



Teacher Use of L1: Different Class Situations

Akinobu Shimura

Asahikawa Jitsugyo High School

Reference Data:

Shimura, A. (2007). Teacher Use of L1: Different Class Situations. In K. Bradford-Watts (Ed.), *JALT2006 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

This paper examines the relationship between teacher use of students' first language (L1) and target or second language (L2) and varying class situations. To analyze the patterns of his own L1 and L2 use, the author used FIFU (Functions of Instructor First-Language Use), a theory-based observation instrument (Yonesaka, 2005). This paper compares the quantity and patterns of teachers' L1 and L2 use in these contrasting situations: class size, course content, and students' cooperation.

この研究では著者が行った3組の状態の異なるクラスにおける学習者の母語(L1)と学習言語(L2)の使用の量と傾向を分析し、クラスの状況が教師のL1やL2使用にどのような影響を及ぼすかを検証する。L1とL2使用の傾向についてはYonesaka(2005)で開発されたFIFU (Functions of Instructor First-Language Use)を利用して分析する。異なるクラスの状況としては、a.クラスサイズ、b.授業内容、c.学習者の授業協力の程度について取り上げる。

Every teacher uses their students' first language (L1) and target or second language (L2) in different ways, depending on classroom situations and subjects. They use the L1 and L2 in different amounts and with varying functions. How do different teaching situations relate to teachers' L1 and L2 use?

This paper looks into the relationship between different class situations and teachers' L1 and L2 use in a Japanese senior high school. To make this mechanism clear, the author compares the amounts and patterns of teachers' L1 and L2 use in these contrasting situations: a. class size, b. course contents, and c. student cooperation. To compare these three contrasting situations, the author analyzed the teacher's speech through the amount and function data of three pairs of classes in contrasting situations. This paper defines function data as the patterns of the teacher's L1 and L2 use in each sentence spoken in class.

The author audio recorded five of his classes, each of which was a different lesson type (one class used two pairs of constrictions, so not six classes). The author recorded all of the lessons using a mini disc or IC-recorder. All of the audio data was transcribed and used to compare three different class situations. Table 1 contains the analyzed characteristics of the audio recorded lessons.

Table 1. Characteristics of audio recorded lesson

Lesson	Class size	Lesson Content	Cooperative Level	Grade
1	Large (38)	Reading (Topic: Finding my way)	4 (cooperative)	11
2	Small (22)	Reading (Topic: Finding my way)	4 (cooperative)	11
3	Small (21)	Reading (Topic: E-mail from Kenya)	4 (cooperative)	10
4	Small (18)	Oral Communication (Topic: Telephone)	4 (cooperative)	10
5	Large (34)	Reading (Topic: E-mail from Kenya)	2 (uncooperative)	10

Notice: Lesson 1-2, and 3 and 5 use approximately the same lesson materials.

The first contrasting situation is class size. In Japanese senior high school, a typical class has about 40 students. In these situations, there were about 20 students in each class. This paper defines classes with over 30 students as large, and those with fewer than 29 students as small. Class size is a frequently cited problem of the Japanese education system. When compared with class sizes in western countries,

Japanese classes are too large. When a class's size becomes smaller, do the teachers' L1 and L2 use amount and function change? To verify this, the author compared Lesson 1 (a large class) and Lesson 2 (a small class). These two lessons are the same grade and approximately the same lesson materials were used for each, so it is easy to compare the effect of class sizes.

The next situation involves the contents of the course. In general, conversation lessons use more L2 than reading lessons. This paper aims to show the ways in which varying levels of L2 use affect different class types. The author compared reading classes and oral communication classes to pinpoint the effect of lesson contents on L1 and L2 use. The author analyzed Lessons 3 and 4. Lesson 3 was a reading lesson and Lesson 4 was an oral communication lesson. Both lessons were small class sizes and the students of each were in the same grade.

