CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction Remarks

This chapter will discuss the theoretical perspectives which become the foundation of this study. Some theoretical backgrounds regarding the L1 usage in the L2 classrooms will be elaborated to provide further insights of what this study is trying to capture. In addition, this chapter will talk about the implementation of the theoretical perspectives discussed in previous section.

In general, this chapter is broken down into four sections. The first section will cover the elaboration of the role of L1 in L2 classrooms in which some functions of L1 in different levels of students’ competence are discussed. The second section will try to relate this study to the discussion of the contrasting views of the role of L1 in L2 classrooms. In this part, the advantages, disadvantages as well as the discussions of the personal beliefs and experiences regarding the pros and cons will also be elaborated. Section three will then move on to the discussion of the research and studies in the use of L1. Further related theories will be presented here. The fourth section which is the last section will try to synthesize the theories with how the data will be analyzed along with the concluding remarks of the previous sections discussed.
2.2. The role of L1 in L2

The circulating views of the use of L1 in the L2 classrooms have resulted in many attempts of providing a framework on the role of L1 in the L2 classrooms. This framework, according to most research on the inclusion of L1 in L2 classrooms, will provide the guidelines for teachers and students in conducting the learning processes in the classrooms that incorporate L1.

Weschler (cited in Cole 1998: 2) states that L1 is most useful at the beginning and low levels. He further argues that if students have little knowledge of the target language, L1 can be used to introduce the major differences between L1 and L2, and the main grammatical characteristics of L2 that they should be aware of. This can be the starting point of learning the target language and can save time in doing lots of guessing.

Teachers can also use L1 in L2 to increase students’ understanding of the L2. With students having had a previous knowledge in L1, teachers can then teach concepts in target language that are similar to students’ L1 so that students can understand the concepts better (Weschler in Cole 1998:2).

Teachers can also use L1 in their L2 class to explain the different concepts of grammar between the two languages so that students can have a better understanding on the grammar concepts and can eliminate mistakes in formulating them. This can be seen in the case of Yamamoto-Wilson (in Cole 1998:2) who looked closely at Japanese and English grammar and explained how two languages can have divergent principal branching directions, which can make acquisition of one of them as a second language more challenging.

Willis (cited in Cole 1998:2) advocates a liberal approach to using L1 by stating:
There are times when it is preferable and more economical as far as time is concerned to drop English for a few seconds... For example... to explain the meaning or use of a new word... to explain the aims of your lessons... as a check of your students’ understanding... and to discuss the main ideas after reading.

This can be applied especially in large, multi-level classes where the logistics and preparatory instructions for activities can be very time consuming.

In the case when abstract words or expressions are difficult to explain (or demonstrate using Total Physical Response) in L2, they are better translated. Weschler further suggests that at Advanced levels, there is much less tendency to “fall back” into L1 and translation may save time. Sometimes discussion in L1 of lesson aims and areas of difficulty can motivate students (1997 in Cole, 1998:2).

In the research done by Barak and Yinon (2005:98) regarding the use of L1 in Arab and Jewish EFL settings, they concluded three major functions of L1 in their findings. The first function is the use of L1 for comparison and clarification. To this end, L1 during the lesson is regarded as a means to gain insight into the structure of the target language, as well as an opportunity for furthering understanding of pupil’s mother tongue. Barak and Yinon also quoted what the student teacher participants involved in their study had to say regarding the use of L1 in their class. One of the student teacher participants stated that “When it comes to certain terms, concepts or answers that the pupils really do not seem to comprehend, it is preferable to use Hebrew”. Other student teacher participant added that in order to simplify matters, he talks to his students in Arabic and translate things into Arabic. While for purposes of clarification, he also gives
instructions, frames and organizes activities in L1. The second function of L1 is for promoting communication and pupil participation. This particularly is done to help students who are in the weaker sides so that they can understand what teachers say, communicate freely with the teachers and enhance their participation in the learning process. The third function of L1 is for managerial and rapport purposes. Barak and Yinon discovered in their study that the general finding for this theme pertained to the important function that both Jewish and Arab student teachers attributed to use of L1 is for establishing a positive rapport with the pupils, for creating an empathetic atmosphere in class, and for gaining control, and sustaining classroom management (Barak & Yinon, 2005:98).

