

# Students' perception of teachers' language use in an EFL classroom

Mizuka Tsukamoto

## 言語学習環境における第 1 言語使用に関する考察

塚 本 瑞 香

### Abstract

This paper examines students' perception of teachers' use of language in EFL classrooms. The debate over whether or not the students' L1 should be used in classrooms is ongoing. In the case of Japan, the students' relatively low proficiency in English, at the time of entering university, makes teachers question whether maintaining English only classrooms "work" or puts too much pressure on students. Questionnaire results from students show that regardless of their proficiency level, most students appreciated that the classes were conducted in English only rather than using Japanese. It also indicated areas for a further action research to consider students' perception of language in classrooms.

**Key words:** EFL classroom, language of instruction, use of L1, target language

(Received October 1, 2011)

### 抄 録

言語教育の分野において、教室で学生の第 1 言語 (L1) を用いるかどうか議論的となっている。日本の場合、大学入学時の学生の英語力が低下していることもあり、目標言語 (TL) のみでの授業形態にどう向き合うかが問われている。本調査では、英語力に関わらず、学生は L1 ではなく TL による授業展開を好むということが明らかとなった。とすれば、今後の言語学習環境の方向性を探るべく、アクションリサーチの実行が有用だといえる。

**キーワード:** 言語学習環境、指導言語、第 1 言語の使用、目標言語

(2011 年 10 月 1 日受理)

## **Introduction**

Educational institutions have their own “policy” of how they want their English classes to be conducted and which language they want their classes taught in: the students’ L1 (in this case, Japanese) or the target language (TL), in this case English. Some institutions do not have specific “policy” and allow the classes to be taught in the students’ L1; others expect and require the instructors to keep to only English in the classroom, regardless of the teachers’ *first language* (the term, *native speaker* will be avoided in this paper, as it may cause confusion due to what constitutes a *native speaker* of a language). In such institutions, not just the teacher-student but also student-student interactions are expected to be kept in English only. Some other institutions encourage the teachers to teach classes in English, however, they have no strict rule about language use and thus some instructors use the students’ L1 in classes. In a recent study, McMillan, Rivers and Cripps (2009) found that EFL teachers had mixed attitudes towards the use of students’ L1 in language classrooms.

The Ministry of Education, Culture, Technology and Science (MEXT) announced a curriculum in which English classes in high schools should be taught in English (MEXT, 2008). It noted that the instructions should be given in English to maximise the students’ exposure to the target language (p. 108). This trend is consistent with the Natural Approach introduced by Krashen (1981). It seems quite reasonable that the English classes at the university level are conducted in English; however, whether or not this English only approach enhances effective language learning is still a question. According to the Central Council for Education (2008), in Japan, more than 60% of the university teachers are concerned about the decline of the students’ academic abilities. Ford (2009) notes there are students who enter universities without having mastered fundamental English skills. In addition, due to the diverse methods of university entrance exams, some students are admitted to university without having to take language (English) exams.

This study took place in English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms in a private university, where the teachers, regardless of their first language, are encouraged to use English in classrooms, however, the university has no such explicit rule. Therefore, the teachers seem to use whatever language they find “suitable” for their classes.

As most English teachers do, the writer has always tried to maintain “use of L2 maximised” classrooms. However, the term *maximised* seems rather vague and the *possible* amount of L2 is rather subjective and cannot be easily generalised. For my own approach, I consider the L2 maximised classroom, as one in which the use of L2 in the classroom is maximised by all the instructions and interactions with the students kept in English. In the classes examined in this study, the students are given the freedom to use either Japanese or English when they interact with other students during activities. However, they are expected and required to communicate with the instructor in English. The preference of maintaining

teacher-student interactions in L2 may come from the writer's own experience of studying in classes taught in English only and having experienced a sense of achievement.

