example when they say page numbers in English, creates important routines for students, and these routines help them follow the lesson and remember new words and phrases.

The teachers and student teachers were asked if TL use in teaching comes naturally to them and if speaking English in a classroom makes them nervous. These questions were included because previous research on student teachers' use of TL and its challenges by Bateman (2008) lists factors that influence student teachers' choice to either use or not use the TL in their teaching. This research reveals that, for example student teachers' lack of confidence in their ability to conduct a class in the TL might affect their TL use (Bateman 2008, 26). As an answer to these questions, the teachers report that TL use in the teaching situation comes naturally to them and they do not feel nervous about their TL use. The 47-year-old teacher reports that she is particularly confident about her TL use in teaching because she teaches in an elementary school where the structures that she uses are simple and things are repeated often. The teachers admit to making mistakes, checking up on words or asking help from the students from time to time when they are using the TL. In spite of not feeling nervous about TL use, the teachers report that they still have to concentrate on their TL use during a lesson. The 54-year-old teacher has noticed that often after giving instructions in Finnish, she has to consciously focus on changing back into English. The 38-year-old teacher reports that even though TL use comes naturally to her today, when she started teaching classes that have English as the predominant language of instruction, TL use caused her nervousness because some of the students are native English speakers:

(2) Yeah, it felt pretty exciting at first in the sense that a part of them [students] are native speakers of English after all. So, there was a kind of, not imposter syndrome, but not, like, having a great self-confidence in it [target language use] either. [. . .] Like 'What they are thinking?' and if I say something wrong or pronounce something so that they think that 'She can't even [speak English]', so in the beginning there was sort of self-criticism at its peak.
(38-year-old teacher)

However, she feels that nervousness and self-criticism towards her own TL use was problematic only when she had just started to teach these classes. After several years of experience in teaching, she feels confident about her TL use in a classroom.

The student teachers find that speaking in the TL in a classroom has made them a little nervous, especially in the beginning of their teacher training. Nevertheless, they feel confident about speaking in English and that teaching in the TL comes naturally to them. The student teachers think that an English teacher does not have to sound like a native speaker of English, as long as their TL use is fluent. However, the 23-year-old student teacher considers speaking in English in a teaching situation as unnatural language use, because when she teaches, she has to concentrate on the way in which she speaks and on the amount of TL that she uses. This differs from her target language use in a more natural situation, such as speaking English with her friends in her free time.

Even though the teachers and student teachers consider their TL use to be natural in a teaching situation, the 23-year-old student teacher has made the observation that her TL use in teaching is not as natural as her TL use in free time. The 33-year-old teacher also points out that in a teaching situation, she has to concentrate on the pace and clarity of her speech and her word choices, so that the language she speaks is in relation to the students' level in English, and this affects the naturalness of the language:

(3) But on the other hand, in my opinion it [the language] can't be too thought-out because there is the fact that it needs to sound and seem (outside) like 'I'm here doing this spontaneously and chatting with you [the students] here and this is a way of self-expression for me.' So, if it's too thought-out, if it's only based on those phrases [textbook phrases], then it doesn't feel natural to the students either because they think that 'Well, now I can only use these already existing phrases.'
(33-year-old teacher)

In example 2, the 33-year-old teacher explains that the textbook phrases that are repeated during lessons are important and stick in students' minds, but free and natural language production should not be forgotten either. She thinks that teacher's TL use should also convey emotions and not only include repeating textbook phrases. These answers show

that the teachers and student teachers are conscious about the quality of their TL use and want their English to sound natural in order for the students to have a realistic model of TL use. The teachers and teacher students seem to also realize that their TL use has to be authentic, which reflects on Riordan's statement of how TL use can create an artificial atmosphere, especially if the teachers and students share the same first language (Riordan 2015, 168). Overall, the teachers and student teachers' answers of the importance and naturalness of TL use and their considering of the authenticity of TL use indicate a positive and realistic attitude towards TL use.

The teachers were also asked to give an estimate of the percentage of their lesson that is usually in the TL. The student teachers were not asked to answer this question during the interviews as they do not have adequate experience of teaching in order to give reliable estimates. The 54-year-old teacher is unable to give a certain percentage of the amount of TL that she uses per lesson, because her TL use depends on the group she is teaching. In general, she proportions her TL use to students' age and proficiency in English. The 33-year-old teacher reports that she also proportions her TL use to the students' age. She estimates that with Grades 3 and 4, 50% of a lesson is in English, whereas with Grades 5 and 6 already 70% of the lesson is in English. The 47-year-old teacher says that she aims at using the TL at least 50% of the time, but often this does not materialize. As for the 38-year-old teacher, the amounts of TL use are different because she currently teaches mostly classes that have English as the predominant language of instruction and with these classes 100% of the lesson is in English.

As the preceding percentages are only the teachers own estimates of TL use, they cannot be proportioned to the research that for example Ellis and Shintani (2014) have conducted on the 'right' amount of TL and L1 use during a lesson. However, they still give an insight into how much TL is used in Finnish classrooms and into the teachers' own idea of their TL use. One of the teachers was unable to estimate the amount of TL that she uses and one teacher mostly teaches classes that have English as the predominant language, but the other two teachers report using TL over 50% of the time with students who are in Grade 3 or older. These estimates are lower than what Ellis and Shintani (2014, 233–235) or Macaro (2005, 82) consider a sufficient amount of L1 use. Studies have also shown that in some cases the TL is used only 10% of the lesson (Littlewood and Yu 2011, 64), so compared to that amount the Finnish teachers' estimates are considerably higher. However, Hall and Cook (2012, 285) note that there is a discrepancy between teachers'

estimate of TL use and the actual use of the TL, so these estimates should be considered as indicative.

Another aspect that was discussed in the interviews was the planning of TL use before a lesson, because the way in which TL use is planned – or whether it is planned at all – will presumably also affect its use. The results indicate that participants have divergent views on planning their TL use before lessons. The 54-year-old teacher does not plan TL use before lessons because she thinks that often lessons are so unpredictable that there is no use to make plans for TL use. This view is echoed by the 33-year-old teacher, who does not feel the need to plan TL use in individual lessons because using the TL has become automatic to her. However, she explains that she plans her TL use before each schoolyear so that she can adjust the language that she uses to each grade's level in English. The 38-year-old teacher's response to planning her TL use is that she considers TL to a great extent when planning a lesson, especially with classes that have English as the predominant language of instruction, and even makes lesson plans for herself in English. The 47-year-old teacher takes TL into consideration when planning lessons as well, an does it by deciding which things she will say in Finnish and which in English. She also thinks that she would use more time to plan her TL use if she had more resources for planning.

When it comes to the student teachers, the 24-year-old student teacher says that she does not plan TL use before lessons because she feels that her TL use had quickly become automatic during the teacher training. She also argues that compared to the French lessons that she has taught, she does not have to focus on her TL use during English lessons nearly as much as in French lessons because the students hear English outside of school, whereas in French she is the main source of input for them. This indicates that the 24-year-old student teacher has realized that in French lessons, her exposing students to the TL is essential for the development of their communicative language abilities (Vold and Brkan (2020, 2), which is why she has to focus on it more than while teaching English.

The 23-year-old student teacher reports that she plans her own target language use to some extent before a lesson. However, she explains that she rather considers how many opportunities the students have to use target language during a lesson. As for the 25-year-old student teacher, he says that he takes target language use into consideration in planning the lesson if the topic of the lesson is for example new vocabulary. Due to his bilingualism, using English in teaching comes more naturally to him than using Finnish.

For this reason, he explains that instead of planning his target language use during a lesson, he plans how he will use Finnish in a way in which students understand him.

According to these results, some of the teachers and student teachers feel that there is no need to plan how they are going to use the TL ahead of lessons, while others consider the planning of TL use important and would use even more time to it if they had unlimited time to plan lessons. This considerable difference in the manner of planning TL use is interesting. The participants who do not report planning their TL use say that their TL use during a lesson is automatic or there is no point in planning ahead as every lesson is different. On the contrary, most the participants who plan their TL use do not specify whether the reason behind the planning is connected to the students or the teacher themselves. However, one of the student teachers says that she focuses on adapting the TL use during a lesson to the students' proficiency level, which supports Ellis' (2012, 117) observation on how most of the teachers adapt their TL use to correspond to the students' level. At least for this student teacher, the motivation to plan TL use is related to the students' needs. The teachers and student teachers were not asked how they think their planning or not planning TL use before a lesson affects their TL use during the lesson, so no indications of this can be made.

In this subsection, I have analyzed and discussed the teachers and student teachers' general thoughts and views on TL use in free time and in teaching. The aim of this section is to answer the main research question of this study: How do teachers and student teachers view target language use in a classroom? All of the teachers and student teachers consider teacher's TL use to be important for students' learning. In their opinion, TL use has a positive effect on students' motivation and courage to use English outside the classroom, and they believe that hearing a non-native speaker use English benefits students. They also report adapting their TL use to students' level in English, which supports previous research (Ellis 2012, 117).

The teachers also explain that TL use comes naturally to them both in their free time and in teaching. The 54-year-old teacher points out that after she has used in English in her free time, it is easier for her to speak English in a teaching situation as well. This indicates that using English in free time has a positive connection to TL use in the classroom. The teachers also think that an English teacher can make mistakes in TL use in a teaching situation, which shows a relaxed and realistic approach to TL use. Furthermore, the teachers' concern over their own language skills possibly deteriorating might indicate that they see their own TL use as an important model for the students and

want to maintain it. Two of the teachers had taken additional language courses outside of their work, which shows that sustaining an adequate level in the TL is a priority to them.

The student teachers also feel that TL use comes naturally to them and share the same relaxed attitude with the teachers about making mistakes in the TL. In spite of these views on TL use, two of the student teachers mention nervousness and lack of confidence related to speaking English in a classroom. This can be expected from novice teachers and some of it can be explained with the stress from the novelty of the teaching situation as a whole, not just from the use of TL in the teaching situation. For the student teachers, the section about TL use in teaching is based on their limited experience in teaching, which should be kept in mind when interpreting their answers. However, the results related to nervousness and lack of confidence reflect Bateman's results (2008, 26).