Other functions of L1 in L2 classroom are also outlined in the study of Manara (2005). In her study she revealed that despite a strong will of the majority of the teacher respondents to use English to the fullest, there are still rooms for L1 to be included. Thus the functions of L1 in the study are to explain difficult grammar concepts, to re-emphasize important points, to establish good rapport with the students, and to give feedback in writing classes.

2.3. The contrasting views of the role of L1 in L2 classrooms

In relation to the roles of L1 in L2 classrooms previously discussed, there have also been contrasting views of the role of L1 in L2. Some noted scholars and language experts as well as the practitioners of English especially in EFL contexts have had their share of beliefs, ideas and criticism towards the incorporation of students’ L1 in L2 classrooms. Their share of beliefs, ideas and criticism is what has led the teaching of
English up to this present condition. In general the share of beliefs of this condition would lead to the failure of the learning phase since encouraging students to be totally engaged in using English would mean that they try to jeopardize students’ already built L1 concept in their classroom activities. This is in line with what Gebhard (in Mattioli 2004:21) argues that:

if students are not motivated to use English in the classroom or are pressured by peers to follow a hidden set of classroom rules that includes interacting in the students’ native language, then...techniques to compel students to use English can become novelties for the students, ones that will likely wane in their effect quickly.

The contrasting views discussed in this section will be the starting points of the study to further elaborate the analyses. Thus those two contrasting views will then be categorized as the proponent sides and the opponent sides which will be discussed in the following section along with the discussions of the personal beliefs and the experiences of the role of L1 in L2 classrooms.

2.3.1 The proponent sides

Strong and intriguing debates and criticism regarding the total exclusion of the L1 in the L2 classrooms have been growing in the field of second language acquisition. The total exclusion of the L1 will mean the ignorance of the existence of other language (the mother tongue) and therefore it ignores other ways of thinking. This could mean a language imperialism when one language (English) is seen as the more superior language than any other languages. In its relation to the monolingualism approach widely acknowledged, Phillipson (1992) asserts that this approach rejects the experience of other
languages which also means that it excludes “a child’s most intense existential experience” (p. 189). He further explains that the educational institutions and teachers in the periphery and outer circle countries neglect the fact that the banning of the mother tongue in the classrooms leads to the “alienation of the learners, deprives them of their cultural identity, and leads to acculturation rather than increased intercultural communicative competence” (1992:193).

As in the EFL contexts around the world, intercultural communicative competence is seen as an important aspect in the teaching and learning of the English language since it can help to reduce negative attitudes of the learners towards English language and perhaps towards the speakers of English themselves. In the EFL contexts in general, studies and research into the benefits of L1 inclusion in L2 classrooms has brought about a significant impact on the practices of teaching English as a foreign language in many countries around the world. New beliefs, concepts and practices regarding the research findings that support the L1 have shaped what today’s teaching and learning in many of the classrooms all over the world are like. Teachers as the sole facilitators have benefited from the research findings. They have gained new insights and support of how to take their position in the classrooms regarding the students’ L1.

Manara (2005) in her study in some tertiary level schools in Indonesia concludes that despite the majority desire of the teachers to use English to the fullest in their classrooms, there are still some indications which show that the mother tongue is still needed in different classroom contexts. In her study, Manara tries to capture the teachers’ beliefs and practices towards the use of the mother tongue as opposed to the monolingualism approach in the EFL classrooms. She involved nine Non-Native speaker
teachers and 216 undergraduate students which were mostly in the first and second year of their study. From the questionnaires and observation she conducted to both the teachers and the students, she concluded that the mother tongue is still needed in the contexts of when dealing with difficult grammatical concepts, in re-emphasizing important points, in establishing good rapport with the students, and in giving feedback in writing classes (Manara, 2005). Teachers in Indonesia can thus be benefited from such study especially in deciding when to incorporate L1 in their classroom.