As mentioned above, the issue of the students' low proficiency in English, at the time of entering university, made the writer think how to manage an EFL classroom when the institution does not specify which approach to take. This issue has, for the last few years, made the writer wonder whether the "English only interaction" with the students is "working" or putting too much pressure on the students and whether or not there is a need for the use of Japanese in classes. Or on the contrary, would the students appreciate a completely English only classroom? What do students think about teacher's use of language in the EFL classroom? What do students like or not like about the teacher's use of English in classrooms? To explore this line of inquiry, a questionnaire was given to the students.

The present research was conducted on the basis of the writer's inquiry on the students' perception of their teacher's use of language in an EFL classroom; whether or not the students were comfortable and what they found was useful or not useful in their teacher's choice of language. This paper will, first, examine the view towards the two approaches to teaching English; Monolingual approach and Bilingual approach and the important findings in the past research. The former approach believes that avoiding the use of students' L1 will be effective for L2 learning and the latter insists that the use of students' L1 in the classroom enhances L2 learning. Following questionnaire results from the students, I will discuss some findings and implications for further research in considering the students' perception of language use in classrooms.

### ***Historical view***

According to Ellis (1985), interest in the language in the classroom has grown steadily and has been motivated by the recognition that successful outcomes may depend on the language used by the teacher and the type of interactions occurring in the classroom, whether it is a subject lesson or a language lesson (p. 143). And the contentious debate between the supporters of "monolingual approach" (avoiding students' L1 in classrooms) and "bilingual approach" (allowing students' L1) over which should be taken to enhance students' learning of English has not seen an end yet to date. Researches, for example, Krashen (1987), Littlewood (1981), Turnbull (2001) support the monolingual approach and the latter approach is supported by Atkinson (1987), Cook (2001), Nation (2003), Auerbach (1993). However, it is probably worth noting that a number of language educators who were in favour of the only approach have validated their experience in how they appreciated the use of L1 as a valuable tool for L2 learning (e.g., Atkinson, 1993; Auerbach, 1994; Burden, 2000).

As the focus of developing English skills moved from written aspect to a communicative spoken aspect, the monolingual approach started to gain support and become more main

stream. Pennycook (1994) argues that one reason why monolingual teaching has been so readily accepted is due the belief of inherent superiority of the Europeans over non-European languages (p. 121) and “the ardent belief of the importance of English, and the disrespect shown towards other languages.” (p. 137). According to Harbord (1992), the idea of avoiding the students’ L1 in foreign language teaching goes back to around the turn of the century, with the appearance of the direct method. In addition, English language teaching became a casual career for young people visiting from Europe to EFL/ESL countries. This encouraged the teachers to make the use of only English in classrooms a necessity. Following this trend, teacher training movement became popular in Britain to meet the needs of providing teachers for multilingual classes, which reinforced the strategy of avoiding students’ L1 (p. 350).

### ***Support for Monolingual approach***

The monolingual approach has long been prescribed by official policies in the field of English Language Teaching (Macaro, 2001; Philipson, 1992) as well as in other contexts (McMillan & Turnbull, 2009). The main reason that the supporters for monolingual approach raise is the exposure to the target language (Krashen, 1987, Turnbull, 2001). Krashen (1985, p. 14) insists that the students’ L1 should not be used in the classroom in order to maximise the exposure of the target language. He stated that all the lesson or as much as possible should be in L2 and that there was a definite relationship between comprehensible input in L2 and proficiency. In a more recent study, Ellis (2005, p. 8) asserts that the more L2 exposure students receive, the faster the students learn.

Indeed, students in an EFL environment do not have much exposure, either input or output, to L2 as it is not a necessary component in their daily life. Therefore, it is quite natural that teachers would want to provide as much exposure as possible in the classroom. Turnbull (2001) also argues that the use of L1 in the classroom takes away the students’ opportunity to have contact with the target language when they do not have much contact outside the classroom. It could also lead to demotivation of the students. Littlewood (1992, p. 45) insists that if the teachers abandon the use of the target language in the classroom, learners will not be convinced that the foreign language they are learning could be an effective means of communication. It is only through the actual usage that the students acknowledge its worth. Similarly, Chaudron (in Duff & Polio, 1990, p. 121) writes “the common belief in the typical foreign language classroom is that the fullest competence in the TL is achieved by means of the teacher providing a rich TL environment”.