6.2 Challenges in target language use

In this subsection, I will discuss the challenges in target language use that the teachers and student teachers voice in their interviews. Thus, the subsection seeks to answer the second research question: What kinds of possible challenges are there in target language use for the teachers and student teachers? Almost all of the teachers and student teachers report that there are challenges in TL use, but the aspects they see as challenging are quite different for every interviewee.

The teachers consider acknowledging students' different proficiencies in the TL and especially the weaker students' understanding of the teacher's TL use as the main challenges in TL use for them. The teachers' answers regarding the challenges in TL use are consistent with the findings of Franklin (1990) whose categorization includes the ability mix of the class as a problematic factor in teachers' TL use. The 54-year-old teacher points out that some of her students do not understand anything that she says in English. The 38-year-old teacher notes that students are often shy to use the TL, even in private situations where there is just her and the student, which means that for many students, even opening their mouth to use English is a big challenge. The 54-year-old teacher has also noticed that sometimes students who are good in English ask her to speak only English during a lesson, but she cannot do this to the weaker students who are too ashamed to admit that they do not understand. The 47-year-old teacher echoes this by saying that it is difficult to use TL in a way that benefits both the advanced students and

students who do not understand anything. She gives a concrete example of students' different levels and need for differentiation:

> (4) I made four versions of the same exam for a class that has 13 students. So, there is one [student] who only studies words and then one who does a kind of downward differentiated exam, then there's the majority who do the normal exam and then one who does a more difficult exam. So, there are (a lot of things) that I have to take into account when I speak.
> (47-year-old teacher)

Even though the 47-year-old teacher gives an example of differentiation in exams and not in the use of spoken language, the example illustrates quite well how big the differences in proficiency can be even inside a single class. In order to benefit both the advanced and lower proficiency students, the 47-year-old teacher has divided students into groups based on their proficiency in English. She reports that this division made her own TL use easier because she has been able to give the advanced group more input in the TL, whereas with the group that has lower proficiency in English, she has used more Finnish. She noticed that when divided into groups, students themselves use the TL more actively as well.

The 54-year-old teacher says that she often finds herself thinking about students whose auditive skills are not strong and how much of her TL use these students understand. She considers it difficult to take into account both the whole groups' proficiency in English and at the same time the individual students' proficiencies and adjusting her own TL use to these proficiencies. The 54-year-old teacher has also reflected on the teacher's TL use from the perspective of the student because as a language student herself (she studies Spanish) she feels distressed if she does not understand what her Spanish teacher is saying:

> (5) I, like, feel that it is really difficult having different learners in every group. And also, as a Spanish student myself, I have now noticed that it is very distressing if you don't understand what the teacher is saying at all, the safe [study] environment suffers from that. [. . .] Feeling safe in a communicative situation and so on, so that you wouldn't have to fear. That is problematic for some [learners] if the teacher speaks in English.
> (54-year-old teacher)

The 47-year-old teacher emphasizes the need for a safe environment in the classroom as well, however that need often contradicts with the teacher's ideal of using more TL in teaching:

> (6) I mean it would be awfully great to be able to use [English] all the time, but then many of the students would miss out on the lesson and they would

become anxious there and then it would be a totally horrible subject when they wouldn't understand anything. So, you have to maintain that feeling of safety and motivation by saying [things] in Finnish even though many of them would understand it in English too.
(47-year-old teacher)

The importance of a safe environment in the classroom and teachers' sensitivity concerning students' understanding of the TL are aspects that all teachers bring up in their answers. According to the teachers, another challenge in their TL use is related to time management, as the 54-year-old teacher explains:

(7) If there is an exercise that the students clearly don't know how to do, I don't think that there is any point in trying to use English when you just want to go ahead with the lesson.
(54-year-old teacher)

Sometimes teachers have to make the choice to use the L1 instead of the TL because there is not enough time to do a certain activity in English as it conflicts with the students' proficiency. Naturally, the choice to use the L1 reduces the amount of input in the TL. The 33-year-old teacher is the only teacher who does not see any significant challenges in TL use, neither for herself or the student. She thinks that students hear a lot of English outside of school and believes that to positive affect their TL use and understanding.

The main challenges in target language use that student teachers' report are different for every participant. The 23-year-old and 24-year-old student teachers consider assessing the students' level in the target language and adapting their own target language use to that level as the most challenging parts of target language use in teaching. The 24-year-old student teacher gives an example of a situation where she gave remedial instruction to a high school student in English and noticed that the student became anxious because she did not understand English well enough to understand what the student teacher was saying. The student teacher feels that she could have more observant with the student's level of English in that situation and that her lack of experience in teaching was the reason she was unable to assess the student's understanding of English. The 23-year-old student teacher considers determining the amounts of target language and L1 use as one of the biggest challenges in target language use in teaching. She explains that sometimes during a lesson the Finnish language "sticks with her" and after the lesson she questions whether she spoke enough English to the students:

(8) Well, during some lessons that [speaking English] kind of happens so that I speak it, like, almost the whole time. [. . .] But then sometimes it somehow

> feels, like, if there has been for example a grammar thing that I have covered in Finnish, then I feel that sometimes I don't remember to go back to speaking English or somehow Finnish like sticks with you and then after the lesson I'm like 'Okay now I spoke a lot of Finnish during this lesson.' as opposed to English.
> (23-year-old student teacher)

The 23-year-old student teacher suggests that it would be easier for her to only speak English during a lesson so that she would not speak too much Finnish. This reflects Littlewood and Yu's (2011, 64) results in that some teachers may feel guilty for "not using the TL enough."

For the 25-year-old student teacher, speaking in English in a classroom feels more natural and easier than speaking in Finnish because he is bilingual. He thinks that he cannot speak Finnish well enough in the teaching situation and would rather use English for this reason. He also feels that changing the language between Finnish and English during a lesson is challenging, which the other student teachers do not report in their interviews. Another challenge related to L1 use during a lesson that the 25-year-old student teacher mentions is using too many anglicisms, i.e. words or constructions borrowed from English to Finnish. During teacher training, his instructor recommended him to avoid this kind of excessive code-switching between English and Finnish in order for his language to be easier for the students to understand. The 25-year-old student teacher says that he is conscious of his use of anglicisms:

(9) The most difficult for me is when you have to switch [languages] in the middle [of a lesson]. [. . .] If I got to decide, I would do it [the teaching] fully in English. [. . .] When I speak in a language, I think in that language and then it's difficult for me to, like, go back and forth with the languages and of course with smaller students this doesn't work because you have to give for example instructions in Finnish, but then also offer the target language that they need to learn.
(25-year-old student teacher)

The 25-year-old student teacher finds code-switching between Finnish and English to be a negative factor in his TL use, but the teachers have noticed a rather positive effect. They report using similarities between English and Finnish as a means to facilitate students' learning, concrete examples of this being searching for English loan words from Finnish with the students or creating mnemonics for similar sounding words in the two languages. The 33-year-old teacher thinks that a deeper understanding of a language is only achieved when students understand the differences and similarities between languages, and for this reason languages should support each other in teaching. The

teachers' thoughts on code-switching seem to corroborate Cook's (2001, 407) idea of TL and L1 as interrelated in a learner's mind because like Cook, the teachers see using both Finnish and English in teaching as beneficial to students' learning of TL.

The challenges related to teacher's TL use in a classroom that appear in the teachers and student teachers' answers include: acknowledging students' proficiency in English and adapting their own TL use to that proficiency, significant differences in students' understanding of the TL, creating a safe environment that encourages TL use, determining the amounts of TL and L1 use during a lesson, and excessive code-switching while using the TL. These challenges reflect on the research of Tammenga-Helmantel et al. (2020, 2), in which experienced foreign language teachers found especially personal (e.g. lack of confidence in pedagogical skills) and teaching practice-related factors (e.g. student-related issues) challenging in TL use. On the contrary, external factors, such as school policy, were not considered as challenges.

As a means to facilitate the challenge in students' different proficiencies in English, the 47-year-old teacher brings up differentiation in the form of dividing students into groups based on their proficiency level in English. In these groups, students use the TL more actively during a lesson, so this solution seems to create a safe environment for the students, and in this way settles one of the challenges in TL use that the teachers voiced in their interviews. However, the division to proficiency level groups leads to polarization as other students get a lot of TL input from the teacher and others next to nothing. The results in this section indicate that the teachers experience different challenges in TL use than the student teachers do, and these differences will be discussed more in-depth in subsection 6.8.

6.3 Target language use in classroom management

The language choice of classroom management was discussed in the interviews with teachers and student teachers as well. According to Crichton (2009, 19), classroom management, which includes for example supervising the students' ability to follow rules, has been proven to be more efficient in the L1 than in the TL. For this reason, the teachers and student teachers' language choice for classroom management is a matter of interest for the current study.

The teachers' preferences in the language of classroom management are segmented. The 33-year-old teacher reports that classroom management should be done in L1 because

it is the students' native language and that makes classroom management clearer and easier for both the students and the teacher. The 38-year-old teacher thinks that classroom management might be easier in Finnish but in her experience, students usually understand instructions given in English as well. The 47-year-old teacher reports that she usually uses English in classroom management at first, but changes into Finnish when the students get used to the English instructions:

(10) Maybe they, [. . .] in the beginning, take it more seriously when they know, like, 'Silence please!' and these [other instructions]. But when they get used to them, then you have to instruct them in Finnish so that it sinks in.
(47-year-old teacher)

The 54-year-old teacher argues against the idea that classroom management is easier in L1:

(11) Sometimes you think that well, in Finnish I get the message through because in Finnish one says everything like 'Now listen to me!' [= in a harsher manner than in English]. But actually, sometimes I think that they [the students] quiet down when you speak in English because they have to make an effort [to understand] and no one wants to mess up, so they are like 'What is she saying and what are we supposed to do?'. [. . .] Sometimes the target language works just because they prick up their ears and want to know what happens.
(54-year-old teacher)

In spite of saying that the Finnish language sounds harsher, and in that way perhaps more commanding than English, the 54-year-old teacher thinks that students, especially younger ones, want to understand what the teacher is telling them to do in English. This might result in them listening to the instructions more carefully if the instructions are given in English. The 54-year-old teacher's notion contradicts with Cook's (2001, 413–416) claim of the act of disciplining being more serious to the students in the L1.