However, teachers need to consider the degree of using students’ L1 in their classroom since it is important to measure the need of incorporating it in the classrooms. Teachers thus need to calculate the necessity according to the students’ needs, levels, and intelligence. This is done in order to enhance students’ learning the target language without negatively influence the flow of learning process. Atkinson (in Mattioli 2004:24) claims that the use of students’ native language should be carefully balanced by considering the doses of the four factors: (1) the students’ previous experiences; (2) the students’ levels; (3) the stage of the course; and (4) the stage of individual lesson. The students’ previous experiences like the learning environments, the learning styles and the teachers’ ways of teaching and communicating with them in their previous levels or schools might bring positive or negative impacts for the students, teachers then can eliminate the negative sides and enhance more the positive sides. The students’ levels that they obtained through a particular entrance test such as beginning, intermediate or advanced levels also carry important aspects for the teachers to consider, we for example cannot treat intermediate learners similarly to the advanced learners and vice versa in terms of teaching techniques and most importantly in terms of the mother tongue used.
The stage of the course is what the learners are learning in a particular level. This shows how and what are the learners dealing with. Thus the stage of individual lesson refers to the lesson being discussed and learned in a particular session.

Furthermore, as a panacea for the terminally guilty, Atkinson proposes an “L1 problem clinic,” where on a weekly or monthly basis learners could talk about problems, as a group, in L1. In this way, teachers could maintain L2-only policies in the class, and remain true in their training (in Mattioli, 2004:24). Teachers might be benefited from such an alternative since they can still adhere to the L2-only policy in the classroom and at the same time are able to communicate in L1 to solve the students’ problems encountered in L2 learning. Most importantly though, this will mostly benefit the students since they will not lose their chance to get valuable L2 input in the classroom while at the same time getting the solution for their problems.

Students, on the other hand, have also benefited from the research findings since they can feel more at ease when they know that they are able to communicate and learn with the teachers using their L1. In terms of beneficial aspects for the students, Schweers proposes that “starting with the L1 provides a sense of security and validates the learners’ lived experiences allowing them to express themselves” (Schweers in Mattioli, 2004:23). If students are allowed to be engaged with their L1, they will feel more secured in the classroom and thus will feel more relaxed and free to express themselves and to take risks in learning the L2.

Using L1 can also provide an easy access for students to solve their problems regarding the teaching activities in the classroom. Wells (1999) and Anton and DiCamilla (1998) agree that problem solving comes about more easily and naturally when the L1 is
used, and it can provide a foundation for learners to build L2 structures, especially during collective activities in class (in Mattioli, 2004:23). Furthermore, using L1 will also mean that students’ cultural backgrounds are respected and that “use of the mother-tongue is a signal to the children that their language and culture have value, and this will have the beneficial effect on self-perceptions, attitudes, motivation and, consequently, on achievement” (Garret et al. in Mattioli, 2004:23).

Teachers’ background knowledge regarding the use of L1 is very crucial in this case. Teachers are required to have an ample knowledge on when and why to use L1 in the classrooms since they are the ones who are mainly responsible for the students’ success in the target language learning. It is suggested that the L1 can be incorporated in any levels as it is functional and does not interfere the students’ understanding of the target language. Commenting on this issue, Atkinson proposes that:

instead of seeing students’ mind as a tabula rasa, English teachers can recognize students’ previous experiences with language and learning and can build on them, and they can expand on learners’ linguistic knowledge by employing the L1 intelligently…. (1987:241).

Once the teachers comprehend this concept, the use of students’ L1 in the classrooms will be beneficial.

The teachers’ role in incorporating the use of L1 in the classroom will also affect the overall understanding of the students on the target language learning. As long as the teachers can justify the use of L1 in the classrooms, students will be much helped in grasping the target language learning. Schweers (cited in Mattioli 2004:23) further suggests that the use of students’ native language will influence the classroom dynamic,
create a better classroom environment, and help students is grasping the lesson effectively.

2.3.1.1 Personal beliefs on the use of L1 in L2 classroom

Further proponent of using L1 in the L2 classrooms are based on the personal beliefs and practices of some English practitioners from different institutions around the world. The first proponent argues that the using of non-target languages in the classroom is, “Yes, conditionally.” Reineman in her argument states that when I am introducing new vocabulary in which meaning can be expressed through drawings, noises, pantomimes or the like, I use the target language exclusively. However, when attempting to communicate ideas that are abstract, I use/permit first language. She further adds that by balancing the proportion of the L1 it can make what she said as a huge burden was lifted from me (Reineman, TESL-EJ: 1-2, 2002).