The final situation is the level of student cooperation in the lessons. When students are cooperative during the lesson, the teacher can use L1 and L2 effectively, but it is more difficult in the opposite situation. To compare whether students are cooperative or not, it is necessary to decide their defining characteristics. These feelings tend to vary for each teacher. However, unified definitions are needed in order to describe different situations in which students use L1 or L2. Sano (2002) developed *Easy-to-teach English Class: Tentative plan of 5 grades* (p.13.) (see Appendix 1). When we use these definitions, we can outline more objective definitions of whether students are cooperative or uncooperative. This paper defines level 3 to 5 students as cooperative and level 2 and 1 as uncooperative. The author analyzed Lesson 3 and

Lesson 5. Lesson 3 was a lesson with cooperative students, and in Lesson 5, the students were uncooperative. The lesson contents and student grade of each class were the same, but the class size was different. It is better to compare classes with the same size and lesson contents, but the author did not have classes with those optimal conditions. This paper posits that lesson contents have priority over class size, so the author analyzed Lesson 3 and 5 to compare the level of student cooperation in each lesson.

Literature review

Duff and Polio's study (1990) quantifies the use of English at the University of California, Los Angeles. They recorded 13 classes covering 13 different languages. The results of L1 use were from 0% to 90%, and the average was 32.1%. Polio and Duff (1994) classified teachers' uses of L1. In the context of Duff and Polio's study (1990s), the teachers used English to explain grammar, manage the class, and adopt a stance of empathy or *solidarity* towards students. Teachers also use English to translate unknown vocabulary items, and help students when they have problems understanding.

Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002) analyzed four French teachers of beginner French classes at the University of Queens land and submit that it is more effective to use L1 for learners for whom translation and contrast facilitate learning of L2 vocabulary and grammar. This research chooses the method of counting words to find how much teachers used L1 in class and about teachers' L1 use of coding schemes, which are categorized herein into three major divisions and fifteen subcategories (Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie, 2002; p.405). Table 2 contains their coding schemes.

The above are analyses of university classes, but Liu, Ahn, Baek, and Han (2004) analyzed how much of and in what ways both L1 and L2 were used in 13 Korean senior high school English classes. The authors also chose to count the L1 and L2, and computed the proportions of L1 (English) and L2 (Korean) in the total number of words. The L1 and L2 functions are categorized into 8 divisions (Liu, Ahn, Baek, and Han, 2004; p.616). Table 3 introduces their English and Korean use by category.

Analysis Methodology

Proportion teacher L1 and L2 use

To analyze amount of L1 and L2 use, this paper chooses to count the Japanese and English words. To compare amount of L1 and L2 use, measuring time spent speaking L1 or L2 is also a common way to compare amounts of L1 and L2. In the case of Japanese senior high school teaching, however, the teachers speak English very slow to be understood by their students more easily, but when they use Japanese, they speak much faster than they do using English. Therefore, it is difficult to compare the amount of time spent using L1 and L2 in this research, so this paper uses the word count method instead. Previous studies have used various systems to determine the amount of language used in lessons. The system of counting words used in this paper was drawn from Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002), and Liu et al. (2004).

Inoue (2002) points out one of the definitions of Japanese words. This definition is described as follows: the constituent unit of an English sentence equals one Japanese word, and this is also equal to one Japanese segment. In other words,

Table 2. The Coding Schemes (Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie, 2002; p.405)

1. TRANSLATION (switching from FL to NL to make input comprehensible)
a) Translation of items from lesson
b) Translation of other items, usually from instructions
2. METALINGUISTIC USES (switching from talking in FL to talking about FL in NL)
a) Comment: on FL forms, FL culture
b) Contrast: FL forms with NL forms, and FL cultural practices with NL cultural practices
3. COMMUNICATIVE USES (switching from talking in FL to talking in NL for communicative purposes)
a) Managing the class
• Giving instructions
• Motivating students to speak FL in class
• Planning exams/activities
• Giving lesson/activity objectives
• Giving feedback
• Checking comprehension
• Dealing with classroom equipment
b) Teacher reaction to student requests in NL
• Answering student questions in NL about FL
• Translation upon student request
c) Teacher expressing state of mind
• Teacher joking
• Teacher emotions

Table 3. English and Korean Use by Category (Liu, Ahn, Baek, and Han, 2004; p.616)

- Greetings
- Directions, Instructional comments
- Questions to check comprehension, etc.
- Explaining text, words, or grammar
- Providing background information
- Managing student behavior
- Compliments / confirmation
- Personal talk/ jokes

to count Japanese words is to count Japanese segments. Japanese segments are composed of a self-sufficient word or self-sufficient word + (attached word ×n). Simply, the same results may be achieved by counting self-sufficient words only. To count Japanese words only, this analysis used *Win CHASEN ver.2.0* Japanese morpheme-analyzing software. This software automatically parses Japanese sentences, so it helps when counting Japanese words.

