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Abstract

The role of L1 in foreign language classrooms has been a matter for debate in FL teaching and learning for many years. In this thesis, it will be argued that it is now time for the current dogma “always teach in the FL” to be questioned and replaced by a view which re-integrates the L1 into FL classrooms in a positive way.

The thesis will trace the historical basis for and implications of the current view first in relation to language learning theories, and then in relation to language teaching theories and practices in the context of the classroom. On the basis of this re-examination of ideas, it will be suggested that many of the arguments leading to the view that the FL should always be used are either questionable in themselves or inappropriate for use in the FL context. In the process, an optimal view of L1 use and a theoretically based framework of potential functional L1 uses will be proposed.

The theoretically based framework will then be used to provide the basis for an empirical investigation of the perceptions and actual use of the L1 in a number of ‘Eadadi’ schools in Egypt. A study of what teachers actually do reveals the current pattern of use of the L1, and a questionnaire for teachers and students reveals the attitudes behind this use. Teachers’ attitudes will then be compared to their actual use to find the motivations behind teachers’ use of the L1, and how far it is optimal. Extracts of classroom interactions are then presented in order to illustrate how use of the L1 could have been used in an optimal way, presenting more learning opportunities to the learners.

The thesis concludes with a set of recommendations for the use of the L1 in FL classrooms.
Introduction

Rationale of the study and research questions

There has been a debate about the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom ever since languages have been taught. This technique has risen and fallen in popularity during different periods of time according to different conditions and beliefs. There has been a controversy between different theories of learning and teaching, and sometimes within the same theory.

For the last twenty years, the language learning field has been dominated by the view that the L2 can be acquired by mere exposure to input in the same way as the L1 is acquired by young children. This view has been overgeneralized to formal FL classrooms without considering the specificities of such a learning context. Such claims were so influential that they developed into pedagogical convictions adopted by many teacher educators and decision makers and were passed on to teachers as the ideal practice without enough investigation of their suitability for the FL classroom. Chaudron (1988) warns of that kind of generalization and shows how the demands on both teachers and students are different in different contexts.

This study considers the reasons why the use of the L1 has been discouraged and finds that there are specific contributions which the use of the L1 may make. It seeks to study the issue with regard to formal EFL classes, specifically Egyptian ‘Eadadi’ EFL classes as, according to the knowledge of the researcher, no study in the whole Arab world, apart from Kharma & Hajjaj’s (1989), has tried to investigate the issue of L1 use in the FL classroom. Kharma and Hajjaj’s (1989) study, though, relied more on teachers’ and students’ opinions. Therefore, further and more recent studies are needed to describe, explain and guide teachers’ use of the L1 in such a context.

An initial literature review shows that previous studies sought to examine the quantities of L1 use, the functions it is used to fulfil, the motivations behind teachers’ use of the L1, but hardly any studies sought to build on Macaro’s (2001) call to establish and raise teachers’ awareness of an optimal view of L1 use in the L2 classroom. The current study will build on this and proposes an optimal view of L1 use. It then seeks to examine actual use in Egyptian ‘Eadadi’ schools and the attitudes towards the use of the L1 of current Egyptian teachers and students. Once these are established, it is possible to compare current attitudes and practice with the optimal view which has been proposed. Recommendations can then be made and
illustrated from the data presented. More specifically, the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1) What do teachers in Egyptian classes think of as the value of the use of the L1?
2) What do pupils in Egyptian classes think of as the value of the use of the L1?
3) To what extent do teachers in Egyptian classrooms make use of the L1?
4) What functions do these uses fulfil?
5) What does the relationship between the perceptions of 1 and 2 and the observations of 3 and 4 reveal about the motivations behind teachers’ use of the L1?
6) On the basis of the discoveries related to 1 – 5, what could be done to ensure an optimal use of the L1 in Egyptian classrooms based on firm learning and teaching principles?

To answer these questions the study adopts an ethnographical research methodology whose main characteristics are eclectic approaches to theory, triangulated methods of data collection and analysis, as well as focus on context (Goetz & LeCompte 1984). This was thought to contribute better, and in a more illuminating way, to our understanding of such a controversial, ‘theory saturated’ and context embedded issue.

Layout of the chapters
Chapter one discusses L1 use from a learning perspective. In a context where there is an increasing awareness of the insufficiency of simple exposure as a means to the end of L2 learning, it will be argued that the role of the L1 can be rethought in such a way as to provide useful input to communicative and declarative language learning.

Chapter two discusses the issue from a teaching methodological perspective. In a context where teachers are conscious of the failure of many Methods, it will be argued that a re-introduction in a reasoned way of the use of the L1 could assist interactive aspects of teaching in FL formal classrooms.

Chapter three discusses the issue from a classroom based perspective. We will look for evidence of how much L1 FL teachers use in L2 classrooms, what functions this L1 use tends to achieve, and what motivations are behind teachers’ use of the L1. In this instance, we will
find that L1 use can assist in establishing good rapport between teachers and learners: a humanistic value for the use of the L1, as well as aiding classroom organization.

On the basis of this knowledge of the theoretical claims and empirical evidence about the contributions of the L1, in chapter four, an optimal view of L1 use is presented of how the L1 could contribute positively to interaction and learning in the FL classroom. This will be followed by a theoretically based framework for the role of the L1 in classroom learning.

Chapter five, then, presents the research methodology of the field study: justification for the research design, methods of data collection, methods of data analysis, and a description of the context of the study.

Chapter six discusses the results, and interprets them in light of the proposed optimal view and the local contextual factors to reveal the current pattern of Egyptian teachers' use of the L1 in ‘Eadadi’ schools.

Chapter seven seeks to extend the discussion on the optimal view of L1 use to enable us to begin to offer illustrated examples of how the use of the L1 in specific classroom interactions could, when motivated by the arguments presented, lead to better learning.

Chapter eight summarizes the arguments and concludes with recommendations for modification to teacher training.
Chapter 1
The L1 in L2 learning

In this chapter we will review the mainstream theories of L2 learning and their implications for the role of the L1 in L2 learning. We will show how the debate about the role of the L1 is embedded in a broader central issue in language learning, that is, how far L2 learning is similar to or different from L1 learning. The review aims to show how ideas have evolved over time from viewing the L1 as a source of interference, to viewing it as irrelevant to eventually reach a balanced, sound and reasoned view of the L1 as a communication strategy that aids both comprehension of, production and interaction in the L2. The L1 is also seen as a cognitive strategy that aids conscious learning which can then be automatized through practice. In the first section, we will provide a brief history of how the role of the L1 has been perceived in relation to L2 learning. The second section will discuss the current perceptions of the role of the L1 in L2 learning. The third and last section will, then, discuss a current state of balance in which the role of the L1 in L2 learning is rethought.

1.1 A brief history of the role of the L1 in L2 learning
In this section, we will review the theoretical background of the role of the L1 in relation to L2 learning. The first part will show how the L1 was viewed as a source of interference within the behaviourist view. The second part will show the reaction against the behaviourist view as a result of Chomsky's contributions. The third section will show how the L1 was viewed as irrelevant within the naturalistic view of learning.

1.1.1 The behaviourist view of L2 learning and the L1 influence
Between the 1940s and 1960s, language learning theories were dominated by behaviourist psychology. This view of learning was related to structuralist linguistics that represented an empirical approach in opposition to the mental philosophical tradition of studying languages. It was an attempt to relate the study of language to the scientific tradition which believed in what is observable (Brooks 1960). From a behaviourist perspective, language learning was seen as habit-formation, like learning any other behaviour. Students are exposed to correct patterns of the language (stimulus); they imitate these correct patterns (response) which they then practice orally till they become automatic habits. Success reinforces the process and the patterns become habits. According to this theory, old habits may interfere with new habits, resulting in learning problems or errors. Applying this to L2 learning, the new language was
seen as a new system that is completely different from the L1 system that the learner has
developed; namely, the L1 represented a set of old habits and the L2 a set of new habits.
Difficulty in learning languages was seen as arising from the differences in basic patterns
between the L2 and the L1, which caused interference.

Thus, the L1 was seen negatively as a source of interference which happens when the learner
transfers the habits of L1 to L2 patterns. If the patterns of the two languages are similar the
transfer will cause no problem (the L1 will thus be a source of help), but if they are different,
the transfer will cause errors (the L1 will thus be a source of hindrance). These errors, in
turn, should not be tolerated otherwise they may become habits themselves; they should be
avoided in the first place through extensive practice of the L2 rules. Generally, the aim, as
Brooks (1960) put it, was to establish a kind of coordinate bilingualism. Children were seen
to be better than adults in adapting to the grammatical, lexical and phonological system of
the new language.

In order to facilitate L2 learning, it was considered necessary to overcome the L1
interference. This was sought in two different ways: on the procedural level, L2 learning was
thought to proceed better monolingually without reference to the L1. The most efficient way
of learning languages was seen to be through intensive practice of basic sentence patterns,
especially those that are different than the L1 patterns. On the level of planning, contrastive
analysis (CA) was used as a technique for comparing L1 and L2 patterns (Lado 1957). Its
aim was to identify points of similarity and difference between the two languages, thinking
that this knowledge would enable teachers to concentrate on certain areas that might be of
difficulty. This was carried out by recognizing points of differences between L1 and L2
patterns which were thought to give rise to points of difficulty, and emphasizing them in the
classroom, making students imitate and practise them until they acquired them, and thus
avoid making errors. Calling on that analysis of difference, CA claimed, at its beginning, to
be able to predict students’ errors; this was “the strong form”. This technique ignored the
linguistic principle under the structuralist view that each language is a unique system that
should be studied in itself without being compared to other languages (Brooks 1960).
However, as will be shown in the next section, later empirical research suggested that many
of students’ errors were not attributable to L1 interference, and CA reduced its aims to a
diagnostic role, that is explaining or accounting for students’ errors; this was called “the
weak form” (Gass 1983, Ellis 1986). This view of language learning was fundamental to the audiolingual method of teaching which will be discussed in chapter 2.

Behaviourist approaches to language learning came under extensive criticism. Chomsky (1959) argued that with its concern with the observable only, ignoring the creative ability of the human mind in acquiring a second language, the behaviourist view of language learning was incapable of explaining how languages are learned. Even on the observable level, it was not easy to define the exact stimulus that elicited a certain response.

Thus, under the behaviourist view of learning the new L2 system was seen to be different from the L1 system and accordingly, L2 learners were to adapt to the habits of the L2 system through extensive practice, avoiding lapses into the L1 habits. The L1 was seen mainly as a negative force to be avoided or overcome.

1.1.2 The Chomskyan influence (the reaction against behaviourism)
As noted above, the behaviourist view came under attack by Chomsky by the end of the 1950s. He claimed that abstract linguistic knowledge (competence) of human beings cannot be explained under the assumption that language is an observable behaviour that is learned through imitation and practice. Such a view cannot explain learners’ ability to be creative, producing sentences they have never come across before, or reaching a similar level of competence while being exposed to different inputs (Chomsky 1965, Dulay et al. 1982). Children’s utterances show that they do not just copy words that they hear from adults; they rather internalize rules and apply them in new situations e.g. “mummy goed”, “it breaked” (Mitchell and Myles 1998: 25). Moreover, children rarely get corrected for making grammar mistakes, and even in cases where they are corrected, they tend to stick to their internal rules. The only aspect of language that is observable is ‘performance’ which, according to Chomsky (1965), is different from competence and does not represent it. This human ability to acquire abstract knowledge (competence) underneath the surface structure of the language which they are exposed to (performance) led to the belief that humans are endowed with a ‘language acquisition device’ (LAD). This refers to an innate ability to acquire language. Language learning was thus seen as an interaction between the child’s innate ability and the language input they receive in their environment, a process that was referred to as “creative construction” (Dulay et al. 1982). This shift in viewing language learning represented the beginning of SLA as a separate field of study.
Chomsky's ideas were supported by morpheme studies in first language acquisition (Brown 1973). This body of research found that children follow a certain order of acquisition and go through similar stages, albeit at different rates, regardless of their linguistic backgrounds. It was also found that children do not merely copy what adults say; they rather form rules and apply them in new situations, as Chomsky claimed. An example of that was that children in early stages start applying some rules, e.g. the plural 's' or the past suffix 'ed' to irregular nouns or verbs. Children were also found to be resistant to error correction.

In second language acquisition, there was growing awareness that the claims made by CA were not true. Points of difference between L2 and L1 that CA predicted to cause difficulties in learning did not necessarily prove to do so, and similarities did not always facilitate learning. The results of research in first language acquisition motivated L2 researchers to analyze learners' errors (Corder 1967, Dulay & Burt 1974, 1983). These studies (see Ellis 1985 for a review) found that a majority of L2 learners' errors were not attributable to L1 influence. Dulay & Burt (1974, 1983), for example, found that only 5% of students' errors were due to L1 interference; most of the mistakes were a result of other sources such as overgeneralization, simplification, and transfer of learning. Moreover, some errors were found to occur in L1 acquisition as well (Brown 1973, Dulay & Burt 1974, 1983, and Felix 1980). These were referred to as developmental errors. It was also found that language learners from different linguistic backgrounds tended to make the same mistakes regardless of the similarities or differences between their L1 and the L2. In addition, many of the errors or difficulties that contrastive analysis predicted would occur did not occur. Another finding was that differences were not the only source of interference; similarities between languages were also found to be a real source of interference. Thus the main linguistic assumption in contrastive analysis, that is, linguistic differences would lead to learning difficulties and consequently to making mistakes, was discredited (Dulay et al. 1982).

The morpheme studies in L1 acquisition were replicated with L2 learners. Dulay & Burt (1973) found similar acquisitional orders of English L2 grammatical morphemes (in terms of the accuracy of production of these morphemes) among three different ability groups of Spanish speaking children. They also found similar acquisition orders among children with different L1 backgrounds (Chinese and Spanish) (Dulay & Burt 1974). They concluded that children tend to follow the same order in acquiring an L2 just as is the case in children.
learning their L1. The findings of their research represented significant evidence against the 
behaviourist claims about the interfering role of the L1 and the validity of the predictive role
of contrastive analysis.

This was even extended to adult L2 learners by some researchers such as Bailey et al. (1974),
Dulay et al. (1982), and Krashen (1981, 1983), but it is most associated with Krashen. This
led to what is known as the naturalistic view of L2 learning. This view was, and still is, very
influential in the SLA field and triggered a lot of controversial debate. The coming section
will be devoted to this view and its implications for the use of L1.

1.1.3 The naturalistic view of L2 learning and the L1 influence
This refers to the idea that adults have access to a language acquisition device (LAD) and
can acquire the L2 in the same way as children acquire their L1, through natural exposure to
the target language. The influence of the L1 on L2 learning was thus minimized for both
children and adults. Actually, the naturalistic view of learning has its roots in the far history
of language teaching. Richards & Rodgers (1986) and Asher (1993) refer to the experience
of Montaigne in the sixteenth century when he was taught Latin through exclusive natural
exposure to the language by his private tutor. In the mid nineteenth century, reformers in the
language teaching field, like Marcel, Gouin and Sauveur, applied this view to language
classrooms (Richards & Rodgers 1986). However, these were individual ideas and it cannot
be claimed that they represented a scientific theory of language learning.

The mentalist naturalistic view of the 1970s and 1980s, by contrast, was strongly rooted in
SLA theories and research. It represented a reaction against the behaviourist view. As
mentioned above, the studies of L1 child morpheme acquisition were extended to adult L2
learners by Krashen and other researchers. They showed that adults also followed a
consistent order of acquisition, albeit different from the order followed in L1 acquisition.
This led to the belief that L2 learners are also directed by internal principles that guide their
learning regardless of their L1s.

Krashen (1981, 1983) proposed his Monitor Model where he tried to build a theory of SLA
based on the results of the morpheme studies. The theory represented a shift in language
learning away from conscious attempts to learn the language rules and from simple habit
formation towards the view that meaningful communication in that language would suffice.
It is not the concern of this study to give a detailed account of Krashen’s theory. Rather, this section will review some of the hypotheses (Krashen’s and others’) that contributed to that view of learning and that, particularly, had implications for the role of the L1.

1.1.3.1 The acquisition-learning hypothesis
Krashen and his colleagues (Dulay, Burt, & Krashen 1982, Krashen & Terrell 1988) claim that knowledge of the L2 develops in two ways which they call acquisition and learning. Acquisition is the unconscious knowledge that develops through exposure to the language in natural communication, and it is the most important factor in gaining L2 knowledge (knowing the language not about the language), while learning is the conscious knowledge of rules that develops through deliberate and explicit effort. Initiating utterances is the function of the acquisition system; conscious knowledge serves as a ‘monitor’ that allows for pre or post corrections of language output. Learning and acquisition are two separate sources of knowledge; an implication of this claim is that conscious knowledge can not turn into unconscious knowledge. Conscious attempts to learn the language such as focus on the rules (grammar teaching), comparison or reference to the L1, or error correction were thought to hinder oral proficiency, and not contribute to acquisition. Language acquisition was believed to happen unconsciously without any explicit effort through exposure to samples of grammatical language that need to be comprehended to activate the internal mechanisms of learning. The assumption was that the L1 is not needed because the L2 can be acquired directly in the same way as the L1 through direct exposure to the L2. This indicated a shift in concern from explicit aspects of learning and teaching to implicit aspects, something which was subsequently reflected in teaching methodology, as will be shown in the next chapter (section 2.2.3).

1.1.3.2 The comprehensible input hypothesis
According to Krashen, basing his evidence on the morpheme studies, learners follow a sequential order in acquiring knowledge of the grammar: it therefore follows that comprehensible input will be enough to provide them with the rules they need for acquisition. Comprehensible input, namely input that is slightly beyond the learner’s current knowledge (i + 1), will facilitate their acquisition of the L2 (Krashen 1985). This i + 1 should contain structures which are slightly beyond the learner’s current competence; to understand the message the learner should focus on meaning (and not form). As for how the input can be
made comprehensible, evidence comes from native speakers’ talk to non-native speakers or teachers’ talk to L2 learners (Foreigner Talk). Native speakers and L2 teachers were found to resort to certain techniques to modify their input to make it comprehensible to learners (e.g. repeating, simplifying, paraphrasing, speaking slowly, using shorter sentences and less complex grammar, etc.) (Gaies 1977, Long 1981, 1985, See Chaudron 1988 for a review of literature). These devices of input modification were found to be similar to caretaker talk (the way parents talk to little children), something which was thought to emphasize the similarity between L1 and L2 learning (Macaro 1998). Making use of extralinguistic aids, context, and learners’ previous knowledge of the world are also ways of making the input comprehensible. Interaction (see next section) can also aid input comprehensibility or trigger more comprehensible input but it is not a prerequisite (Krashen 1982). Learners do not need to produce language themselves in order to acquire the L2. Speaking the language will come naturally and automatically after they have assimilated enough ‘comprehensible input’ in the L2. At the beginning, students respond physically to commands (as in the Total Physical Response Method), or give one-word answers to questions (Krashen 1982). Any deliberate efforts to focus on form, correct errors or monitor one’s learning including reference to the L1 can destroy the natural order of acquisition and hinder the work of the internal mechanisms of learning.

1.1.3.3 The interaction hypothesis
As an extension to Krashen’s input hypothesis, Long (1981, 1983) proposed the interaction hypothesis. He found that input modifications were greater in two-way exchanges rather than one way input. Two-way interaction, in turn, allows for negotiation of meaning, a process through which input is made more simplified and comprehensible. This meant that mere exposure to L2 input is not enough for acquisition to take place. Negotiation of meaning is central in the interaction hypothesis; it is the process through which speakers try to prevent beforehand any breakdown in communication, or remedy any breakdown that may have already happened. These ‘collaborative efforts’, as Mitchell & Myles (1998) call them, are important to increase the input comprehensibility and aid acquisition. This can be achieved by many devices such as confirmation checks, comprehension checks, and requests for clarification. These are called interactional modifications in contrast to input modifications that can happen in one-way input without engaging in interaction or meaning negotiation. Interactional modifications only happen in two-way interaction and involve or trigger input modifications which are thought to increase the comprehensibility that activates the internal
mechanisms for learning (Long 1981, 1983). It was also found that these interactional
modifications led to repetition of content rather than any simplification of grammar; on the
other hand, “interaction resulted in input that was more complex than input that was
modified according to conventional criteria of linguistic simplification” (Pica et al. 1987:
750). Pre-modified input did not seem to be helpful as it deprived learners from the benefit
of repetition which provides more input. For Long and Pica, the importance of input and
interaction does not mean that they cause learning or are sufficient for it to happen; they
rather facilitate it. Thus, learning happens when learners are engaged in communicating and
negotiating meaning, and handling any breakdowns in communication without any
deliberate/conscious attempts to analyze the linguistic content of the language used. In this
way, the interaction hypothesis aimed at fostering implicit aspects of learning (Ellis 1999)
and maximizing the use of L2 through monolingual strategies of use (Macaro 1998, 2005,
Levine 2003). This was the general assumption under the interaction hypothesis in its early
stages. Later on, as will be shown in section 1.4.2.3, the interaction hypothesis evolved to
emphasize the importance of attention, awareness, negative evidence, and focus on form.

The general assumption behind the naturalistic view of learning was that exclusive exposure
to and use of the L2, through natural communication, would stimulate acquisition on the part
of the learners by way of activating the internal mechanisms of learning (the LAD) without
the need for deliberate manipulation of the language system. Thus, learning experiences that
focus on natural exposure, meaning and communication gained more credit over conscious
attempts at learning which focus on linguistic analyses of the language rules and error
correction. Such a view of L2 learning gave no room to the use of L1 as a conscious tool of
learning. Use of the L1 was seen to lessen the natural use of the L2.

1.2 Current perceptions of L2 learning and the L1 influence
The principles which underlie the interaction hypothesis are generally well-founded.
However, there are questions to be asked about whether comprehensible input, supplemented
and modified by appropriate interaction, will suffice for all learners in all contexts. There are
also recent theoretical perspectives which, it may be argued, suggest that L2 learning (by
adults or older children in formal contexts) is not exactly the same as L1 learning as naturally
acquired by young children. (From now on, the term adult learners will be used to refer to
both adults and older children, around the age of adolescence, as opposed to small children
learning either L1 or L2 in naturalistic contexts). We will now examine the relevance of
these perspectives and these contexts before returning to a re-evaluation of the potential contribution of the L1.

1.2.1 A universal grammar view of L2 learning and the L1 influence
This theory is the foundation of the mentalist view of L1 learning which claims that learners are born with an innate ability to learn language that is activated by exposure to the language input. This view, which originated with Chomsky, has been developed in the context of the study of second language acquisition under the title of Universal Grammar Theory (UG) (Lightbown & Spada 1993, White 1989, 2003).

This view of language learning comprises a general language theory that perceives language as an unconscious computational system. Thus, it is concerned with the underlying knowledge of language structure (competence) rather than with language use (performance).

This theory assumes that there is a shared built-in knowledge that characterizes all languages in general, and which constitutes our unconscious mental knowledge of language, i.e. language competence. This "abstract system of principles and rules", biologically gifted to all human beings, is known as Universal Grammar. This "innate language faculty" explains the degree of similarity shared between languages, and helps children learning their L1 to achieve notably fast and similar proficiency out of a "degenerate input" regardless of their levels of intelligence or, within limits, their level of exposure to language (Mitchell & Myles 1998, White 2003).

Universal Grammar, in general, is thought to constrain the scope of language learning by looking at all languages as consisting of principles that are common between languages, and parameters which allow for variations within the universal principles (Mitchell & Myles 1998). Not all principles are applied in every single language, but each language draws on some of these principles to a certain degree. Parameters, on the other hand, represent possibilities that a speaker has to choose from (White 1989). Thus, this linguistic theory is concerned with the syntax of language (as pure mental language knowledge) on the assumption that all languages share common features. It has nothing to do with the study of vocabulary, communication, or pragmatics. These aspects are more related to performance, which requires recourse to general cognitive skills. They are not part of linguistic
competence, but they may affect it. “The rule itself is part of competence; the conditions governing its use are not” (White 1989: 36).

The characteristics of this knowledge are common to both L1 and L2. L2 learners have an “internalised grammar” which constitutes their language competence, and which may change over time (White 1989: 36).

L2 learners often end up with a highly complex unconscious mental representation of their L2 (not necessarily identical to an NS’s grammar), which is underdetermined by the L2 input, suggesting that built-in knowledge must be involved ... (White 1996: 91).

In this theory, language learning, in general, is seen to take place, not only as a result of exposure to language input, but as a result of innate constraints that work as *a priori* knowledge of language. These constraints interact with the input to which children are exposed to form language competence (White 1989, 2003). Evidence of this is to be found in many facts. For example, children acquire knowledge of language that goes beyond the input they have been exposed to. Children produce sentences they were not exposed to. In addition, all native speaker adults reach the same competence although they might have been exposed to different inputs (White 1989). As a result of their exposure to the language spoken in their environments, learners end up by setting the appropriate values to the appropriate parameters, and this is how language acquisition takes place (McLaughlin 1987, Shortall 1996).