Ornella Spano of Cagliari, Italy has his comment about using L1 with his students in his classroom. He shares that as far as concerns grammar structures, at first I explain the topic only in English and then, by the means of transparencies or Power Point Presentation I present the topic in Italian. He admits that he feels his students are more confident when they understand everything. He is not an Alien creature anymore in his classroom! (Spano, TESL-EJ: 3, 2002).

Teaching with her beginning students at MA Petaluma Adult School Petaluma, California, Susan Connick-Hirtz admitted to use L1 in the classroom. She addresses the following reasons for using L1 in her classroom: I use it primarily when they enter the classroom to assist them in feeling comfortable and to encourage them to take risks.
Many of my students have spent little time in a school at all. Some are illiterate. Some are terrified of a school setting and particularly, of Americans. Many are here illegally and are desperate to learn as much as possible as quickly as possible for a variety of reasons. While motivated, they don’t understand the educational process (Hirtz, TESL-EJ:6, 2002).

One question regarding the exclusive use of L2 in the classroom is should we really believe that our students do not form syntheses in L1 of grammatical phenomena while learning? The answer is according to Tomasz Pilch who teaches in formal school in Poland that the students do and we’d better check carefully the quality and shape of these syntheses. He further argues that to make students understand what they are being taught correctly it would be helpful if the teacher knew the grammar and vocabulary of their language and sometimes referred to it to prevent the students from forming a wrong idea of the nature of they are thought. He also strongly agrees that teaching a foreign language should take into consideration the L1 saying that universal approach ignoring the peculiarities of the students’ mother tongue profits mostly the teacher who will not learn anything new (Pilch, TESL-EJ:7, 2002).

Bill Snyder of MA TEFL Program, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey has another story of using L1 in his classroom. It happened when he taught English at the survival level English classroom to Russian immigrants in the US:

The students came into the class with no English and I insisted on only using English in the classroom, hiding my knowledge of Russian from them. We worked well and hard, but finally the day came when the word ‘however’ popped up in a reading. The students were baffled and the reading ground to a halt. I spent what felt like an eternity trying to explain ‘however’ to them in English. I tried everything-
pantomime, drawings, verbal explanation...no luck. It was beyond current ability level to understand the concept through these means and the result was an increasingly frustrated group, including me. Finally, I gave up and had one of the students search through her belongings for her dictionary to look it up, wasting a few more minutes. Everyone was relieved the torture was over.

Snyder further comments that the students’ L1 is not an enemy of learning unless we make it one...I believe it can be a resource, one that has to be used sparingly and appropriately. It may actually help students learn (Snyder, TESL-EJ: 11, 2002).

Another experience that supports the use of L1 in L2 classroom comes from Dennis Bricault of North Park University in Chicago, IL USA. He teaches Spanish and ESL at a small university in Chicago in which he couldn’t possibly get away with using only Spanish in his beginning Spanish courses. He further argues that my students would either revolt or drop my class due to frustration; I use English judiciously when talking about abstract topics (grammar) or when sharing anecdotes about my experiences while living in Spain (Bricault, TESL-EJ: 4, 2002).

In the case of when not whether or not to use L1 in L2 classroom, N. Eleni Pappamihiel of Florida State University has her say that in cases where the entire class represents one language group, she strongly believes use of the students’ L1 TO SUPPORT L2 acquisition is appropriate but not in the case where the use of the L1 rescues unprepared teachers! (Pappamihiel, TESL-EJ: 5, 2002)

Pappamihiel’s belief is in line with what Loewenstein agrees that there is a time and place in which to utilize the L1 in order to facilitate the acquisition of the L2. She adds that during her teaching time in a self-contained bilingual elementary school in New Jersey, USA, concepts were introduced in Spanish to ensure the students’ understanding
and avoid delays in learning academic content while they were acquiring the English vocabulary but the rest of the lesson was taught (as the students progresses in English) in English (Loewenstein, TESL-EJ: 6, 2002).

As in the case of a monolingual classroom, Dick Tibbetts of University of Macau, Macau SAR, China allows L1 in the classroom when he feels it’s absolutely necessary. He says that sometimes a quick translated word makes life easier. Sometimes, too, it helps to compare the way the L1 and the L2 work. It gives, what Tibbetts says as an insight into language (Tibbetts, TESL-EJ: 12, 2002).