Ellis (1985, p. 120) also highlights the importance of using the TL for both language related and classroom management functions. He argues that:

In the EFL classroom, however, teachers sometimes prefer to use the pupils’ L1 to explain and organize a task and to manage behaviour in the belief that this will facilitate the

medium-centred [language-related] goals of the lesson. In so doing, however, they deprive the learners of valuable input in the L2 (p. 133).

Burden (2000) came to believe an integral part of language learning is lost when the students "mother tongue" is used as students' only regular exposure to English is in the classroom. Similarly, seen from the teacher's point of view, Macaro (1997) found that teachers did not state any pedagogical value in using the learner's L1 and that it is "clearly something that gets in the way of L2 learning" (p. 29).

### ***Support for Bilingual approach***

Though some may feel L1 use actually slows acquisition of the target language, is a waste of time, and leads to bad feelings, others see judicious use of it as a necessary element for learner support. The reasons for the bilingual approach could, perhaps, be categorised into the following three: to maintain a comfortable classroom atmosphere, to promote the students' comprehension and to use the class-time efficiently. Polio and Duff (1994) note that the use of L1 could be useful for creating a relaxing atmosphere in the classroom. Burden used an "English only approach" for his classes, however he notes that he began to feel "remote" from the students as individuals because there was little natural conversational interaction in English or Japanese (2000, p. 5). He also found in his research that starting with the L1 provides students with a sense of security and validates the learners' lived experiences, allowing them to express themselves. The learner was then willing to experiment and take risks with English (Burden, 2000). According to Nation (1990), exclusion of students' L1 is a criticism of the language and that this degradation has harmful psychological effect on the learners. Auerbach (1994) insists that how students' L1 is managed in the classroom may create tension, and that monolingual policies tend to be combined with political reasons than pedagogical reasons (Auerbach, 1993).

The second reason is to increase students' comprehension. Atkinson (1993) states, that for many learners, particularly adults and teenagers, occasional use of the L1 gives them the opportunity to show that they are intelligent and sophisticated people (p. 13). Auerbach (1993) similarly argues that the bilingual policy is not only effective but also necessary for adult ESL students by providing positive results of recent studies with L1 use in ESL classrooms. She found in her studies that the use of L1 had a successful effect in lowering the students' anxiety levels and other affective barriers for students (Auerbach, 1993). Krashen (1982) points out that exposure to comprehensible input is crucial for successful language acquisition. If the students cannot understand what has been mentioned, they will not be comfortable in proceeding with a task or retain it in their mind. He also states that quality bilingual education provides students with knowledge and literacy in their first language, which indirectly but powerfully aid them as they strive for English proficiency (Krashen, 1987). Cook (2001)

argues that teaching should take advantage of the many L1-L2 connections that learners naturally make in their minds, by highlighting the similarities and differences between the two languages. Harbord (1992: 351) similarly states that students will also naturally equate what they are learning with their L1 so trying to eliminate this process will only have negative consequences.

Turnbull (2001) suggests that maximizing the TL does not and should not mean that there is harm in the teachers using the students' L1 and that "A principle that promotes maximal teacher use of the TL acknowledges that the L1 and TL can assist simultaneously.

Atkinson (1987) gives time-saving as one of his principle arguments in favour of using L1 and, at the practical level, the most frequent justification given by teachers for L1 use is that time saved by communicating in the mother tongue can be used for more productive activities.