In contrast to the research on the effectiveness of L1 in classroom management (Cook 2001; Franklin 1990; Vold and Brkan 2020), the 24-year-old student teacher reports that classroom management is more natural to her in English:

(12) It's kind of the same for me with all situations where I speak English, that somehow all of those things [spoken things] that don't go with my own personality when speaking in Finnish, like being really bossy or saying 'Be quiet now!' or something like that, those things sometimes come more naturally in English because then I can kind of break free from my Finnish [personality].
(24-year-old student teacher)

For the 24-year-old student teacher, classroom management and especially supervising the students' conduct is easier in English because she does not feel credible enough to give orders to the students in Finnish. However, she admits that if the students' proficiency in English is low, it is not worthwhile to use the target language in classroom management. The two other student teachers' opinion on classroom management is that it is easier in Finnish. The 23-year-old student thinks that in more difficult situations, classroom management should be done in Finnish, but simple instructions, such as a request to be quiet, can also be given in English without losing the efficiency of the instruction. When teaching a class where the predominant language of instruction is English, the 25-year-old student teacher has sometimes changed the language into Finnish in a situation that required classroom management. He thinks that changing the language in a situation such as this interrupts the teaching and makes the students understand that the teacher is serious.

For most of the teachers and student teachers, it was clear what language they prefer to use in classroom management. Two of the answers highlight the fact that teachers and student teachers believe that changing the language in a classroom management situation can make the students realize that the teacher is serious. Surprisingly, one of the participants thinks that changing the language into English will make the students listen to the teacher, while the other participant thinks that changing into Finnish will do this. Changing the language into the TL contradicts with previous research (Cook 2001), as does the finding of one of the student teachers thinking that when she gives instructions in English, it suits her identity better in the role of a teacher. She feels that she is not credible enough when she does the same in Finnish, which differs from previous findings where the lack of authority was found to be a factor that affects teacher's TL use in classroom management negatively (Kang 2013, 160; Bateman 2018, 18–19). Based on these findings, teachers and student teachers have individual preferences in choosing the language of classroom management and the language choice depends on the students' understanding of the TL, students' ability to follow rules, students' response to changing the language, the efficiency of the language in giving instructions, and the teacher's own authority.

6.4 The functions of using TL during a lesson

Studies have found that the target language and the first language are used in certain functions in the classroom. The TL is used for simple instructions and chatting, whereas the L1 is used for classroom management, teaching grammar, and complex instructions (Polio and Duff 1994; Cook 2001). In order to identify the functions in which teachers and student teachers in Finland use the TL, one of the supporting research questions that the current study seeks to answer is: In what kinds of functions do teachers and student teachers use target language in the classroom? Based on the interviews, all of the participants use TL and L1 in similar functions during lessons, which supports Bateman's findings (2008, 25–26). All of the teachers and student teachers report that basic instructions and greetings are always in the TL, regardless of students' age or level in English. The majority of teachers and student teachers say that they first give instructions in English but then give the same instructions in Finnish if students have not understood them in English.

Furthermore, repeated phrases, such as the suggestion to take out books, are always delivered in the TL so that students get used to these phrases and even students who have weaker skills in English will understand them. The 33-year-old teacher usually starts and ends her lessons with nursery rhymes which are always in English, as well as the games and playing that takes place during English lessons. She also tries to have small conversations with students in English in every lesson but Finnish is also used in these conversations. She feels that there are hardly any situations in which she could not use English, but that she might switch to Finnish if she notices that students do not understand.

The functions in which the L1 is used during a lesson are also systematic. The teachers and student teachers on the whole report that grammar is always taught in Finnish, often even in classes where the predominant language of instruction is English. The 54-year-old teacher comments that teaching grammar in Finnish has been an unspoken rule the whole time she has worked as a teacher. In addition to this, complex or particularly important instructions should also be given in Finnish to ensure that all of the students understand them.

Another function in which the teachers and student teachers prefer using Finnish to English is when they are talking about a topic that is new for students. New topics are often first introduced in Finnish before changing the language into English. The 47-year-old teacher gives culture-related topics as an example of a function in which she rather teaches in Finnish than in English. The 25-year-old student teacher mentions giving essay

feedback for high school students as a function in which he felt that he should use Finnish even though he mainly used English when teaching these students. He argues that he is more approachable to the students when he speaks in Finnish, which is particularly important when giving feedback on students' personal essays. Compared to the other teachers and student teachers, the 38-year-old teacher has a different point of view on the choice between the TL and the L1, as she mainly teaches classes where the predominant language of instruction is English. However, commenting on the functions in which she prefers to use Finnish during a lesson, she mentions sensitive, private conversations with her and a student as an example. In these situations, she feels that using Finnish is often a safer choice, assuming that Finnish is the student's native language.

According to these answers, using the TL and L1 in their respective contexts in the classroom appears to be similar for teachers and student teachers, in spite of the difference in their level of experience in teaching. This result might be due to the common guidelines and conceptions on how for example grammar should be always taught in the L1. These guidelines and conceptions seem to still exist in language teachers' training because both the teachers and student teachers give similar answers to how they use TL in teaching. In conclusion, based on these findings, teachers and student teachers use the TL for the following contexts: basic instructions, greetings, repeated phrases, activities such as nursery rhymes and games, and small, casual conversations. As for the L1, the reported functions of use are: teaching grammar, teaching new or culture-related topics, giving complex instructions, giving essay feedback, and having sensitive conversations. Both Crichton (2009) and Vold and Brkan (2020) say that often teaching of grammar is done in the students' L1 as well as giving of complex instructions. Furthermore, the research of Vold and Brkan (2020) on how the contexts of use of the L1 have less variation than the amounts of L1 use seems to be correct based on the teachers and student teachers' answers as both of these groups report similarly on the functions in which the TL and the L1 are used during a lesson.

6.5 Target language instruction in studies and thoughts on using target language in the future

In the interviews, the teachers and student teachers were asked about the instruction in TL use in their university studies and if they felt that they got enough support for future TL use during their studies. Previous research on TL instruction in university studies can

be found from Scotland where student teachers are encouraged to use TL in teaching, however the use of TL is not instructed in teacher training (Crichton 2009). Most of the teachers who participated in this study do not remember clearly if TL use was discussed when they were studying. Only the 47-year-old teacher remembers that she had an English teacher who instructed TL use and the emphasis in her studies was that the TL should be used as much as possible in a classroom.

The other teachers recall that there was not a lot of emphasis on TL use in their studies. The 54-year-old teacher feels that her ability in using English in teaching was very low when she started to work as a teacher and she had to build it up over time. The 33-year-old teacher also says that instruction in TL use in her Finnish university was minimal and thinks that student teachers would benefit if more instruction was included in their studies. During her teacher training, the 33-year-old teacher got to teach a class where 70% of the instruction was in English, and she feels that this was a useful experience because she got to practice TL use in teaching to a great extent with this class.

The student teachers have differing views on how TL use has been instructed in their studies. The 24-year-old student teacher says that she got support for TL use in the beginning of Teacher's Pedagogical Studies, but hoped for more instruction in the later stages of teacher training. The 23-year-old student teacher wishes for more support in TL use during Teacher's Pedagogical Studies:

(13) What would be important in my opinion is that in teacher training they would ask 'Do you use enough target language?' That would be important to always ask [each teacher trainee].
(23-year-old student teacher)

According to the 25-year-old student teacher, TL use was not instructed in Teacher's Pedagogical Studies or his other studies, but he did not feel the need to be instructed in it either. Even though all of the interviewees did not voice a need for more instruction in TL use in teaching, the results suggest that the lack of instruction in future teachers' TL use should be addressed in universities.

Based on the teachers and student teachers' views on the instruction of TL use in university studies, the situation in Finnish universities seems to resemble that of Scotland: Student teachers are encouraged to use the TL but there is not enough instruction on how they should use the TL. A further study could assess whether new language teachers' abilities to use the TL in their teaching could be improved by increasing the instruction of TL use in their training and university studies. Increasing the amount of instruction in

TL use would prepare new teachers for their work and prevent them from experiencing lack of confidence in their TL use in the way the 54-year-old teacher had experienced in the beginning of her career.

The student teachers were asked to describe their thoughts on using English in teaching in the future. All of them think that they will approach TL use in teaching as positively as at the time of the interviews. The student teachers also share the belief that as they will have more experience as teachers, both their own skills in TL use and their understanding of students' level in the TL will be better. The 23-year-old student teacher reports that she Teacher's Pedagogical Studies have given her "a stepping stone" for TL use in her future career as a teacher:

> (14) I have to say that I have not really thought about that [target language use], because maybe I kind of take it for granted that of course I will use the target language as much as possible during my own lessons in the future. And, like, in #the name of the teacher training school# I have gotten a good, like, stepping stone for that [target language use] and I have, like, realized how important it is to use target language in the classroom, so for me it goes without saying that target language will be used.
> (23-year-old student teacher)

The 25-year-old student teacher is going to speak as much English as possible as a teacher and also wants to make his students speak English. He also hopes that the assessment of students' proficiency in spoken English would have a greater weight in the Finnish matriculation examination.

The teachers were not asked to describe their thoughts on their own TL use in the future, because their use of English will presumably remain as it was at the time of the interviews. However, as mentioned in subsection 6.1, some of the teachers have concerns about keeping up with the development of the TL in the future. To prevent their TL skills from deteriorating, some of them have taken additional language training alongside their work as teachers or plan to further practice their English skills in the future. The teachers were asked how their spoken English or TL use has evolved during their years of working as teachers, to which the 54-year-old teacher feels that her proficiency in spoken English has not developed but the manner in which she uses the TL in the classroom has become more fluent and automatic over time. She believes that if she would continue working in higher secondary education, it would be easier to maintain her skills in spoken English as opposed to working in primary education. As for the 47-year-old teacher, she says that both her spoken English and TL use have developed immensely over the course of her

teaching career. She also reports that she tries to consciously improve her skills in spoken English and avoid using same phrases and constructions in teaching year after year.