If this is the case in L1 acquisition, in case of L2 learning, the major question is: Do adults have access to UG in the same way as children, acquiring their L1, do? Opinions differ, ranging from the claim that UG proceeds in the same way as in L1 acquisition to the claim that UG has no role at all in L2 learning. Central to the issue of adults’ access to UG is the issue of the L1 role. Four stances have been adopted:

a) Direct access: this view claims that L2 learners have direct access to UG in exactly the same way as L1 acquirers do. Some researchers support that interpretation (e.g. Flynn 1987 quoted in White 2003). This view raises a debate regarding the question of whether or not this means complete exclusion of any role for the L1. In its extreme version, this view
parallels Krashen’s views that L2 acquisition proceeds exactly in the same way as L1 acquisition (White 1989).

b) No access: proponents of this view claim that L2 learners resort to their L1 grammar rather than to UG (Schachter 1988, 1990, and Bley-Vroman 1990). Only properties of UG that were acquired in the L1 will be available. In this case, those parameters or principles that learners did not set in their L1 cannot be acquired or will require learners to resort to other routes of learning to acquire them. This interpretation is used to justify the differences between L1 and L2 learning, and the difficulty inherent in L2 learning, particularly for adults. This view seems to be complementary to, or making use of, the critical period hypothesis of language acquisition, which will be discussed later on. Schachter (1996) uses such an interpretation to account for language transfer and the differences in the outcome between L1 and L2 learning. She agrees with Johnson & Newport (1991) in that the older learners start L2 learning the less they show access to UG. Even in the case of child L2 learners, there are not enough studies to show that they do have access to UG. White (1996, 2003) recommends that more comparisons between child L2 learners and adult L2 learners, as well as between the former and child L1 learners are needed.

c) Partial access: this view holds that L2 learners, although referring to their L1 grammar, still have direct access to some aspects of UG which enable them to acquire aspects of grammar that were not represented in their L1 grammar. They may, for example, have access to principles but need to reset some of the parameters (Mitchell & Myles 1998).

d) Indirect access: in this view, L2 learners are thought to access UG via their L1 (White 1989, 1991, Cook 1991, Felix & Weigl 1991, Cook & Newson 1996, Shortall 1996). This view is different from the no access view in that learners will be able to reset previously activated parameters in their L1 to accommodate the L2 input (Mitchell & Myles 1998); there is no need to resort to other routes of learning.

As White (2003) clarifies, these interpretations sometimes overlap. For example, the interpretation referred to mostly as indirect access, is argued by others (Thomas 1993) to involve direct access as learners still have access to UG even though through their L1. Likewise, the no access stance can involve partial or indirect access as learners refer to their L1 which involves UG properties (Schwartz & Sprouse 1996). Also, the partial access and
the indirect access positions overlap, and sometimes are used as alternatives. What matters, for the purpose of our study, is that only one interpretation of this theory takes the view that adult L2 learning proceeds in exactly the same way as L1 acquisition through the direct activation of UG. All other interpretations conceive of differences between the two processes. The L1 is seen to influence L2 learning whether directly or indirectly, totally or partially.

An extremely important element in this debate is the critical period hypothesis. The critical period hypothesis claims that adults do not and cannot, biologically, learn languages in the same way as children do. Research in SLA shows that age plays a role in the degree to which, and rate at which, individuals learn a language. Lightbown & Spada (1993) and Towell & Hawkins (1994) claim that the younger a learner is exposed to an L2 the closer he or she is likely to get to native-like proficiency. It is thought that adults' brain does not work in the same way as children's in learning a language. This change is thought to take effect by the beginnings of adulthood (12 years old) (Patkowski 1980, Dulay et al. 1982 and Lightbown & Spada 1993) or, for some researchers, at the age of seven (Towell & Hawkins 1994). This is referred to as the critical period hypothesis. According to some mentalist and universal grammar linguists, it is thought that the LAD is no longer available for language learning as it was in early childhood; adults seem to rely on other faculties or learning abilities (Dulay et al. 1982, Johnson & Newport 1991, Lightbown & Spada 1993, and Schachter 1996). This justifies why adults learning an L2 cannot reach the same proficiency or fluency as younger learners even if they (adults) were faster at the early stages of learning (Patkowski 1980, Dulay et al. 1982).

This argument is supported by neurolinguistics. Paradis (2004) claims that the procedural memory, which is responsible for incidental, implicit acquisition of language (as is the case in acquiring the L1), declines after the age of five. Adult language learners rely on declarative memory, which is responsible for conscious explicit learning, instead. Thus the critical period hypothesis applies to implicit competence and not to explicit conscious learning. Explicit knowledge compensates for adults' "inability to acquire language incidentally" (Paradis 2004: 60).

If this position's argument is correct, then it would follow that the LAD would not be fully available to adult learners and thus, refute claims such as Krashen's, that adults can learn an
L2 uniquely through exposure to language input as children learn their L1. It suggests that adult L2 learners may need to be exposed to explicit learning and the use of other cognitive and more conscious skills, although UG specialists argue that such knowledge does not lead to the same kind of acquisition. This becomes even more relevant, whether with adults or children, if we are talking about formal settings, where opportunities for natural exposure are rare, and, in effect, learning may depend more on conscious cognitive abilities (Lamendella 1977, Patkowski 1980).

This debate developed, as White (2003) explains, into an interest in the nature of the L2 learner’s interlanguage, and how far it is constrained by UG. Some studies (Bley-Vroman 1990, Schwartz & Sprouse 1996, Towell & Hawkins 1994) agree that the L1 represents the initial stage of L2 learners’ interlanguage. Other studies examine the differences in conditions or contexts between the L1 and L2 input such as the availability of negative input (including error correction) and explicit positive input (explicit teaching), and the extent to which they may influence access to UG. Cook (1991) explains that the input that L2 learners are exposed to in L2 classrooms differs from natural L1 input in many ways. Unlike L1 learners, L2 learners often get their errors corrected; they get grammatical explanations, and, in many cases, get “highlighted input”, in the sense that it is made easier for learning. The very nature of classroom learning led Felix & Weigl (1991) to claim that classroom learning puts constraints on, or ‘blocks’ the access to UG. As we shall consider in the next section, the debate then turns to the way or the extent to which other kinds of learning may compensate for this lack of total access.

Thus, according to the UG view, children acquire their L1 through an interaction between the input they are exposed to and an abstract universal system that they possess (UG). Adult L2 learners, on the other hand, can not refer to UG in the same way as L1 learners do. L2 learners tend to refer to their L1 grammar, if not fully, at least partially or at initial stages (Bley-Vroman 1990, Towell & Hawkins 1994). Thus, at the abstract level, the process of learning is not identical. From a UG perspective, the context of learning and the nature of the input are different in the case of L1 acquisition than in the case of L2 learning, thus mere exposure to positive L2 input is unlikely to be enough to help learners develop full and accurate knowledge of L2 grammar (apart from the claims of the direct access position). Thus it can be concluded that, the age of the learner, the presence of previous linguistic knowledge (the L1), and the (formal) L2 learning context ‘block’ or limit the access to UG
or, more generally, to the abstract language system that is claimed to be responsible for the natural acquisition of the L1. As Skinner (1985) puts it,

"not even Chomsky would argue that an innate linguistic element is triggered in L2 by the same language experience that triggered the equivalent L1 element. The mere fact that the learner possesses L1 will modulate whatever language experiences the learner may have in L2 ........... Clearly, the process of acquisition cannot be identical. Neither the early learning environment nor the lower level of earlier mental operations nor the fact that the L1 learner possesses no other language proficiency can be replicated for the L2 learner." (Skinner 1985: 375) (His italics).

A similar conviction of how L2 learning is different from LI learning is expressed by Wells (1998), as a first language researcher:

Learning a foreign language in adulthood seems a completely different affair. On the one hand, at least in the early stages, the foreign language usually figures as the object of the activities in which it is encountered, as a system that must be mastered before it can be used in achieving goals beyond itself; on the other hand, literate adult learners approach the enterprise with a very different set of potential strategies from those available to pre-linguistic infants. In particular, they already have considerable knowledge about the world, including linguistic interaction, and they also have available a language through which they can objectify the target language as a system and negotiate the relationships between forms and intended meanings and the tasks in which they are used (Wells 1998: 344).

What is needed, in addition to the insights of UG, is a broader cognitive interpretation of how learners acquire and use this abstract knowledge, and the role of the L1 in this process.

1.2.2 A cognitive view of L2 learning and the L1 influence

In the previous section, we have seen how some studies within the UG theory have shown that adult L2 learners cannot proceed in language learning in an identical way as children do for biological reasons. We have also seen how neurolinguistic research supports that claim, suggesting that the procedural memory declines after the age of five which leads adults to rely more on the declarative memory. Within cognitive theories of learning, cognitive factors that condition adult L2 learning also provide evidence that adult learners cannot learn languages in the same way as children do, and that learners employ different strategies to facilitate their learning and use of the L2.

Adult learners rely on conscious learning to compensate for their inability to learn implicitly. They can abstract, generalize, and analyze; these skills make them better in dealing with the abstract nature of the language (Sweet 1964, Taylor 1974). In other words, adults' cognitive
maturity makes it impossible for them to take the same route in learning an L2 as young children do in learning their L1. In line with this, Skinner (1985: 373) quotes from Piaget that all humans go through four stages of conceptual development:

1. The Sensorimotor period: Ages 0 – 2 years;
2. Pre-operational Thought: Ages 2 – 7 years;
3. Concrete Operational Thought: Ages 7 – 11 years; and

As Skinner notices, when children go to school they have almost undergone the first two stages; this makes their conception of the world different than when they started acquiring their L1. This analysis supports the notion that adults or older children cannot learn the L2 in the same way as children acquire their L1. According to Skinner (1985), this ‘language equivalency’ assumption, as he calls it, requires learners to abandon the cognitive conceptual level they have reached in their L1 to work at a much lower conceptual level. This results, as Skinner argues, in a ‘cognitive gap’ or ‘cognitive disfunction’ which leads to frustrations and difficulties in learning.

Modern cognitive psychology views the learner as an active individual who has control over his or her learning processes and output (McLaughlin 1990); and unlike UG theory, this view is concerned with both language competence and performance. According to this, learning a language is similar to learning any other skill or knowledge. Thus, learning starts as a controlled process that requires attention and takes time. Through practice, this controlled knowledge or skill can be automatized, and stored in the procedural long-term memory for quick effortless recall. Controlled knowledge initially takes up considerable space in short-term memory but as it becomes automatized, the short-term memory is freed to handle new information or more complex skills in the same way, thus building on the previous knowledge. In this way, L2 learning is seen as a skill building process in which learners acquire sub-skills, and then integrate them in fluent production through practice (McLaughlin 1987, 1990, Towell, Hawkins & Bazergui 1996). This also entails that language learning proceeds in stages, so simpler information has to be acquired first (McLaughlin & Heredia 1996). Thus, L2 learning will require learners to attend to the processing of the L2 input via the short-term memory. Then through practice, this knowledge may, in turn, be automatized and stored in the procedural long-term memory (subconscious knowledge) for quick recall (Mitchell & Myles 1998, McLaughlin 1987). In this way, the learner initially consciously processes the vocabulary, grammatical and pragmatic rules that
facilitate or contribute to the production of language (McLaughlin 1987), and then internalises the knowledge.

Thus, within this view of learning, conscious or explicit aspects have been given prominence in language learning, whether for their usefulness in developing knowledge about language and grammatical accuracy, or for their contribution to fluency in language use through automatizing the conscious knowledge. Contrary to Krashen’s claims, this means that conscious knowledge can develop, through practice, into automatized knowledge (Ellis 1990, 2006, Paradis 2004). Yet, this does not mean that language learning is a linear process that simply proceeds from conscious explicit knowledge via practice to automatized knowledge (McLaughlin 1987, Lightbown & Spada 1993). At some stages, learners seem to show a loss in their previously acquired knowledge or make sudden progress. That is because when a learner meets new forms, an interaction between these new forms and the knowledge he or she already possesses occurs which may lead the learner to reorganize or modify his previously acquired knowledge. This process is called restructuring (McLaughlin 1987, 1990, Lightbown & Spada 1993).

Hawkins & Towell (1996) agree that subconscious knowledge facilitates communication in the L2, but they comment that this may not be sufficient to reach target norms, especially with learners who start learning the L2 after childhood. In line with this, Schmidt (1990) gives importance to implicit knowledge, while at the same time arguing that explicit knowledge facilitates learning. Hawkins & Towell add that conscious knowledge has a role in improving students’ grammatical accuracy, which, at least, does not harm their communicative development. Moreover, some consciously learned aspects can be accelerated through use, and can be ‘automatized’ themselves to be used in spontaneous communication. Paradis (2004), for example, argues that with practice (repeated use) of correct output learners can reach some automaticity in language use or speed up their controlled knowledge. Skehan (1998) even goes further and argues that explicit learning is more advantageous than implicit learning as consciousness enables learners to notice the gap between their interlanguage and the target language system.

According to this view, variation in the effectiveness of the controlled declarative memory can be a determining factor in improving language learning, and hence may be responsible for individual differences (McLaughlin & Heredia 1996). This view has led to an interest in
investigating strategies that successful learners employ in their L2 learning with the purpose of teaching them to less proficient or new learners. Transfer or reference to the L1 has been found to be one of the cognitive strategies that learners make use of in order to facilitate their L2 learning (O'Malley & Chamot 1990). It has also been found that reference to the L1 in the form of literal translation or code switching (see section 1.3.4) is used as a communication strategy (Yule & Tarone 1997). Thus the L1, within a cognitive framework, has been given a positive role, which is facilitative to L2 learning on both the receptive (acquisition) and the productive (communication) levels, and which even requires a degree of sensitivity, awareness, intention, and, possibly, proficiency on the part of the learner (Ellis 1997).

The view of the L1 within a cognitive perspective was, as implied in Gass & Selinker (1983) an attempt to reconcile the two opposing views of L1 influence in behaviourist and mentalist views. As shown above, this view handles language learning as a set of cognitive strategies employed by the language learner to store the new L2 knowledge, while making use of the already stored knowledge including L1 (Gass & Selinker 1983, Ellis 1986). Ellis (1997: 52) describes the role of L1 within this cognitive framework as an “input from the inside”.

On the basis of these arguments, it is possible to envisage a different way of examining the role of the L1 within a contrastive or comparative framework. UG theory with its emphasis on underlying universality provides a concept of abstract competence from which different languages can be derived. This applies essentially to syntax at an abstract level. Cognitive psychology provides a more general framework which allows us to see how language forms, on the performance level, interact through memory systems with the abstract principles of language. Both views suggest that for older children or adult learners, conscious learning has a significant role to play in L2 acquisition. These ideas have led scholars to revise their views of the potential contribution of the L1.

Within a cognitive framework contrastive analysis has many aspects and potentials: “the structural and semantic relations between MT [mother tongue] and FL are now seen as appropriate objects for study” (James 1996: 145). The major development in contrastive analysis within a cognitive framework is the interest in comparing, not only the structural linguistic features of languages, but also the communicative uses of them; a development which was known as ‘contrastive pragmatics’. Within such a trend, L1 influence is seen as a
communication strategy that learners resort to in order to facilitate interacting their ideas (Ellis 1986).

It is likely that Contrastive Analysis will increasingly turn to pragmatic issues in the future. In this new formulation it is possible that Contrastive Analysis will recover not only its theoretical bearings (which arguably it never entirely lost), but its practical worth to language teachers (Ellis 1986: 39).

This argument sounds recent (yet, that seems to be what was intended by Lado, one of the originators of contrastive analysis when he called for comparing cultures, see Lado 1957: 2). It is really contrastive analysis in that sense which can best contribute to communicating in the L2.

Thus, according to the cognitive theory, L2 learning is seen as a skill building process that needs conscious and explicit efforts on the part of the learner. According to this view, the L1 can be seen as a valued source of knowledge, and a cognitive strategy that learners use to improve their learning of the L2 on both the receptive (as a learning strategy), and productive (as a communication strategy) levels.

Yet another dimension that is claimed to 'block' learners' conscious and cognitive abilities to learn is the affective factor (motivation). The next section will show that affective aspects of learning influence learners' abstract competence (conscious and unconscious) as well as performance.

1.2.3 A socio-cultural interactionist view of L2 learning and the L1 influence
From a socio-cultural perspective, language learning is not merely a mental process that happens completely inside the learner's mind as claimed by SLA theorists. Language learning is rather a social process that is an outcome of active participation in the outside world (Firth & Wagner 1997, Lantolf 1996). According to this view, language learning happens when individuals can progress from a certain cognitive level to a higher, more complex level (which is called the zone of proximal development (ZPD) through the use of available tools in social interaction; this is called mediation (Lantolf & Appel 1994). One such tool is talk; thus, language is developed first on the social level through collaboration with others then individually on the psychological level. In other words, there are two kinds or levels of interaction; social interaction and private speech as, Frawley & Lantolf (1985) call them. Language in this view is perceived as an important semiotic tool that mediates
between social activities and higher cognitive functions. Through collaborative work with others (social interaction), learners get assistance (scaffolding) that helps them to develop knowledge or skills that are within the ZPD; in other words, to produce language that was originally beyond their competence (Anton & DiCamilla 1998). In this way, interaction is a social process through which learners develop their linguistic knowledge and use of the language.

Thus, in the L2 classroom, learning happens when the learner engages in problem solving interaction with other members in the classroom (Anton & DiCamilla 1998). As Swain & Lapkin (2000: 254) demonstrate, “through such dialogue, students engage in co-constructing their L2 and in building knowledge about it. From their collective behaviour, individual mental resources can develop. That is, the knowledge building that learners have collectively accomplished becomes a tool for further individual use of their second language”.

Socio-cultural interactionists criticized the mentalist interactionist view of learning for focussing on aspects of input negotiation, and conversational devices employed to make the input comprehensible through the exclusive use of L2 (Anton & DiCamilla 1998). The L1 is seen to be important in learners’ interaction in that it helps in scaffolding each others’ learning, reaching intersubjectivity: i.e. establishing a shared perspective about the task and its objectives, and externalizing inner speech (Anton & DiCamilla 1998). The L1 was also shown to help in “making meaning of text, retrieving language from memory, exploring and expanding content, guiding their action through the task, and maintaining dialogue” (Villamil & DeGuerrero 1996: 60). Besides, it was found to facilitate L2 production, initiate and sustain interaction, and encourage talk about L2 forms (Brooks & Donato 1994). While the previous references referred to SL and FL contexts, Swain & Lapkin (2000) found similar uses in immersion classes, and concluded that the L1 helps “students learn the L2 and acquire the cognitively challenging academic content presented to them”.

1.2.4 An affective view of L2 learning and the L1 influence

Dodson (1967) argues that when children learn their L1 they are directed by a very urgent motivation, that is, to use the language as a part of their struggle to survive through expressing their needs. They have the strongest desire to categorize the world. On the other hand, the L2 learner does not have such strong motivations. He or she has already achieved that aim through their L1; (s)he has got the experience of how to deal with concepts and
situations in the L1. As said earlier, the adult L2 learner can already analyze and make generalizations. This means that the L2 will add nothing to his/her understanding or categorization of the world. All the L2 learner needs from learning the new language is how to express the same situations and needs in the L2; in other words, he needs L2 equivalents to L1 sentences:

"he wishes to learn how to handle known and constantly recurring situations through the medium of the foreign language; he does not wish to learn how to handle completely new situations in foreign language terms" (Dodson 1967: 47).

More recently, Paradis (2004: 24) quotes from Lamendella (1977) that there seems to be 'a general communicative system' available to all humans; the L1 is integrated into this system "and thus possesses a limbic base", that is motivation or a strong desire to communicate. L2 learning, on the other hand, especially in formal contexts, does not integrate into that system and, thus, does not enjoy that limbic base. This shows how the adult's motivation to learn an L2 differs from the child's motivation to learn his/her L1. Paradis (2004) agrees with Schumann (1975) and Brown (1981) that adults are directed by either integrative motivation, which relates to their desire to integrate with the target culture (C2), or instrumental motivation which refers to pragmatic reasons for learning, such as getting a job. According to Dulay et al. (1982), both are important in facilitating L2 acquisition.

Language learning becomes more successful when the learner has more positive attitudes towards himself and the native speakers of the target language. Lightbown & Spada (1993: 39) state "we do not know whether it is motivation that produces successful learning or successful learning that enhances motivation". So, it is important to make the learning process enjoyable, supportive, and related to their needs in order to enhance students' motivation, and consequently their acquisition of the L2.

Affective factors, as Schumann (1975) argues, are the main source of adults' failure to learn a second language; affective factors may work to 'block' adults' cognitive abilities. Littlewood (1984) agrees with Rutherford (1987) and Tudor (1996) that the process of learning a new language is frustrating, as it affects learners' abilities to express themselves or understand others either clearly or freely as they are used to in their L1. Tudor (1996) points out that adult learners feel hindered and lose their self-esteem; they feel they are no more themselves. This feeling has negative affective influences on their attitudes towards the language they learn. Brown (1981) attributes this to the fact that by the age of adolescence, a
concept of self has been developed, which brings with it “defensive inhibitions”. The process of learning a new language involves threatening that self-esteem as learners feel unconfident or alienated because of their lack of competence in the new language. Thus, affective factors influence learning both on the abstract and performance levels.

Paradis (2004) argues that success in L2 learning relies much on how positively the L2 learner evaluates the input, as well as the general learning situation. This can help in converting the input into intake which, in turn, facilitates retention of the material in long term memory. He explains how the brain assesses the input and, based on this assessment, an implicit response is triggered:

“the peripheral nervous system assesses the motivational relevance and emotional significance of stimuli ............. These assessments are made on the basis of whether or not the stimulus is pleasant, enhances an individual’s goals and needs, and is compatible with his or her coping ability, self image and social image” (Paradis 2004: 24).

Affective factors also work as inhibitions on the part of adult learners to prevent them from socializing and communicating with L2 speakers as freely and meaningfully as little children do, which negatively affects their second language acquisition. Schumann (1975) suggests that adult learners have developed a feeling of security in their own language; they feel threatened when trying to use a new language, especially because of the feeling that they are dependent on others. Young children, on the other hand, do not mind depending on others for learning; this does not make them feel threatened. Many of these issues will be considered again in the context of teaching methodology (2.2.4) and the FL classroom context (3.4.1).

These recent perspectives on the nature of adults’ L2 learning and how it is a different experience from L1 learning contribute to a rethinking of the role of L1 in L2 learning.

1.3 Rethinking the role of the L1 in L2 learning

These perspectives taken together lead us to question the idea that, for adult learners in classroom settings, exclusive exposure to the L2 is enough for learning to take place; in other words, the sufficiency of positive evidence is being rethought. There is a growing recognition of a role for focus on form, consciousness raising, negative evidence and, more generally, explicit aspects of learning. The change has come from different perspectives.
These will be reviewed under the following titles: a) rethinking the comprehensible input hypothesis, b) rethinking the interaction hypothesis, c) rethinking focus on form, and d) rethinking the transfer issue.

1.3.1 Re-thinking the comprehensible input hypothesis

The 'comprehensible input' hypothesis has also been criticized as being untestable (McLaughlin 1987). It is not clear what makes input comprehensible, whether generally or for particular learners. Also, the 'comprehensible input' in itself does not help in explaining how certain language aspects are acquired, such as formulaic expressions, which some children acquire and use effectively without knowing the meaning of the constituent words (McLaughlin 19847). There have also been contradictions within Krashen's own claims about comprehensible input. McLaughlin (1987) argues that at one point Krashen (1985) claimed that simple-coded input achieving the principle of i + 1 is an ideal comprehensible input; at another point, he claimed that adult learners are faster in the early stages of learning because they receive more comprehensible input. This is because they benefit from their knowledge of the world, including their L1, to maintain communication, and also benefit from the use of the monitor to 'repair' their output. If the first claim was right, this would have meant that children receive more comprehensible input (McLaughlin 1987).

White (1987) comments that, although Krashen warns of manipulating the input to deliberately aim at i + 1, because it is difficult to know the learner's current state of competence he attributes a lot of importance to simplified input which is itself a form of input manipulation. White attributes this to Krashen's insistence that the input has to be comprehensible. She thinks that the point of comprehensibility is misleading in more than one sense. By its dependence on simplified input, comprehensible input in that sense can deprive learners of useful language properties/forms (see Hall’s 1995 and Neil’s 1997 studies in section 2.3.1). By its dependence on context and extra-linguistic cues, comprehensible input ignores the presence of other internal factors within the learner him/herself. The main claim that comprehensible input leads to acquisition was also questioned. Sharwood-Smith (1986) and Faerch & Kasper (1986) argued that comprehension alone is not sufficient for acquisition. They differentiated between two processes. In some cases, learners may comprehend a message without necessarily attending to its constituent structures (making use of contextual cues and their knowledge of the world). Acquisition, on the other hand,
would require learners to attend to the linguistic components of the input and compare them with their current knowledge.

Furthermore, White (1987) argues that incomprehensibility can sometimes lead to development in the learner’s competence because then any resulting communication breakdown has to be dealt with. She also thinks that positive input cannot, in all cases, guarantee target-like competence (such as in cases where learners overgeneralize some L2 rules or transfer rules from their L1), hence the importance of negative input and grammar teaching. White (1987) adds that in some cases ungrammatical input can be comprehensible, and thus learners may stick to the wrong form. According to Hall (1995) defining comprehensible input in terms of simple syntax, limited vocabulary, repetition, etc. deprives learners of more complex input that could further their learning opportunities b (see section 2.3.1).

Swain (1985) showed that in situations where students received considerable comprehensible input (immersion classes in Canada), their performance still lagged behind native speakers’ in grammatical aspects of the language. She proposed the comprehensible output hypothesis in contrast with Krashen’s comprehensible input. Only when learners produce language, they can notice any gaps between the target rule and their current competence. Comprehensible output, unlike comprehensible input, forces learners to engage in processing language on the syntactic level and not only on the semantic level. It also helps learners test their current L2 hypotheses and focus on form.