In this way, Japanese word counting systems are developed, but this research needed to compare English and Japanese words, so it is necessary to regulate English words. To count English words, this article used the word count function of a word processor. However, to conform to the definitions of English and Japanese words, some function words of English had to be excluded from word counting. The function words of English are prepositions, articles, auxiliary verbs and conjunctions. In Japanese, conjunctions are often used as self-sufficient words, so in this word

counting system, English conjunctions are counted as English function words. Thus, when counting English words, prepositions, articles, and auxiliary verbs are not included.

Functional analysis of utterances (L1 and L2)

For the Functional analysis of utterances, the researcher selected *Functions of Instructor First-language Use (FIFU)* (Yonesaka, 2005; p.52.) to show the patterns of the teacher's L1 and L2 use. FIFU has 4 different categories and 15 functions of teachers' L1 use. These functions are adaptable to junior high, senior high school, or university English lesson situations in Japan. The current version of FIFU is attached in Appendix 2. In this research, each one sentence is analyzed by FIFU according to L1 (Japanese), and L2 (English). When one sentence has Japanese and English mixed, this paper counts both. FIFU was originally developed to analyze L1 use functions, but it can also be applied to L2 use except for function 1(translations). FIFU's functions are expressed as a percentage of the rate at which L2 was used in each lesson.

Results

Class Size

Proportion teacher L1 and L2 use

When Lesson 1, a large class, and Lesson 2, a small class, were compared, there was not much difference between the amount of L1 and L2 used. There was not a big difference, although there was 5% more L2 used than Lesson 2. The rate of L2 use in both classes is very low, because of the lesson

contents. These lessons were the first using a new topic, so the teacher explained the topics' background and new words using L1.

**Table 4. Proportion teacher L1 and L2 use:
Class size (%)**

	L1 use (Japanese)	L2 use (English)	Total
Lesson 1 (Large)	81.2	18.8	100
Lesson 2 (Small)	86.2	13.8	100

Functional analysis of utterances

In these classes, there are few differences in the tendency of L1 and L2 usage as defined by FIFU, except for Japanese FIFU function 3(Comment on L2 forms). The only difference regarding function 3(Comment on L2 forms) was that a lot of L1 was used in Lesson 2—about 9% more than in Lesson 1. Regarding the amount of L1 and L2 use, Lesson 2's rate of L1 use was about 5% higher than the Lesson 1 class, so it is likely that this amount influenced the result.

Course contents

Proportion teacher L1 and L2 use

When comparing Lesson 3, a reading lesson, and Lesson 4, an oral communication lesson, there was a clear difference between the amount of L1 and L2 used. In Lesson 2, the teacher used L2 35% more. The subject of Lesson 2 is Oral

Table 5. The comparisons of L1 and L2 use functions: Class size by FIFU (%)

Functions of Teacher talk		Lesson 1		Lesson 2	
		Large		Small	
		E-FIFU	J-FIFU	E-FIFU	J-FIFU
LANGUAGE TEACHER ONLY	1. Translation	n/a	7.4	n/a	8.4
	2. Explanation or summarizing	2.2	4.7	1.9	5.3
	3. Comment on L2 forms	25.6	14.0	22.8	23.1
	4. Comment on content	1.7	24.0	2.5	22.8
TEACHER Any Subject	5. Comment on language learning	0.3	1.1		
	6. Give feedback	0.6	4.7	0.9	3.8
	7. Give instructions	2.5	2.5	0.3	4.7
	8. Check comprehension	0.8	1.7		0.9
	9. Manage, control students		2.2		
	10. Comment on lesson	0.6	2.2	0.6	1.9
INSTITUTION	11. Comment on classroom equipment				
	12. Comment ,explain institutional information		0.3		
PERSONAL	13. Comment about self		0.3		
	14. Comment about students				
	15. Comment about general knowledge not related to the lesson		0.8		
TOTAL		100		100	

E-FIFU = The rate of FIFU functions in English sentence

J-FIFU = The rate of FIFU functions in Japanese sentence

Communication 1 and is team-taught by a Japanese teacher and a Native English teacher. Therefore, the rate of L2 use became high naturally, because the Native English teacher often used L2, and the Japanese teacher used L2 a lot, too. In team teaching lessons, the Japanese teacher interacts with the Native English teacher very frequently, so the Japanese teacher's rate of L2 use is naturally high.