Both the teachers and student teachers were unanimous in the view that they can offer something to the students with their own target language use during lessons. The teachers feel that their speaking and pronunciation of English is a model for students. The 54-year-old teacher reports that especially younger students are often fascinated to hear her speak in English. The 47-year-old teacher feels that her target language use can motivate students. As an example of this, she gives a situation where she is telling a story to the students and some of them start laughing. She thinks that these kinds of situations can motivate students to listen to her speech more carefully because the students that are not laughing with the others also want to understand what was being said. The 33-year-old teacher thinks that her target language use gives students a more realistic model in the sense that they see that an English speaker can make mistakes, whereas the textbook's audiotapes give them the model of a native English speaker. The 25-year-old student teacher feels that he can offer students a model of real-life language use even in the context of teaching:

(15) Because I don't, like, write my sentences beforehand or something. [. . .] So, it's like, language that comes out in that real situation even if it was a teaching situation, so it's, like, real language at least up to a point. (25-year-old student teacher)

The other student teachers also hope that as teachers, they will be able to give students a realistic example of the use of spoken English. Moreover, they want to encourage and inspire students to speak more English. As a matter of fact, when asked if anything in TL use had surprised the student teachers during their teacher training, they reported that students' proficiency level in English had been a positive surprise to them. In addition to that, students' willingness to discuss in English during the lessons had also positively surprised the student teachers.

The 54-year-old teacher echoes the positive remarks of students' English skills by explaining that today, students often come talk to her in English, which did not happen 20 years ago. She believes that the students are better in English nowadays, however she also remarks that there are also always students who don't understand anything the teacher says in TL. The teacher has to be the helping hand for the students whose proficiency in English is low, and not just the source of input for those who understand well, especially as students hear English in many other sources as well. Therefore, the 54-

year-old teacher thinks that it is important that there is a right balance between the TL and the L1 in a classroom, and a significant part of a teacher's work is to determine this balance and follow it in their TL use. The 33-year-old teacher justifies the students' need for hearing the TL by stating:

> (16) It's enriching to have these bilingual classes so that these other students [who are not in a bilingual class] see and hear it [English] too, like, it really is a communication tool here at school. So that it isn't always artificial, like 'We are all Finnish-speaking here but let's speak English'. [. . .] And if they themselves have to talk to somebody who doesn't speak Finnish, they have to use English and there is an available model for that around them the whole time.
> (33-year-old teacher)

According to the 33-year-old teacher, the students benefit from hearing English in their immediate surroundings and also from having opportunities to use the language themselves. It is educational for them to understand that the TL they hear and use at school does not only consist of artificial phrases but can be used outside of the classroom as well. These remarks are linked to Franklin (1990) stating that if the teacher speaks the L1 to the students, it sends them the message to use the L1 when discussing something real, whereas the use of the TL is limited to the exercises done in the classroom (Franklin 1990, 20). This indicates that teachers hope to bring TL use closer to the students by showing that English can be used in all situations.

The importance for both the teachers and students' TL use is visible in the teachers and student teachers answers throughout the interviews. However, especially the challenge related to the significant differences in students' proficiency levels appears in many answers, as was already discussed in subsection 6.2. On the opposite side, the teachers and student teachers acknowledge that there are a lot of students who have excellent proficiency in using the TL and who are eager to use it as a result of the input they receive from all around them these days. The teacher's role in the TL input that students get at school is summarized by the 54-year-old teacher as determining the right balance between the TL and the L1 in a classroom and following that balance in their own TL use. Both the teachers and student teachers are unanimous in the view that they can offer something to the students with their own TL use during lessons, whether that something is motivation, inspiration, a model of realistic language use, or just being a source of input. In the future, offering the right balance of TL and L1 in the classroom appears to be the main challenge that both teachers and student teachers have to consider in their daily work.

6.6 Comparing teachers and student teachers

In this subsection, I will compare the teachers and student teachers' thoughts and experiences on target language use in the classroom. Thus, the section seeks to answer the third research question of the thesis: How do teachers and student teachers' views on target language use in a classroom differ from each other? As the two groups presumably have different approaches to how they view TL and how they use it due to the contrast in their level of experience in teaching, one of the aims of this study is to compare the two groups to be able to give a description of these different approaches to TL.

A comparison of the teachers and student teachers' answers reveals that the two groups agree on most aspects related to the teacher's TL use. In the teachers' answers, the concern about the permanence and development of their English skills is emphasized, whereas the student teachers do not raise this concern. As the student teachers are still finishing their studies, they have up-to-date proficiency in English but the teachers who have been teaching for several years, or even decades, start to feel their TL skills deteriorating, especially if they are teaching younger students and the daily use of TL does not include complex structures. TL use is natural to both the teachers and student teachers, but the some of the student teachers feel nervous about using the target language in teaching. The teachers do not report feeling nervous about TL use, but some of them remember being conscious about their TL use when they began teaching.

All teachers and student teachers find that there are challenges in TL use in teaching, but the aspects in which challenges are found are different. For teachers, the challenges seem to be more related in the students' TL use: the significant differences in students' proficiency in English and creating a safe environment for students' TL use. As for the student teachers, the challenges in their TL use are connected to their own abilities and characteristics. They have difficulties in assessing the students' level in the target language and adapting their own target language use to that level, and also in determining the amounts of TL and L1 use in order to make sure that students get enough input in the TL. The reason behind the student teachers' challenges being directed to their own TL use rather than students' is presumably due to their lack of experience in teaching. Determining the optimal ratio between the use of the TL and the L1 during a lesson has been challenging for the researchers as well (cf. Vold and Brkan 2020; Ellis and Shintani 2014; Macaro 2005), so it is not surprising that novice teachers see it as a challenge as

well. In addition to the above-mentioned, the need for a safe environment for students' TL use is also a challenge that all teachers bring up in their answers, whereas student teachers do not, which also indicates that the teachers are more qualified to look at TL use from students' point of view in addition to their own.

Another aspect where the teachers and student teachers' views on TL use differ is whether they see code switching as a challenge or not. The bilingual 25-year-old student teacher's remarks of his own TL use do not support Cook's (2001, 407) research on how both the use of the TL and the L1 are beneficial to a learner because the languages support each other in the learner's mind. Naturally in this case the student teacher's use of anglicisms had been excessive and affected the clearness of his teaching negatively, but based on Cook's results, there should be a benefit in using the two languages simultaneously. The teachers agree with Cook's findings as they have noticed a rather positive effect in using Finnish and English simultaneously in teaching. Moreover, these results of teachers' positive attitude towards code-switching in teaching differ from Park's (2015) previous study where some teachers considered it difficult to incorporate the translanguaging approach to their teaching.

The teachers do not find it challenging to change the language from Finnish to English or vice versa during a lesson, which indicates that experience in teaching aids in this. The teachers do remember that changing between the languages was more difficult in the beginning of their teaching careers, which in accordance with the student teachers listing this as a challenge in their TL use. The 24-year-old student teacher has difficulties in Finnish sticking in her mind, whereas the teachers report the opposite: The 47-year-old teacher says that after an English lesson, she often greets everyone in the hallways in English for a while.

Furthermore, another aspect where teachers and student teachers' thoughts differ is how natural they see their own TL use in teaching. The student teachers consider the English that they use in a teaching situation to be less natural compared to how they use English in their free time. The 23-year-old student teacher argues that this is stems from having to concentrate more on the way in which she speaks and on the amount of TL that she uses. The 25-year-old student teacher echoes this by stating that the TL used in a teaching situation is not entirely realistic (example 15), although he still believes that he is able to give a realistic model of language use to the students. Teachers do not report thinking that the TL use in teaching is less natural than the TL outside of the classroom, but admit that there is a risk that the teacher's TL becomes too thought out (example 3).

On the contrary, the teachers view the TL used at school as a communication tool that can be used in real-life situations as well, and not just repeating artificial phrases (example 16).

Overall, the comparison between teachers and student teachers seems to indicate that teachers are more focused on the students' perspective in TL use, whereas in the student teachers' answers their own presence and abilities as users of the TL were emphasized. This is understandable considering the difference in teachers and student teachers' experience in teaching. The teachers' experience helps them to focus on the students and they also have an extensive knowledge of the reality in schools, which can often come as a shock to a novice teacher (Macías 2018, 154). However, this does not indicate that student teachers ignore students' needs, which is proven by the 23-year-old student teacher saying that she rather considers how many opportunities the students have to use TL during a lesson than her own TL use. Student teachers do not yet have the confidence that experienced teachers have, which might prevent them from reaching their full potential in TL use. Fortunately, the teachers report that their TL use has improved over the years even though some of them also lacked confidence at first. Moreover, in spite the lack of instruction in TL use in university studies and the initial nervousness towards speaking English in teaching, all of the student teachers agree that they had been surprised by the effortlessness of their own TL use in teacher training and believe that their TL use will develop as they start working as teachers. The results indicate that the student teachers see the future in a more positive light than the teachers, who have fears of their skills in English deteriorating in the future.

This comparison of the teachers and student teachers' thoughts on TL use shows that their thoughts differ most in the aspects that are seen as challenges in TL use. The teachers and student teachers' views on TL use in future and their own abilities in using the TL have differences as well. An interesting difference between the two groups is also that the student teachers consider the English that they use in a teaching situation to be less natural than their TL use in their free time, whereas the teachers think that the TL used in teaching is not artificial and can be used in real-life situations as well. Conversely, when comparing the teachers and student teachers' thoughts on the language of classroom management, there are no significant differences between the two groups but rather it appears that the differences are individual and depend on the students' understanding of the TL. As for the planning of TL use, differences between the group of teachers and the group of student teachers do not exist either, even though there are again individual

differences in the preference to either plan TL use before a lesson or not. Furthermore, the results on the situations in which TL and L1 are used during a lesson were again similar with the two groups. Surprisingly, in relation to the instruction of TL in university studies, there are participants in both groups who think that more instruction in TL use would be useful for future teachers. This indicates that the instruction of TL use in university studies in Finland appears to be on the same level today than decades ago.