Thus, comprehensible input in Krashen’s sense does not really guarantee comprehension or learning on the part of the learners. Learners seem to need more enhanced and elaborated features of talk than those described in the comprehensible input to move beyond mere comprehension of messages to internalizing [and using] the language (see chapter 2, section 2.3.1).

1.3.2 Re-thinking the interaction hypothesis
As mentioned earlier, the interaction hypothesis was linked to the input hypothesis in claiming that comprehensible input promotes acquisition or, to use UG terms, that positive evidence is enough to activate the abstract universal system, and thus trigger knowledge of the L2 rules (see section 1.2.1). Long (1981 & 1983) aimed to prove that a) interactional
modifications lead to input comprehensibility, b) comprehensible input leads to acquisition, and therefore c) interactional modifications lead to acquisition. This meant that to prove the interactionists’ main claim that interaction and negotiation of meaning is responsible for acquisition, a preceding step would be to prove Krashen’s claim that comprehensible input causes acquisition. According to the discussion in the previous section (1.3.1), this claim was not proved, which meant that the main interactionist claim that interaction can promote acquisition was not easy to prove. Most of the research within the interactionist work could only give some evidence for proposal (a), i.e. interactional modifications increase input comprehensibility (Pica et al. 1987, Gass & Varonis 1994). Even that claim was not uncontroversial as it was claimed by Krashen that pre-modified input, that is not negotiated, can be equally helpful for acquisition (Chaudron 1988). Another problem with that research was that it was not clear-cut if the effects of the interactional modifications were due to the qualitative benefit of these modifications or to the extra time and input they allow for. Moreover, as Pica (1996) proposes, negotiation of meaning may hinge on the students’ level; it may be more effective with intermediate learners, as she suggests. (See Ellis 1999: 6, 7 for a summary of the problems of the early interaction hypothesis).

According to the comprehensible output hypothesis, Swain (1985) suggests that negotiation of meaning which aims at passing a message across is not enough for promoting students’ grammatical competence. The comprehensible output, in turn, requires that learners be pushed to produce accurate language and not just to communicate successfully in a given situation. This also gives prominence to negative input which results from communication breakdown as learners are then forced to adjust their output to deliver their messages more appropriately. The importance of the comprehensible output is that it allows students to use their knowledge of the language in a meaningful way, try out their hypotheses about the language, and focus on form as well as meaning. The significance of the comprehensible output is to enhance, not only communicative competence, but also linguistic competence.

This led to a renewed interest in formal aspects of learning, consciousness raising, and negative feedback (see next section) This had a strong impact on the interaction hypothesis which led Long (1996) to modify his interaction hypothesis; he admitted that comprehensible input, i.e. positive evidence was not enough for acquisition to take place and assigned an influential role to attention, consciousness-raising, focus on form, and negative feedback in L2 acquisition. This also produced a more general tendency in SLA studies to focus on
formal aspects of the language within a broader communicative framework; an approach that is generally known as Focus on Form (FonF) (Doughty & Williams 1998). We will discuss the characteristics of that approach briefly in the next section and will return to it in chapter 2 (section 2.2.2) to examine it in context of FL teaching and the role of the L1 in it.

1.3.3 Rethinking focus on form

Researchers such as Gass & Varonis (1994) and Loschky (1994), failing to find clear supportive evidence for the impact of interaction on acquisition, called for paying more attention to the role of noticing, attention and consciousness-raising on L2 acquisition. Braidi (1995) attributed the failure of the interactionist research to show any evidence of the impact of interaction on acquisition to the methodology adopted in that research; that is focusing on the functional aspect of Foreigner Talk rather than on the grammatical characteristics of that talk. She called for a more grammatical approach in studying Foreigner Talk, making use of the contributions of Universal Grammar. Pica (1996) acknowledges the limitations of the interaction hypothesis for developing linguistic competence, and how some linguistic aspects cannot be negotiated, e.g. inflectional morphology. She also extends her call for seeking support from focus on form.

Use of the LI seems to play a positive role in this. The sociocultural interactionists (see section 1.2.3) found that learners used the LI as a valuable cognitive tool, in collaborative learning, to scaffold each others’ learning in the form of advising, reacting, eliciting, and requesting clarification, which helped them to reach to higher levels of development (Anton & DiCamilla 1998, Villamil & Guerrero 1996). The LI as a cognitive tool was also found to help students to:

"understand and make sense of the requirements and content of the task; to focus attention on language form, vocabulary use, and overall organization ........... Without their LI use, the task presented to them may not have been accomplished as effectively, or perhaps it might not have been accomplished at all" (Swain & Lapkin 2000: 268).

Other researchers sought to demonstrate the role of negative evidence for L2 acquisition from different perspectives. Error correction was shown to be helpful in learning some structures, taking into consideration individual differences, e.g. extrinsic motivation, anxiety (DeKeyser 1993). In a series of studies on adverb placement in second language acquisition, White (1991) and Trahey & White (1993) found that, in classroom L2 learning, positive
evidence did not seem to be enough for learners to access UG. The learners tended to over-
geneneralize the values of their L1 parameters to the L2 grammar, something which could not be eliminated by positive evidence only. They concluded that, in such contexts, error correction and explicit teaching are more influential in helping L2 learners to acquire the rules of adverb placement in the L2. Spada and Lightbown (1993) showed results favouring implicit, consistent error correction by the teacher of students' wrong use of rules (WH-questions) over explicit teaching of these rules. Lyster and Ranta (1997) found six types of feedback being used in immersion classrooms; (viz. explicit correction, clarification requests, recasts, repetition, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback). Recasts, although used most by teachers, were not really conducive to self correction on the part of students. Other types of error correction seemed to be more effective in that they put pressure on learners to attend and respond to them. More recently, Ellis et al. (2006) found empirical evidence in favour of explicit feedback (including metalinguistic explanation) over implicit feedback (recasts) on the acquisition of past tense (ed) by low-intermediate adult ESL learners in a context that aimed at developing communicative skills in the L2. By and large negative evidence, including explicit error correction, was shown to be useful to varying degrees for some students for the acquisition of, at least, some structures.

1.3.4 Rethinking the transfer issue

The work that minimized the role of the L1 soon came under attack on many grounds. First of all, it concentrated exclusively on errors, making the same assumption as the behaviourist view that errors are an indicator of learning difficulties. According to Ringbom (1987), errors are not enough to show learning problems. Thus, the fact that certain errors do not happen does not mean that there is no learning problem; it may, alternatively, mean that the problem or the difficult rule is avoided, something which error analysis cannot capture. This implies that L1 influence does not necessarily manifest itself in errors; avoidance is another strategy that students employ when they are faced with a language pattern that they are not used to in their L1. In Ringbom's (1987:69) words: “Not all errors in learner language are due to transfer, and not all instances of transfer lead to errors”. Second, this work concentrated on the influence of the L1 on grammatical aspects of the language, while there were rarely discussions of the L1 influence on phonological, lexical, or rhetorical aspects (Odlin 1989, Ringbom 1987). A third pitfall in that kind of study of the L1 role in L2 learning was the concentration on the influence of the L1 on production (language use) rather than on comprehension (Ringbom 1987). A fourth problem was related to the difficulty in
categorizing errors, as it was acknowledged that there were many other factors that cause errors apart from L1 influence. It was hard, for example, to discriminate between interference and developmental errors (Ellis 1994). Some errors could be classified as, for example, simplification in some cases, and as the influence of the L1 in others (Odlin 1989).

Odlin (1989) and Ringbom (1987) agree that there was a kind of deliberate neglect of the positive contributions of the L1, even when there was evidence for them. Ringbom, for example, criticized the work of Dulay & Burt (1974) for ignoring the fact that Spanish learners, in their study, did better than Chinese learners, and that the logical interpretation for that was that Spanish learners could have referred to their L1 which is closer to English than Chinese is. This tendency to ignore the possible contributions of the L1 may be due to the limited view of transfer in the context of errors, as discussed earlier, and to a pre-supposed belief that the L1 influence (transfer) is a behaviourist principle. Ellis (1994) also agrees with Gass & Selinker (1983), in the same vein, that this was an over-reaction against the concept of L1 transfer because of its direct association with behaviourism. “For many scholars, transfer was too much the theoretical creature of dubious psychology and dubious linguistics” (Odlin 1989). After the decline of behaviourist psychology and contrastive analysis there were no available theories or interpretations to justify the idea of the L1 influence, so it was easier to reject or deny it completely. “The skepticism about transfer did not result simply from the growth of empirical research” (Odlin 1989: 22).

There was a re-examination of the conditions under which L1 transfer could occur. Thus, Kellerman (1983) raised again the issue of similarity and difference between L1 and L2, as a condition that affects the degree of L1 transfer, but not in the sense of positive and negative as it was handled under the behaviourist view. What he meant was that, when the distance between the two languages is narrow the learner is more likely to transfer L1 knowledge, but when the distance is great this is less likely to happen. Or, as Corder (1983a, and b) interprets it, similarities between L1 and L2 give greater assistance in learning the L2, while differences between them give less help. Another condition for L1 transfer relates to the L1 itself, that is, the learner seems to have an awareness of which features or items of his language are peculiar and which are not; hence, he tends to transfer the latter but not the first (Kellerman 1983).
The stage of learner development represents another factor in L1 transfer. Ellis (1994) shows how researchers differ in regarding the effect of learner level of development; some see that transfer increases in the early stages and decreases in the later stages, considering that L1 features will be gradually replaced by L2 ones as the learner's acquisition develops. Others argue that L1 transfer requires a degree of development, or proficiency and consequently, it will increase in advanced stages. Kellerman (1983) is in line with the second opinion. Corder (1983a) thinks that the first account may apply to acquiring the L2 phonological system, while not to the acquisition of syntax. Skinner (1985: 380, 381), quoting from Cummins, puts the issue of transfer in a broader context in what he calls "common underlying proficiency"; he argues that the greater the proficiency the learner has in his or her L1, the more likely he or she will transfer its rules to the L2.

Within UG, transfer gained a strong sound theoretical justification. Work in UG shows that certain typological features are more common among certain varieties of languages than other features, and that some language behaviour patterns are attributed to developmental factors, some to L1 influence, and some to both (Odlin 1989). In a Universal Grammar theory, the effect of the L1 is not narrowly seen as a transfer of the surface rules, but rather as a transfer of parameters that need to be revised and adjusted to the L2 grammar (McLaughlin 1987). In line with this, Shortall (1996) points out that in the first case two languages only are involved, while in the latter, there could be a deeper comparison between sets of parameters, which involves almost all languages. Hence, the UG linguistic claim that languages share common features can form a better basis for contrastive analysis, as a learning tool that makes use of the L1, than the structuralist claim that each language is a unique system that merits study in itself. This is supported by Shortall's (1996) argument that contrastive analysis may find a meaningful base to start from within a UG theory of learning. Shortall (1996) attempts to show that contrastive analysis can have a lot of potential and contributes to FLT within a theory of Universal Grammar, which conceives of languages as sharing basic features in common (principles), while differing in other features which are language-specific (parameters). It is the latter which may cause interference from the L1, and which may need explicit instruction. In conclusion, as Shortall (1996) claims, if languages are perceived according to this view, then learners' L1 is to be valued as a source of knowledge and a useful tool in facilitating L2 acquisition.
On the other hand, some writers referred to L1 use as a communication strategy that the learner may refer to when he/she experiences a difficulty in expressing his/her intention in the L2 (Corder 1983b, Faerch & Kasper 1983). Although Blum-Kulka & Levenston (1983) and Corder (1983b) point out that reference to the L1 (code-switching) as a compensatory communication strategy is different from language transfer as a learning process, they agree with Faerch & Kasper (1983) that the first can eventually lead to learning. Reference to the L1 (code-switching), is an achievement strategy that helps the learner to expand his/her communicative resources, maintaining his/her intended message, instead of reducing or abandoning his/her communicative goals (Corder 1983b, Faerch & Kasper 1983). In other words, code-switching is a risk-taking strategy that the learner can adopt instead of resorting to avoidance strategies. This “can lead to hypothesis formation as the first step in the L2 learning process” (Faerch & Kasper 1983: 54).

Conclusion
In this chapter, we have examined how the view towards the role of the L1 has changed over time depending on the prevailing views of language learning. We have seen that within a behaviourist view of language learning, the L1 was viewed negatively as a set of old habits that interferes with the learning of the L2 as a set of new habits. Accordingly, that set of old language habits had to be put aside or avoided while learning the new language habits. The naturalistic view, on the other hand, did not perceive any role for the L1 as L2 learning was seen to proceed naturally with no conscious effort, just like child L1 learning. Then, new theoretical perspectives that conceived of L2 learning as a different experience from L1 learning (on the internal and external levels) contributed to a balanced view of L2 learning and the influence of the L1. These views, complementing and contributing to each other, seemed to result in re-thinking many of the hypotheses that encouraged monolingual strategies of learning and discouraged use of the L1.

It can be concluded that from a theoretical point of view, even if children refer to an abstract language system that interacts with input to develop their knowledge of the L1 (natural acquisition), we cannot claim that adults’ knowledge of the L2 develops in an identical way. From a UG point of view, there is an abstract pre-determined universal system from which each language selects its parameters. Even if adult learners refer to that abstract knowledge it is never sufficient. Adult learners and older children learning in FL classrooms have a different balance between implicit/unconscious and explicit/conscious learning. We have
seen a majority of interpretations support the claim that L2 learners either do not refer to UG directly at all, referring to the L1 grammar instead, or that they refer just partially or indirectly to UG. This means they rely either fully, partially, or at least initially on their L1 grammar. The context of learning is also different; L2 learners usually receive highlighted and negative input.

This means that, for full acquisition, adult learners have to make use of other routes for learning the L2. This gives room and credibility to more general cognitive interpretations of how L2 learning takes place. We have seen that cognitive theory conceives of L2 learning as a skill building process that makes use of explicit conscious efforts of learning, which can be accelerated through practice. The L1 is seen as both a learning as well as a communication strategy. From a socio-cultural perspective, L2 learning was shown to be both a social and a cognitive process. The L1 is seen as a scaffolding tool that aids higher cognitive functions, and thus aids L2 learning. We have also seen that according to an affective view of learning, learners’ conscious and cognitive abilities of learning may, in turn, be ‘blocked’ by affective factors. The L1 is seen to possess a limbic base that the L2 does not have. Attempts to ignore that fact or work against it will hinder learning. The L1 is part of learners’ life experience that can be employed to enhance their motivation to learn the L2.

This multi-dimensional revision of the potential influence and contributions of the L1 has shown that natural exposure to positive L2 input can help trigger implicit aspects of learning, but that these are not enough to develop adult learners’ (including older children) linguistic knowledge to satisfactory levels, or to master all target L2 rules. Adults, as cognitively mature learners, need more explicit and enhanced forms of input (formal teaching and error correction) to develop a sound knowledge of the L2. They also need to develop positive attitudes towards learning the L2. Theory and empirical evidence from these complementary domains contributed, and are still contributing, to this balanced view of L2 learning. The L1 was shown to contribute to the components of learning of such a balanced view that appreciates the internal and external differences between the two experiences of L1 and L2 learning.

The next chapter will, in turn, examine the role of the L1 in relation to L2 teaching, and build on this chapter’s contributions to show how further the L1 can help in enhancing the different aspects of learning as discussed in this chapter.
Chapter 2
The L1 in L2 teaching methodology

In the last chapter, we traced the views of the role the L1 can play in L2 learning as reflected in language learning theories and research. We concluded that a balanced view of L2 learning appreciates the internal and external differences between the two experiences of L1 and L2 learning. Natural exposure to positive input is necessary but not sufficient; certain features of the L2 input need to be highlighted in order to be acquired. Learners’ motivation is also important, so the learner’s life experience (including his or her linguistic background) needs to be valued for the learning experience to be successful. The current chapter will, now, review the role of the L1 in relation to L2 teaching methodology. In the first section, we will give a brief history of the role of the L1 in L2 teaching. The second section will examine the current shifts in L2 methodology that brought about a new role for the L1.

2.1 A brief history of the role of the L1 in L2 teaching
In the distant history of language teaching (Middle Ages and the Renaissance), the L1 had a central place in L2 teaching (Kelly 1969). It was used for explaining meaning and new grammatical points, and carrying out translation activities. This remained the case until the 18th century, when these practices became known as the Grammar Translation Method (GTM).

By the end of the nineteenth century, interest in learning foreign languages increased; specialists in language teaching sought to improve the practices of foreign language teaching (FLT). This endeavour mainly took the shape of developing ‘Teaching Methods’ that offered idealized frameworks of recommended teaching practices, to be maintained by teachers, that were thought to facilitate L2 learning on the part of learners. Since then, new individual ideas and teaching methods have continued to appear, each method adopting different attitudes to the way foreign languages should be taught. Most methods tried to avoid the use of the L1 in L2 teaching, treating it as the main factor behind the failure of the GTM. Some of these methods ignored the L1 influence completely, some denied its influence, and some, even, distorted it.

In this section, we will give a brief background of how the role of the L1 has been perceived within these methods of L2 teaching. This will be reviewed as follows: a) The Grammar
Translation Method, b) the reaction against the Grammar Translation Method, c) the influence of science, d) the influence of the Communicative Movement, and e) The influence of socio-political factors.

2.1.1 The Grammar Translation Method
Language teaching practice preceded behaviourist psychology and SLA theories in history. So, in the distant past, ideas about language learning emerged in the context of language teaching and were reflected in language teaching methods.

The use of grammar and rhetoric in language teaching employing the use of translation as a major activity for emphasizing them goes back to the Middle Ages and the Renaissance (Kelly 1969). This remained the case until the 18th century, when these practices became known as the Grammar Translation Method (GTM). All that the GTM did was to “adapt these traditions to the circumstances and requirements of schools” (Howatt 1984: 131). The defining characteristic of the Grammar-Translation method was “the replacement of the traditional texts by exemplificatory sentences” (Howatt 1984:131). Each lesson consisted of new grammatical rules, vocabulary lists, and sentences to translate. The L1 was a central feature of the method, used in explaining new items and comparing L2 with L1. The ability to translate was seen as an indication of mastering the language. Halliday et al. (1964: 265) suggest that the method was given that name because “translation alternates with formal grammar as the main activity in class and homework”. This method dominated language teaching until the end of the 19th century when it came under severe criticism. Yet, Brown (1994, 2000) claims that the practices of the GTM are still persistent in many language education systems around the world.

2.1.2 The reaction against the Grammar Translation Method
One of the well-known reasons for criticizing the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom was the way the L1 was overused in the GTM (Snell-Hornby 1985, 1988). Heltai adds that not only was it overused, but “it was used inefficiently too” Heltai (1989: 288). This was subsequently followed by a reaction against the use of translation, and the L1 in general, in FLT. This reaction was so strong that it manifested itself persistently in the ideology and practices of almost all the subsequent methods in different degrees. In this part, I will discuss the two major developments that represented a direct reaction against the practices of the GTM: the Reform Movement and the Direct Method.
2.1.2.1 The Reform Movement

The debate began with the beginnings of the Reform Movement by the mid nineteenth century, when there was a feeling that the formal education system failed to meet the growing interest in learning foreign languages among Europeans (Richards & Rodgers 2001). Individuals interested in language teaching (like Marcel and Gouin in France, and Prendergast in England) began to seek reform; most of them had worthy ideas but not a coherent ‘school of thought’ to relate their ideas. So, in spite of the fact that their ideas were inspiring to their followers in the Reform Movement, they achieved no permanent impact (Howatt 1984, Richards & Rogers 2001). From 1880, serious attempts were made by linguists such as Passy in France, Vietor in Germany, and Sweet in England to establish the basis for the development of language teaching methods. Most of their ideas rested upon the belief that “speech patterns, rather than grammar, were the fundamental elements of language” (Richards & Rodgers 2001: 8). The basic features of the Reform Movement were: a) the superiority of spoken language over the written language, b) the priority of connected texts rather than separated sentences, and c) the priority of oral-based methodology. This led to discouraging the use of translation, although the L1 was used to explain new items and check comprehension. Thus, monolingual methods were preferred, but the L1 was not excluded (Howatt 1984). This compromise might have been sought to resolve a debate around the issue of L1 use. While some reformers insisted on the exclusive use of L2, others like Sweet and Passy found the complete abandonment of the L1 difficult and impractical (Stern 1996).

2.1.2.2 The Direct Method

By the end of the nineteenth century, while reformers were seeking to set the foundations for a scientific language teaching methodology, there was a parallel attitude which sought to base language teaching on ‘naturalistic principles’ of child first language acquisition. Hence, they were called natural methods. The assumption which natural methods were based on was that language learning is not a ‘rational process’, it is rather an ‘intuitive process’ that can work successfully under the co-ordination of three components: “someone to talk to, something to talk about, and a desire to understand and make yourself understood” (Howatt 1984: 192).

Proponents of the natural methods believe that foreign languages can be taught
monolingually without reference to L1, illustrating meaning directly through demonstration and action. They ignored translation completely (Dodson 1962, Richards & Rodgers 2001). These principles led to what was called the direct method in the late nineteenth century. As Howatt (1984: 197) comments “the true roots of natural language teaching methods lie deep in the art of teaching itself”. He clarifies that the success of Pestalozzi (the originator of the natural methods in their modern sense) and Sauveur (whose ideas led to the Direct Method) lay in the kind of the conversations they conducted with their students, the component which became central in all natural methods.

The most extreme form of the Direct Method was reflected in Berlitz schools in which all teachers were native speakers, who were directed to concentrate on oral work, delaying the presentation of grammar until later stages, using the question-answer technique, and avoiding the use of L1 under any conditions (Howatt 1984).

2.1.3 The influence of science
By the end of the 19th century and the development of science, linguistics and psychology appeared as independent subjects. The direct method was seen as another excess that ignored the realities and demands of formal education and the need for ‘grammatical insight’. Decoo (2001: 5) refers to the period following the decline of the Direct Method as a ‘search for balance’ in which eclectic methods dominated the field almost between 1910 and 1940. Then a new methodological development emerged influenced by the current linguistic and language learning theories. Two methods appeared; one in Britain and the other in America.

2.1.3.1 The Aural-Oral Approach/ Situational Language Teaching:
This approach was introduced by British applied linguists, notably, Palmer and Hornby; it dominated the field of ELT from 1920-1960 (Richards & Rodgers 2001). The method adopted some of the principles of the Direct Method such as the centrality of oral work, as is clear from its name, and the use of the question-answer technique, but was distinguished by having a profound scientific basis. Speech, vocabulary, and grammar were given great importance in the Aural-Oral Approach. Grammar was seen to form the basic patterns of spoken sentences, simple grammatical forms were introduced before more difficult forms, and substitution tables were thought to facilitate acquiring the language rules. Vocabulary was graded and a sufficient core vocabulary was necessary for developing reading proficiency. Accuracy was prioritized; hence, the learning material was carefully selected
and graded. On the procedural level, the teacher presented the new vocabulary and structures orally before moving to reading or writing (Pittman 1963). The teacher controlled the learning content and activities; learners had to listen to and repeat after the teacher; only when students have had enough control of vocabulary and grammar they were allowed to initiate language. The most distinguishing feature of the Aura-Oral Approach was the use of context and situations in teaching new language items; Textbooks and visual aids were important materials in helping the teacher in ‘Situational Language Teaching’ (Pittman 1963). For Bell (1981), the method was an eclectic approach that attempted to set a balance between the use of grammar and situations. Hence, explanations in L1 or even L2 were discouraged, since the meaning was expected to be induced from the situation or the context in which the new language items were presented (Billows 1961). This was thought to resemble and replicate the L1 learning experience, and would help more in acquiring the language and applying it to new situations. Palmer, one of the originators of the method, did not reject the use of L1 completely; he, moreover, criticized the Direct Method for its exaggerated attitude against the use of L1 (Palmer 1917).

2.1.3.2 The Audiolingual Method
This approach was developed by American linguists in the 1950s, as a result of the increased awareness, after World War II, of the failure of the foreign language teaching methodology in public education. Methods in use at the time were the GTM, the Direct Method, and reading-based methods (Krashen & Terrell 1988, Richards & Rodgers 2001), and, in many cases, rather eclectic methods as mentioned above.

As shown in Brooks (1960), this method was an outcome of structuralist theories in linguistics (Fries 1945) and behaviourist language learning theories (discussed in chapter 1). An earlier influence of these trends seemed to happen outside the formal educational system; this was known as the American Army Programme. This programme relied heavily on extensive exposure of a small number of learners, who were highly motivated, to oral practice with a native speaker of the language. In such special conditions, learners achieved a high level of success, which led linguists and people interested in language teaching to think seriously of adopting the same techniques into formal language teaching (Bell 1981, Richards & Rodgers 2001).

Structural linguistics claimed to study language scientifically in the sense that each language
had its own system that merited study on its own. Samples of spoken language were collected, transcribed and analyzed for their structural patterns. Learning a language meant learning the constituent grammatical patterns of that language. Thus, grammar and phonology of language were important for understanding and producing that language (Brooks 1960). Behaviourists, as shown in chapter 1, viewed language learning as developing habits through the use of stimuli (language patterns) that the learners responds to. Correct responses should be rewarded and incorrect patterns should not be tolerated. In the context of language teaching, the principles of the Audiolingual Method were as follows: speech was prior to writing; the latter should be delayed to later stages of the language learning process. Phonological and grammatical structures were prior to vocabulary, which should be delayed until students master the sounds and forms of the language. Accuracy was seen as prior to fluency. Hence, students were not encouraged to initiate language until later stages. In early stages of learning, students were rather involved in practising language patterns in different contexts. Teachers would make use of tapes and language laboratories to provide alternative models of drills and to vary tasks and situations for the students. Also, the use of drills and situations for teaching grammar were given prominence over explicit talk about the L2 rules; this was thought to help students to discriminate, generalize, and induce grammar rules. Linguistic and cultural contexts were regarded as important in teaching meaning (Rivers 1964, Bell 1981).