### ***When is the L1 used in classrooms?***

Previous research confirms that the amount of the L1 used in a classroom varies. Following are the percentages of the use of L1 found by various researchers: Macaro (2001): 4-12%, Rolin-Ianzizi & Brownlie (2002): 0-18%, Levine (2003): 0-60%, Duff & Polio (1990): 0-90%. Regarding the use of L1, researchers have noted different functions that occur in classrooms. Duff and Polio (1990) found a variety of L1 use among foreign language (FL) teachers. One teacher who almost never used the L1 (English) in the classroom did so mainly due to following the institution policy which prohibits the use of L1 in the classroom. On the other end, a teacher who used the L1 ninety percent of the time did so for grammar explanations and during lectures on history and culture. Atkinson (1987, p. 244) in his discussion of use of L1 in EFL offers three reasons for allowing limited L1 use in the classroom:

1. A learner-preferred strategy: given the opportunity, learners will choose to translate without encouragement from the teacher.
2. A humanistic approach in that it permits them to say what they want
3. An efficient use of time: L1 strategies are efficient in terms of time spent explaining. (Atkinson, 1987, p. 244)

Auerbach (1993) suggests 13 possible occasions for using the mother tongue as a teaching resource, which include classroom management, language analysis, and discussion of cross-cultural issues.

To sum, from the teacher's side, the L1 is used in these instances: providing instructions and concepts and grammar (Duff & Polio, 1994, Macaro, 2001; Rolin-Ianzizi & Brownlie, 2002), classroom management duties (Duff & Polio, 1994, Macaro, 2001; Rolin-Ianzizi & Brownlie, 2002) and explaining concepts which do not exist in L2 (Duff & Polio, 1994) and for time efficiency (Cook, 2001; Duff & Polio, 1990).

Seen from the students' side, they used L1 when they interacted with one another either in pairs or small groups (Swain & Lapkin, 2000), and during long instructions from the teacher (Macaro, 2001).

### ***Procedures***

A paper-based questionnaire was administered to two groups of English major students on the last day of the classes. One group was a class of first year students, who were in the intermediate level (16 students), and the other was in the two classes of students in the second year or above, in the advanced level (26 students). The first year students' class was an integrated skills class in which development of the four skills (reading, listening, speaking, and writing) was the goal, and the other group of students were in a vocabulary acquisition focused class.

It was felt that the anonymity of the questionnaire would encourage students to answer honestly according to their personal experience and thoughts. The writer also felt that open-ended questions would produce the most personally relevant, self-driven answers. There were 42 completed questionnaires.

For the purpose of this paper, the following four questions on the questionnaire, which directly relate to the language use in the classroom, will be focused upon. However, only a few students wrote comments for Q4, which overlapped the answers for Q2. Therefore, the response will be included in the comments for Q2.

Q1. Did you feel the instructor needed to use Japanese in class?

Q2. If yes, when did you feel the need?

Q3. What was good about the instructor using English in class?

Q4. What was not good about the instructor using English in class?

### ***Students' views towards the language use in classrooms***

On the questionnaire for the intermediate students, it was noted that they may write comments in Japanese. This was particularly noted as a previously conducted questionnaire, to the intermediate level students for a different purpose, revealed some comments that were not so easy to understand and also to enable students to write their honest feeling about a class they had taken for one semester. Some parts of their comments are edited here for spelling and grammar, unless otherwise specified. One student in each group answered in Japanese, which is translated by the writer in this paper.

In the questionnaire, the students were asked, "Did you feel the instructor needed to use Japanese in class?" As seen in Table 1, of the total of 42 students, 35 students (14 intermediate and 21 advanced) students answered "No." Next, they were asked, "If yes, when did you feel the need?" Seven students (2 intermediate, 5 advanced) wrote comments. Among the reasons

were, “activity instructions”, “when the teacher explained about final exams”, and “to explain what I thought was difficult”. The former comments were written by students in the advanced level in the vocabulary-focused class. However, they also noted that they were able to understand what they had to do as they actually got into the activity or by asking the instructor for further explanation. They also had the opportunity to check their comprehension with their classmates in Japanese. Had the students been banned to use Japanese to check their comprehension, it might have led them to confusion or demotivation. Harbord (1992, p. 352) also writes, “if students are unfamiliar with a new approach, the teacher who cannot or will not give an explanation in the L2 may cause considerable student demotivation.” Swain & Lapkin (2000) also, found in research that students used L1 when they interacted with another either in pairs or small groups. Allowing room for the use of Japanese amongst themselves may have contributed to the students not feeling the need for the instructor to use Japanese.