7 Conclusion

In this qualitative study, I have described and compared Finnish teachers and student teachers' views on TL use in teaching. The data for this study was obtained in semi-structured interviews with and the interviews were analyzed using Schmidt's (2004) strategy for analysis of semi-structured interviews. The results of the analysis were discussed by taking into account themes that were based on the research conducted on TL use.

Firstly, I examined the teachers and student teachers' general thoughts on TL use in teaching, which reveal that almost all of the participants use TL extensively in their free time and consider this to have a positive effect on their TL use in teaching. All of the participants agree on the importance of teacher's TL use relative to students' learning and believe that it prepares students for using English outside of the classroom as well. The teachers and student teachers were also asked about the naturalness of their own TL use. The teachers report that in the beginning of their careers, TL use in teaching made them nervous, but now that they are experienced teachers, TL use during a lesson is natural and easy for them. The student teachers report feeling nervous while using TL in teaching, however they generally feel confident about their own TL use. Teachers and student teachers' answers support previous research regarding the importance of teacher's TL use and that teachers adapt their TL use to students' proficiency in the TL (cf. Maijala 2018; Ellis 2012).

The analysis of the data related to the challenges that teachers identify in TL use are significant differences in students' understanding of the TL, acknowledging students' proficiency in English, and adapting their own TL use to students' proficiency level. They also voice a concern over maintaining their skills in the TL. The student teachers have difficulties in determining the amounts of TL and L1 use during a lesson and excessive code-switching while using the TL. The student teachers' challenges in TL use appear to be problems that will be solved as they gain experience as teachers, but the teachers' challenges are more difficult. Keeping up with the developing TL requires effort from the teachers themselves. One solution to the teachers' student-related challenges could be dividing students into proficiency level groups to enable the teacher to use TL in a way that benefits both the advanced and weaker students. This seems to be a useful arrangement from time to time, however in the long term it might lead to polarization in the input available to students.

Interesting findings were also made on the language of classroom management. According to Crichton (2009), classroom management has been proven to be more efficient in the L1 than in the TL. However, the teachers and student teachers' views on this were divided as one of the participants thinks that changing the language into English will make the students listen to the teacher, while another participant thinks that changing into Finnish will make the students realize that the teacher is serious. These findings contradict with Cook's (2001, 413–416) claim of the act of disciplining being more serious to the students in the L1. Overall, the results on classroom management seem to indicate that the language choice often depends on what language the teacher assumes sounds credible to the students, which supports previous research on the topic.

The contexts in which the TL and the L1 are used in the classroom appear to be similar for teachers and student teachers, in spite of the difference in their level of experience in teaching. This might be a result of common guidelines and conceptions in teacher training in Finland. In conclusion, based on these findings, teachers and student teachers use the TL for the following contexts: basic instructions, greetings, repeated phrases, activities such as nursery rhymes and games, and small, casual conversations. As for the L1, the reported situations of use are: teaching grammar, teaching new or culture-related topics, giving complex instructions, giving essay feedback, and having sensitive conversations. These findings reflect previous research (Crichton 2009, Vold and Brkan 2020) that has found grammar teaching and giving complex instructions often being in the L1 and not showing much variation. As for the common guidelines and conceptions that direct the language of certain activities, such as grammar being taught in the L1, teachers should be informed about the reasons and research behind these guidelines in order for them to learn what contexts have been found effective to teach in the TL and what in the L1.

The hypothesis behind this study was that teachers and student teachers' views on TL use differ from each other because of their different level of experience in using TL in teaching. The findings suggest that the teachers and student teachers' views on TL use differ most in the aspects that are seen as challenges in TL use. The comparison between the two groups seems to also indicate that in relation to the challenges in TL use, teachers are more focused on the students' perspective in TL use, whereas in the student teachers emphasize their own abilities as users of the TL, which is understandable considering the difference in teachers and student teachers' different experience in teaching. Furthermore,

the results indicate that the student teachers see the future in a more positive light than the teachers, who voice a concern about their skills in the TL deteriorating in the future.

The limitations of the present study are related to representativeness, as these results are not fully generalizable because the sampling is rather small. This leads to the participants' individual qualities being emphasized in the results of this study, which may cause distortion to the conclusions. In order to gain a more extensive view on teachers and student teachers' TL use in teaching, the study could be extended by including more participants. In addition to interviewing the participants to gather qualitative data, quantitative data could also be acquired for example by observing teachers and student teachers in a classroom and examining the amount of their TL and L1 use during a lesson. This kind of quantitative data would support the participants' own observations and give more realistic estimates on the amounts of TL use in a classroom. Even though the small sampling of this study does not give a comprehensive view on teachers and student teachers' views on TL use in Finnish schools, it succeeds in shedding light on this relatively uncharted area of study. The results of this study are potentially useful for teachers, especially teachers who are at the beginning of their career. Even though the participants' individual qualities affect the overall view of the results of this study, at the same time, these individual aspects give interesting points of view to the topic and the relatively small sampling enables the possibility of examining teachers and student teachers' responses more in depth.

Based on the teachers and student teachers' views on the instruction of TL use in university studies, student teachers do not receive enough instruction on how they should use the TL in teaching, which causes lack of confidence in their own skills. Riordan (2015) has found that conflicting practices and instructions in the amount of TL use might lead to confusion among teachers. Vold and Brkan (2020) have also arrived to the conclusion that TL use in the classrooms that they followed in their study varied considerably, although all teachers followed the same curriculum. In order to avoid confusion and uncertainty about the practices of TL use and teachers experiencing lack of confidence in their own skills, a further study could assess whether new language teachers' abilities to use the TL in their teaching could be improved by increasing the instruction of TL use in their university studies. Another suggestion for future study is to continue this study longitudinally by interviewing same student teachers again after they have worked as teachers for a few years. This kind of future research could establish

further information on how teaching experience affects student teachers' views on their TL use.

Overall, the results of this study indicate that teachers and student teachers consider both their own and students' TL use to be important. In spite of challenges in TL use, the teachers and student teachers have a positive attitude towards TL use in teaching and find that their TL use can motivate students to speak English themselves. Research on TL use has demonstrated that even though teachers' TL use is important for students' foreign language learning, teachers do not always have knowledge on how to apply TL in teaching (e.g. Polio and Duff 1994). This creates a dilemma, especially for novice teachers, who do not receive enough instruction on TL use in their university studies. Teachers were also found to experience lack of confidence in their own TL use in the beginning of their career, which further reinforces the requirement for more instruction in TL use in Finnish universities. Furthermore, a common guideline for TL use in FLT should be provided in Finnish schools in order to facilitate and standardize both experienced and novice teachers use of TL in teaching.

References

Bateman, Blair E. 2008. “Student Teachers' Attitudes and Beliefs About Using the Target Language in the Classroom.” *Foreign Language Annals* 41: 11–28. ProQuest.

Butzkamm, Wolfgang. 2003. “We Only Learn Language Once. The Role of the Mother Tongue in FL Classrooms: Death of a Dogma.” *Language Learning Journal* 28, no. 1: 29–39. Taylor & Francis Online.

Crichton, Hazel. 2009. “‘Value added’ Modern Languages Teaching in the Classroom: An Investigation into How Teachers' Use of Classroom Target Language Can Aid Pupils' Communication Skills.” *The Language Learning Journal* 37, no. 1: 19–34. EBSCOhost.

Cook, Vivian. 2001. “Using the First Language in The Classroom.” *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57, no. 3: 402–423. EBSCOhost.

De La Campa, Juliane C., and Hossein Nassaji. 2009. “The Amount, Purpose, and Reasons for Using L1 in L2 Classrooms.” *Foreign Language Annals* 42, no. 4: 742–759. ProQuest.

Edstrom, Anne. 2006. “LI Use in the L2 Classroom: One Teacher's Self-Evaluation.” *Canadian Modern Language Review* 63, no. 2: 275–292. EBSCOhost.

Ellis, Rod. 2012. *Language Teaching Research and Pedagogy*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley.

Ellis, Rod, and Natsuko Shintani. 2014. *Exploring Language Pedagogy Through Second Language Acquisition Research*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Finnish National Agency for Education. 2014. *Peruskoulun opetussuunnitelman perusteet* [National Curriculum for Basic Education]. Helsinki: Finnish National Agency for Education. https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/perusopetuksen_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2014.pdf. Accessed 3.6.2021.

——. 2019. *Lukion opetussuunnitelman perusteet* [National Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Education]. Helsinki: Finnish National Agency for Education. https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/lukion_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2019.pdf. Accessed 3.6.2021.

Franklin, Carole E. M. 1990. “Teaching in the Target Language: Problems and Prospects.” *Language Learning Journal* 2, no. 1: 20–24. Taylor & Francis Online.

Gumperz, John, J. and Norine Berenz. 1993. “Transcribing Conversational Exchanges”. In *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*, edited by Jane A. Edwards and Martin D. Lampert, 91–122. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hall, Graham, and Guy Cook. 2012. “Own-language Use in Language Teaching and Learning.” *Language Teaching* 45, no. 3: 271–308. Cambridge University Press Journals Complete.

Hirsjärvi, Sirkka, and Helena Hurme. 2008. *Tutkimushaastattelu: Teemahaastattelun teoria ja käytäntö* [Research Interview: The Theory and Practice of Theme-centered Interview]. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Kang, Dae-Min. 2013. ”EFL Teachers’ Language Use for Classroom Discipline: A Look at Complex Interplay of Variables.” *System* 41, no. 1: 149–163. *Elsevier.*

Kvale, Steinar. 2007. *Doing Interviews.* London: SAGE. SAGE Research Methods.