Donna Minick of Rancho Santiago College, Santa Ana, CA, USA advocates that when the material is already covered, target language is a must but in the case when the material is still new teachers need to resort them selves to L1. Minick teaches mainly Spanish speakers, and she feels that clarification in the target language, or comparison between grammar practices in English and Spanish can help adult learners, and provide them with an anchor so that they don’t feel totally adrift (Minick, TESL-EJ: 11, 2002).

2.3.2 The opponent sides

The opponent sides of the use of L1 in the L2 classrooms mostly criticize the L1 inclusion as interference errors (also called negative language transfer) as bad habits that were to be eradicated through drills, memorization, and a strict limitation on the use of L1. This was a popular belief that appeared around the mid-20th century when the influential Audiolingual Method was widely applied (Mahmoud, 2006:28). This Audiolingual Method strongly restricted the use of L1 and therefore, teachers have to
implement the techniques of drilling and memorization to maximize the use of English in the classrooms.

Date back, new approaches to language learning also considered the use of the L1 as undesirable. These new approaches appeared in the 1970s and 1980s when cognitive psychology theorized that people acquire their L2 in a manner similar to the way they acquired their L1 as a child (Mahmoud, 2006:29). There has been a kind of similar route of learning between learning the L1 and the L2 in the brain of the children. Therefore, the inclusion of L1 is seen as a negative interference in this phase of learning. Cook (2001b) in Manara (2005) has his say regarding the similar manner between learning L1 and L2 from the second language acquisition point of view that it is mostly based on two hypotheses: (1) L2 acquisition is the same as L1 acquisition. This hypothesis is based on how children learn their first language. The teaching and learning of L2 should be based on the characteristics of L1 acquisition. Cook disagrees with monolingualism for grounding its approach on this hypothesis. He argues that this perception does not encourage L2 learners to rely on their L1 since children learning their mother tongue do not have another language in their mind. Cook regrets the fact that this idea of teaching and learning a second language has been adopted by many teaching methods since the ‘Reform Movement’ (Cook, 2001b:404 in Manara, 2005:85). This has the implication that the way children learn a second language is to some extend similar to the way children acquire a first language. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no need to relate the students’ mother tongue in the process of students’ learning a second language. This hypothesis also tries to relate to the argument that L1 and L2 learners do not have different characteristics in acquiring a second language. (2) The second hypothesis states
that L1 and L2 should be kept separate in the mind (compartmentalization). According to this hypothesis, L2 learning can only happen by using the L2 instead of being connected to the L1. This strong tendency of separating L2 and L1 exists in the many attempts of teaching meaning without using the L1. Teachers use L2 to define an L2 word, mime the word, use visual aids, and other ways which do not involve the L1 with the hope that learners will build up a separate L2 system in their brain (Cook, 2001b in Manara 2005:85). This tendency also explains the many attempts teachers in Indonesian schools both in formal and non-formal institutions to use paraphrase in defining L2 words in order to avoid using L1. The circular belief among teachers is that this method would increase the acquisition of L2 by the learners.

Other influential argument regarding the L1 exclusion in terms of second language acquisition is far dated back to the year of 1974 when in relation to the acquisition of grammatical morphemes, Dulay and Burt (1974a; 1974b) began with the premise that the first and second language acquisition in children were the same process, and that the kinds of errors made by a second language learner would be the same as those made by a first language learner of the same language (Nunan, 1999:39). This explains that in terms of grammatical morphemes, children are expected to learn them through the L2 instruction most of the time.

Other influential belief of the negative interference the L1 might bring into the effective learning of the L2 also comes from the view that students’ using the L1 in the classrooms with their peers is merely a “hidden” set of classroom rule that neither teachers nor students should or are obliged to acknowledge it. Scholars further argue that this condition would lead to the failure of the learning phase since encouraging students
to be totally engaged in using English would mean that they try to jeopardize students’ already built L1 concept in their classroom activities. This is in line with what Gebhard (in Mattioli 2004:21) argues that:

if students are not motivated to use English in the classroom or are pressured by peers to follow a hidden set of classroom rules that includes interacting in the students’ native language, then...techniques to compel students to use English can become novelties for the students, ones that will likely wane in their effect quickly.

Regarding this, Gebhard believes that the already L1 built concept in the students’ interaction with their peers in the classroom would to some extend negatively influence the students’ willingness to use English. Thus he concludes that it is important that teachers motivate students to use English to the fullest.