According to Brooks (1960), The Audiolingual Method represented a shift in the language teaching profession from an art to a science. According to the linguistic and psychological principles of learning (discussed in chapter 1), the L1 was seen as a set of old habits that can have a negative influence on L2 learning. The aim was to suppress that influence as much as possible. This was achieved, on the level of design and testing, by employing the CA technique, and on the level of pedagogy (presentation and practice), by emphasizing monolingual teaching, and extensive practice of L2 patterns. These ideas were very influential as they had strong scientific justifications from linguistics and psychology, which made monolingual teaching more persistent.

2.1.4 The influence of the communicative movement
Situational language teaching and audiolingualism began to lose favour by the mid 1960s as a result of Chomsky's criticism of structural linguistics and behavioural psychology (1959) (See section 1.2.1). Also, within the language teaching field, a study comparing the
audiolinguial method with a cognitive approach that exploited the L1 and grammar teaching showed an advantage for the latter over the audiolinguial method (Smith 1970 quoted in Allwright 1988). This led to a general frustration and contributed to the decline of the method. There was a renewed tendency towards the use of eclectic methods until a new trend took the initiative (Decoo 2001).

In fact, contributions from many disciplines gave rise to that new approach. In philosophy, philosophers such as Austin and Searle proposed ideas about the nature of language, and how language is used to do things; this attracted attention to the illocutionary force of language (Bell 1981). In linguistics, some linguists such as Halliday (1973, 1975) focussed their studies on semantics and language in use. In sociolinguistics, Hymes (1972) proposed the concept of ‘communicative competence’ as opposed to Chomsky’s (1959, 1965) ‘grammatical competence’. This idea, in particular, was very influential in the field of L2 teaching; it led to the appearance of notional syllabuses (Wilkins 1976). Instead of the traditional methods of analyzing the language in terms of grammatical or lexical units, Wilkins analyzed categories of communicative meanings that a learner would need to learn to communicate in that language. These involved notional categories and categories of communicative functions. Thus, meaning took priority over grammatical and lexical rules in the study of language. This, as Bell (1981: 146) puts it, represented “a fresh approach to language teaching rather than a change in method”.

The ability to communicate effectively in the L2 was now explicitly expressed as a goal for L2 learning. The Direct Method, Situational Language Teaching, and the Audiolinguial Method also aimed at communication through adopting dialogues and real life situations in order to use the language for a purpose. The reason for not making this aim clear might be that these methods were rather restricted by a structural view of language under the influence of the predominant linguistic theories then. So, the aim of communication in the L2 was not adequately articulated or discussed in the same way as was done in the communicative approach. It is really the discussion of this aim and the explicit emphasis on ‘communicative competence’ that represented the revolutionary part in the communicative approach. Its principles were widely accepted as a valuable contribution to language teaching (Brumfit 1980, Brumfit & Johnson 1979, Littlewood 1981).
It is now important to move on to discuss the position of the L1 in CLT. This will be dealt with in detail for CLT, as the last revolution in FLT methodology, is claimed to be adopted by many, if not most, FLT contexts worldwide (including the EFL context in Egypt).

Although Richards & Rodgers (2001) state that CLT does not object to the ‘judicious’ use of L1 if needed, Kharma & Hajjaj (1989) and Cole (1998) agree that the place of L1 in CLT is not clearly stated. On the other hand, Mitchell (1988), Howatt (1984), and Izumi (1995) take the view that CLT is basically a monolingual method. Swan (1985a, b) takes the view that CLT ignores the interfering role of the L1 on the levels of theory, design, presentation, and practice. The case seems to be that the negative view towards the L1 use increased with the advent of CLT. This seemed to be attributed to some of the principles and constructs that CLT adopted with the aim of maximizing the use of L2 in the L2 classroom.

First of all was the emphasis on ‘communicative competence’. The concept of communicative competence as was proposed by Hymes (1972) referred to the knowledge and ability (skill) required to communicate in the language in a variety of situations. According to Canale (1983), activities that aim at knowledge only do not lead, in themselves, to the ability to use the language in real communication. He emphasizes the importance of skill-oriented activities from the early stages of learning to enable students to communicate effectively in the L2. Although Canale stresses the importance of both of them for developing the communicative competence, he sees a direct link between exposure to the L2 and the enhancement of both knowledge and skill in the L2, while conceiving of the L1 use as only a knowledge-oriented activity that does not develop the actual communication in the L2. He refers to four components of communicative competence: grammatical or linguistic competence (knowledge of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar), sociolinguistic or pragmatic competence (knowledge of how to use appropriate language in the appropriate situation to communicate effectively), discourse competence (knowledge of how to perform with the language in a coherent way both in writing and conversation), and strategic competence (knowledge of how to direct and maintain communication). By strategic competence, Canale means being able to compensate for any incompetence with the other components of communicative competence, or to handle communication breakdowns. This refers to strategies in the L2 (e.g. paraphrase, slowing down, etc.).
Thus, communicative competence was thought to increase through the active use of the L2; the use of the L1 was seen as only a disruptive factor to fluent communication. “The development of the communicative approach has focused the attention on learning a language through its use so that content and process are not separable” (Chambers 1991: 27).

Another principle of communicative teaching is to involve learners in meaningful, genuine communication in realistic situations similar to those they will encounter in real life communication. This is called authentic use of the language. Many studies that dealt with this aspect (e.g. Cathcart 1989) interpreted and committed themselves to authenticity as language based on native speaker/native speaker discourse, or in other words, they exemplified native speaker proficiency, something that the L1 has no role in. In cases where such discourse is too difficult for learners, Cathcart (1989) suggests that learners can be given the chance to discuss and negotiate it which will trigger input modification instead of being given already modified samples of the language. Again, the L1 has no place here.

This relationship between the concept of ‘authenticity’ and the exclusion of the L1 is noticed by Atkinson (1993a):

“use of the mother tongue runs counter to the promotion of authenticity in the classroom because, by definition, only interaction in the target language can ever be authentic: thus ‘communicative’ teachers should insist on 100% target language” (Atkinson 1993a: 2).

Influential theories and hypotheses from SLA, such as Krashen’s and Long’s (see section 1.1.3), emphasized communicative principles and linked them to monolingual principles of teaching. These views, as explained previously, claimed that L2 learners can acquire the target language in the same way as children acquire their L1 through exposure to language input and communicative use of the L2.

Krashen & Terrell (1983) proposed together what is known as The Natural Approach of FL teaching, which they claim is a version of the Communicative Approach. The main assumption behind this approach is that language knowledge develops in two ways: acquisition and learning (this was discussed in detail in section 1.1.3.1). In this approach, language problems, in the early stages, are assumed to happen when students concentrate on accuracy or, in other words, language forms which hinders oral proficiency. That is why formal aspects are of little importance in the natural approach (Krashen & Terrell 1988).
Comprehensible input in the L2 is thought to be enough for the acquisition of the language. To avoid 'lapses' into L1, students are not expected to produce language until they have acquired enough comprehensible input in the L2. At the beginning, students respond physically to commands (as in Total Physical Response), or give one-word answers to questions.

The above overview of FLT Methodology shows that the extensive use of the L1 in the GTM was criticized, and that it discouraged subsequent methods from accepting the L1 in the L2 classroom. L1 use was seen as an obstacle or a sin that had to be eliminated. The direct method seemed to adopt a hostile attitude to the use of L1. Subsequent methods, even though they did not adopt the same extreme attitude, either looked at the L1 use negatively or ignored it. CLT with its emphasis on communicative competence, authenticity, and natural exposure to and communicative use of the L2 contributed to the exemplification of the monolingual principle and the exclusion of the L1 from the FL classroom. From a variety of perspectives, it seemed that monolingual teaching in the L2 was preferable (Howatt 1984, Mitchell 1988, Izumi 1995).

2.1.5 The influence of socio-political factors

There are other researchers who argue that the negative attitude towards the L1 use in L2 teaching methodology was motivated by socio-political reasons and ideological factors (Phillipson 1992, Auerbach 1993, Medgyes 1994, Decoo 2001).

It is argued that there has been an impact from socio-political factors on the calls against the use of the L1 which was reflected in the adoption of two tenets in monolingual approaches: a) exclusive exposure to the L2 leads to better learning (the monolingualism tenet), and consequently b) native speaker teachers are better than non-native. By the term 'tenets', we mean unjustified beliefs that are not based on empirical evidence.

2.1.5.1 The monolingualism tenet

While Medgyes (1994) and Stern (1996) agree that the Reform Movement laid the foundations for the monolingualism tenet, Phillipson (1992: 183) mentions that Gatenby was the first to formulate it in 1950, then it was confirmed at "the Commonwealth Conference on the Teaching of English as a Second Language, held at Makerere, Uganda in 1961". Medgyes (1994: 66) adds that this tenet was further supported by "the growing influence of
the English speaking countries”. Auerbach (1993: 12) claims that the ‘English only’ movement was mostly “determined by political rather than pedagogical factors” She agrees with Phillipson (1992) that monolingualism reflects power relations in colonial policies. Auerbach (1993) further argues that ESL instruction was seen as a means of supporting the Americanization movement, and that ELT was in fact supportive of British neocolonial control.

In addition, this monolingual approach was reinforced by the fact that much EFL methodology arose from ESL contexts in multilingual adult classes, and in this case, teachers did not have the ability to use or know all students’ native languages (Cook 1999). The claim behind the prohibition of the L1 use was that if students were exposed exclusively to the L2, heard and used it all the time they would be more likely to learn it. This kind of argument helped to foster the monolingualism principle in EFL; meanwhile, as Stern (1996) observes, this discouraged or prevented practitioners and researchers from researching the benefits that L1 use could contribute. The assumption in all cases continued to be that the use of L1 has no place in L2 teaching. According to Decoo (2001), this “monolingualism tenet” became so axiomatic that there were few attempts to test it empirically.

2.1.5.2 The superiority of the native speaker teacher

One of the reasons why the use of L1 was ignored in language teaching was that within the Direct Method most teachers were native speakers of English who could not understand the students’ native language, nor did they have the motivation to learn it (Taylor 1972, Auerbach 1993, Rinvolucri 2001). This was accompanied by the belief that native speaker teachers are better than non-native speaker teachers. Phillipson (1992) and Auerbach (1993) agree that, similarly to the monolingualism tenet, this tenet has the same sociopolitical aspect; the two tenets are complementary to each other; the native speaker was the tool used to achieve the principles of the Americanization movement.

Another factor which might have, indirectly, contributed to this belief came from SLA research which tended to emphasize the importance of the native speaker’s proficiency by measuring students’ L2 proficiency against native-like proficiency. This manifested itself in many writings in SLA, e.g. Ellis (1986) and Lightbown (2000), whose assessment of SLA research showed that the aim of attaining native-like proficiency constituted one of the generalizations of the field.
Thus, the discussion in this section has shed light on the factors that led to minimizing the use of the L1 as a useful resource in L2 teaching. The discussion shows that the monolingual approach to teaching was adopted by language teaching methodology, not as a theory or research based shift, but rather as a reaction against the GTM, in part, and as a belief based on false ideologies, in another part. This change, which started with the Reform Movement by the turn of the nineteenth century, preceded any linguistics or language learning theories or research. It was, mostly, based on intuition and experience with the failure of the GTM, attributing this failure to the adoption of the L1 as a tool of teaching and learning about the L2. Since then, the language teaching field seemed to have as its priority the search for the best ‘Method’. One method followed another, each claiming to give better solutions to language teaching problems. Most, if not all language teaching methods, after the GTM, either viewed the L1 negatively or ignored its influence. The prevailing attitude, either explicitly or implicitly, was that the L1 should be avoided in L2 teaching.

This negative attitude to the L1 use was further reinforced by ideas from the SLA field that were adopted enthusiastically without testing their validity in the formal L2 classroom such as, the behaviourist view that the L1 is a source of interference, and then, the naturalistic view that the L2 can be acquired implicitly, rather than learnt explicitly.

Thus, most of the influential ideas about adopting an L2-only approach to FLT came from outside the FLT field; from linguists and language learning specialists who were not in direct contact with the FL classroom setting. In other words, most of the claims about the lack of influence of the L1 in L2 learning seem to have originated in naturalistic or ESL contexts. FL specialists, on the other hand did not make enough effort to test such contributions in the context of FL classrooms. The FL classroom has its specific nature, special demands, and various kinds of abilities and competencies shown by large numbers of students who study in a limited artificial setting (these factors and their influence on teachers’ use of the L1 will be discussed in detail in the next chapter). What applies to or works in naturalistic or ESL settings does not necessarily apply to the formal FL classroom context. The FLT field seemed to be readily prepared to accept such a conviction of the sufficiency of monolingual approaches without feeling the need to properly test the validity of such claims and hypotheses empirically inside the FL classroom context. Monolingualism has developed to the point where it has become dogma in the field of FLT. Even the socio-political arguments
mentioned above in section 2.2.4 were hardly tested or supported by research, and, although they might sound convincing, it will be shown, in the next section, that most of these arguments can be challenged.

This pre-established bias towards monolingual methods discouraged researchers from searching out the potential that use of the L1 could add to L2 classrooms, or, from another point of view, from articulating the impracticality of monolingual methods. The other reason which added to the problem was that many of the figures who sought to defend the use of the L1 throughout different times such as Sweet (1899, republished in 1964), Dodson (1962, 1967), Stern (1996), and Widdowson (2000) also depended, in their arguments, more on experience and intuition than on empirical evidence.

What we can say, then, is that little has been done to investigate the positive aspects that the use of L1 can contribute to the specific teaching/learning situation of FL classrooms. The monolingual assumption in language teaching seemed to be motivated and fostered by ideological factors, supported in some cases by theoretical claims, more than by empirical evidence. There has been what we can call a general bias towards monolingual teaching. The advent of the communicative approach with its principles that were strongly supported by SLA theory and research (particularly Krashen’s and the interactionist views) emphasized monolingual strategies of learning and teaching. Methodologists seemed to be reluctant to admit any use of the L1, and sought to preach the advantages of teaching the L2 by means of the L2 itself. The small amount of empirical research that has been conducted aimed at fostering the already established belief in the superiority of monolingual methods of teaching, overlooking any difficulties or shortcomings that may arise (Stern 1996).

Yet, recently, there seems to be major shifts in L2 methodology that contributed to rethinking the role of the L1 in L2 teaching. The next section will discuss the main features of that shift.

2.2 Current methodology and a role for the L1
Recently, there have been shifts in L2 methodology that contributed to preserve a role for the L1. In this section, we will discuss these shifts and the role of the L1 in them. In the first part, we will refer to a major broad shift in L2 methodology; that is the growing awareness of the limitations of ‘Methods’ in their prescriptive sense. In the second section, we will show
growing evidence of the limitations of monolingual strategies of communication in the FL classroom. In the third part, we will discuss the interest in dual focus of language teaching and the role of the L1 in it. The fourth part will discuss the interest in humanistic aspects of teaching and the role of the L1 in it.

2.2.1 Growing awareness of the limitations of ‘Methods’

With the failure of methods one after another, there has been frustration and a tendency to eclecticism. This, as Decoo (2001) points out, always happened after the failure of each teaching method, which once claimed to have the solution for all language teaching problems. The twentieth century concern with methods has shifted to a concern against methods, or in Rodgers’ (2000: 2) words, an “anti-methods view of language teaching methodology”. Some specialists have been discussing the problems of ‘Methods’ as follow:

First, most methods were generally based on the idea of highlighting one aspect of learning over other aspects; this didn’t mean that the other aspects were not included, but they were given less importance. Thus, it was easy for one method to play down the validity of the previous method by highlighting its shortcomings or inability to deal with those missing components (Decoo 2001). In this way, the GTM was criticized for its focus on explicit aspects of teaching, in general, and its over-use of translation and grammar as teaching tools, in particular. By the same token, the Direct Method could not survive long as it could not fulfil formal education requirements (Dodson 1967); the Audiolingual Method was later criticized for its exclusive focus on surface structure (Hajjaj 1985). Most recently the communicative approach was criticized for its exclusive focus on meaning and implicit aspects of teaching, minimizing the role of formal aspects.

Second, Methods sold themselves as offering “new ideas”; these new ideas were, in most cases, re-phrasing or re-selling of previously discussed ideas (Decoo 2001). This is what makes Methods overlap sometimes. We have seen earlier the resemblance between the audiolingual method and the oral approach, and between them and the ideas of some earlier reformers such as, Passy and Vietor. We have also seen the resemblance between recent communicative and natural ideas and the ideas of the earlier natural or direct Methods.

Third, Methods claimed to seek proof from research; this, in fact, was misleading as these proofs were often purposefully selective and over-generalized (Decoo 2001). We have seen
in Chapter One some of the errors that accompanied the research which intended to compare ‘Methods’, or to support one view of learning over another, as in the case of error analysis research. Besides, even though the learning process is not fully understood, a method would be applied to any context anywhere. Teachers’ and learners’ roles in the teaching/learning process were overlooked; it all depended on the ‘Method’ and its application (Richards & Rodgers 2001).

Another problem is that ‘Methods’, at their outset, were generally applied in well designed situations (experimental or commercial), and implemented by enthusiastic practitioners or researchers. Things change when these methods are generalized to “less ideal situations” as in state schools with large numbers, mixed abilities, less motivated students, and overloaded, less enthusiastic, or less proficient teachers (Decoo 2001). An example of this was the difference in outcome when the army ‘Method’ in America was generalized to public education. Moreover, within classroom practices, methods lose their distinctive features, and practices become similar among methods (Richards and Rodgers 2001)

One last and major problem of ‘Methods’ is that they are subject to the general changes in society and the broader educational system (Decoo 2001). Thus, whenever conditions and aims change the old ‘Method’ cannot fulfil the new requirements; hence a new method appears condemning its predecessor. This has created a gap between theory and practice.

Hence, the idea of following a definite method or a certain dogma is no longer in favour (Allwright 1988, Nunan 1988, Rodgers 2000). Allwright (1988), Chaudron (1988), and Long (1983) agree that no prescription is fully supported by research. Experience has proved that, in real practice, it is difficult to strictly follow a prescribed method, and that there is a high possibility for methods to overlap. This “inherent weakness of the concept of method” as Pennycook (1989: 606) calls it was picked up by many writers. Allwright (1988) agrees that because behaviour is not easy to change, teachers may be working under the title of a new method but still adopting the same practices they used to do in the older method. As DeKeyser puts it, “what most teachers end up doing in the classroom is not exactly a stereotypical implementation of any method” DeKeyser (1998: 50).

The prevalence of the idea of Methods in the field of language teaching for the previous century did not seem to help the teaching/learning situation in any sense. It rather used to
serve the advancement of academic careers and limit the practice of teachers" (Pennycook 1989: 609). Prabhu (1990) criticizes this exhausting and fruitless search for the best 'Method' and puts more emphasis on the involvement of teachers and students for the teaching process to become more active and rewarding. Long (1983), Allwright (1988), and Polio (1996) agree that what really counts is what happens inside the classroom. This lack of interest in 'Methods' may explain why there has been no revolutionary development in EFL methodology since the advent of the Communicative Approach; no more new methods have been proposed. Instead, in this 'post-communicative era', there has been a revision of the focus of L2 methodology.

2.2.2 Growing evidence of the limitations of monolingual communicative strategies in the FL classroom

The impracticality of excluding the LI from the L2 classroom has been noticed at different periods of time since the adoption of monolingual methods. It was noticed early in the Reform period by Sweet (1899, republished in 1964), and later on, in the time of Direct and Oral Methods by Palmer (1917). Dodson (1962, 1967) in the heyday of the Audiolingual Method was more aware of the problem. He referred to teachers' tendency to use 'eclectic' methods as a way to overcome the impracticality of monolingual methods in real practice. Dodson suggested what he called "the bilingual method", in which he called for the integration of LI in L2 teaching in the belief that this would positively enhance the L2 learning context. He thought that monolingual methods were unrealistic, did not fulfil the examination's requirements, and overloaded teachers, as they took too much time and effort. On the other hand, GTM was boring, exclusively grammar-based, and highly demanding for students. He believed that "the bilingual method" could be suitable for all teachers whatever their proficiency, and, by the same token, for all students.

Throughout the 'communicative era', a number of writers have sought to bring the role of the LI to the fore such as, Titford (1983, 1985), Duff (1989), Stern (1996), and Widdowson (1979, 2001). Swan (1985a, b), for example, points out that students can transfer the value of communication skills from their LI without necessarily having to learn them anew in the L2. Use of the LI in translation activities can, as will be shown in the next section, complement and add to communicative activities which can help in enhancing students' linguistic and communicative competence.
Polio and Duff (1994) in an empirical study (see section 3.3) found that teachers used the L1 for varying functions among which were teaching grammar, managing classrooms, building rapport with students, supporting students' comprehension, and responding to students' initiations in the L1. Polio and Duff objected to most of these uses of the L1. They thought that students needed to practise inferring meaning from context and to process information in the L2 instead of relying on translations or explanations in the L1. From their point of view, lack of comprehension should be used to lead students to ask for clarification, negotiate meaning in the L2, and thus get involved in real and meaningful communication. They recommend exposing learners to comprehensible L2 input, and giving them opportunities to produce comprehensible output. They recommend instances of meaning negotiation and input modification as those referred to in sections 1.1.3.2 and 1.1.3.3; they commented that:

the examples of a teacher switching to English (the L1) at signs of comprehension failure suggest that teachers may lack necessary experience or strategies to rephrase and otherwise modify their speech. As with other uses of English, ...., this reduces the amount of input presented to learners and, furthermore, offers little incentive for students to initiate meaningful interaction in the TL themselves, since that behaviour is not being modeled for them by their teachers (Polio & Duff 1994: 323).

This quotation can broadly represent a counter argument against that put forward in favour of the use of L1 in the L2 classroom. What can be understood from such an argument is that input and interactional modifications can best aid learners' comprehension (and consequently learning) and use of the L2 in classroom communication. We have, however, presented theoretical and research evidence in chapter 1 section 1.3.3 that these strategies, whilst necessary, are not sufficient to guarantee better learning or use of the L2. In this section we will show further empirical evidence within FL classrooms that these strategies are not really enough to aid students' learning and use of the L2 in the FL classroom.

In this section, we will examine two empirical studies that tried to study the effect of teacher's communicative language use, in terms of providing learners with opportunities of input and output using the monolingual strategies of input and interaction modification referred to in chapter 1 and recommended by Polio & Duff (1994), on students' language development.

The ultimate goal of communicative FL classrooms is to facilitate comprehensible interaction and thereby achieve learning on the part of students. We have seen in chapter 1
that in order to achieve that, learners need to be exposed to comprehensible input (that should be simplified or modified to be just beyond the students' level) in order for them to internalize the L2 rules and then produce output themselves. These two studies raise genuine reservations about the sufficiency of monolingual strategies of interaction in the FL classroom in facilitating and pushing the interaction or achieving the purpose of learning.

The first study (Hall 1995) dealt with the issue from a socio-cultural perspective. Hall states that language learning in communicative classrooms is based on what she calls 'interactive practices'; namely the patterns of interaction that occur between the teacher and students in the classroom and that lead to learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 2.1 Hall (1995)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Languages: L1 = English, L2 = Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools: Audio-recording and some video-recording, students' questionnaires and interviews, Teacher's interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: 1 teacher, 15 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context: Year 9 in a high school in a Southern state in America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In her study (1995), Hall sought to find out how far the teacher’s talk helped or pushed students’ communication or interaction in the L2. She concentrated on one year 9 class of Spanish L2 high school students for a whole year. The teacher was described as very proficient and committed to enhancing students' oral skills in the L2 through a monolingual setting.

Hall proposes that, developing the interactional competence (to make sense of the talk and thus maintain the interaction) which is part of the communicative competence requires the participants to understand, manage and respond to topical issues so that they can reach a 'shared basis of meaning'. "Our ability to figure out what is going on 'topically' helps us to devise relevant next moves and thus respond appropriately to the previous utterance, extend the talk, or detect and correct possible mismoves ..." (Hall 1995: 39).

She found that the teacher adhered to the interaction pattern IRE (Teacher: Initiate > Student: Respond > Teacher: Evaluate) (see quoted examples) which relied heavily on 'lexical
chaining' rather than on a broader topical issue for students to figure out or develop to reach a shared basis of meaning. She observed extensive repetition and rephrasing, and insistence on the lexical chain (IRE) without any attempt to build on ideas or topics that come up. It has to be noted that this same input is comprehensible in Krashen's sense, involving the use of repetition, simplification, rephrasing, and even clarification and confirmation requests.

The first example shows a pattern of that teacher's behaviour where he asks a student, repeats his/her answer, and then asks the same question of another student, then again repeats his/her answer. (Note: the following is a transcription in English of the teacher's original speech in Spanish; the English translation was taken from the author's appendix pp: 58 - 60. The words in italics were originally uttered in English [the L1]).