It was rather interesting to see that the number of students that felt the need for Japanese instruction did not differ much between the two levels (13% vs 19% respectively). However, this may have resulted from the different variety and complex activities in class. It is probably worth noting the one student in the intermediate level wrote that she did not feel the need for Japanese and she explicitly wrote, in Japanese, that if the instructor used Japanese in class, she would have overused Japanese and not have tried to use English.

Burden (2000, 2001) in both his studies found that students in the Japanese university preferred their teachers to use English, not only when giving instructions and explaining grammar and class rules, but also when providing a rationale for class activities and checking for understanding.

**Table1: Q1. Did you feel the instructor needed to use Japanese in class?**

	Intermediate (n=16)		Advanced (n=26)		Total (n=42)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Q1	2 (13%)	14 (87%)	5(19%)	21(81%)	7(17%)	35(83%)

The next question was “What was good about the instructor using English in class?” The responses to this question could be classified into the following categories:

- development of listening skills
- development or motivation to develop speaking skills
- learning of the usage of words
- creation of collaborative learning environment
- providing a “role model”

The most common response from the students was that they felt they were able to develop their listening skills. A student in the advanced level wrote “In my other vocabulary

focused class, the teacher spoke in Japanese, but in this class, the teacher spoke in English, so it helped my listening practice." Another mentioned, "I was able to hear the correct pronunciation of the word and learn how to use the word." As mentioned earlier, Littlewood (1992, p. 45) insists that if the teachers do not use the target language in the classroom, students will not be convinced to accept the foreign language as an effective means of communication. Through the usage of the language in the classroom, students are able to acknowledge the language as a tool for communication.

Regarding the third question, responses from the students included, "We can make habit to speak in English only. It was hard for me to speak English but now I use English as more as possible. Then now I can speak English little by little"(student's original comment) and "It made me speak in English when talking to the teacher"(student's original comment). A remarkable comment a student wrote is that when she was put in the situation to speak in English to communicate with the teacher, she realised that she can actually "use" English. Along with the previous student's comment, a positive aspect of the teacher using only English can be seen. Interestingly, a few students wrote "collaborative atmosphere" as one of the good points. Indeed, as a consequence of the teacher-student interactions in English, what could be observed in the classrooms was "collaborative learning". Students who understood the teacher's instructions would say it aloud in Japanese and another would make a comment, often to check for clarification or to voice a different interpretation. Repetition of this produced a collaborative learning atmosphere in the classroom. Students seemed comfortable in asking one another. It certainly consumed time in class and was on the other end of "efficient" usage of class time. As Atkinson (1987) argued about the use of students' L1 in order to promote time efficiency.

Providing a "role model", in consequence, was another positive point that the students brought up. In spite of their teacher's first language not being English, all the interaction with the students were kept in English and this seems to have inspired and motivated the students. Comments from students included "My teacher is Japanese, but she did not speak Japanese. I want to be like her." and "I thought I have to improve English to communicate with my teacher."

To enable students' comprehension, the language used in the classroom was "graded". However, one of the students wrote, "The teacher sometimes used easy words." No further comment or reference was made, but perhaps, this student expected the classroom language to be kept at the "standard" level and let the students ask more questions to the teacher for clarification.

### ***Conclusion and implications***

This small study prompted by the writer's concern about the possibility of putting too

much pressure on the students by keeping the teacher-student interactions in English only and interest in the students' perception on the teacher's use of only English in classrooms. On the contrary to the concern prior to the study, the questionnaire results revealed that most students did not feel the need for the writer to use Japanese in class. They seemed to be pleased to be able to practice their speaking and/or to *develop* their listening skills.

Regardless of the set goals of the different classes, students expressed the development of listening skills and speaking skills during and after the classes. It could be said that the students were satisfied with the writer's use of language in the classroom, of which the intention was to increase exposure to the TL. Provision of role model for future aspirations was another positive aspect that was found.