Littlewood, William, and Baohua Yu. 2011. “First Language and Target Language in the Foreign Language Classroom.” *Language Teaching* 44: 1, 64–77. Cambridge University Press Journals Complete.

Macaro, Ernesto. 2005. “Codeswitching in the L2 Classroom:A Communication and Learning Strategy.” In *Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession,* edited by Enric Llurda, 63–84. Boston: Springer US. Springer.

Macaro, Ernesto. 2018. “Teacher Use of Codeswitching in the Second Language Classroom: Exploring ‘Optimal’ Use.” In *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning,* edited by Miles Turnbull and Jennifer Dailey-O’Cain, 35–49. Bristol: Blue Ridge Summit. De Gruyter.

Macías, Diego Fernando. 2018 “Classroom Management in Foreign Language Education: An Exploratory Review.” *Issues in Teachers’ Professional Development* 20, no. 1: 153–166. ProQuest.

Maijala, Minna. 2018. “Aitoa vuorovaikutusta vieraan kielen oppitunnilla.” [Real Interaction in a Foreign Language Lesson.] *Kielikukko* 4: 7–20. http://www.parnet.fi/~finra/Kielikukko/Kielikukko%204%202018%20www.pdf. Accessed 25 May 2021.

Park, Mi Sun. 2015. “Code-switching and Translanguaging: Potential Functions in Multilingual Classrooms.” *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics* 13, no. 2: 50–52. Columbia University Libraries.

Polio, Charlene, and Patricia Duff. 1994. “Teacher’s Language Use in University Foreign Language Classrooms: A Qualitative Analysis of English and Target Language Alternation.” *The Modern Language Journal* 78: 313–326. ESBCOhost.

Riordan, Emma. 2015. “The Policy and Practice of Teacher Target Language Use in Post-primary Foreign Language Classrooms in Ireland.” *European Journal of Language Policy* 7, no: 2: 165–179. ProQuest.

Rolin-Ianziti, Jeanne and Rachel Varshney. 2008. “Students’ Views Regarding the Use of the First Language: An Exploratory Study in a Tertiary Context Maximizing Target Language Use.” *Canadian Modern Language Review* 65, no. 2: 249–273. EBSCOhost.

Schmidt, Christiane. 2004. “The Analysis of Semi-structured Interviews.” In *A Companion to Qualitative Research,* edited by Uwe Flick, Ernst von Kardorff and Ines Steinke, 253–258. London: Sage Publications.

Söderberg Arnfast, Juni and J. Normann Jørgensen. 2003. “Code-switching as a Communication, Learning, and Social Negotiation Strategy in First-year Learners of Danish.” *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 13, no. 1: 23–53. EBSCOhost.

Tammenga-Helmantel, Marjon, Liza Mossing Holsteijn and Jasmijn Bloemert. 2020. “Target Language Use of Dutch EFL Student Teachers: Three Longitudinal Case Studies.” *Language Teaching Research,* 1–29. SAGE Journals.

Turnbull, Miles, and Katy Arnett. 2002. “Teachers’ Uses of the Target and First Languages in Second and Foreign Language Classrooms.” *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22: 204–218. ProQuest.

Vold, Eva Thue, and Altijana Brkan. 2020. “Classroom Discourse in Lower Secondary French-as-a-foreign-language Classes in Norway: Amounts and Contexts of First and Target Language Use.” *System* 93: 1–16. Elsevier.

Wang, Danping. 2019. “Translanguaging in Chinese Foreign Language Classrooms: Students and Teachers' Attitudes and Practices.” *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 22, no. 2: 138–149. EBSCOhost.

Wengraf, Tom. 2001. *Qualitative Research Interviewing: Biographic Narrative and Semi-Structured Methods*. London: SAGE.

Appendix 1: Interview Questions for Teachers and Student Teachers

Background information

- Age
- Teachers: Possible other languages the interviewee teaches/has taught besides English / Student teachers: Possible other languages the interviewee can teach when they start working as a teacher
- Experience as a teacher (how long they have worked as a teacher and what groups or grades they have taught)
- Other factors that may have affected the interviewee's target language use (bilingualism, studies abroad, working abroad, other longer stays abroad etc.)

1. Using spoken English outside of teaching

- Do you speak English in your free time? In what kinds of situations and how?
- What is your experience in using spoken English in your free time?
- How do you see your own competence in using spoken English?

If the interviewee has worked abroad or had longer stays abroad:

- In what kinds of situations and how did you use spoken English abroad?
- What was your experience in using spoken English abroad?

Student teachers:

- In what kinds of situations and how have you used spoken English in your university studies (not including Teacher's Pedagogical Studies)?

2. Using spoken English in teaching

Teachers:

- What is your experience with using spoken English in teaching?
- Is target language use during a lesson important? Why/why not?
- Does target language use in teaching come naturally to you?
- How do you speak English during a lesson?
- What percentage of your lessons is usually in the target language?
- What kinds of classes/groups/individuals have you taught? Has there been anything special in the English teaching of these classes/groups/individuals (e.g. students who have been native speakers of English)?

- When you were studying in university, was target language use in a classroom discussed or taught? Did you feel that you got enough support for future target language use during your studies?
- When you are planning a lesson, do you take target language use into consideration? Or do you focus on it while teaching?
- If you plan students' target language use when you plan a lesson, do you take into consideration for example the students' level or the situations in which you will use target language?
- Have you noticed anything special regarding target language use while working as a teacher?
- How has your spoken English or target language use evolved during your years of working as a teacher?
- Do you feel that you can offer something to the students with your own target language use?

Student teachers:

- What is your experience with using spoken English in teaching?
- Is target language use during a lesson important? Why/why not?
- Does target language use in teaching come naturally to you?
- Does speaking English in a classroom make you nervous?
- What kinds of classes/groups have you taught in teacher education? Has there been anything special in the English teaching of these classes/groups (e.g. students who have been native speakers of English)?
- How have you used spoken English during the lessons that you have taught in teacher education?
- Did you feel that you got enough support for future target language use during Teacher's Pedagogical Studies?
- When you are planning a lesson, do you take target language use into consideration? Or do you focus on it while teaching?
- If you plan students' target language use when you plan a lesson, do you take into consideration for example the students' level or the situations in which you will use target language?
- What are your thoughts on using English in teaching in the future?

If the interviewee has work experience as a teacher:

- How do you speak English during a lesson?

- Have you noticed anything special regarding target language use while working as a teacher?
- Do you feel that you can offer something to the students with your own target language use?

3. Possible challenges in using spoken English in teaching

- Do you have challenges in target language use in a classroom?
- Are there challenges in target language use in a classroom for the students?
- If you experience challenges in your own target language use, what factors affect that?
- Is classroom management easier in the target language or in Finnish (assuming that the class is Finnish-speaking)?

4. The situations in which target language can be used in a classroom

Teachers:

- In what kinds of situations do you use English in a classroom?
- Have you noticed that you use English for particular purposes during your lessons (e.g. greetings, teaching grammar)?
- Are there situations in the classroom where you prefer using Finnish over English? If there are, what are these situations like?
- Are there situations in the classroom where you prefer using English over Finnish? If there are, what are these situations like?
- When you are teaching, do you see English and Finnish as separate languages or do the languages support each other?
- How does it feel to switch between English and Finnish when teaching?

Student teachers:

- Have you noticed that you use English for particular purposes during your lessons (e.g. greetings, teaching grammar)?
- Are there situations in the classroom where you prefer using Finnish over English? If there are, what are these situations like?
- Are there situations in the classroom where you prefer using English over Finnish? If there are, what are these situations like?

Appendix 2: Transcription Conventions

(from Gumperz and Berenz, 1993)

( )	Unintelligible speech
(example)	A good guess at an unclear word
##	Use of hatchmarks when when extratextual information needs to be included within the text (e.g., R: hello mister A #surname#?)

Appendix 3: Finnish Summary

Tämän pro gradu -tutkielman aihe on suomalaisten opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden näkemykset kohdekielen käytöstä englannin oppitunneilla. Kohdekieltä on tutkittu laajasti ja opettajan kohdekielen käyttöä pidetään tärkeänä oppilaiden vieraan kielen oppimisen kannalta. Tutkijat eivät kuitenkaan ole yksimielisiä siitä, tulisiko oppilaiden äidinkieltä (L1-kieltä) käyttää vieraiden kielten opetuksessa (Cook 2001). Vaikka kohdekielen mahdollisimman laajamittaista käyttöä pidetään ideaalina vieraiden kielten opetuksessa, tutkimusten mukaan opettajat kuitenkin todellisuudessa käyttävät paljon oppilaiden L1-kieltä opetuksessa (Littlewood and Yu 2011).

Huolimatta ristiriitaisista tutkimustuloksista kohdekielen ja L1-kielen väliseen käyttösuhteeseen oppitunnilla liittyen, tutkijat ovat yhtä mieltä siitä, että opettajan kohdekielen käyttö on tärkeää ja muodostaa ison osan oppilaiden oppitunneilla kuulemasta kielisyötteestä (Maijala 2018). Opettajien tietoisuudessa siitä miten, milloin ja missä laajuudessa kohdekieltä tulisi oppitunnilla käyttää on kuitenkin puutteita (Polio and Duff). Riittävän kohdekielisen kielisyötteen oppilaille tarjoamisen ja kohdekielen käyttöä koskevien ohjeistuksien puutteen välinen ristiriita aiheuttaa opettajille ja erityisesti uusille opettajille ongelmia.

Kohdekielinen kieltenopetus vaikuttaa olevan tavoiteltavaa useimmissa maissa, mutta esimerkiksi Skotlannissa opettajat väittelevät kohdekielen käytöstä ja erityisesti sen käyttömäärästä opetuksessa (Crichton 2009). Suomessa ei juurikaan ole tutkittu opettajien kohdekielen käyttöä vieraiden kielten oppitunneilla, joten aihetta olisi tarpeellista käsitellä lisää. Tämän tutkimuksen tarkoituksena oli selvittää millaisia näkemyksiä opettajilla ja opettajaopiskelijoilla on kohdekielen käytöstä englannin oppitunneilla ja miten tulevien ja kokeneiden opettajien näkemykset eroavat toisistaan. Lisäksi haluttiin tutkia aiheeseen perustuvan taustatutkimuksen perusteella esiin nousseita teemoja, kuten kohdekielen käyttöön liittyviä haasteita, kohdekielen ja L1-kielen käyttömääriä ja kohdekielen käyttötilanteita oppitunneilla. Näiden teemojen perusteella muodostettiin yksi päätutkimuskysymys ja kolme sitä avustavaa tutkimuskysymystä:

Päätutkimuskysymys:

- Miten opettajat ja opettajaopiskelijat näkevät kohdekielen käytön oppitunneilla?