Example 2.1

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Julio:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>T:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>now sir . do you like it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Julio:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>T:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Julio:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>T:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I don't like the music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Several students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rafael:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Andrea:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The example, as the author tries to show, reveals a concern, on the part of the teacher, with "local lexical chaining" rather than with raising an issue to talk about. As a consequence, some students seem to be lost, not knowing what they are talking about, as expressed by one student (line 11). This confusion seems to last as that same student again later (at line 34 in the following example) indicates his/her inability to follow the teacher.

Example 2.2

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>T:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Several students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>T:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Rafael:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>T:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last two lines of the examples show how that confused student tries to catch up with the topic, but, as the author comments, this was ignored by the teacher. In the following example, when similar attempts are made by other students to move on, building on the topic, the teacher tries to get the talk back to the controlled chain, and cuts out this opportunity for real interaction.

Example 2.3

61 Santiago:  *hey can we listen to some Spanish rap called the Spanish*
(unintelligible)
62 T:  *pardon*
63 Santiago:  *(repeats the name [unintelligible])*
64 T:  *do you like it*
65 Santiago:  *yeah [(unintelligible talk)]*
66 T:  *[ah good fantastic do you have the tape]*
67 Santiago:  *yeah*
68 T:  *yes the tape is in the (goes to get cassette tape) here (holds up tape)*
69  the tape class the tape
70 Ss:  *the tape*
71 T:  *yes::: yes the tape do you have the tape of ::: (unintelligible)*
72  do you have the tape the tape
73 Male S:  *where'd you get it*
74 Rafael:  *where'd you get it*
75 Laura:  *do you have it on tape*
76 Julio:  *do you have it on tape*
77 Rafael:  *do you have it on tape*
78 Santiago:  *I don't have it on tape I saw it in a store I saw it*
79  *in a [store]*
80 T:  *[o::::::h buy it for me eh]*
81  ok good fantastic

As is clear from the above examples, the teacher is consistently attempting to use the interrogative and negative forms to illustrate his topic through the exclusive use of the L2 no matter how students feel or react, or whether they know what is going on or not. Even in cases where students tried to extend the scope of the interaction (in the L1) the teacher
ignored these attempts or cut them short instead of extending or building on them (in either language), and tried to bring the students back to his strict interactional pattern.

As Hall comments, this pattern of interaction was not helpful in pushing students' interaction forward. In other words, it did not offer students opportunities to engage in more complex extended interaction in the L2 classroom, thus not offering enough potential for development. The problem, although not elaborated by Hall, seems to rest in the teacher's efforts to avoid the use of L1. Extending the scope of the interaction in the way students were seeking would likely require the use of vocabulary or structures beyond the students' level of competence; consequently, the teacher would probably have to refer to the L1 to aid students' understanding. The latter option would, from the teacher's point of view, contradict with his commitment to promote students' oral competence in 'a Spanish language environment'.

What we can say then is that relying on the L2 only, especially with beginner learners can lead to a dependence on simple discursive patterns that can be deprived in their language input (lexically, semantically, grammatically, and topically/conceptually), and thus do not help in developing the learner's knowledge of or the ability to interact in the L2 in more complex extended discourse. Hall warns that this kind of deprived classroom interaction is what is recommended in many SLA studies (most prominently Krashen's and Long's) as 'rich-input environment'. Then, there is a problem "with the features of talk we have considered to be significant to the creation of comprehensible input". She continues that "providing interactive environments which help facilitate the development of learners' L2 interactional competence, particularly their practice-specific discursive knowledge and skills, involves significantly more than the use of, e.g. simple syntax, multiple repetitions, and clarification requests" (Hall 1995: 56).

Hall concludes that there are different discursive frames, structures and functions to talk, and that there are linguistic, social and cognitive consequences to the varied uses of these resources [that] may be easily overlooked if the classroom environment is defined as one type, e.g., 'communicative' 'comprehensible' or 'naturalistic' and if the features of such talk are defined only in terms of semantic and syntactic simplicity, and the use of simple discourse features such as comprehension checks and clarification requests (Hall 1995: 57).
In the second study (Neil 1997), most teachers agreed about the importance of exposing students to opportunities of L2 input and output (practise using the language) in the class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 2.2 Neil (1997)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Languages: LI = English, L2 = German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: 10 teachers, 184 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools: Teachers' interviews and self reports, and students' interviews (with a sample of three students from each teacher's class) and questionnaires, video-recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context: Key stage 4 in grammar schools in Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers exposed learners to a varied kind of input (positive, explicit and negative) that was mainly in the L2, although on occasions the L1 was used especially with difficult L2 rules. Results show that students, although they were able to communicate in guided situations within the classroom, did not have enough communicative confidence or linguistic independence to be able to cope effectively with (or apply what they have learned in) new situations outside the classroom. The reason, as shown by Neil, seems to be that those teachers, especially those who used high rates of the L2, tended to rely too much on simplified L2 input through the use of different devices, e.g. change of the tone of voice, repetition, reference to context, and use of aids. The result of this simplification was that on the syntactic level, teachers tended to avoid the use of subordinate clauses, preferring the use of two simple sentences instead. In addition, teachers over-used the present tense. In general, the L2 input was in many cases confined, as Neil put it, to the 'here and now' of the classroom setting. This seemed to deprive learners of well developed input and, to use Hall's words, of more complex extended interaction that would suit their developmental level. Although Neil’s study was meant to encourage monolingual communicative strategies and improve them, the results implicitly show their limitations as represented in the kind of input they lead to.

These two studies suggest that input simplification does not help in pushing learners beyond a certain level. It may help students to communicate to some extent within the classroom context under the teacher's guidance, but it does not equip them with the necessary skills to develop beyond that 'pre-communicative' stage, as Neil (1997) calls it, where they can communicate but in a limited way.
Macaro (1998), in a Ph.D. study about interaction and use of the L1 in the FL classroom, summarises the problem, focussing on the teachers’ decision making regarding language choice (remaining in the L1 or switching to the L2) as follows:

“If they [teachers] opt for more natural discourse structures, with fewer display questions and more complex discourse structures, they risk learner comprehension failure and failure to engage the learner in interaction. If they opt for simple discourse structures there is less chance of communication breakdown but the interaction is teacher controlled, does not involve the learner in real-life communication, may be well below some learners lexical and syntactical capabilities and can be, ultimately, boring. In the latter option there is the additional factor that a lack of learner feedback to teacher input will not bring about a change in the characteristics of the teacher’s verbal activity. In other words a teacher’s style risks becoming ossified and non-reflective” (Macaro 1998: 79).

Macaro continues that it is within teachers’ attempts to move from simple IRE exchanges towards more complex discourse that recourse to the L1 is triggered. “TL1 [teacher’s L1] does not reduce the time available for L2 interaction. It can, in fact, be used productively to repair L2 discourse or promote pupil use of L2”. He carries on, clarifying that sticking to the IRE pattern enables the teacher to remain in the L2 “but makes the lesson teacher-centred, the discourse tightly controlled and ...... provides few opportunities for pupil talking in L2” (Macaro 1998: 303).

Thus, the monolingual interactional strategies recommended in sections 1.1.3.2 and 1.1.3.3 for aiding comprehension, and consequently learning do not seem to be enough in pushing the interaction in the FL classroom and developing students’ competence to higher levels. This leads us to the next point which is the interest in dual focus of language teaching and the role of the L1 in it.

2.2.3 An interest in dual focus of language teaching

We have seen in chapter 1 (section 1.3.3) that there has been a renewed interest in language forms and general aspects of consciousness raising. This interest is not an end itself; i.e. the purpose is not to practice or memorize patterns of the L2 rules; rather this new interest in language forms is a way of presenting learners with an ‘enhanced input’ as an alternative to “comprehensible input” which may not be enough for language learning to take place in FL classrooms. This recent focus on form advocates a balance between the two aspects: communication/fluency and form/accuracy, in the sense that they should be dealt with together and not separately (Lightbown & Spada 1993, Seedhouse 1997). In Skehan’s words,
"approaches which, in the context of meaningful communication, draw attention to form in more inductive ways or raise consciousness" (Skehan 1998: 40). In other words, language forms are presented within a broader framework of communicative-focussed teaching. As Doughty & Williams put it with more emphasis on the state of research,

"...the fundamental goal in the classroom is to teach language for communication. Accordingly, the larger context of interpreting focus-on-form (FonF) research must be the act of communication and the development of communicative competence. Ultimately, the aim of FonF studies is to determine how learner approximation to the target can be improved through instruction that draws attention to form but is not isolated from communication". (Doughty & Williams 1998: 197)

On the level of teaching this meant a revision of both formal and communicative principles of teaching. Over time, awareness has grown of the difficulties, in teaching, which arise when 'pure' communicative approaches are used with their exclusive focus on meaning, fluency and monolingual strategies of communication, ignoring language forms in general, and the use of L1 in particular (see Hall's and Neil's studies in the previous section). This, as Lightbown & Spada (1993) and Skehan (1998) agree, might be useful in the short term, as learners become more capable of carrying out conversations and engage in actual interaction in the L2, but in the long term, this lack of exposure to form (including L1 use) will negatively affect their progress. This can be reflected in inaccuracy and lack of grammatical insight. In Chapter 1, we saw that research results indicate that conscious knowledge enables students' accuracy to be closer to target norms (White 1991, Hawkins & Towell 1996). This is also claimed to enhance the effectiveness of communication in the L2: "Only accurate speech will communicate effectively with a wide range of listeners in many different situations" (Brumfit 1980: 118). Littlewood (1981) also emphasizes the importance of grammar for increasing the effectiveness of communicating in the L2. Linguistic competence has always been seen as a component of communicative competence (Canale 1983). Swain (1985), for example, shows how some sociolinguistic patterns depend on knowledge of grammar, such as the use of 'vous' as a politeness marker in French. "It has perhaps been a misconception about communicative language teaching that it does not aim for a high standard of formal correctness" (Hedge: 2000: 47). White et al. (1991) found evidence in favour of explicit formal teaching and corrective feedback not only on accuracy, but also on students' oral performance in communicative spontaneous tasks.

Recent language teaching methodology aims at a dual focus on both formal (explicit) and communicative (implicit) aspects of language rather than on separated linguistic features
dealt with out of context (Doughty & Williams 1998). Thus, focus-on-form can be seen to compensate for the restrictions that the classroom setting puts on implicit internalization of the language, and to contribute to bridging the gap between the learner’s language and the target language.

Nunan (1988) makes the point that there is no proof that ‘non-communicative’ activities, in themselves, do not contribute to the development of communicative skills. Both translation (Weschler 1997, Joseph & Ramani 1998) and grammar (Rutherford 1987) were put in a new framework as social tools that convey functional meaning and facilitate learning, rather than as an end in themselves.

Widdowson (2001) recommends the use of learning activities that highlight the similarities and differences between L1 and L2 to facilitate L2 learning. One technique of language teaching that employs the L1 effectively and consciously to enhance functional and grammatical aspects of meaning is contrastive analysis (Pellowe 1998, Widdowson 2001). Two techniques that have employed contrastive activities to promote the dual focus in L2 teaching, and thus provide enhanced input will be presented: 1) Language awareness activities, and 2) Use of translation.

2.2.3.1 Language awareness activities

‘Language Awareness’, as a view of language in education, is concerned with both teachers and learners being able to talk explicitly about the nature of the language and its influence on them, and consequently, being more able to use the language (Brumfit 1991 and Donmall 1991). Language awareness, it is claimed, helps teachers to be more creative in their teaching and to be more able to relate the language teaching Methods to the larger context of the society and the education system. For students, it is claimed that language awareness contributes to second language acquisition, which consequently contributes to language proficiency (Brumfit 1991).

According to Brumfit (1991), the roots of the Language Awareness movement are attributable to many factors such as the intellectual view of language caused by Chomsky’s ideas and the spread of English as an international language. In addition, there was a need to meet the demands of multilingualism which resulted from immigration in some countries as was the case in England, as discussed in Hawkins (1984). Language awareness is seen, by
Hawkins (1984), as a necessary link between many language aspects: it is a link between written and spoken language, between form and meaning, and between the L1 and the L2. Thus, the study of foreign languages, according to this view, is not seen as an end in itself; it is rather seen as a part of a ‘trivium’ which works as follows: Mother tongue/ Awareness of language/ Foreign language (Hawkins 1984: 37). The aim of such a view is to eliminate prejudice and broaden students’ minds by increasing their awareness of how languages, in general, work in order to convey meaning. Thus, FLT can contribute to language awareness if methods of teaching

“encourage pupils to compare their emerging insights in the new language with their intuitions about their mother tongue. A mere drilling in simple dialogues to meet hypothetical ‘survival situations’ could not contribute very much to language awareness, nor offer that apprenticeship in ‘learning how to learn’ languages on which later acquisition, by intensive means, of the language(s) of adult need could build” (Hawkins 1984: 42).

Thus, from the ‘language awareness’ point of view, the L2 can be taught more effectively by referring to the L1, or as Hawkins (1984) puts it by comparing the L2 patterns with the L1 patterns.

In line with this, contrastive analysis was recently employed to raise students’ awareness of the similarities and differences between the L1 and L2 with the purpose of enhancing their learning of the L2 in different contexts and with different ages. Sheen (1996) examined the difference between what he called an inductive approach with minimal explanation and a deductive approach employing contrastive analysis on error rates of Adult ESL Saudi male students. The results showed significant results in favour of the group which received contrastive input as their errors were minimized, especially on written tests. Kupferberg & Olshtain (1996) compared the results of two groups of Israeli secondary school students in a formal EFL context where one group was taught through a variety of communicative activities (natural linguistic input), whilst the other group was taught through communicative activities as well as the use of contrastive input comparing the L1 and L2 rules. They found that the group which received contrastive teaching outperformed the group which was taught through communicative input only on both recognition and production of the L2 rules.

2.2.3.2 Translation activities

Translation activities are claimed to be effective in developing accuracy, and making students aware of the false notion of equivalence (Duff 1989, Cook 1998, and Pellowe
1998), something which contributes positively to both form and meaning. Atkinson (1993b) agrees that translation is a good contrastive technique that increases learners’ awareness of the similarities and difference between their L1 and the L2. This, as he argues, reduces interference from the L1. It has been argued in Chapter 1 that pragmatic contrastive analysis can contribute to communicative aspects of language. Widdowson (2001) recommends the use of translation for achieving a pragmatic use of contrastive analysis in the sense discussed by Lado (1957), and Ellis (1986) in Chapter 1. In the same trend, Weschler (1997) proposes what he calls “the functional-translation method”. In this method, Weschler argues that if translation is meant to convey the social or functional meaning as well as the grammatical meaning it would be a good tool for explaining, or at least clarifying, meaning.

"With all due consideration to the red herring of cultural differences, I would still argue that unless you can rephrase a statement in your own first language such that the essence of the meaning is maintained, you really don’t understand it. And understanding of meaning is the key to true communication" (Weschler 1997: 5).

Contrary to the claim that translation is a text-bound or uncommunicative activity, Atkinson (1993b: 53) argues that translation “forces learners to think carefully about meaning, not just to manipulate forms in a way that many ‘mechanical’ grammatical exercises do”. He further maintains that it forces learners to be engaged with both meaning and use.

Widdowson (1978) argues that translation can contribute in developing communication in the L2 in the sense that it makes it clear to the student that he/she uses his L1 for a purpose, that is, to communicate. This brings awareness that the L2 can be used for communication as well. In other words, translation serves as a link between the language that the learner has already learnt to communicate in, and the new language he/she is in the process of learning, making the student aware that the L2 is to be used for communication, as he/she uses his/her L1. Similarly, Tudor (1987) sees that translation can become a communicative activity in itself, if it is used as a means of communicating ideas across languages and cultures.

Lado (1979) recommends the use of delayed translation, in which students recall the ideas or thoughts of the source text later from memory and ‘encode’ them in the L2 (‘deep translation’). He argues that this practice approximates communicative language use, and shows less interference from L1 than the traditional way of immediate translation. In line with this, Heltai (1989) suggests the use of oral translation of short texts to consolidate the learning of vocabulary; he also suggests delayed translation in the form of an oral activity, in
which the teacher reads a text to his/her students and then asks them to translate what they heard without seeing the text. As Heltai argues, the use of translation in this way can replace other communicative activities, especially with less qualified students.

Titford (1983) comments that even if translation in itself may not be a communicative activity, it can prepare for, or build on other communicative activities. In this way, translation can be used by students to apply what they have learnt beforehand, and to add to it, or, alternatively, a translation exercise could be followed by communicative activities to support what the students have learnt in the translation activity. Either way, translation is not used alone, but is complementary to other activities, as Duff (1989) recommends.

2.2.4 An interest in humanistic aspects of teaching
We have seen in chapter 1 how L2 learning can be frustrating to adults. Burden (2000a and b) agrees with Tudor (1996) that a method which does not take into account students' attitudes and beliefs about language learning will no longer be able to involve students, who will in one way or another resist it. Tudor claims that a humanistic approach to teaching is not bound to any method or ideology: "openness to a variety of experiences and insights makes the language teacher better able to respond to local needs" (Tudor 1996: 25). The primary concern is the learner and his or her interest regardless of the way or the method used to achieve this.

One aspect in humanistic thinking, as Stevick puts it, is 'intellect'; "this aspect fights against whatever interferes with the free exercise of the mind, and is suspicious of anything that cannot be tested intellectually" (Stevick 1990: 24). If we consider the evidence from SLA theories and research which indicates that referring to the LI is a valuable strategy that students employ both cognitively and communicatively to facilitate learning the L2 (Selinker 1972, Ellis 1986, 1994), then from a humanistic perspective, teachers should employ the strategies that students feel most comfortable with. We have also seen earlier arguments which claim that forcing learners, through monolingual methods, to work at a lower conceptual level results in 'cognitive disfunction' and consequently to frustrations in learning (Skinner 1985).

Underhill (1989:25) refers to the main themes in humanistic psychology, among which are "respect for an individual's subjective experience" and "self empowerment". If we agree that
one of the most important subjective experiences for any individual is their native language, and if we consider the evidence that the L1 is a cognitive strategy that students employ to facilitate learning the L2, then the use of L1 can be argued to be an important tool in ensuring that L2 learning is a satisfactory experience from the affective point of view. The prohibition of students' L1 deprives them, and the teaching process itself, of their valuable long-established experiences, and, thereby, hinders the learning process (Auerbach 1993). Hymes, who first emphasized the importance of 'communicative competence', even goes further to talk of a state of 'repression' for students who are denied the right to use their L1 or, as he calls it, “normal competence” in classrooms (1972a: xxi).

Thus, humanistic teaching calls for considering students' life experiences, employing teaching strategies that students prefer. The purpose is to empower students and enhance their motivation to learn the L2. The humanistic approach to L2 teaching resulted in questioning the ideological axioms of the monolinguism tenet, and the related tenet of the superiority of the native speaker teacher that have been discussed earlier in this chapter.

2.2.4.1 Rethinking the monolinguism tenet

There are a number of facts that emphasize the invalidity of the monolinguism tenet, and the political connotations that it implies. First of all, this tenet contradicts linguistic human rights as it deprives the students of the right to make use of their linguistic and cultural experiences, something which may lead to their alienation (Phillipson 1992 and Auerbach 1993). Also, it reflects a negative view of bilingualism and multilingualism, both of which exist in many developing countries. “Monolinguism cuts across this social reality and attempts to impose a single lens on the world” (Phillipson 1992: 189).

Recently, Cook (2002) proposed the concept of L2 user proficiency as a target for L2 learners instead of native speaker proficiency. “The term L2 user can then refer to a person who knows and uses a second language at any level” (Cook 2002: 4). According to this, L2 users have the right to be themselves and to use the language differently from natives. Their aim should be to become proficient L2 users.

The L2 user perspective suggests, however, that in general teachers should recognize the classroom as an L2 user situation. In particular, they should develop the systematic use of the L1 in the classroom alongside the L2 as a reflection of the realities of the
classroom situation, as an aid to learning and as a model for the world outside (Cook 2002: 332).

Finally, Auerbach (1993) draws attention to two facts to demonstrate the humanistic aspect of allowing the L1 use in L2 learning; first that most of the research that advocates the use of L1 considers language as a tool for negotiating and solving the problems that students may encounter in their lives. The use of L1, in this sense, is seen as a tool to 'empower' learners, while monolingualism 'disqualifies' them. Secondly, many of the invitations to use L1 come from "countries where multiculturalism rather than English only is stressed in the wider political and policy context" and in which, consequently, teachers are encouraged to respect students' cultures and languages like Canada, Australia, and England, but not the U.S.A. (Auerbach 1993: 23).

2.2.4.2 Rethinking the tenet of the "superiority" of the native teacher

The view that native speaker teachers are better has also been subject to re-examination. Defying this axiom, Auerbach (1993) points out that being a native speaker is neither a sufficient advantage, nor even a necessity for teaching EFL. This had even been noticed earlier; Brooks (1960), for example, noted that teacher competence in language is important, but it is not everything; it is equally important to know how to employ this competence. Sweet (1964), more clearly, stated that trained non-native teachers, who have an awareness of the relations between the two languages, are better than untrained natives. This has been, more recently, supported by (Phillipson 1992), who adds that not understanding students' native languages is another problem with those teachers. These defects make them unable to explain the system of the language in a convenient way to their students (Harbord 1992, Auerbach 1993, and Medgyes 1994). Arva & Medgyes (2000), argue that nonnative teachers, who themselves experienced the process of acquiring the target language, are more qualified to understand and utilize their students' different needs. Phillipson (1992) goes further to argue that, while the traits of the native speaker could be acquired by non-native teachers through good training and self-study, there are some important qualities that distinguish the non-native teacher from his native counterpart, and which are difficult to acquire. Such qualities include: sharing the same linguistic and cultural background as their students and having undergone the same experience of learning the foreign language. Medgyes (1992) agrees with the second part of Phillipson's argument, adding the valuable conclusion that it is this shared background, and language learning experience, that makes the non-native
teacher a better attainable model than the unattainable native speaker model. This is overtly recognized by a teacher referred to in Schweers (1999). The teacher claims that he uses the L1 to act as a model of an efficient bilingual speaker to his students. Arva & Medgyes (2000), in their experimental study, demonstrate the effect of these qualities especially on teaching grammar, empathizing with students, and spotting students’ weaknesses. Medgyes (1992) has what he himself calls a ‘liberal attitude’ towards this issue. While admitting the existence of differences between native and nonnative teachers as a natural result of their different language backgrounds, he maintains that it is not a difference in efficiency: “both groups of teachers serve equally useful purposes in their own terms” (Medgyes 1992: 349).

In two different attempts to support this claim, Arva & Medgyes (2000) studied the different roles of native and non-native teachers in classrooms, each group working separately, while Tajino & Tajino (2000) studied them, working together in team teaching, or what they call ‘team learning’. They agree that each group has its own strengths and weaknesses, and that they can benefit the teaching situation, if they collaborate together. Cook (1999) also admits the differences between native and nonnative speakers in general, emphasizing that using the native speakers as the only example to emulate, or trying to make the nonnative speakers an imitation of the native speakers is unfair as it denies their status as L2 users.

The long insistence on the two axioms of monolingualism and the superiority of the native speaking teachers was seen to achieve, besides the political power mentioned previously, other economic benefits, such as being practical and economic for multilingual classes (classes with native speakers of different languages), creating jobs for native English speaking teachers, and marketing monolingual textbooks and tapes (Phillipson 1992 and Cook 1999). But, thanks to multiculturalism, linguistic human rights, democratization, and anti-imperialism movements, these tenets are no longer taken for granted everywhere as they used to be.

As seen above, many EFL specialists around the world and even in English speaking countries are discussing the possibility of employing the L1 in English language classrooms in one way or another. The role and efficiency of non-native teachers is also being re-evaluated. As a non-native, Medgyes (1986), for example, calls for giving the chance to qualified non-native teachers to “act as filters, letting the moderate ideas through, while blocking the more far-fetched” (1986: 112), while Bolitho, as a native, admits, in a talking shop with Medgyes (2000), “the importance of professional partnerships, in which the
approach and methods chosen are fully negotiated and appropriate to the context”, and continues “It’s time the big British publishers realized that they can’t simply sell their big global courses into every country indiscriminately, regardless of appropriateness to the context” (Medgyes 2000: 386).

**Conclusion**

The previous analysis of the situation in FLT methodology shows that “the theoretical pendulum swings from one extreme to the other, each exaggeration is followed by its opposite” (Swan 1985b: 86). The use of L1 was a victim of this process. This is why Swan (1985b) advises teachers to adopt new techniques and methods without abandoning the useful old ones. Similarly, Kharma & Hajjaj comment that “changing climates across history …… could reflect changing needs but not necessarily changing strategies of learning. One such strategy that has persisted, in classrooms, is the use of the mother tongue” (Kharma & Hajjaj 1989: 231).

We saw that the L1 has been viewed negatively by most language teaching ‘Methods’ after the GTM. The assumption in most subsequent Methods was to avoid the L1 use as far as possible. With the recent changes in L2 methodology, including the abandonment of ‘Methods’ in their prescriptive sense, the way was paved to reconsidering the position and contributions of the L1 in L2 teaching. There has been a general revision of the role of the L1 in L2 teaching, yet, the nature of that role does not seem to be addressed clearly enough. Recent L2 methodology seems to adopt a more relaxed view of the L1 role, but does not seem to have formed a theoretical framework that refers to and seeks support from the valuable recent contributions of SLA theories and research. More writers now question the monolingual principle of teaching, and call for re-admitting the role of the L1 in L2 teaching, but there are no clear theoretically based principles of when and how best the L1 can be employed.