Others scholars would argue on the danger of overusing the L1 stating that it would deprive the learners of valuable input in the L2. This is what Ellis notes that too much L1 use could “deprive the learners of valuable input in the L2” (in Mattioli, 2004:23). This to some extend will hamper students’ acquisition of the L2 if teachers are engaged more in the L1 and students will lose their chance to get the valuable L2 input. Atkinson in this case also argues that there is a strong need to maximize the L2 usage by stating that “every second spent using L1 is a second not spent using English-and every second counts.” This provides a “warning” for teachers that if they include L1 in their classrooms, students will miss their valuable moment of acquiring the L2. In the EFL contexts in general this is considered unbenefficial since learners have no other immediate exposures with English other than inside the classroom settings (in Mattioli 2004:23).
In relation to the valuable input that students need to get in the classrooms, the proponents of second language (L2) exclusivity (or near exclusivity) argue that learners do not need to understand everything that is said to them by the teacher and that switching to the first language (L1) undermines the learning process (F. Chambers, 1991; Halliwell & Jones, 1991; Macdonald, 1993). In this case the learners’ own in-built language system should be taken into consideration. It can be done through providing the maximum exposure to the target language in the classrooms, because teaching entirely through the target language can provide a real language situation for the students, it can also allow learners to experience unpredictability in learning the target language. These positions would seem to imply support for Krashen’s hypothesis of comprehensible input and natural order of acquisition (in Macaro, 2001:531). This also leads to the opponent by Cook (1991) who strongly states that whereas principles of code switching may exist, in the FL classroom use of L1 inevitably cuts down on exposure to the L2.

2.3.2.1 Personal beliefs against the use of L1 in L2 classroom

In addition to the theories against the use of L1 in L2 classroom previously discussed, there have been some personal strong debates against the use of L1 in L2 classroom from some English practitioners from some teaching institutions from different countries. One strong opposition stated that teachers using L1 in L2 classrooms are performing an act of “comfort now, pay later”—an act of comforting students to easily learn English at a particular time by providing the risks for students in the future. It is also stated that students need to get used to the risks of the difficulties of learning English.
since the beginning, using L1 to comfort the students is then considered as an act of sabotage (Tillyer, TESL-EJ:3, 2002).

Other opposition said that students in EFL contexts do not have the immediate exposures to English outside the classroom. There is no street conversation, no TV, no newspapers or magazines that help students to practice their English. Therefore, you cannot spend too much of this valuable teaching time using L1 (Tibbets, TESL-EJ:6, 2002). Furthermore Tillyer stated that it is important for teachers to be freed of the tyranny of use of L1, just as much as we want to give our learners the strength and confidence to try everything in L2. She further argued that teachers can act out, demonstrate, or illustrate the English words without having to use L1 (Tillyer, TESL-EJ:8, 2002).

Often students do not have the language for performing linguistic tasks, therefore, Swain, in her teaching practice provides the items in which students do not know how to make requests or ask something in English to the teacher. Swain lists the following sample items:

Could you repeat that?
I am sorry? Excuse me?
Can you speak louder, please?
How do you spell_________?
What does_______________ mean? Etc.

Swain added that it is very exciting to see the light go on when students first use these phrases and are able to negotiate their way through the problem (Swain, TESL-EJ:10, 2002).
Final argument comes from Taylor who argues that *learning a language is like learning how to swim. You have to get in there, splash around, get wet, probably swallow a few mouthfuls of water. If you continue to hold on the bar at the side-and are not discouraged from doing so, you will never win an Olympic medal.* Taylor further argues that based on his experience teaching English in the Czech Republic, surprising results regarding students’ success in learning English were shown by the native teachers of English who could not speak the L1 because then they had to conduct all the interaction and communication with the students in English (Taylor, TESL-EJ:16, 2002).

2.4. The research and studies in the use of L1

Many studies that support the use of students’ native language in the EFL classrooms have been mushrooming over the decades. These have mainly been caused by the awareness of the existence of other languages and cultures and by the shifting paradigm of English as an International language. Many practitioners and teachers themselves have stated an agreement on the beneficial aspects of L1 usage in L2 classrooms both to the teachers and to the students (Cole 1998; Schweers in Mattioli, 2004).