Table 6. Proportion teacher L1 and L2 use: Lesson Contents (%)

	L1 use (Japanese)	L2 use (English)	Total
Lesson 3 (Reading)	49.5	50.5	100
Lesson 4 (Oral communication)	12.7	87.3	100

Functional analysis of utterances

There are big differences in the tendency about the function 1, translation, to 3, Comment on L2 forms, by FIFU in lesson contents. In Lesson 3, many parts of translation, explaining or summarizing lesson items, and commenting on L2 forms are used by L1, but these are rarely used in Lesson 4 class. Especially, translation functions have never been used in Lesson 4. It is more than probable that these results are the difference in the lesson purpose of a reading lesson and an oral communication lessons. Oral communication lesson uses easier English contents than reading lesson, so it is not necessary for student understanding to do translation or grammar or vocabulary explanations using L1. However, reading lesson contents are much more difficult than oral communication lesson, so they need more careful explanations in the L1.

Function 7, Give instructions, is also different. Compared with Lesson 3, in Lesson 4, the rate of L2 use was quite high with a difference of 22%. This result is influenced by the teaching style of these lessons. In the oral communication lesson, there were many activities involving interaction, so this lesson employs a student-centered teaching style. On the other hand, the reading class mainly consisted of explanations by the teacher, so it is a teacher-centered teaching style. Lesson 4 involves frequent pair or group work, so it is necessary to explain to the students what to do in the lesson. As a result, function 7: Give instructions, was used a lot.

Table 7. The comparisons of L1 and L2 use functions: Lesson Content by FIFU (%)

Functions of Teacher talk		Lesson 3 Reading		Lesson 4 Oral Communication	
		E-FIFU	J-FIFU	E-FIFU	J-FIFU
LANGUAGE TEACHER ONLY	1. Translation	n/a	4.9	n/a	
	2. Explanation or summarizing	25.7	14.6	29.22	0.97
	3. Comment on L2 forms	11.9	14.9	7.47	3.90
	4. Comment on content		2.2	0.97	1.30
	5. Comment on language learning				
TEACHER Any Subject	6. Give feedback	6.3	0.7	12.99	
	7. Give instructions	3.7	4.9	25.32	3.90
	8. Check comprehension	2.6	1.5	3.57	
	9. Manage, control students	0.7	1.1		
	10. Comment on lesson	2.6	1.5	10.39	
	11. Comment on classroom equipment				
TOTAL		100		100	

Student cooperation*Proportion teacher L1 and L2 use*

The rate of L2 use was about 15% higher in Lesson 3, in which the students were cooperative, than in Lesson 5, in which the students were uncooperative. In the lesson with cooperative students, the teacher tried to use L2 a lot, and the learners responded to this, so this class had a high rate of L2 use. In the uncooperative lesson, however, the teacher abandoned frequent English use. Therefore, the L2 usage rate was not so high.

Functional analysis of utterances

Functions 2, Explanation or summarizing, and 4, Comment on content, of FIFU differed in Lesson 3 and Lesson 5. In Lesson 3, the rate of function 2, Explanation or summarizing, was higher by about 9% than in the difficult-

Table 8. Proportion teacher L1 and L2 use: Student Cooperativeness (%)

	L1 use (Japanese)	L2 use (English)	TOTAL
Lesson 3 (Cooperative)	49.5	50.5	100
Lesson 5 (Uncooperative)	64.9	35.1	100

to-teach class. By contrast, Lesson 5 had a high (9%) occurrence of function 4. In lessons with cooperative students, the teacher can often explain lesson items in L2, but it is difficult to do this with less cooperative students. To make up for this deficiency, the teacher provided background information in L1, because the teacher tried to make the lesson content fun for those uncooperative students.