This chapter has shown how the L1 could be employed positively, in accordance with recent L2 methodology, to enhance the learning aspects discussed in Chapter 1. Thus, the L1 has been shown to contribute to the dual focus of language teaching, which means it can potentially contribute to both: a) communicative aspects of teaching, which enhance comprehension and use of the L2, and b) formal aspects of teaching, which enhance explicit and declarative knowledge of the L2. Moreover, the L1 has been shown to contribute to c)
humanistic aspects of teaching, which enhance affective and motivational aspects of learning.

The next chapter will still trace the issue of L1 use in L2 teaching but from a practical empirical perspective. It will attempt to examine how far real practices in the L2 classroom are responding to these theoretical, methodological, and ideological changes in viewing and exploiting the role of the L1 in real classroom teaching.
Chapter 3
The L1 in the FL classroom context

Chapter 1 showed that until recently, much of SLA research appeared to adopt the assumption that the process of L2 language development could proceed in the same way as L1 language development, making use of the same components under any conditions. In the same vein, L2 methodology, as shown in chapter 2, seemed to make the assumption that a single Method could work effectively for everyone (Van Lier 1988). Thus, the view that L2 learners can learn the L2 by mere exposure to input, as is the case with L1 learning, has been overgeneralized to adult learning in FL contexts. This view seems to be one of the major reasons for emphasizing a monolingual approach to L2 teaching, employing monolingual strategies and prohibiting use of the L1 in the L2 classroom.

However, as we have seen, in more recent times, this view of learning, and the monolingual principle of teaching have been challenged on theoretical and methodological levels. We saw that there have been changes in the last few decades that suggested re-thinking the role of the L1 in both the fields of SLA and language teaching methodology. We argued in chapter 1 that the rejection of L1 use was not justified by the current state of learning theory and research, which gave evidence of biological, cognitive, affective and contextual differences between L1 and L2 learning. In chapter 2, we saw how language teaching Methods that have, for a long time, prescribed a monolingual approach to L2 teaching, together with monolingual strategies of communication, have been challenged by approaches which show greater concern with dual focus and humanistic teaching.

In this chapter, the monolingual principle will be shown to be further challenged on the practice level. It will be argued that the characteristics and realities of the FL classroom do not seem to allow for the replication of the unilingual experience of L1 learning, nor for the use of monolingual strategies of communication. The literature shows that, in practice, the monolingual approach to teaching a FL, as opposed to SL, has always proved impractical, or in Medgyes’ words, it “has seldom been carried through” (1994: 66). As we have shown in chapter 2 (section 2.2.2), there have always been calls that challenge the monolingual approach and argue for not abandoning the L1 as a useful resource regardless of the prevailing theories of learning or teaching.
In this chapter, we will come closer to the FL classroom to find out, through empirical data, how the L1 is viewed and actually used by FL teachers on the level of practice. In the first section, we will present empirical data on how teachers and students perceived the value of L1 use. In the second section, we will present data on the amounts of L1 use as reported and as actually used by teachers. In the third section, we will survey the functions or purposes teachers use the L1 to achieve. Finally, we will examine the reasons or factors behind teachers’ use of the L1 in the FL classroom.

3.1 Perceived value of L1 use

The main concern in this section is with teachers’ attitudes, but students’ attitudes may also be referred to whenever available. Many of the studies that have elicited teachers’ attitudes towards the use of L1 or L2 have found that teachers agreed that exposing students to the L2 is important but that flexibility is required, taking into consideration local contextual demands and students’ needs. It has to be noted that the findings of these studies relate to respondents’ beliefs rather than to real samples of classroom interaction.

In one of the pioneering studies in the U.K., Mitchell (1988) interviewed and observed volunteer teachers who were committed to implementing the ethos of the communicative approach of teaching and developing students’ communicative competence in grades 1 & 2 in Scottish secondary schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 3.1 Mitchell (1988)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Languages: L1 = English, L2 = French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools: Teachers’ interviews, and classroom observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: 59 teachers (interviewed), 13 teachers (122 lessons observed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context: Secondary schools in Scotland, 20 schools (involved in the interviews), 4 schools (involved in the observations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitchell found that only a very small number of teachers thought that the L2- only should be the norm. She also found that about a third of the teachers experienced a feeling of guilt in admitting to using the L1 in the FL classroom.
Kharma and Hajjaj’s study (1989) is, to my knowledge, the only study that dealt with this issue in an Arabic speaking country. Kharma and Hajjaj conducted a large scale study in which they collected teachers’ and students’ views about LI use.

**Box 3.2 Kharma & Hajjaj (1989)**

- **Languages:** LI = Arabic, L2 = English
- **Tools:** Teachers’ questionnaire, students’ questionnaire, interviews with teachers and supervisors
- **Sample:** 185 teachers, 223 students
- **Context:** intermediate and secondary schools (seems to be in Kuwait as the authors were working at Kuwait University)

The questionnaires showed that a majority of teachers (93%) and students (95%) use the LI in the FL classroom, and that teachers used the LI either out of conviction or in accordance with textbooks rather than in response to official policies or guidelines. Most teachers and students thought that the LI facilitated teaching and learning the L2 especially when it was used for comparing the L2 and the LI, expressing oneself, pushing communication, explaining meaning and grammatical points, and eliciting answers from students. Students were happy with their teachers using the LI as it assisted their learning, and helped them express themselves when they had difficulty doing this in the L2.

In a large scale survey of teachers’ opinions about L2 and LI use in the FL classroom in England and Wales, Dickson (1996) elicited the attitudes of 508 teachers of one of three modern foreign languages (French, German, and Spanish).

**Box 3.3 Dickson (1996)**

- **Languages:** LI = English, L2 = French, German, and Spanish
- **Tools:** Teachers’ questionnaire
- **Sample:** 508 teachers (of high school students)
- **Context:** Secondary schools in England and Wales
Although a majority of those teachers recommended the use of L2, they commented that this use should be flexible allowing teachers to adapt to the circumstances of their classrooms and their students’ needs. Insisting on the use of L2 was thought to harm the rapport between the teacher and students, and to allow the teacher less power over his/her students. They also observed that, whereas the use of L2 can benefit high achieving students, it can be harmful to low achievers in that it can hinder comprehension, increase anxiety, and thus decrease motivation.

The latter, i.e. learner anxiety and motivation were studied by Levine (2003) in relationship to the reported amount of L1 use.

Levine’s large scale internet-based questionnaire elicited information from University teachers and students. He found that more teachers think that students feel anxious having to use the L2 in most classroom activities than students themselves do. He found that both teachers and students think it is important and challenging to communicate in the L2. He also found that monolingual students tend to feel more anxious about having to use the L2 than students who come from bilingual and multilingual backgrounds. The study found that higher L2 use does not relate directly to higher language anxiety in the sense that students who claimed to use more L2 reported lower levels of anxiety about their L2 use. Similarly, teachers who claimed a high level of L2 use in their classes anticipated low levels of anxiety about L2 use in their students. Levine concludes that claims that use of the L1 helps in reducing anxiety among students are not true as students feel comfortable using the L2 when they are used to that. On the other hand, frequent use of the L1, or in Levine’s words, unmarked use of the L1, is what leads to students’ anxiety when having to use the L2, as they have not been trained in such use.
It has to be noted, though, that Levine's sample is not representative in the sense that only adult motivated students and teachers who had access to the internet participated. We have seen teachers' reservations in Dickson's (1996) study above that L2 use can benefit high achieving rather than low achieving students. Levine himself proposed that low motivation would mean low L2 use and vice versa; he further found positive relations between high motivation and students' self expectations of getting high grades and year of instruction (year 2 were more motivated), as well as being a bilingual, i.e. students who were brought up as bilinguals were more motivated than those who were brought up as monolinguals.

Neil's study (1997) which was referred to in chapter 2 elicited teachers' and students' views about the use of L2 in the FL classroom (for easy reference the box information is replicated here).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 3.5 Neil (1997)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Languages: L1 = English, L2 = German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: 10 teachers, 184 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools: Teachers' interviews and self reports, and students' interviews (with a sample of three students from each teacher's class) and questionnaires, video-recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context: Key stage 4 in grammar schools in Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neil analyzed the L2 use within a broader focus on the issue of positive input/explicit teaching/negative input. As mentioned in chapter 2, although teachers agreed about the importance of exposing students to L2 input, they agreed that this would not be enough and could be boring. Eight out of ten teachers stated that their departments recommended use of the L2 as much as possible. Nine out of ten teachers thought that too much emphasis on the use of L2 can harm the rapport between the teacher and students, which agrees with Dickson's (1996) findings. Teachers were divided about the use of the L2 with different age groups; some thought it was easier with beginners and some thought the opposite as younger learners do not have enough linguistic background to refer to.

As for students, they thought that the L2 should be used, at least to some degree, with all activities apart from examination practice. Their views matched with their teachers' views. They were aware of their teachers' efforts to make the language comprehensible for them; they even mentioned some of the strategies used by their teachers, e.g. slowing down speech,
using facial expressions and hand gestures, paraphrasing, changing tone, using easier cognates, and using the L1. Students expressed preference for teachers using gestures rather than referring to the L1 as it gave them more opportunities to listen to the L2. They also preferred having a native speaker assistant to listening to a tape because of the problems of the latter such as; the speed and accompanying background noise. As for speaking, students appreciated pair work and role-playing as they gave them an opportunity to practise using the L2.

It has to be noted, though, that this is a special context in that these are more able students in a grammar school who have native speaker assistants in their classes which is not typical to many formal FL contexts.

The above studies show that teachers in L2 classrooms, while realizing the importance of using the L2, view the L1 as an important tool in facilitating the teaching and learning of the L2 and motivating learners (especially beginners). Although most of these studies were influenced by the current orthodoxy of monolingual teaching, there was no evidence in teachers’ responses for supporting an L2-only approach to teaching.

3.2 Quantities of teachers’ L1 use

Many writers and researchers have shown that in practice, teachers rarely adopt a 100% monolingual approach to L2 teaching; referring to the L1 seems to be inevitable (Matthews-Bresky 1972, Cook 1999, Simon 2001, Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002). Kharma & Hajjaj (1989) agree with that, arguing that use of the L1 is widespread in FL classrooms regardless of what theories of learning or methods of teaching prescribe.

The findings of some studies on reported quantities of teachers’ use of the L1 show that teachers tend to reduce their use of L1 with increased proficiency of L2 learners. In Kharma & Hajjaj’s study (1989), which is referred to in the previous section (see Box 3.2), the intermediate group teachers reported that they used the L1 for an average of about 40% of class time, while the secondary group teachers used the L1 for an average of 20% of class time. Similarly, in his large scale study referred to earlier (see Box 3.3), Dickson (1996) found that in KS3, 68% of teachers used the L2 for half or more of the class time, and 31% used it for half or less of the class time while in KS4, 51% of the teachers used the L2 for half or more of the class time, and 49% used it for half or less of the class time. He also
found that native speaker teachers used the L2 more than non-native teachers, especially with older learners (KS4) when language gets more demanding.

However, studies of observed amounts of L1 use show varied amounts and ranges of L1 use regardless of the students’ level of competence or age. At the university level, Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie (2002) found that the overall average of L1 use was 8.80%, L1 use ranging from 0% to 18.15%. The focus of the course was on oral skills, and all four teachers observed used the same materials.

Box 3.6 Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie (2002)
Languages: L1 = English, L2 = French
Tools: Audio-recording
Sample: 4 teachers (2 native speaker and 2 non-native speakers, a total of 6 hours and 45 minutes)
Context: Beginner university classes in Australia

At the high school level, Macaro (2001 based on his PhD research 1998) found even lower amounts of L1 use. Student teachers used the L1 for a mean of 4.8% of their talk in the lesson, and only two out of the fourteen recorded lessons contained more than 10% L1 use by student teachers.

Box 3.7 Macaro (2001)
Languages: L1 = English, L2 = French
Tools: Video-recording
Sample: 6 student teachers (total 14 lessons)
Context: 4 high schools in South England

Thus, these two studies show low percentages, as well as low ranges, of L1 use in both high school and university levels; yet there was more L1 use at the university level although this is clearly more advanced than high school level. Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie attributed the low percentage of L1 use and the low variation across teachers in their study to the fact that all teachers worked in the same institution under similar conditions, and taught similar lessons (based on listening activities partly from the teacher and partly from a video). Yet, Macaro’s
teachers, who even used less amounts and ranges of L1, worked in different contexts (different schools in different areas with different socio-economic backgrounds). The low percentage of L1 use in Macaro's sample may be attributed, though, to the fact that these were student teachers who may have been influenced more than practicing teachers by the 'current orthodoxy', especially given that the researcher was their supervisor as well. This was reflected by one of the student teachers' comments in the interview, saying that the lack of motivation in the class she taught did not give her a chance "to use the methodology" by which she meant teaching in the L2 (Macaro 2001: 539). Another factor may be the difference in the methods of quantification used in the two studies. Macaro played a bleep every 5 seconds to code the language used while Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie opted for counting words. The latter, as noted by Macaro, can yield more L1 use. Also, in Macaro's study, the sample was chosen on a voluntary basis. The student teachers were taught by the researcher who chose only successful student teachers who had a good command of the language to participate in the study.

Other studies in similar contexts reveal much higher averages and wider ranges of L1 use. Duff and Polio (1990) recorded lessons for 13 university foreign language teachers. Each teacher was teaching a different foreign language of which he/she was a native speaker.

Box 3.8 Duff & Polio (1990)

| Languages: L1 = English, L2 = 13 different European and non-European languages |
| Tools: students' questionnaire, Teachers' interviews, audio-recording and classroom observation |
| Sample: 13 native speaker teachers (two 50 minute sessions for each teacher) |
| Context: University of California, Los Angeles |

For quantifying purposes, they noted down the language used every 15 seconds as either L1 only, L2 only, or mixed. Duff and Polio's study shows a very wide range in the amount of observed L2 use from 100% to 10% with an average of 67.9% and median of 79%, which reversely means the L1 was used for an average of about 32%. Most students reported that teachers used the L1 to some extent, and a majority of them were happy with the amount of their teachers' L1 use regardless of how much or little it was. Students also reported that they understood most or all of their teachers' talk in the L2.
A recent study by Liu et al. (2004) obtained data about both reported and observed amounts of L2 use.

Box 3.9 Liu et al. (2004)
Language: L1 = Korean, L2 = English
Tools: students' questionnaire, Teachers' interviews based on an open ended questionnaire, audio-recording (one 50 minute lesson for each teacher)
Sample: 13 Korean teachers
Context: 3 different schools in three different cities in South Korea

Teachers reported that they used the L2 for an average of 32% of class time, and they thought that the L2 should be used for an average of 58% of the class time. On the other hand, students reported that teachers used the L2 for an average of 41% of class time (which is higher than the average that teachers themselves reported), and that the L2 should be used for an average of 53% of class time (two teachers, though, did not allow their students to answer the questionnaires). It seemed that students tended to overrate the amount of teachers' L2 use which may be due to difficulties in understanding their teacher talk in the L2 (they reported understanding an average of 49%).

To calculate the percentage of actual L1 use, Liu et al. preferred word count to time slots as they thought the former is more simple and straightforward. They found that the amount of L2 used varied among teachers ranging from 10% to 90% with an average of 60%, which reversely means that the L1 was used for an average of 40% (although the teacher with the highest percentage of L2 use gave a lesson that was a meant to be a model for teaching in the L2, and thus the average excluding that teacher was 57%). This percentage of L2 use was higher than both the teachers' reported quantity of L1 use (32%) and what the authors believed to be the norm in Korean classes. As the authors point out, those teachers seemed to use more L2 in the recorded lessons than they usually did. This may have been influenced by the fact that the official policy demanded teachers to use more L2 in the classroom, and considered teachers' use of the L2 an indicator of their competence.

In Neil's (1997) study that was carried out on teachers of high ability students in grammar schools who had native speaker assistants (see box 3.5), teachers were given a list of
activities that are usually carried out in the classroom; they had to rank the amount of L2 or L1 they thought they used with each activity (either 100% in the L1, 75% in the L1 and 25% in the L2, 50% in the L1 and 50% in the L2, 25% in the L1 and 75% in the L2, or 100% in the L2). The average of reported language use for all teachers was 50% L1 and 50% L2. The analysis of video-recordings (by noting the speaker and the language used every 10 seconds) revealed an actual L1 use that ranged from 0.8% (of a total teacher's talk of 96.6% of class time) to 42.8% (of a total teacher's talk of 97.6% of class time).

These previous studies on the amounts of L1 use in FL classrooms reveal that monolingual teaching is seldom maintained in actual teaching. The L1 is used to different degrees in different contexts regardless of learners' abilities or level of competence; thus, it was used in high schools, grammar schools, and universities in European and non-European contexts. As Liu et al. (2004) suggest, in reality the "ideal" of uniquely L2 use seems to be challenged by factors such as the teaching context and teachers' beliefs. The next section will, in turn, discuss the nature of this use of the L1, i.e. what functions the L1 is used to achieve in the FL classroom.

3.3 Functions of L1 use

In this section we will review in some detail the potential uses of the L1 as documented in previous studies. This will feed into our framework of theoretically-based functions of teachers' L1 use in our proposed theory of optimal L1 use in chapter 4.

Guthrie (1984) recorded lessons for two teachers with the purpose of generally examining their language use in classroom interaction. Only one of the two teachers was bilingual and spoke the students' language.

Box 3.10 Guthrie (1984)

Languages: L1 = Chinese, L2 = English
Tools: Audio-recording of lessons
Sample: 2 teachers (data came from only one of them as the other could not speak the students' language; 11 reading lessons (totalling 185 minutes)
Context: an elementary school in the U.S. with a high population of Chinese students
Although the teacher deliberately used less L1 than he used to, as pointed out by the author, the data showed that he used the L1 for a variety of functions: translating unknown words, as a we-code for establishing social membership, directing students to do things, clarifying words that might be conceptually contrasted with Chinese equivalents, checking for students' understanding when he sensed confusion or misunderstanding on their part. What these uses reveal is a primary concern with students' comprehension.

In a number of studies, that were mostly based on eliciting teachers' views (rather than on analyzing real samples of classroom behaviour) in Scotland (Mitchell 1988, Franklin 1990), England (Dickson 1996), and Ireland (Neil 1997), the language functions that were used were seen to be similar.

In Mitchell (1988) (see box 3.1), the researcher carried out interviews with teachers where they raised a number of issues related to communicative language teaching. The interviews were recorded then analyzed; use of the L1 was one among 15 themes raised. Some (and not all) teachers referred to the use of language (L1 or L2) with certain functions. Their views were summarized in table 3.1. Other teachers did not link the use of either language to definite functions; they rather referred to students' comprehension or lack of comprehension as the clue to continue in the L2 or rather switch to the L1. They preferred the use of the L1 with abstract ideas and to encourage students' contribution in discussions, while the L2 was used with simple routine interaction. A few teachers said they employed a kind of regular switching in the sense that they say the same thing in the two languages regardless of the activity type. The following table, adapted from Mitchell (1988), is a quantitative representation of the functions some of the teachers addressed with regard to language use.
Table 3.1: Appropriacy of FL and L1 for classroom purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed activity</th>
<th>No. teachers advocating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal talk with pupils</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing instructions</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity instructions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining meanings</td>
<td>(not coded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining grammar</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching ‘background’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of objectives etc</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction of written work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running tests</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplining</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Mitchell (1988: 29)

The table shows that most teachers recommended the use of the L1 with almost all functions, most particularly explaining grammar and disciplining students.

In analyzing actual language use, Mitchell used large discourse units (segments), which, as she describes, are similar to Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) episodes to code the language used as 'L1-medium', 'practice FL', or 'communicative FL'. Mitchell found that although use of the L1 was not very common in these classes, the type of the L2 used was mostly for practice purposes (e.g. structure drilling), rather than for communicative purposes. The L1 was mainly used for teaching grammar, discussing objectives, tests and homework. More generally, the L1 was used with activities that required substantial contributions from teachers or students.

Franklin (1990), drawing on Mitchell's elicited functions, produced a list of language functions and asked teachers in a similar context (Scottish secondary schools) to judge them as: possible to be carried out in the L2, could be carried out in the L2 but with difficulty, or best performed in the L1.
The following table, adapted from Franklin, shows teachers’ answers.

### Table 3.2: How easy it is for different activities to be carried out in L2 or L1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed activity</th>
<th>in French</th>
<th>in French with difficulties</th>
<th>In English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing the classroom</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving activity instructions</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatting informally with pupils</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplining</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running tests</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting written work</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining meanings</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching background N + 168</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing language objectives</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining grammar</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Franklin (1990: 21)

N.B. N = 201 except where mentioned

The table shows similar results to those in Mitchell’s; teachers used the L1 for almost all the functions. It is also noticeable that functions that are more linguistically or academically/conceptually demanding lead to higher use of the L1.

Dickson (1996) (see box 3.3) prepared a list of functions for teachers to tick according to how difficult or easy they found it to carry out these functions in the L2. Dickson did not make it clear, though, where he got this list from. The following table, adapted from Dickson (1996), shows teachers’ answers.
Table 3.3: Teaching in the TL: difficulty of particular functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Very easy</th>
<th>Quite easy</th>
<th>Quite difficult</th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask questions</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment on work</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct pupils</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct mistakes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise activities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline pupils</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set homework</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain meanings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach grammar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 505

Adapted from Dickson (1996: 14)

Again, the results agree with Mitchell’s and Franklin’s, showing that activities which are not linguistically demanding are easy for teachers to carry out in the L2, while linguistically demanding functions are more difficult.

In line with this, Neil (1997) (see box 3.5) found that the areas where teachers used the L2 a great deal were those that included routine functions or short (one-word/two-word) utterances. He divided teachers’ reported language use into three categories; content areas with high L2 use (75% - 100%). These included praising, greeting, and instructions. Content areas with average L2 use (more than 50%); these included moving on from activities; namely discourse markers, questions on a text, personal language, and introducing objectives (explaining to students what is to be done). Then content areas with low L2 use (some of which scored almost zero L2 use) and these included grammar teaching, examination techniques, instructions for tests, and disciplining students. Observed lessons tended to support this pattern of language use, with type of lesson affecting the language used. Thus, grammar lessons or lessons aimed at discussing and practising examination techniques scored the highest L1 use.

Kharma and Hajjaj (1989) (see box 3.2) have found from the questionnaires they collected from teachers that the L1 was reported to be used for different purposes; these included: explaining new/difficult items (71%), teaching grammar (66%), and clarifying difficult
questions (63%). A smaller number of teachers used the L1 for greeting, taking the register, clarifying instructions, especially with beginner students.

In a follow up to their previous study (Duff & Polio 1990) in which they quantified university teachers’ L2 use (see box 3.8), Polio and Duff (1994) tried to find out what functions the teachers actually use the L1 to achieve. They qualitatively analyzed the recorded data from six teachers out of the thirteen they included in their previous study. They classified eight L1 uses under three broad variables as follow:

1) Function of item/utterance(s) produced  
   a) for administrative vocabulary items  
   b) for grammar instruction  
   c) for classroom management  
   d) to index a stance of empathy/solidarity  
   e) for English practice by the teacher with tutoring from the students  
2) Difficulty of the language being used  
   a) to provide translations for unknown TL vocabulary  
   b) to remedy students’ apparent lack of comprehension  
3) Interactive effect involving students’ use of English  

(Adapted from Polio & Duff 1994: 317)

They found that the most common L1 use by teachers was for administrative purposes; such as with key words that related to the academic context (e.g. test, quiz, review section, midterm, etc.). The use of such vocabulary was thought to be either to help catching students’ attention, or because there was no suitable equivalent in the L2. Teachers also used the L1 to some degree in teaching grammar, managing classrooms, building rapport with students, practising the L1 themselves (as previously mentioned, those teachers were native speakers of the L2), translating unknown words, supporting students’ comprehension, or responding to students’ initiations in the L1. They found that teachers lacked awareness of how, when, and to what extent they used the L1 in the L2 classroom. They recommended that developing teachers’ awareness of their practices inside classrooms will help them improve their teaching (Polio and Duff 1994).

Turnbull (2000), in a briefly presented study, observed and recorded lessons for 4 teachers of French (ten lessons each but he analyzed only six lessons for each teacher).
Three teachers used the L1 for managerial functions. Two teachers used the L1 for social purposes and academic functions. All teachers used translation but in varied styles; two teachers translated isolated words and two translated full phrases.

In their empirical study where they observed teachers' use of the L1 in actual classroom teaching, Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie (2002) (see box 3.6) referred to previous literature to produce a coding scheme to categorize teachers' actual use of the L1 for the purposes it achieves. Samples were coded against this literature-based version which was, then, further modified to produce a second and last version of coding scheme against which the sample was coded again. The 'passage' was used as the basic unit for coding the functions of teachers’ uses of the L1 (see section 5.9.2.3.2 for the characteristics of the passage).

The final version of Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie's coding scheme looked as follows:

1. **Translation** (switching from FL to NL [native language] 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

(adapted from Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002: 409, 410).

They found that the L1 was used most for communicative purposes (48.62%), then for translation (30.94%); these included translations of certain vocabulary items within different stages of the lesson to make the input comprehensible to students, and then for metalinguistic purposes (20.44%). Communicative L1 uses included managing the class, in the broader sense of managing the interaction, responding to students’ initiations in the L1, and the teacher’s emotional state. A high percentage of these L1 uses was for managing the class (33.70% out of the 48.62% of L1 uses in this category). In the metalinguistic category, the authors differentiated between comments on L2 forms or culture, and contrasts between these forms or cultural practices in the L1 and the L2; they found that comments represented 16.02% of metalinguistic L1 uses, while contrasts represented only 4.42% of these uses. They also found that the frequencies of L1 uses were similar among teachers in the main categories with some discrepancies in the subcategories. In other words, all teachers used the L1 for translation, metalinguistic comments, instructions, motivating students to use the L2, and managing the class, while their language use varied for the rest of the functions.

However, Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie’s categorization system did not have a theoretical basis to justify it. Moreover, it seemed arbitrary and loose in so far as it allowed for coding some units (passages) in more than one category.

Macaro (1998), in turn, see (box 3.7) classified teachers’ recourse to the L1 (RL1) within a broader taxonomy of teacher’s talk as either message-oriented or medium-oriented input. Message-oriented input refers to input conveying new information to students; medium-oriented input refers to input drawing students’ attention to the language itself. When dealing with instances of RL1 (recourse to the L1), Macaro classified them into four categories three of which are message oriented with one medium oriented.
1) Instructions for activities (message-oriented)

2) Information giving (message-oriented); this category included 4 sub-categories:
   a) reprimands
   b) outside plane shift (giving information that are not pertinent to the topic of the lesson)
   c) inside plane shift (giving information that are pertinent to the topic of the lesson)
   d) evaluative feedback

3) Eliciting and repairing (message or medium-oriented)

4) Medium-oriented; this category included 4 sub-categories:
   a) translation L1>L2
   b) translation L2>L1
   c) teacher echo (evaluative feedback which, unlike 2d, is medium-oriented)
   d) correcting the L1

Table 3.4 shows the number of instances of RL1 within each category.

**Table 3.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional category</th>
<th>Functional orientation</th>
<th>RL1 frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructions</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprimands</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Plane Shift</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside Plane Shift</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative Feedback</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliciting and Repairing</td>
<td>Medium &amp; Message</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation L1&gt;L2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation L2&gt;L1</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Echo</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting the L1</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Macaro (1998)

Macaro pointed out that medium RL1s usually consisted of one or two words, while Message RL1s ranged in length between one word and a whole transaction, and they are related to the ability to communicate (particularly the information giving category). The length and complexity of message-oriented input seemed to be the reason behind the high
frequency of RL1 in this category, which seem to agree with Mitchell’s (1988), Franklin’s (1990), and Dickson’s (1996) results.

The studies on the functions of L1 use show that not enough has been done to study what functions use of the L1 can help to achieve inside the FL classroom. Many of the studies that tried to examine the functions of teachers’ L1 use depended on eliciting teachers’ views rather than studying and analyzing real samples of classroom behaviour. Moreover, there is no consensus among different studies about functions of the language that the L1 is used with. The L1 is used for a variety of purposes ranging from simple routine functions such as greetings and praise to linguistically demanding functions, such as talking explicitly about the L2 rules. Yet, from teachers’ reported use of the L1, the L1 seems to be used more with linguistically and conceptually demanding functions, such as the teaching of forms and meanings, and maintaining communication.

3.4 Reasons or factors that motivate teachers to use the L1

In this section we will refer to the different factors that research has shown to influence teachers’ behaviours and motivate them to use the L1. Actually, examining the reasons behind teachers’ practice in classrooms is not something straightforward or easy to test empirically. Yet, there are a few empirical studies that tried to find out the reasons behind teachers’ use of the L1 in the FL classroom, either by eliciting information from teachers through questions (e.g. Franklin 1990, Dickson 1996) or by inferring from the interactional context (e.g. Macaro 2001, Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002). Moreover, because the discussion in this section is important in shedding light on how teachers’ use of the L1 in the L2 classroom is justified (whether it is based on sound teaching and learning principles or not), the discussion was thought to be more informative if extended to involve contributions from different studies and perspectives (empirical and non-empirical). Thus, the discussion will not be confined to empirical investigations and results.

Through our survey of the possible factors behind teachers’ use of the L1 in the L2 classroom we found that teachers’ uses of the L1 were mostly motivated by one or more of the following sets of factors: a) factors related to students, b) factors related to the teacher, and c) external factors.
3.4.1 Factors related to students

Dickson (1996) (see box 3.3) quantified the factors that challenge teachers' attempts to use the L2 exclusively and motivate them to use the L1; he found that factors related to students were particularly influential and then came factors related to teachers. In many EFL classes (as in most Arab countries), students are mostly monolingual and monocultural and rarely have access to the FL outside the language classroom. In such contexts, students do not have high motivation to learn the L2, and there is a high possibility of transfer from the L1 (Kharma and Hajjaj 1989b). These conditions are very common and typical in many classroom contexts around the world. Teachers often find that they have to have recourse to the L1 to compensate for lack of proficiency and motivation on the part of learners. Low achievement on the part of students was among the factors that challenged teachers' use of the L2 according to Dickson (1996) (see table 3.2). Motivation as well determines how well teachers can move on with their lessons, and how much students can learn (Atkinson 1993b). One of the teachers in Macaro's (2001) empirical study, as mentioned above commented on how the level of the students did not give her a chance to conduct what she thought would be a good communicative lesson conducted in the L2 only.

Teachers in many EFL classes deal with large numbers of students; fifty or more is quite common in some countries (like Egypt). In Franklin's study (1990), 81% of teachers referred to class size as a main reason for resorting to the L1. Dickson's survey showed that 58% of teachers thought that large classes challenged their use of the L2. Mixed ability classes were also seen as another challenge for teachers' use of the L2 (see table 3.2). These classes are usually empty of any resources or teaching aids except for, in some cases, a few pictures made by students. Within such poor classes with large numbers of students, there are fewer guarantees that students will understand or get involved if the teacher opts to talk in the L2 all the time. In such large monolingual classes, Holliday (1994) recommends the use of L1 for facilitating teaching and learning. Kharma & Hajjaj (1989) reported that 63% of teachers said they used the L1 because they thought it was supportive to students' learning (in the sense of explaining meaning and grammar and encouraging use of the language). Dickson (1996) also reported that teachers used it to aid students' learning in the sense of helping accuracy, increasing confidence and motivation and, particularly, increasing cultural awareness and knowledge about the L2 rules. Normally, an important factor that motivates teachers to use the L1 is to make their input comprehensible, that is, to guarantee maximum understanding among their students (Chambers 1991, Macaro 2001, Liu et al. 2004).
Further, these conditions, i.e. large numbers of students, mixed abilities, and unmotivated students, are the main reason, as Franklin (1990) argues, behind disruptive behaviour in the L2 classroom. Students' disruption appears as a major factor that motivates teachers' use of the L1 in both Franklin (1990) and Dickson (1996). Franklin's study shows that 95% of teachers resort to the L1 to maintain discipline. In Dickson's study, 74% of teachers reported it affected their behaviour very much or quite a lot while 5% only said it did not. Teachers think use of the L1 is more effective in controlling students' behaviour (Chambers 1992). It even seems to be more justifiable for some teachers than L1 use with other more linguistically demanding activities. The teacher referred to earlier in this section in Macaro's study (2001) had some sense of guilt when using the L1 for procedural instructions, but not for reprimands.

Table 3.5: Factors affecting teachers' use of TL in the classroom (Student-related factors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A bit</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly behaviour</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower achieving pupils</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large classes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed ability classes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 504

Adapted from Dickson (1996: 10)

3.4.2 Factors related to teachers

As discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.1.2.4.2), one of the factors which led to the decline in the use of the L1 was the appearance of the Direct Method. Most teachers were native speakers, who were in many cases teaching multilingual classes, a context in which the L1 had no obvious place. Many EFL teachers, nowadays, are non-natives who share the same language as their students. Those teachers find it difficult and impractical to be 100% loyal to monolingual practice (Hajjaj 1985). Maintaining an L2-only interaction in such a situation seems unnatural and impractical (Sticchi Damiani 1985, Atkinson 1987, Mitchell 1988, Kharma & Hajjaj 1989, Auerbach 1993, Medgyes 1994). As Breen (1985: 67) puts it, “given the actual social potential of a classroom, the contrivance of ‘other worlds’ within it may not
only be inauthentic but also quite unnecessary”. In many cases, such teachers may have never had the chance themselves to use the L2 naturally in a target language speaking community (Wilkins 1974). They may lack confidence and fluency in the L2; they tend to be “used up in the constant struggle with their own language deficiencies, leaving only a small fraction for attending to their students’ problems” (Medgyes 1986: 112). This does not seem to give much potential for the constant use of the L2. Teachers’ answers in Franklin’s study support that claim as 83% of teachers ranked confidence in speaking the language as an important factor that encourages them to use the L1; also 79% ranked tiredness, which is related to the factor of confidence, as a reason for using the L1.

Yet, this doesn’t seem to be confirmed by empirical observations. Duff & Polio (1990) observed highly varied amounts of L1 use among native speaker teachers of the L2 (ranged between 0% – 90% compared to the 100% 10% L2 use they reported, see section 3.2), while Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie (2002) observed low variation of L1 use among native and non-native speaking teachers (0% 18.15%). They also found that being a native speaker teacher or a non-native teacher did not influence the distribution of L1 and L2 use. Dickson (1996), in his large scale survey, found that language competence did not play a major role in encouraging or discouraging teachers to use the L2 as native speakers and non-native speakers did not differ in their responses on this point. Teachers’ responses in Dickson’s study revealed that factors related to the teacher were generally less influential than factors related to students in motivating them to use the L1 (compare teachers’ answers in table 3.3 and table 3.2).

Table 3.6: Factors affecting teachers’ use of TL in the classroom
(Teacher-related factors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A bit</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your fatigue, stress</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your views on TL use</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your confidence (FL2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your confidence (FL1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Dickson (1996: 10)
NB. FL2 = second foreign language; FL1 = first foreign language (as those teachers were teaching more than one foreign language)
3.4.3 External factors

These are factors that are not related to the participants (teachers and students). They refer to broader institutional and socio-political constraints that are imposed on the classroom and influence teachers’ behaviours.

3.4.3.1 Time constraints

Dodson (1967) claims that, contrary to the claim that the L1 harms more than helps and that it takes away from the time which should be spent learning the L2, the use of L2-only methods is the real waste of time as it consumes classroom time in a process that Dodson calls a “puzzle game”. The teacher seeks to make students understand what he/she is saying in the new language without them being involved in any active oral participation, which adds nothing to their actual learning.

Language classes in EFL contexts (as in Egypt) often occur once or twice a week with a maximum of two hours per week. Teachers in many cases (as is the case in Egypt) are restricted to a certain curriculum and a certain book that they have to finish before the examination time. So they may find it exhausting and time wasting to maintain a monolingual approach all the time, especially in explaining grammatical points that may contain a high degree of abstraction or complex language, in presenting the meanings of abstract nouns, or in administrative work. In such cases, teachers may find it more convenient, practical, and time saving to carry out these tasks in the L1 (Green 1970, Atkinson 1987, Medgyes 1994, Dickson 1996). Mitchell (1988) shows that teachers in her study believe that L1 use saves time and accelerates communication. Although Polio & Duff (1994) object that using the L1 under the assumption that it saves class time is faulty, as the repetitions and modifications that result from the interaction using the L2 is what really aids language acquisition, Richards & Rodgers (2001), and much earlier Dodson (1967), noted that teachers following the monolingual methods were overwhelmed when avoiding the use of L1, when at many times it would be more direct and convenient to give a short explanation in the L1. More recently, Seedhouse (1997) gives a practical example to support this. In a long conversation between a teacher and a student, in which the former tried to elicit from a student “who” instead of “what” to refer to people, the teacher at last resorted to the L1 to produce the correct word. Seedhouse comments that if the teacher had resorted to the L1 earlier “the interaction would probably have continued smoothly” (Seedhouse 1997: 341).
In line with Dodson (1962) and Sweet (1964), more recently, Lightbown & Spada (1993) agree that children acquiring their L1 spend a lot of time in contact with the language, which is not available to adults learning an L2, especially in formal settings because of time constraints and large numbers of students. Moreover, children learning their L1 are not required to acquire every utterance they hear. They only pick those items which have significance to them (Dodson 1962); this again requires plenty of time, which cannot be afforded in classrooms. Add to this the availability of a ‘silent period’ to children learning their L1, which is again not available to adults or older children in classrooms (Dulay et al. 1982, Lightbown & Spada 1993). L2 learners in the classroom setting are under pressure to use the language in the early stages of exposure to fulfil the requirements of the curriculum and the examinations. These pressures and demands lead them to rely on explicit routes and shortcuts to learning (cognitive and conscious skills). Alternatively, Dodson proposes that monolingual methods can work on one condition, that is, if the teacher has plenty of time to give each student a chance to be involved in active oral contact with the L2 for a considerable time. As this is impossible in reality, this leads Dodson to argue that the real problem in language teaching is not, as was mistakenly thought, the use of L1, but the factor of time (Dodson 1967).

3.4.3.2 The evaluation system

Another external factor that encourages teachers’ use of the L1 in EFL classrooms is the evaluation system. In a few empirical studies (Duff & Polio 1990, Franklin 1990, Liu et al. 2004) teachers report that the focus of examinations is one of the reasons that influence their use of the L1. “It is often the case that the teachers’ main concern is to complete the syllabus, in preparation for the examination, rather than teach the second language as such” Kharma & Hajjaj (1989: 227). The system of examinations in many countries is still lagging behind, in the sense that it concentrates totally on the testing of reading and writing; fluency and oral abilities have no part in such examinations. It is risky for teachers not to equip their students with what they need to pass these exams (Hedge 2000), hence, teachers are tempted to concentrate more on teaching language forms and developing accuracy, for which the L1 can have a facilitating and accelerating role. Thus it is hard to convince teachers to avoid explicit teaching of forms, such as explaining grammar or using the L1, when exams concentrate solely on language forms and vocabulary.
3.4.3.3 Department policy

Department or school policy was also reported to play a role in influencing teachers' behaviour regarding the L1 use. Duff & Polio (1990) found that teachers take into consideration the official policy towards the L1 when using the language in the L2 classroom. A policy instructing teachers not to use the L1 seemed to be more compelling, for them not to resort to the L1, than a policy calling for increasing the L2 as much as possible. Add to this, the pressures on teachers to finish the content of the textbook to a mixed ability class by the end of the year. 49% of teachers in Kharma & Hajjaj's (1989) study reported they used the L1 in accordance with course books (it was not clear in what ways) and a minority of 10% said they used it because supervisors recommended it. In Macaro (2001), although teachers received theoretical training regarding the issue of L1 use prior to the recording of the lessons, one of the two analyzed teachers was more strongly influenced by the official policy (The National Curriculum) than the theoretical training she received.

3.4.3.4 Language distance

One of the factors reported to motivate teachers' use of the L1 is the linguistic and cultural distance between L1 and L2 (Simon 2001). Teaching English to Thai, Chinese or Arab students, for example is more likely to trigger L1 use than in the case of teaching English to French or Spanish students. In the latter case, the L2 may share more cognates with the L1. In their study, Duff & Polio (1990) found that differences between the L1 and L2 in grammatical terms motivated teachers' use of the L1. They also found that most of the teachers who used more L1 with their classes were teaching languages that have different writing systems from the L2.

Thus, in this chapter, we have seen that teachers tend to use the L1 in the L2 classroom to achieve pedagogical functions and that their use of the L1 is motivated by the realities and constraints of the formal FL classroom setting rather than by a conviction that it is an effective psycholinguistic tool that can contribute to students' learning. In other words, teachers use the L1 mainly as a practical teaching tool to overcome the difficulties of the formal classroom teaching situation, whether these difficulties are related to themselves, their students, or to other external factors in order to achieve linguistic and managerial functions in the classroom. It can be claimed that, just as the L1 was shown in chapter 1 to be a strategy that learners exploit to improve their learning of the L2, teachers also seem to resort to the L1 as a strategy that improves their teaching of the L2. It helps them to take
shortcuts to carry out their instructional job; that is, delivering the linguistic content to students, overcoming classroom constraints that may be hard to handle sticking to the L2 only.

However, Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie (2002) noted that use of the L1 is not always motivated by a need to explain the linguistic content or raise comprehension on the part of learners. Sometimes teachers use the L1 out of their keenness to motivate students to participate in the classroom and produce language themselves; at other times, teachers’ use of the L1 is motivated by students’ initiations or requests. Moreover, teachers were found to switch to the L1 for no obvious pedagogical purpose (Liu et al. 2004). As Simon comments,

these rules are never constant or stable, as a great degree of personal choice and freedom on the part of the teacher enables him/her to make a choice which may not be in compliance with the general rule for the task but which appears more suitable to achieve the pedagogical aim........ Teachers may also have different teaching styles and their idiosyncratic code choices may be tacitly understood by their learners” (Simon 2000: 327).

This means that the nature and context of interaction in the FL classroom also has a great effect on teachers’ use of the L1.

Conclusion

Our survey of the literature reveals that teachers (even those committed to the communicative approach, e.g. those in Mitchell’s 1988 study) resort to the L1 for varying reasons ranging from concern about students’ comprehension to encouraging learners to produce language themselves to merely responding to students’ initiations in the L1. It has not, however, proved easy to establish a list of functions achieved by the use of the L1 and even less easy to offer a theoretically based explanation or justification.

On one hand, the empirical evidence in chapter 2 (section 2.2.2) showed that monolingual strategies of interaction are likely to be insufficient to develop students’ L2 knowledge beyond a certain level. Relying on the L2 is likely to result in “lessons at a lower level of difficulty” as Guthrie (1984: 40) puts it. This does not help in aiding students’ learning of or interaction in the L2 as desired.

On the other hand, the empirical evidence of L1 use in this chapter has not demonstrated that the L1 use has had significant interactional or learning consequence; i.e. we still do not know
to what extent the L1 use can aid learning of or interaction (communication) in the L2. The studies that sought to code and classify the functions of teacher’s L1 use in the L2 classroom were not enough to reach a consensus about what functions the L1 can contribute positively to or in what ways. One reason for this may be that these studies concentrated on the pedagogical or teaching functions that the L1 can achieve without moving beyond those to justify the L1 uses from a psycholinguistic learning perspective. In other words, there was no clear endeavour on the part of classroom studies to exploit the advancements of theories and studies in the SLA field to justify these pedagogical functions of L1 use from a learning perspective in an effective and critical way (although Neil 1997, Macaro 2001, and Rolin-lanziti & Brownlie 2002 did so to some extent).

This is perhaps the reason why several studies which effectively recommend the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom do so reluctantly, as if the authors have not themselves found sufficient theoretically motivated justification for the use of the L1. Harbord (1992: 351), for example, stresses clearly that his conditional acceptance of the L1 is not an invitation to over-use the L1, “but rather a justification for its limited use in certain situations”. Harmer (1991) refers to the L1 only as a quick way to overcome some presentation problems. Nation (1978) considers it one among other alternatives for conveying meaning, and that it should be confined to the teaching of unimportant words, which students are not expected to utilize. This reservation is also seen clearly in the contradictory views of some writers such as Green (1970) and Nation (1978). Hard evidence of that contradiction manifests itself in the following statement from Green while arguing for L1 use in L2 teaching: “given a bright class and an energetic teacher with plenty of time at his disposal, almost anything can be presented without resorting to the vernacular” (Green 1970: 219). Although this final quotation is traced back to an earlier era before the more recent developments in SLA and FLT methodology, more recent work still shows similar reservations about use of the L1 in L2 teaching. Writers such as Atkinson (1987), Auerbach (1993), and Simon (2001) refer to teachers who experience a feeling of guilt when having to use the L1 in the L2 classroom. Also, researchers such as Mitchell (1988), Macaro (2001) and Pellowe (1998) noticed such feelings in some of the teachers they observed. This kind of 'shy' invitation seems to allow for the use of L1, not because it is completely a desirable teaching tool or because it is a psycholinguistic strategy that can help learners in building their L2 knowledge, but as “a necessary evil” (Cook 1999: 202), as a “fall from grace” (Stern 1996: 293), or, at best, as something that requires justification. This is what Macaro (1997, 1998, 2001) calls a
maximal view, in contrast with an optimal view of LI use; in the former, teachers resort to
the LI use, not as a valuable resource to be exploited, but because of lack of good
teaching/learning conditions.

What we can say, then, is that, just as the long persistent prescription 'not to use the LI in L2
teaching' has not been completely supported by sound principles of learning, or by enough
valid empirical evidence in the L2 classroom context, the current calls for using the LI in L2
teaching do not, either, seem to be based on sound principles of learning or enough empirical
evidence in the L2 classroom. This may be the reason behind the inconsistency and the
hesitancy behind many of the recent calls to re-admit the LI role in L2 teaching. Language
teaching does not seem to have reached a mature balanced view of exploiting the role of the
LI in the L2 classroom.

It can be argued that, although there is much more consensus about the importance of the LI
role in L2 teaching, and although the monolingual approach has always been challenged both
theoretically and practically, empirical research shows a considerable range of teachers' LI
uses that are varied in quantity and purposes. There is, therefore, a need for a better
understanding of the functions of teacher's LI use in the L2 classroom and the
psycholinguistic consequences of these functions. This can help in moving towards what
Macaro (1997, 1998, 2001) calls an optimal view of LI use. It is important to reach a better
understanding of when, why and how best the LI can be employed to good effect in the L2
classroom. In Macaro's words,

    future research needs to establish some principles for codeswitching in FL classrooms
    by understanding its functions and consequences. Even though the phenomenon
cannot be dissociated from its sociocultural environment .............. we need to
provide, especially for less experienced teachers, a framework that identifies when
reference to the LI can be a valuable tool and when it is simply used as an easy option.
In this way we may work towards a theory of optimality for the use of codeswitching
by the teacher. (Macaro 2001: 545) (My emphasis).

In the same way, Simon (2001, citing Castellotti 1997), calls for "theorizing and producing
formal guidelines to integrate codeswitching into pedagogical practice in a reasoned,
structured and constructive manner" (Simon 2000: 338).
The literature review shows that some studies sought to count the quantities of L1 use whether observed or reported (e.g. Duff & Polio 1990, Macaro 2001, Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002) and the functions it is used to fulfil (e.g. Polio & Duff 1994, Dickson 1996, Neil 1997, Macaro 1998). Some studies (Mitchell 1988, Franklin 1990, Dickson 1996) examined the motivations behind teachers’ use of the L1. Fewer studies sought to compare observed behaviour to participants’ perceptions (e.g. Polio & Duff 1994). Hardly any studies sought to build on Macaro’s (2001) call to establish an optimal view of L1 use in the L2 classroom.

What is needed, then, is a more theoretically justified view of the role the L1 can play in the formal FL classroom that takes into consideration the theoretical as well as contextual and pedagogical features of classroom learning, and that addresses the psycholinguistic consequences of the L1 use on students’ learning. In other words, the use of the L1 in L2 teaching needs to be based on sound psychological and pedagogical principles rather than being used in a casual way subject to the teacher’s fancy or used with a sense of guilt to overcome unprivileged teaching/learning contexts.

The argument of this thesis has, so far, been seeking to examine a variety of theoretical positions to present guidelines for such an optimal theory of teachers’ L1 use by the teacher. Chapter 4 will then set out the basis for such an optimal view of L1 use, and refer to the contributions of SLA studies to establish a theoretically justified framework of L1 use in the FL classroom. The following chapters will seek to build on this by examining the different functions of L1 use as documented in previous studies and evidenced in actual classroom teaching and addressing their pedagogical, psycholinguistic, and practical consequences with the aim of collecting evidence of how the L1 can be used in an optimal way.
Chapter 4

Towards an optimal view of L1 use

The last few chapters revealed that, although language learning theories and language teaching methods have for long denied or played down the role of the L1 in L2 learning, there have always been calls that challenged the monolingual approach and argued for not abandoning the L1 as a useful resource. More recently, learning theories and teaching methods seemed to adopt a less dismissive view of the L1 role. In addition, the L1 persisted in real practice regardless of the prevailing theories of learning or teaching. In the last chapter, we surveyed the different functions that teachers tend to use the L1 to achieve and the different factors that challenge the monolingual principle of teaching in the L2 classroom and motivate teachers to use the L1.

It was shown that teachers use the L1 as a tool that enables them to achieve pedagogical and practical functions and overcome the difficulties and constraints of the teaching/learning environment. We also saw that there was a significant risk that teachers’ use of the L1 in the L2 classroom was not based on sound learning principles; previous studies recorded a state of guilt feelings within some teachers when having to use the L1. Use of the L1 to achieve pedagogical functions in the L2 classroom seemed to be motivated by an urgent need to overcome difficult teaching/learning conditions rather than by a conviction of its potential psycholinguistic effects on learners’ learning. Similarly, on the methodological/research level, there have not been enough serious efforts to discuss the potential learning consequences of the different pedagogical functions of teachers’ L1 use.

We concluded, in chapter 3, that what is needed is to replace this prevailing maximal view of L1 use by an optimal view that is theory-based; i.e. that justifies the use of the L1 as a potential useful resource that can aid students’ learning in the L2 classroom. In this chapter, we will attempt to set out a theoretical basis for an optimal view of L1 use. We will make use of the theoretical claims in chapters 1 and 2 regarding the role of the L1 in L2 learning and teaching, as well as the empirical examination of classroom interaction presented in chapter 3 to generate a framework to establish the potential value of L1 use. In chapters 5 and 6, we will use a coding system derived from our theoretical framework to carry out an ethnographic study of attitudes towards the use of the L1 and the actual use of the L1 in Egyptian FL classrooms. In chapter 7, we will look at real examples of L1 use to see in what
ways teachers' use of the L1 can benefit students' learning in the way that will be suggested in our proposed theory of optimal LI use.