Though in contrast with the regulated policy in their respective institutions, teachers to some extent can then benefit from the following research and studies:

Lameta-Tufuga examined the effects of having learners discuss a task in their first language before they had to carry it out in writing in the second language. This, according to them could enable the students to fully understand the task through the medium of their first language before they performed the written task in English. The first language discussion of the task had some interesting features. Firstly, the learners
were all very actively involved in coming to grips with the ideas. Secondly, the first language discussion included quite a lot of the second language vocabulary which would be used in the later task. Thus the discussion not only helped learners to get on top of the content, but it also helped them gain control of relevant L2 vocabulary in a very supportive L1 context (in Nation, 2003:4).

The same finding was also discussed in Knight in comparing the two different groups of doing and not doing the preparatory L1 discussion, the researcher found out that the learners who did the preparatory L1 discussion in groups did much better on the L2 written task than other learners who did preparatory L2 discussion even though that discussion was in the same language as the subsequent written task (in Nation, 2003:3)).

The two research discussed above has an implication that there has been a useful role of L1 in helping learners gain the knowledge needed to reach a higher level of L2 performance. Thus whenever a teacher feels that a meaning based L2 task might be beyond the capabilities of the students, a small amount of L1 discussion can help overcome the problems (Nation, 2003:3).

When it comes to ways of conveying an unknown word, teachers tend to adopt the ways of giving the definition in the L2, a demonstration, a picture or a diagram, a real object, L2 context clues, or an L1 translation. Whichever way a teacher uses, studies have revealed that in comparing the effectiveness of various methods for learning, the studies always come up with the result that an L1 translation is the most effective (Lado, Baldwin and Lobo 1967; Mishima 1967; Laufer and Shmueli 1997 in Nation 2003). Further study showed that when the use of an L1 translation is combined with the use of word cards for the initial learning of vocabulary, then learners have a very effective
strategy for speeding up vocabulary growth (McKeown cited in Nation 2003:4). It is further argued that although there are frequent criticisms raised of learning L1-L2 word pairs, these criticisms are not supported by research. The research tend to show opposite result, the direct learning of L2 word cards with their L1 translations is a very effective method of learning (Nation, 2003:3).

To support the study regarding ways of conveying L2 words, there have been some studies on dictionary use. The surveys conducted on use of dictionary by Laufer and Kimmel 1997; Atkins and Varantola 1997 and Baxter 1980 show that learners favour bilingual or bilingualised dictionaries. Bilingual or bilingualised dictionaries are those that make use of the L1 translation. If learners make use of the monolingual dictionaries—those that only use L2, learners are expected to have a range of 2000 vocabulary and this can be gained by the learners if they have studied English for five to six years. Monolingual dictionaries have more difficult definitions, which are much more difficult than L1 synonyms. This explains why according to the survey most English learners tend to make use of the bilingual or bilingualised dictionaries (Nation, 2003:4).

In finding out how frequently and for what purposes the teachers of the University of Puerto Rico, Banyamon Campus used Spanish in their classes of mono-lingual Spanish speaking classes, Schweers (1997-1998) designed and conducted research on the use of the mother tongue in English classes. The research involved both the teachers and the students and the result indicated that a high percentage of the students participants felt that Spanish should be used in their classes especially to explain difficult concepts and more importantly to help students feel more comfortable and confident, to check comprehension, and to define new vocabulary items. From the fourth teachers that were
involved in the research, all of them admitted to use Spanish in their classes when students had difficulties in answering in English. The teacher then allowed them to use Spanish when making some illustrations about English such as in comparing between greetings in English and in Spanish, by throwing English phrases in Spanish to keep students who do not understand every word on track. The results from this research showed that in English classes in a Puerto Rican university, Spanish should be used to some degree. Students feel there are cases when Spanish will facilitate their comprehension of what is happening in the class. A majority of the students also agree that the use of Spanish helps them to learn English (Forum Magazine, 2003: 34-37).