There were some limitations to the study. Students' positive comments towards the English only interactions come from their self-awareness of the *development* of listening skills and/or speaking skills due to the English only interactions with the teacher. However, there is no clear evidence that the students have become more proficient in English, except for a response from an intermediate student commenting, "I could not understand what the teacher was saying but now I can. My listening skill has improved". This is, still, subjective. Had the student's listening skill really developed? If yes, to what extent has it developed?

Another problem in this study is that the sample number was small. Also, students who answered the questionnaire were not in comparable classes, as the classes focused on different aspects and had different achievement goals. Although no difference was seen in the results, the advanced level students were in the elective class and may have had higher motivation. The lower level students were in a compulsory/required class, in which they had no choice but to be in the class. The students' responses may be different in, for example, a content-based class, which requires more explanations about the content from the teacher.

It may be worthwhile conducting an action research in an English only classroom, requiring the students to interact in English amongst each other, to investigate the students' interactions with each other, and with the teacher. Will the students have the same positive attitudes towards the only English interactions with the teacher? And will there be differences depending on the focus of the class? This action research will enable teachers to see when and what kind of assistance in L1 students feel is necessary, and it will also lead to establishing an effective learning environment for the students.

### References

- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource?, *ELT Journal*, 41/4, 241-247.
- Atkinson, D. (1993). Teaching in the target language: A problem in the current orthodoxy. *Language*

*Learning Journal*, 8, 2-5.

- Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 27, 11: 9-32.
- Auerbach, E. (1994). The author responds ..... *TESOL Quarterly* 28, 157-161.
- Burden, P. (2000). The use of the Students' mother Tongue in Monolingual English "Conversation" classes at Japanese Universities. *The Language Teacher*, 24/6: 5-10.
- Burden, P. (2001). When do native English speaker teachers and Japanese college students disagree about the use of Japanese in the English conversation classroom? *The Language Teacher*, 25 (4), 5-9.
- Central Council for Education (2008). *Gakushi katei kyouiku no kouchiku ni mukete* [Towards Establishing an Education for Bachelor Degree]. Retrieved August 20, 2011 from [http://www.mext.go.jp/component/b\\_menu/shingi/toushin/\\_icsFiles/afieldfile/2008/12/26/1217067\\_001.pdf](http://www.mext.go.jp/component/b_menu/shingi/toushin/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2008/12/26/1217067_001.pdf).
- Cook, V.(2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 402-423.
- Cummins, J. & Swain, M.(1986). *Bilingualism in education*. Harlow: Longman.
- Duff, P. A., & Polio, C. G. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *Modern Language Journal*, 74, 154-166.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(3).
- Ford, K. (2009). Principles and practices of L1/L2 use in the Japanese university EFL classroom. *JALT Journal*, 31 (1), 63-80.
- Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 46/4, 350-355.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981) *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. New York: Pergammon Press.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Longman: London.
- Krashen, S. D. (1987). Principles and practice in the second language acquisition. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Levine, G. S. (2003) Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use and anxiety: report of a questionnaire study. *Modern Language Learning* 87, 344-364.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). Communicative language teaching: An introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1992). Communicative language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macaro, E. (1997). *Target Language, Collaborative Learning and Autonomy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' code-switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 531-548.
- McMillan, B., Rivers, D. J., & Cripps, T. (2009). The L1 in the L2 classroom: University EFL teacher perceptions, *The Language Teacher*, 33(10), 6-7.
- MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology). (2008). Koutougakkou Shidouyouryouan (High school Educational Guidelines). Retrieved 28 August, 2011, from [http://www.mext.go.jp/a\\_menu/shototu/news-cs/081223.htm](http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shototu/news-cs/081223.htm).
- Nation, I. S. P. (1990) *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. New York: Newbury House.

- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning, *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(3), Retrieved April 2011, from [http://asian-efl.com/june\\_2003\\_pn.pdf](http://asian-efl.com/june_2003_pn.pdf).
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Longman: London.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Polio, C. G. & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 313-326.
- Rolin-Ianziti, J. and Brownlie, S. (2002) Teacher Use of Learners' Native Language in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review-revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes*, 58 3: 402-426.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 251-274.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second language and foreign teaching, but.... *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 531-540.