Avustavat tutkimuskysymykset:

- Millaisia mahdollisia haasteita kohdekielen käytössä on opettajille ja opettajaopiskelijoille?
- Millaisiin toimintoihin opettajat ja opettajaopiskelijat käyttävät kohdekieltä oppitunneilla?
- Miten opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden näkemykset kohdekielen käytöstä eroavat toisistaan?

Tutkielman taustalla on oletus siitä, että opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden näkemykset kohdekielestä, haasteet sen käytössä ja käyttötilanteet eroavat toisistaan, sillä ovathan heidän kokemuksensa kohdekielen käytössä ja opetuksesta yleensä hyvin eritasoiset. Opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden näkemyksiä tutkimalla ja kokemuksia vertaamalla pyritään etsimään tukea siihen, miten erityisesti uusien opettajien kohdekielen käyttöä voitaisiin helpottaa heidän aloittaessaan uransa.

Tutkielman kahdessa ensimmäisessä teoriaosiossa käsitellään aiempaa tutkimusta kohdekielen ja L1-kielen käyttöön liittyen sekä opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden kohdekielen käytön erityispiirteitä. Aiemman tutkimuksen perusteella tutkijoiden käsitys kohdekielen ja L1-kielen välisestä suhteesta vaihtelee suuresti, sillä L1-kieli voidaan nähdä joko esteenä kohdekielen oppimiselle tai kohdekielen oppimista tukevana tekijänä (Cook 2001). Osa tutkijoista rohkaisee opettajia maksimoimaan kohdekielen käytön vieraan kielen oppitunneilla, kun taas osa painottaa L1-kielen hyötyjä tietyissä käyttötarkoituksissa (Turnbull ja Arnett 2002; Macaro 2005; Ellis 2012). Näiden vaihtelevien näkökantojen keskellä opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden tulee itse määrittää optimaalinen kohdekielen käyttö omilla oppitunneillaan, sillä yhtenäistä linjaa tai ohjeistusta sille ei ole.

Teoriataustan pohjalta nousseita haasteita opettajien kohdekielen käytölle ovat oppilaiden osaamistaso kohdekielessä, oppilaiden käyttäytyminen, opettajien luottamus omaan kohdekielen osaamiseensa sekä ulkoiset tekijät, kuten koulukohtainen suhtautuminen kohdekielen käyttöön (Franklin 1990). Tutkimusten mukaan kohdekieltä käytetään useimmiten yksinkertaisiin ohjeistuksiin ja jutusteluun, kun taas esimerkiksi kieliopin opetus ja monimutkaiset ohjeistukset annetaan L1-kielellä (Polio ja Duff 1994; Cook 2001). Aiemmat tutkimukset kertovat myös, että luokanhallinnassa on useimmiten helpompi käyttää L1-kieltä, mikäli opettaja on epävarma omasta kohdekielen osaamisestaan (Kang 2013; Bateman 2018). Koodinvaihto tulisi normalisoida vieraiden kielten opetuksessa, sillä sen käyttö hyödyttää oppijoita ja auttaa opettajaa luomaan oppitunnille turvallisen tilan (Cook 2001; Wang 2019).

Tutkielman teoriataustan toinen osa käsittelee opettajaopiskelijoiden kohdekielen käyttöä ja sen aiempaa tutkimusta. Yhteinen tekijä opettajien kohdekielen käytölle vaikuttaa olevan opettajien taipumus sovittaa oma kohdekielen käyttönsä oppilaiden kohdekielen tasoon (Ellis 2012). Teoriataustan pohjalta nousi esiin myös huomio siitä, että opettajien kohdekielen käytössä on huomattavasti yksilöllistä vaihtelua sekä vaihtelua eri koulujen ja maiden välillä (Vold ja Brkan 2020). Opettajaopiskelijoiden kohdekielen käyttöä on tutkittu huomattavasti vähemmän, mutta aiempien tutkimusten mukaan suurimmat haasteet opettajaopiskelijoiden kohdekielen käytössä koskevat luottamuksen puutetta omiin opetustaitoihin liittyen ja kykenemättömyyttä puhua englantia tarpeeksi hyvin (Bateman 2008). Opettajaopiskelijoita rohkaistaan kohdekielen käyttöön yliopisto-opinnoissa, mutta heille ei anneta juurikaan konkreettisia neuvoja sen käyttöön opetuksessa (Bateman 2008). Tämä viestii siitä, että opettajankoulutuksen tulisi kiinnittää huomiota aiheeseen.

Tutkimuksen kolmannessa teoriaosiossa puolestaan esitellään lyhyesti Schmidtin (2004) strategia puolistrukturoitujen haastattelujen analyysiin. Tämä viisivaiheinen strategia tukee taustatutkimuksen perusteella kerättyä teoriapohjaa ja auttaa tutkijaa vastaamaan haastatteluihin. Strategian ensimmäisessä vaiheessa pohjustetaan haastattelujen analyysia varten tarvittavat kategoriat. Toisessa vaiheessa nämä kategoriat kootaan arvioinnin avulla opasteeksi, jonka avulla haastattelujen osia voidaan analysoida ja koodata kategorioihin kolmannessa vaiheessa. Neljännessä vaiheessa tuotetaan tapausesimerkkejä kategorioihin koodatuista haastattelun osista. Nämä muodostavat perustan viidennelle vaiheelle, jossa annetaan tarkempia tulkintoja eri tapauksille ja analysoidaan niitä yksityiskohtaisesti.

Tutkimuksen osallistujina toimi neljä englanninopettajaa ja kolme opettajaopiskelijaa. Kaksi tutkielmaan osallistuneista opettajista on luokanopettajia, jotka toimivat myös kieltenopettajina kouluissaan. Kaksi muuta opettajaa työskentelevät kieltenopettajina, toinen yläkoulussa ja toinen lukiossa. Tutkielmaan osallistuneet opettajat edustavat täten erilaisia koulutustaustoja ja suomalaisen koulujärjestelmän eri asteita. Tutkimukseen osallistuneiden englanninopiskelijoiden haluttiin puolestaan olevan joko suorittamassa opettajan pedagogisia opintoja haastatteluhetkellä tai suorittaneen ne maksimissaan viimeisten kahden lukuvuoden sisällä. Näin varmistettiin se, että he olivat haastattelun aikaan yhä opiskelijoita, joilla ei ole juurikaan työkokemusta opettajana toimimisesta, ja pystyisivät edustamaan opettajaopiskelijoiden näkökulmaa opettajiin verrattuna. Yksi tutkimukseen osallistuneista opettajaopiskelijoista ei ole

toiminut opettajana opetusharjoittelun ulkopuolella, kahdella muulla on jonkin verran opetuskokemusta.

Tutkielman tiedonkeruumenetelmänä käytettiin puolistrukturoitua teemahaastattelua, sillä haastattelun haluttiin etenevän taustatutkimuksen perusteella saatujen teemojen pohjalta, mutta kuitenkin suhteellisen vapaasti. Tutkimuksen laadullinen luonne näkyy myös siinä, että haastattelut tehtiin hyödyntäen kerronnallista lähestymistapaa, jotta saataisiin tietoa osallistujien omakohtaisista kokemuksista ja ajatuksista kohdekielen käyttöä kohtaan. Haastatteluista kertyi yhteensä noin 230 minuutin pituinen materiaali. Haastattelut tehtiin suomeksi ja ne litteroitiin noudattaen Gumperzin ja Berenzin (1993) kehittämiä litterointikonventioita. Tutkimuksessa esimerkkeinä käytetyt litteroidut nostot haastatteluista käännettiin myöhemmin englanniksi.

Haastatteluista saatu data analysoitiin kvalitatiivisesti käyttäen apuna Schmidtin (2004) strategiaa puolistrukturoitujen haastattelujen analysointiin. Schmidtin viisivaiheista strategiaa hyödyntäen luotiin aluksi kategoriat, jotka perustuivat aiempaan tutkimustietoon kohdekielen käytöstä opetuksessa sekä haastattelujenkin pohjana oleviin teemoihin, joita olivat: kohdekielen käyttö opetuksessa, kohdekielen käytön sujuvuus, kohdekielen käyttömäärät, haasteet kohdekielen käytössä, kohdekielen käyttö luokanhallinnassa, kohdekielen käyttötilanteet ja kohdekielen käytön opetus yliopistossa Tämän jälkeen strategian toisessa vaiheessa koottiin kategorioita tarkentamalla opas, jonka avulla haastattelun osia koodattiin sopiviin kategorioihin kolmannessa vaiheessa. Schmidtin strategian neljännessä vaiheessa kategorioista voidaan muodostaa esimerkiksi taulukoita, mutta koska tämän tutkimuksen otanta on liian pieni määrällisiin tarkoituksiin, ei tätä koettu kannattavaksi tutkimuksen tarpeisiin nähden. Lopuksi tulokset koottiin systemaattisesti yhteen muistiinpanojen, kategorioihin luokitellun materiaalin ja teoreettisen viitekehyksen perusteella ja kirjoitettiin auki, jotta niiden analysointi ja tutkimuskysymyksiin vastaaminen oli mahdollista.