The study on the use of Spanish in a Puerto Rican university conducted by Schweers also provided the suggested uses for the L1 in the EFL classroom as can be seen in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Uses for the L1 in the EFL Classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Eliciting language</strong> “How do you say ‘x’ in English?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Checking comprehension</strong> “How do you say ‘I’ve been waiting for ten minutes’ in Spanish?” (Also used for comprehension of a reading or a listening text).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Giving complex instructions to basic levels</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Co-operating in groups</strong> Learners compare and correct answers to exercises or tasks in the L1. Students at times can explain new points better than the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Explaining classroom methodology at basic levels</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Using translation to highlight a recently taught language item</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Checking for sense** If students write or say something in the L2 that does not make sense, have them try to translate it into the L1 to realize their error.

8. **Testing** Translation items can be useful in testing mastery of forms and meanings.

9. **Developing circumlocution strategies** When students do not know how to say something in the L2, have them think of different ways to say the same thing in the L1, which may be easier to translate.

Adapted from “The Mother Tongue in the Classroom” By David Atkinson.

Other research on the use of L1 in L2 classroom was also conducted by Lily Barak and Yinon from The Faculty of Education, The University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel. In their study they involved 14 Arab and Jewish EFL student teachers who are investigated in the terms of their perspective towards the use of L1 in their EFL classroom. The result of the research showed that both Jewish and Arab student teachers exhibited new insights regarding the different purposes for which L1 can be used in a communicative lesson. These were classified into three major themes/content categories: (1) using L1 for clarification purposes; (2) using L1 for promoting communication in L2 and for enhancing pupil participation; (3) using L1 to assist the novice teacher in managerial aspects of the lesson and in building rapport with the pupils (Barak & Yinon, 2005: 91-113).

In their research, Barak and Yinon also provide the extract of student teachers’ personal beliefs regarding the use of L1 in their L2 class as can be seen in the following table:

---

Adapted from “The Mother Tongue in the Classroom” By David Atkinson.
Table 1 Student teachers’ quotations, sorted according to the categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Using L1 for clarification purposes</th>
<th>Using L1 for communication purposes</th>
<th>Using L1 for managerial purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>I have realized that L1 is often an effective strategy for clarification – especially with weaker pupils and to make sure that everyone understands</td>
<td>The use of L1 is contrary to what I had thought sometimes helpful for promoting communication in L2 – to reassure pupils or to stimulate them to elaborate on a point if they don’t know every single word in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>I believe that it is far better to participate in Hebrew rather than not participate at all… This is not a problem, but rather a sign of learning</td>
<td>Using L1 for humour or as an ice-breaker has proved to be an effective strategy for classroom management, something I wasn’t aware of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It implies that teachers with whichever background of practices and beliefs towards the L1 usage in the L2 classroom, can still benefit from the incorporation of L1 in their classroom to some extends in an attempt to enhance students learning the L2.

2.5. Concluding remark and the synthesize of the theories to the study

The issue on the use of L1 in the L2 classroom especially in EFL contexts in all over the world has brought about two contradictive views. The opponent sides argue that it is a non-questionable policy to use target language in the EFL classroom to the utmost
level of usage. It is argued that if students are allowed to interact in their L1, the learning process of the L2 will be hampered and thus the acquisition process of the L2 is considered a failure. The proponent sides on the other hand view the inclusion of students’ L1 in their L2 learning will mean helping students to be engaged more in the learning process since students will feel more comfortable when teachers acknowledge their L1 as an important aspect in the classroom.

Concerning the inclusion of L1 in the L2 classroom in the EFL contexts, the proportional use should be the main consideration for teachers and practitioners who are in the favor of using L1 in their L2 classroom. The proportional use of L1 includes the level of the students and the materials being taught in the level while the functions of the L1 in the L2 classroom ranging from to explain difficult concepts, to check for comprehension, to give feedback in writing classes, to keep students on the track and to build good rapport with the students.

The theories and the contrasting views regarding the role of L1 in L2 classrooms will serve as the main guidelines for the researcher to collect the pertinent data in this study. The researcher will try to capture the functions of the L1 used by both the teachers and the students and will try to relate and analyze the results based on the relevant theories that support the findings. As for the contrasting views, the researcher will analyze the views of the teacher respondents based on the interview results and will try to compare and contrast the views related to the use of L1 in their respective classrooms. The results of the analyses may or may not be in line with the theories outlined in this section due to the nature of the research itself which is not about what it should be but about what it is and so the data and the result presented will be based on the actual data.
collected in the research. Another aspect that influences it is also due to the nature of the teaching and learning contexts of the L2 in the research site where the researcher conducted this study.