Table 9. The comparisons of L1 and L2 use functions: Students Cooperative by FIFU (%)

Functions of Teacher talk		Lesson 3		Lesson 5	
		Cooperative		Uncooperative	
		E-FIFU	J-FIFU	E-FIFU	J-FIFU
LANGUAGE TEACHER ONLY	1. Translation	n/a		n/a	7.1
	2. Explanation or summarizing	17.2	17.2	17.2	11.6
	3. Comment on L2 forms	8.2	8.2	8.2	11.0
	4. Comment on content	1.1	1.1	1.1	11.3
	5. Comment on language learning				
TEACHER Any Subject	6. Give feedback	3.4	3.4	3.4	4.0
	7. Give instructions	3.7	3.7	3.7	5.9
	8. Check comprehension	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.7
	9. Manage, control students	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.4
	10. Comment on lesson	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.1
	11. Comment on classroom equipment				
TOTAL		100		100	

Function 9, Manage, control students lesson with uncooperative students had a high rate of L1 and L2 use. All of these were utterances of caution when students were chatting or not concentrating. In these lessons, the teacher must take care to control the students before teaching English.

Conclusion

Classroom contexts have a definite influence on L1 and L2 use, and the teacher properly adjusts the rate of usage and the function of L1 or L2 according to each situation. When this tendency can be known, the rate of L2 use can be raised each lesson.

The author would like to conclude this paper with the following points:

1. Teaching situations relate to teachers' L1 and L2 use.
2. Class size does not have a strong effect on teachers' L1 and L2 use.
3. Course contents affect teachers' L1 and L2 use.
4. Student cooperation influences teachers' L1 and L2 use.

Why do different situations influence teachers' L1 and L2 use? The author suggests that depending on lesson situations, teachers change their own theoretical positions. Macaro (2001) developed three positions to make sense of various stated beliefs regarding the teacher's use of the students' L1. *The Virtual Position* (Macaro, 2001; p.535.) states that, the classroom is the virtual target country, so the aim of the

classroom is the total—or near-total—exclusion of the L1, as long as the teacher is skilled enough. *The Maximal Position* (Macaro, 2001; p.535) forwards the belief that because there is no pedagogical value in L1 use, teachers try to employ the L2 maximally as the language of instruction. *The Optimal Position* (Macaro, 2001; p.535) suggests that some aspects of learning may actually be enhanced by the use of the L1. We need to discover the pedagogical principles for using the L1. Yonesaka (2005) added one more position applicable to Japanese junior high or senior high school teaching situations. It is *the Regressive Position* (Yonesaka, 2005; p.40) supports that in some contexts, i.e. teachers of L2 monolingual classes, believe they should rely mainly on L1 instruction, which they believe is the most effective way for these classes to be taught.

Macaro (2001) points out three and Yonesaka (2005) points out one position to make sense of various stated beliefs regarding the teacher's use of the students' L1. The Listening and Speaking classes have two positions: the Native English Teacher teaches *the Virtual Position*, so she never uses L1 and the classroom is changed to a virtual version of L2's country. The Japanese Teacher teaches *the Maximal Position* to agree with this idea, but sometimes uses L1 to help learners. Reading and easy-to-teach classes are taught from *the Optimal Position*. Depending on student achievement and lesson content, teachers use L1 effectively to help student language acquisition. Lessons with uncooperative students were taught using *the Regressive Position*, because the teacher cannot use a lot of L2 and uses L1 reluctantly in the class based on student needs. Macaro (2001) and Yonesaka (2005) explain that these positions are

based on every teacher's personal language teaching beliefs, so they have the potential to influence the educational philosophies of individual teachers.

Akinobu Shimura teaches at Asahikawa Jitsugyo High School. He is also a graduate student at Hokkaido University of Education, Asahikawa. He is currently interested in second language acquisition, code switching and grammar teaching. <rxa03643@yahoo.co.jp>.