Tutkimuksen tuloksissa käsiteltiin aluksi opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden yleisiä näkemyksiä kohdekielen käyttöön liittyen. Lähes kaikki osallistujat raportoivat käyttävänsä kohdekieltä laajasti vapaa-ajallaan ja kokivat, että vapaa-ajan englannin käytöllä on positiivinen vaikutus kohdekielen käyttöön oppitunneilla. Kaikki osallistujat ovat yhtä mieltä siitä, että opettajan kohdekielen käyttö on tärkeää oppilaiden kannalta ja valmistaa heitä käyttämään kieltä myös oppituntien ulkopuolella. Osallistujilta kysyttiin myös kohdekielen käytön sujuvuudesta. Opettajien mukaan heitä saattoi uransa alussa

jännittää kohdekielen käyttö opetustilanteessa, mutta nykyään sen käyttö on luonnollista ja sujuvaa. Opettajaopiskelijat kokevat englannin puhumisen opetustilanteessa hieman jännittävänä, mutta ovat kuitenkin luottavaisia oman kohdekielen käyttönsä suhteen. Opettajia pyydettiin antamaan arvio siitä, kuinka paljon he käyttävät kohdekieltä opetuksessa. Osa opettajista ei kyennyt antamaan arviota, sillä opetustilanteissa on heidän mukaansa niin suurta vaihtelua. Kaksi opettajaa kertoi useimmiten käyttävänsä kohdekieltä ainakin 50% tunnista 3.-luokkalaisten ja sitä vanhempien oppilaiden kanssa. Tämä määrä kohdekieltä on alhaisempi kuin joidenkin tutkijoiden asettama ideaali kohdekielen käytölle (Ellis ja Shintani 2014; Macaro 2005), mutta koska tutkimukset ovat myös osoittaneet joissakin tapauksissa kohdekieltä käytettävän vain 10% tunnista (Littlewood ja Yu 2011), vertautuvat suomalaisopettaijien arviot näiden välimaastoon. Kohdekielen käytön suunnittelussa ennen tuntia oli merkittäviä yksilöllisiä eroja, sillä osa osallistujista suunnittelee kohdekielen käyttöään tarkasti ja osa ei ollenkaan.

Lähes kaikki osallistujat kokevat, että kohdekielen käytössä oppitunnilla on haasteita. Opettajat kokevat suurimpina haasteina oppilaiden erilaiset osaamistasot ja erityisesti kaikkein heikoimpien oppilaiden ymmärryksen kohdekielestä. Oman kohdekielen käytön suhteuttaminen oppilaiden osaamistasoon on hankalaa, sillä osa saman ryhmän oppilaista tarvitsee laadukasta kielisyötettä, kun taas osa ei ymmärrä yksinkertaisiakaan ilmauksia englanniksi. Lisäksi haasteina opettajille ovat turvallisen tilan luominen oppitunnille, jotta oppilaat uskaltavat käyttää englantia sekä ajanhallintaan liittyvät ongelmat. Opettajaopiskelijat puolestaan kokevat haasteellisena oppilaiden osaamistason arvioinnin ja oman kohdekielen käytön suhteuttamisen tähän osaamiseen. Myös kohdekielen ja L1-kielen välisen käyttösuhteen määrittäminen ja liiallinen koodinvaihto kohdekieltä käyttäessä olivat haasteita opettajaopiskelijoille. Opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden haasteet kohdekielen käytössä peilautuvat aiempaan tutkimukseen aiheesta.

Kohdekielen käyttö luokanhallinnassa jakoi osallistujia. Joidenkin osallistujien mielestä luokanhallinta on helpompaa ja selkeämpää suomeksi, joidenkin mielestä taas oppilaat kuuntelevat luokanhallinnallisia ohjeita paremmin englanniksi, koska heidän täytyy tällöin keskittyä ymmärtääkseen mitä opettaja sanoo. Yksi opettajaopiskelijoista kokee olevansa uskottavampi antaessaan käskyjä englanniksi kuin suomeksi, mikä on ristiriidassa aiemman tutkimuksen kanssa (Kang 2013; Bateman 2018). Mielenkiintoista oli, että yksi osallistuja kokee opetuskielen vaihtamisen suomeksi luokanhallinnallisia ohjeita annettaessa saavan oppilaat ymmärtämään, että opettaja on tosissaan, kun taas

toinen osallistuja kokee oppilaiden ottavan opettajan käskyt tosissaan silloin kun opettaja käyttää englantia. Kielen vaihtaminen L1-kielestä kohdekieleen luokanhallinnassa eroaa aiemmista tutkimuksista, joissa luokanhallinnan on nähty olevan tehokkaampaa L1-kielellä (Franklin 1990; Crichton 2009; Vold ja Brkan 2020). Luokanhallinnan kielestä annettujen vastauksien perusteella opettajan kielivalintaan vaikuttavia tekijöitä ovat oppilaiden kohdekielen ymmärryksen taso, oppilaiden kyky totella sääntöjä, oppilaiden reaktio kielen vaihtamiseen, käskyjen antamiseen käytetyn kielen tehokkuus sekä opettajan oma käsitys auktoriteetistaan.

Kohdekielen käyttötilanteet oppitunnilla ovat tämän tutkimuksen perusteella samankaltaisia sekä opettajilla että opettajaopiskelijoilla, mikä saattaa johtua yleisistä suosituksista ja käsityksistä kohdekielen käyttöön liittyen. Kohdekieltä käytetään perusohjeistuksiin, tervehdyksiin, toistuviin ilmaisuihin, lorujen ja pelien kaltaisiin toimintoihin ja jutusteluun. L1-kieltä puolestaan käytetään kieliopin opettamiseen, uusien aiheiden esittelyyn, kulttuurinopetukseen, monimutkaisiin ohjeistuksiin, esseepalautteeseen ja arkaluontoisiin keskusteluihin. Tässä tutkimuksessa raportoitu kohdekielen ja L1-kielen käyttö on yhtenäistä aiempien tutkimusten kanssa. Tulokset vastaavat myös aiempaa tutkimusta siitä, että L1-kielen käyttötilanteissa oppitunneilla on vähemmän opettajakohtaista variaatiota kuin L1-kielen käyttömäärässä (Vold ja Brkan (2020).

Tutkimukseen osallistuneet opettajat eivät ole varmoja, ohjattiinko heitä kohdekielen käyttöön yliopisto-opintojensa aikana, mutta heidän muistikuviensa mukaan ohjeistusta ei juurikaan ollut. Yksi tutkimukseen osallistuneista opettajista koki, että hänen taitonsa kohdekielen käytöstä opetuksessa olivat hyvin alhaiset hänen aloittaessaan uransa. Opettajaopiskelijoiden kokemukset kohdekielen käytöstä vaihtelevat, yksi opettajaopiskelijoista heistä ei kokenut tarvetta ohjeistukselle opinnoissaan, mutta kaksi muuta olisi toivonut enemmän ohjeistusta kohdekielen käyttöön. Tulosten perusteella englanninopettajiksi opiskelevia rohkaistaan käyttämään kohdekieltä, mutta sen käyttöä ei juurikaan ohjata yliopisto-opinnoissa.

Opettajat ja opettajaopiskelijat suhtautuvat pääosin positiivisesti kohdekielen käyttöön tulevaisuudessa ja kokevat pystyvänsä tarjoamaan omalla kohdekielen käytöllään oppilaille mallin englannin käytöstä sekä innostamaan oppilaita itseään englannin puhumiseen. Kaiken kaikkiaan tutkimuksen tuloksista välittyy opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden myönteinen suhtautuminen kohdekielen käyttöön ja kohdekielen käytön nostaminen tärkeään asemaan oppitunneilla. Tutkimuksen osallistujat kuitenkin

ymmärtävät, että oppilaiden toisistaan eroavat osaamistasot asettavat haasteita heidän kohdekielen käytölleen ja että kohdekielen ja L1-kielen välisen optimaalisen käyttösuhteen määrittäminen opetuksessa on heidän vastuullaan.

Opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden näkemysten vertailu kohdekielen käyttöön liittyen osoitti, että ryhmät ovat samaa mieltä monista kohdekielen käyttöön liittyvistä teemoista. Suurimmat erot ryhmien näkemysten välillä olivat siinä, mitkä asiat koetaan haasteina kohdekielen käytössä. Opettajien kokemat haasteet liittyvät enemmän oppilaiden kohdekielen käyttötaitoihin, kun taas opettajaopiskelijoiden haasteet liittyvät heidän omiin taitoihinsa opettajina. Myös näkemyksissä kohdekielen käytöstä tulevaisuudessa on eroja: Siinä missä opettajaopiskelijat suhtautuvat myönteisesti kykyynsä käyttää kohdekieltä opetuksessa tulevaisuudessa, opettajia huolestuttaa se, pystyvätkö he ylläpitämään taitojaa kohdekielen kehittyessä.

Tutkielma avaa Suomessa vähän tutkittua opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden kohdekielen käyttöä nostamalla esiin erilaisia kohdekielen käyttöön liittyviä haasteita ja kohdekielen ja L1-kielen välisiä käyttöeroja. Lisäksi tutkielma antaa osviittaa siitä, millaisia eroja kokeneiden opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden näkökulmissa on kohdekielen käyttöön liittyen sekä tarjoaa ideoita jatkotutkimukselle ja opettajan pedagogisten opintojen kehittämiselle. Suuremmalla otoksella ja myös kvantitatiivista dataa sisältävällä materiaalilla voitaisiin tutkia tarkemmin opettajien ja opettajaopiskelijoiden kohdekielen käyttöä. Tuleva tutkimus voisi keskittyä siihen, olisiko opettajaopiskelijoiden kyky käyttää kohdekieltä opetuksessa korkeammalla tasolla, jos heitä ohjeistettaisiin sen käyttöön enemmän opiskeluissa. Myös opettajaopiskelijoiden haastattelu uudelleen pitkittäistutkimuksessa heidän tehtyään opettajan töitä joitakin vuosia voisi tuoda lisätietoa siitä, miten työssä saatu kokemus vaikuttaa ajatuksiin kohdekielestä. Opettajien kohdekielen käyttöä helpottamaan ja yhtenäistämään tulisi suomalaisiin kouluihin kehittää yhtenäiset suositukset siitä, miten opettajien kannattaa käyttää kohdekieltä opetuksessa.