Reference

- Duff, P. and Polio, C. (1990). How Much Foreign Language is There in the Foreign Language Classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 74.
- Inoue, Y. (2002). *Nihongo bunpou no shikumi, series-nihongo no shikumi wo saguru 1*, Machida, K. (Ed.), Tokyo: Kenkyusya.
- Liu, D., Ahn, G., Baek, K., and Han, N. (2004). South Korean High School English Teacher's Code Switching: Questions and Challenges in the Drive for Maximal Use of English in Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, No.4.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4).
- Polio, C. and Duff, P. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78.
- Rolin-Ianziti, J. and Brownlie, S. (2002). Teacher use of learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58(3).
- Sano, M. (2002). Action-Research deno jyugyo kaizen, dai 3-kai mondai no kakutei to yobi cyosa. *STEP Eigo jyoho*, 7-8gatsu go, 2002. Zaidan hojin nihon Eigo kentei kyokai.
- Yonesaka, S.M. (2005). A Proposal to Use Classroom Discourse Frames to Investigate Patterns of Teacher LI Use. *Hokkai Gakuen University Studies in Culture*, 32.

Appendix 1

Easy to teach English Class: Tentative plan of 5 grades (Sano, 2002, p.13.)

The following information has been translated into English from Japanese by the author.

Level 5: Most students participate in the class.

Most of the students are positive about the English class and the teacher, and they actively participate in any kind of activity. The class identifies strongly with the teacher and each other, and the class is laugh-filled. The teacher takes control in a mature manner and can carry on the class joyfully and in a relaxed atmosphere.

Level 4: 80% of students participate in the class. Need kind warnings

About 80% of students are positive about joining in the

English classes, and they participate in most activities. Teachers need to be alert sometimes, but it is enough to be gentle about it. When teachers think about student needs and make a plan carefully, they can do the class joyfully and in a relaxed atmosphere.

Level 3: 50% of students participate in the class. Some chatting or sleeping students

Over half of the students are collaborative, but sometimes, there are some students who don't participate in the activities. They sometimes chat with friends, walk in the classroom, or sleep when teachers are not watching them. When teachers alert them however, at least they stop their bad behavior. Although teachers think of their needs and make a plan carefully, the classes sometimes go amiss. On the other hand, sometimes all of them are pumped up for classes and concentrate in class. Unless a teacher always controls the students, the lessons do not advance smoothly.

Level 2: 20% of students participate in the class. Many chatting or sleeping students.

Eighty percent of the students hate English class, so unless the teacher asks the students strongly, they don't participate in the classes. Between teachers explaining, students are often walking around, chatting with friends, or sleeping in class. If the teacher doesn't alert them, the class is confused. But the students don't resist the teacher outright, like throwing something at the teacher. When the teacher slaps down strongly, they take heed at once, but they will not for long as many students cannot maintain concentration.

Teachers use more energy for discipline than to teach the lesson. Before class, teachers feel nervous to meet these students.

Level 1: Few students participate in the class. Collapse of classroom Gakyuu-hokai

Most of the students cannot accept not only English class but also any classes in the school. When it is time to start the class, some of the students don't enter the classroom, wandering out of classroom, or have group meetings in the class. The classroom peace completely collapses, so the teacher's attentions are ignored or replied to with rebellious attitude. The teacher cannot teach preprinted activities, and feel they are in danger.

Appendix 2

Functions of Instructor's First-language Use (FIFU)

As you watch the lesson, listen for utterances by the instructor that are in the students' first language. What is the instructor doing via the utterance? Number the function.

Instructor's role: LANGUAGE TEACHER (This utterance could occur only during a language lesson.)

1. Translate. (Translate lesson item or instructions; Translate an utterance.)
2. Explain or summarize lesson item.
3. Comment on L2 forms (Teach grammar, vocabulary formation, or pronunciation explicitly.)

4. Expand on content (Provide background information to make lesson comprehensible.)
5. Comment on language learning (Comment on language or language learning in general.)

Instructor's role: TEACHER (This utterance could occur in any classroom during any lesson.)

6. Give feedback
7. Give instructions (Give procedural instructions for complex activities.)
8. Check comprehension
9. Manage / control students
10. Comment on lesson
11. Comment on classroom equipment

Instructor's role: MEMBER OF AN INSTITUTION (This utterance could occur anywhere in the school.)

12. Comment/explain institutional information

Instructor's role: PERSON (This utterance could occur anywhere outside the school.)

13. Comment about self
14. Comment about students
15. Comment about general knowledge not related to the lesson