Macaro (2005: 81) sets the criteria for principled LI use in the L2 classroom 'as a means to an end', emphasizing that "codeswitching is beneficial where the classroom interaction either facilitates that interaction or improves the learning of the L2 or both". Thus the optimality in LI use does not mean that certain functions should be used or that others should not, it rather sets out the benefits of LI use weighed against adhering to the L2 only. This chapter, as well as chapter 7, will contribute to such a theory of optimality in LI use.

In this chapter, the first section will show that the LI naturally complements other interactional and learning purposes in the formal FL classroom; in other words, that it can be theoretically as well as practically motivated and justified. The second section will take the discussion a step further to build a theoretically justified framework for teachers' LI use that is based on and guided by the discussion in chapters 1 and 2. The discussion in this chapter will serve to bridge the gap noticed in previous studies, i.e. lack of justification for the different functions of teachers' LI use. This step is necessary to enrich and validate studies about LI use, and justify the inclusion of the LI, not just as an important pedagogical and practical tool of teaching, but also as an important psycholinguistic tool that assists learning of and interaction in the L2, as shown by SLA research.

4.1 Principles of an optimal theory of LI use

As Malamah-Thomas (1987) puts it, learning is a non-observable internal individual process which happens as a result of an external observable interaction between the teacher and students. Allwright and Bailey (1991) confirm that, whatever planning teachers do before a lesson or methods they claim to implement, it is the interaction between the participants that really affects learning. Van Lier (1988) agrees that this interaction is not an end in itself; the interaction is a means to the ends determined by the nature of the participants' learning. Thus managing the interaction is always oriented towards the aim of managing learning; that is classroom interaction does not lead directly to learning, but rather, offers conditions and opportunities for learning to take place. These are represented in input opportunities and practice (output) opportunities (Hall 1995). Hence, a better understanding of the nature and purpose of classroom interaction will lead to better learning or, as Hall (1995) puts it, will
help in setting out more realistic and relevant expectations of what type of teacher’s talk can improve students’ learning opportunities.

Van Lier (1988: 29) states that the classroom “does not provide the same motives for communication as participating in the outside social world does”. Breen points out that “the classroom has its own communicative potential and its own authentic metacommunicative purpose” (Breen 1985: 154). The main argument that will be made in this section is that the L1 is compatible both with the nature of classroom interaction and with the purpose of that interaction: i.e. learning. In the first part of the discussion, we will claim that the interaction in the FL classroom is not an end in itself, but rather a means to an end. The metacommunicative purpose behind the interaction in the classroom, as Breen puts it, is that it is “a particular social context for the intensification of the cultural experience of learning” (Breen 1985: 154) (his italics). In chapter 2 (section 2.2.2), we presented empirical evidence that monolingual strategies are not always the best way to achieve that purpose of intensified learning. In this chapter, we will argue that the L1 has a role to play in bringing about that learning. In the second part of the discussion, we will claim that the FL classroom is bilingual in nature; hence, bilingual strategies are more natural and authentic to the context of communication than monolingual strategies.

Thus, the main discussion in this section will argue that the prohibition of the L1 in L2 teaching is challenged by the very nature of interaction and purpose of learning in the FL classroom when it is defined in this way.

4.1.1 The FL classroom interaction is an opportunity for intensified learning

Unlike SL contexts in which learners need the language to achieve immediate communicative purposes outside the classroom, learners in formal FL contexts need to develop skills which go beyond immediate communicative outcomes, they need to develop the skills of self-learning. Using the language for communicative purposes is not necessarily among those learners’ immediate priorities. CLT is accused of concentrating on communicative competence while ignoring linguistic competence (Mallikamas 1997). Lightbown & Spada (1993) also cite research evidence that the development of oral communicative skills depends on factors of personality rather than on intelligence, while written skills are more influenced by the level of intelligence. This lends support to the need
for effective language teaching to give more attention to the cognitive skills of learning, and not only to oral communicative or natural use of the language, as implied in pure CLT. A pure communicative approach may result in trivializing the aim and the process of language teaching. It seems that this is what Brumfit (1980: 114) warned of when he said:

"we run a risk of confusing fashion or style with a fundamental ability and encouraging those who can mimic language use rather than those who can operate most effectively".

He states clearly that a restricted, simplified view of language as communication will neglect other aspects of language which learners may need to develop in order to facilitate skills other than communication, which was supported by empirical evidence in section 2.2.2. Moreover, imposing such a view on learners may be counterproductive in that it alienates learners and consequently hinders their learning. In other words, the insistence on total use of the L2 causes teachers and course book writers to limit the range of expressions in the L2 classroom to a point where it becomes self-defeating. What is said represents too narrow a range of language to permit development and in the process becomes boring.

The classroom may not offer the most effective context for natural acquisition or use of the language; rather, "the classroom aims to be a shortcut to language development. In a limited amount of time, measured in classroom periods, it aims to make up for the continuous and long-term exposure and the vital need for communication that characterize the child's acquisition of the mother tongue" (Van Lier 1988: 78). This is the sense in which classroom learning is intensified learning. Hence, "the teachers' job is to help the students to make as much progress as possible in the circumstances. All teachers have a responsibility to make sure that their students are as successful as possible, allowing for the time and resources available" [his italics] (Atkinson 1993b: 76).

For teaching to be effective, the interaction should focus on conditions and practices which lead to effective internal learning taking place in such a condensed context. Monolingual teaching and concomitant monolingual teaching strategies do not seem to be enough to lead to effective internal learning. According to the socio-cultural interactionist view (section 1.3.3), research evidence shows that students use the L1 in collaborative learning to scaffold their learning (advising, reacting, eliciting, and requesting clarification) (Anton & DiCamilla 1998, Villamil & Guerrero 1996). We also saw in section 2.2.2 that restricting teacher's
input to being natural or comprehensible by using input modifications (simpler grammatical sentences, more restricted vocabulary, exaggerated pronunciation, and clearer articulation) or interactional adjustments (comprehension checks, confirmation checks, and clarification checks) was not enough to help students develop their interactional skills, sufficiently to engage in complex extended L2 talk (Hall 1995) or apply what they learned in the classroom to new situations (Neil 1997). Besides, relying heavily on these strategies brings into question the issue of authenticity; namely, the language students encounter in the L2 classroom is not the same as the language they encounter in real communication with native speakers. Also, these devices may sound unnatural, in the sense that they are not related to the learners’ environment and experience (Tsui 2001). Moreover, there is no consensus that these devices are really enough to make the input comprehensible, or even if they make the input comprehensible, that they lead to learning (Sharwood-Smith 1986, Faerch & Kasper 1986). This gives credibility to the need to use explicit methods to achieve the purpose of learning (Chambers 1992, Heltai 1989).

L2 learners need to be equipped to cope with the demands and conditions of real life communication so, they must be exposed to opportunities of authentic use of the language inside the classroom (Hedge 2000). Code-switching (see section 1.3.4), as a feature of bilingual speech communities, will be proposed as a more natural and authentic device that can be exploited in the FL classroom and that can contribute to the comprehension, use, and the maintenance of interaction in the FL. Thus, we can claim that code-switching can and should be added to other conversational and interactional adjustments.

4.1.2 The FL classroom interaction is bilingual in nature

People communicate most easily with those they have most in common with. When they have little in common with each other, they communicate only with difficulty. A teacher with the same sort of background and experience as his or her students will have a good chance of communicating with them (Malamah-Thomas 1987: 13).

If we accept that people communicate more effectively if they share the same background, and if we accept that the L1 is the most prominent common knowledge that the participants in the FL classroom share, then it is sensible to claim that use of the L1 can enhance and increase the effectiveness of communication in the L2 classroom, while prohibiting this common background between teachers and students can lead to difficulties in communication.
Hedge (2000) agrees with Medgyes (1986) in that CLT practices and techniques have been too demanding for non-native teachers, who represent the vast majority of FL teachers. By emphasizing the monolingual use of the language, CLT has been even more linguistically demanding. Insisting on the monolingual principle of teaching seems to consume teachers' energies and to take priority, for them, over handling many other learning problems and contextual realities.

Native-speaking teachers tend to ignore, among other things, the fact that a great proportion of the energy of their non-native colleagues is inevitably used up in the constant struggle with their own language deficiencies, leaving only a small fraction for attending to their students' problems. By putting an especially heavy linguistic strain on the teacher, the Communicative Approach further reduces the time non-native teachers have available for their students (Medgyes 1986: 112).

Widdowson expresses the bewilderment of non-native English language teachers, saying how “they are denied the exploitation of a bilingual competence they have and at the same time exhorted to exploit a communicative competence that they do not” (Widdowson 2001: 12, 13) (my italics).

This preoccupation with the monolingual principle does not even guarantee a parallel preoccupation on the part of learners. As for learners, Widdowson (2001) and Simon (2001) agree that whatever teachers or teaching Methods do to impose a monolingual type of teaching or prescribe a monolingual view of learning students make use of bilingual strategies (see the socio-cultural interactionists' clams in section 1.2.3).

It seems, then, that the word ‘bilingual’ is key to understanding the interaction in the FL classroom as a social context and, more particularly, the implications of the participants’ use of the L1.

According to Mackey (1970: 554), “bilingualism is not a phenomenon of language; it is a characteristic of its use”. This shows that in any context where two languages are in use bilingualism is in charge. So, it can be safely claimed that the FL classroom is a bilingual setting (Simon 2001). The L2 is a pedagogical subject whose major key is the point of “foreignness”: 
“the notion of a second language implies the existence of a first, and you cannot recognize what is foreign in a language without relating to another which is familiar” (Widdowson 2001: 12).

He even goes further to suggest that ignoring this foreignness in dealing with the L2, and assuming that it is the same as the language that native speakers use is responsible for many of the problems that monolingual teaching claims to treat.

“Many of the problems that monolingual language pedagogy has sought to grapple with over the years are self-inflicted, and therefore, of course, also inflicted on learners; ... much of its energy has been devoted to resolving difficulties of its own making rather than those that learners themselves encounter in the learning process” (Widdowson 2001: 12).

Widdowson (2001) argues that bilingualism or, to be more accurate, bilingualization processes, are more relevant and appropriate to FL contexts than monolingual principles are. He claims that the subject of L2 learning is bilingual in its nature, in the sense that there are two languages in contact. Widdowson (2001) believes that monolingual teaching seeks to contradict the natural inevitable process of bilingualization that takes place in the student’s mind. Thus, it overlooks an important resource that students draw on in learning the L2. Stern (1996) makes a similar comment for justifying use of the LI:

the use of L1 and other crosslingual techniques in the L2 class can be justified, not as a compromise or a lapse from a unilingual ideal, but because a crosslingual strategy corresponds to natural psychological processes in second language development (Stern 1996; 285,86).

In bilingualism, code-switching is a prominent feature of bilinguals’ speech. Many scholars and researchers give various definitions to the phenomenon of code-switching according to the contexts or aspects of the phenomena they deal with. Hoffmann (1991: 110) defines it as “the alternate use of two languages or linguistic varieties within the same utterance or during the same conversation”. Cook (2001: 102) defines code-switching as “going from one language to the other in mid-speech when both speakers know the same two languages”. Ellis (1994:696) defines it as a phenomenon wherein “a speaker changes from one variety or language to another variety or language in accordance with situational or purely personal factors”.

Simon (2001) and Eldridge (1996) comment on how reference to the L1 is commonly employed in bilingual and multilingual classrooms while rejected in FL classrooms, and when used it tends to be accompanied by a feeling of guilt. A major question that presents
itself here is whether code-switching, as a feature of bilingual speech, is applicable to the FL classroom.

Many factors contribute to make code-switching a natural and authentic tool that is closely related to the context of the FL classroom. Sert claims that “it should be kept in mind that a language classroom is a social group; therefore a phenomenon related to naturally occurring daily discourse of any social group has the potential to be applicable to and valid for any language classroom” (Sert 2005: 2).

Another factor that brings about the use of the L1 lies within the participants. The participants in the L2 classroom share the same L1 but they have unequal competence in the L2. The teacher in his/her communication with learners seeks to reduce this gap in competence, a situation that will inevitably trigger the use of the shared linguistic resource, i.e. the L1 (Simon 2001). As Simon puts it, “the teacher is focused on the metacommunicative level aimed at obtaining utterances in the foreign language, while the learner’s concern is to make the classroom discourse available as input for learning” (Simon 2001: 333). Hence, the teacher is sometimes compelled to switch to the L1 to aid the learning process on the part of the learners. In this case, code-switching “is a learning strategy mobilized by the learner” (Simon 2001: 333). “Potentially the classroom is a code-switching situation par excellence since the students all know two languages”, as Cook (2002: 332) puts it.

Simon (2000) refers to code-switching in the classroom as a learning strategy employed by the learner to facilitate the process of learning and/or to increase his/her verbal repertoire in order to contribute to discussion. This fits with in our discussion in chapter 1 about students’ use of the L1 as a learning and communication strategy. On the part of the teacher, code-switching will be claimed to be a pedagogical resource that helps to support learners’ learning of, and communication in, the L2.

There have also been attempts to distinguish different types of code-switching according to different purposes of studies. Blom and Gumperz (1972), looking at what triggers code-switching, differentiate between situational code-switching which is triggered by a change of social situation, and metaphorical code-switching which “relates to particular kinds of topics or subject matters rather than to change in social situation” (Blom and Gumperz 1972: 425).
In discussing the grammatical rules that govern code-switching, Hamers & Blanc (2000, citing Poplack 1980), distinguish three types of code-switching according to the occurrences of the two languages on the sentence level:

(1) extra-sentential code-switching, or the insertion of a tag, e.g. 'you know', 'I mean', from one language into an utterance which is entirely in another language;

(2) intersentential code-switching, or switch at clause/sentence boundary, one clause being in one language, the other clause in the other, e.g. 'Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English and finish it in Spanish' (Spanish-English bilingual recorded by Poplack (1980) in the Puerto Rican community of New York City).

(3) intrasentential code-switching, where switches of different types occur within the clause boundary, including within the word boundary (i.e. loan blend, e.g. check-er, English verb check + French infinitive morpheme -er). The following is an example of intrasentential code-switching: kio ke six, seven hours te school de vic spend karde ne, they are speaking English all the time ('Because they spend six or seven hours a day at school they are speaking English all the time') (Punjabi-English bilingual in Britain recorded by Romaine, 1995) (Hamers & Blanc 2000: 259, 260).

On the psycholinguistic level, Poulisse & Bongaerts (1994) differentiate between intentional and unintentional code-switching. Intentional code-switching may reflect a contextual or linguistic strategy that the speaker employs intentionally to achieve social or psychological purposes such as, marking moves between subjects and messages, directing attention to a certain interlocutor, or as a we-code strategy. On the other hand, unintentional code-switching is similar to slips of the tongue; Poulisse & Bongaerts (1994) call such switches 'performance switches'. Poulisse & Bongaerts explain the reason behind these unintentional code-switches as following:

Because L1 words are often of a much higher frequency than the corresponding (and intended) L2 words, which are, after all, new to beginning learners, L1 lexical items will often reach the level of activation required for lexical selection before the corresponding L2 items do. This raises the chances that the L1 items are accidentally selected instead of the intended L2 items............... As L2 learners become more efficient in the L2, ........ L1 words no longer require a great deal less activation to be selected than L2 words, so that the chances of an L1 word being selected instead of an L2 word diminish accordingly. (Poulisse & Bongaerts 1994: 46)

However, unlike Poulisse & Bongaerts's (1994) claim that the more proficient L2 learners are the less likely it is that they will switch to the L1, Eldridge (1996), in an EFL context, found that students' proficiency level did not influence students' code-switching, in the sense that both more proficient and less proficient students tended to code-switch regularly. The only difference appeared when students were under pressure not to use the L1 (in oral
more proficient students could function well in the L2 only while less proficient students struggled and had long pauses of silence. Hence, Eldridge (1996: 308, 309) claimed that code-switching by proficient students was "a strategy of preference", and code-switching by less proficient students was "due to competence problems".

Simon (2000) argues that code-switching in the FL classroom has a specific nature, and is more complex than code-switching in social life due to the complex nature of communication in the FL classroom. We have referred above to the differences, in L2 competence, between the participants, something which delineates the distinct relationship between them as "a relationship of instructor – instructed, or competent-not-yet-competent" (van Lier 1988: 139). Besides, participants in the L2 classroom play a double role; one is social as members of community sharing the same background and L1, the other is institutional as a teacher and students. Thus, code-switching sometimes indicates a shift in roles (Simon 2000).

The LI use in the FL classroom under a theoretically and pedagogically justified framework of teachers' code-switching can be employed as a pedagogical strategy that contributes to the enhancement of the teachers' input and the overall interaction in the L2 classroom. This will, consequently, contribute to learners' processing of the input, and to their use of the L2. Thus, viewing the FL classroom as a social context of bilingual interaction that aims for intensified learning, rather than viewing it as a replication of natural language acquisition settings, gives the L1 a specific role in FL classroom teaching. Hence, reference to the L1 is seen as a direct and explicit tool that helps in facilitating and pushing the interaction and creating better opportunities for learning and use of the FL, and as a natural process and an authentic feature that characterizes any bilingual interaction. This implies that code-switching in the L2 classroom has a double face that caters for the double role of the participants:

a) It can serve pedagogical functions, i.e. facilitating the learning of and interaction in the L2 in the FL classroom, which is peculiar to classroom interaction. This fits in with the institutional role of the participants as a teacher and students.

b) It can serve social psychological or individual functions with no clear pedagogical purposes, just as when bilinguals switch in real social life, to increase their verbal repertoire, overcome language deficiencies or just to switch to the code they feel most comfortable with for expressing ideas, thoughts and feelings. In one sense, such
switches (that may or may not be deliberate) may be a result of teachers' lack of proficiency, laziness or tiredness, and thus, the L1 is used as a compensatory communicative strategy that may take the pressure off the teacher. In another sense, these switches may be a choice of preference; this fits in with the social role of the participants as members of the same community sharing the same background and L1.

It is within the former type of code-switching where the use of the L1 can be optimized, i.e. used in an optimal way for the benefit of the learner. The latter rather seems to be an easy casual option subject to teachers' capabilities or fancies.

Thus, this section proposed an alternative optimal theory for viewing the role of the L1 as a learning and communicative strategy that complements the interaction and learning purposes in the FL classroom. In accordance with such an optimal view of L1 use, there is a need for a theoretically justified framework of L1 use by teachers. Such a framework should consider, not only the pedagogical, social, and practical functional uses of the L1, but exceed that to address the interactional and learning effects of these uses. In this way, the L1 becomes 'a means to an end' and not an end in itself or an undesirable non-professional option that teachers resort to out of inconvenient teaching/learning conditions. The second half of this chapter will be dedicated to working on such a theoretically justified framework.

4.2 A framework of theoretically justified L1 use by the teacher

In the above section, we set the criteria for optimal use of the L1 in the L2 classroom; we claimed that for the L1 to be used in a principled optimal way, it should support interaction and/or learning in the L2 classroom. What needs to be established again here is that this does not mean that there are lists of do's and don’ts to be given to teachers regarding optimal uses of the L1. Rather, it is how beneficial and supportive these uses can be for classroom interaction and learning, compared to sticking to the L2 only, that makes such uses optimal.

We have seen previously in our multi-dimensional theoretical approach that classroom language learning should provide opportunities for communication in the L2, develop declarative knowledge of the L2, and enhance motivational affective aspects of L2 learning. Moreover, in the previous section, we also saw the importance of managing both interaction and learning. These four aspects, communicative, declarative, affective, and organizational
represent the main source of classroom requirements that help students develop and use their language, the main purposes of classroom interaction, and the main focus of the teacher’s input. This is supported by Malamah-Thomas (1987); she argues that the interaction in the FL classroom has three purposes: pedagogical, affective, and organizational. The pedagogical aspect centres on the objective of teaching, that is, the instructional part that involves the transmission of knowledge to students; e.g. presenting structures, explaining new vocabulary, explaining pronunciation features, as well as providing students with opportunities to practice these aspects. Thus, this will involve both the declarative and communicative aspects of language. The affective aspect of the interaction centres on the humanistic process of achieving that objective. The organizational aspect relates to the necessity of organizing the classroom interaction for assisting and managing learning.

Hence, an optimal view/theory of L1 use should address these aspects of learning: communicative, declarative, affective, and organizational. In other words, these represent the basis for our theoretically justified framework for optimal L1 use by the teacher in the FL classroom. Thus, the main categories for our framework will be as follows:

1) Use of the L1 to aid communicative use of the language.
2) Use of the L1 to aid explicit declarative learning of the language.
3) Use of the L1 to aid affective aspects of learning.
4) Use of the L1 to aid organizational aspects of classroom learning.

As may be clear from our discussion about the process of learning (chapter 1), the first three uses of the L1 by the teacher are expected to contribute directly to the process of learning as it happens in the learner’s mind. According to Paradis (2004), if teaching approaches are aimed towards communicative purposes implicit competence will be enhanced; if they are aimed towards cognitive purposes students’ metalinguistic or explicit knowledge will be enhanced; and if they are aimed towards affective, motivational purposes both implicit and explicit knowledge will be enhanced.

The fourth use (organizational) is believed to enable the teacher to manage the interaction effectively, which contributes to improving learning;

“We do not manage interaction purely for its own sake. We manage interaction in the language classroom for the sake of giving everyone the best possible opportunities for learning the language........ In this way, managing interaction and managing learning come together” (Allwright & Bailey 1991: 21).
The implications of each of these uses of L1 by the teacher in assisting interaction (communication) and learning in the FL classroom, and thus contributing to an optimal view and principled use of the L1 will be discussed in the rest of this chapter. The theoretical advances discussed in chapters 1 and 2, as well as the practical considerations discussed in chapter 3 will inform our discussion.

4.2.1 Use of the L1 to aid communicative use of the language

As Littlewood puts it, “since communicative use is the goal as well as a means of learning, better insights into the nature of this goal may point towards more effective ways of helping learners to reach it” (Littlewood 1984: 81). Communication in L2 classrooms is, generally, more complex than communication in social life, or in other subject classrooms. The fact that the L2 is both a means and an end creates a double level of communication. As communication in the language is an end in itself, teachers use the language to transmit to students information about the language structural and functional rules to achieve the purpose of learning, which creates a multi-level of communication (Simon 2001).

The L1 will be shown to contribute to increasing the effectiveness of the communicative input in the L2 classroom in many respects, and to compensate for lack of natural exposure and conditions for natural use of the language.

4.2.1.1 Use of the L1 helps to prepare for communication

In order to have the class involved in effective communication, the teacher can introduce the communicative task before working on it. This involves introducing any cultural information or differences that students may need to know in order to understand the situations they are going to communicate about. They can also help in understanding some of the linguistic forms involved in the tasks better, such as the use of ‘vous’ in French in formal situations. Knowing such a linguistic feature is not sufficient to communicate properly in the L2 without knowing when and how appropriately to use it in appropriate situations (Al-Mutawa and Kailani 1989).

This social use of the language involves, among other things, cultural allusions or conventions such as ways of thinking, custom, mores, art forms, idioms, etc. It also involves paralinguistic features like tone of voice, gestures and facial expression. Such cultural features are essential to understand the ideas and meanings entailed in speech
acts.................... He (the learner) must also conform to norms of English culture, knowing which expressions are polite, acceptable, formal, informal, etc........... In addition, he needs to understand nonverbal communication such as nods, smiles and the like. (Al-Mutawa and Kailani 1989: 87).

Another important aspect in preparing for communication is talking about what is to be done, the purpose of carrying out the task or, as Liu et al. (2004) call it background information. These can be named meta-communicative activities. Use of the L1 with such activities can clarify what students need to communicate about and help them to understand the task better; if the content of the task is not clear enough to students before they begin their task communication may break down at different stages. Atkinson (1993b) argues that using the L1 in helping students to understand clearly the activity and its purpose reduces the possibility of students resorting to the L1 themselves.

4.2.1.2 Use of the L1 helps to enhance the input for comprehension
As we have seen, the principle behind comprehensible input is that learning is achieved by exposing learners to messages in the L2 that are just beyond their level of proficiency. Learners’ knowledge of the L2 will develop when the messages are understood, in other words when meaning is grasped. We have seen earlier that in order to make their input comprehensible, teachers adjust their talk in certain ways; we have argued that code-switching can be a useful authentic device that can add to or complement other devices of adjusting talk to make it more meaningful and comprehensible for students.

A major serious problem in applying the monolingual principle in L2 teaching seems to be comprehension (Asher 1993). Pellowe (1998) agrees with (Weschler (1997) in assuming that there seems to be a mismatch in the relationship between communicative methods and monolingual methods of teaching in this aspect. Weschler clarifies that

"if one assumes that a basic tenet of true communication should be “comprehensible input”, then if anything an English-only approach for most students would be totally non-communicative”.

Krashen (1985) claims that one of the methods ‘acquirers’ apply to understand messages is their knowledge of the world. If we apply this to L2 learners in the classroom, as we have argued in chapter 1, it should be clear that the L1 is a very important part of this knowledge. It is, therefore, possible to claim that L1 use in the classroom could be one source of ensuring that the input is comprehensible to all learners. According to Krashen (1985)
himself, this reference to the L1 is an advantageous resource which enables adult learners to get more comprehensible input than do young learners of the L2, and consequently they can participate earlier in conversations. Moreover, he states clearly that resorting to the L1 facilitates this process.

Proponents of the monolingual approach to learning claim that, by using the L2 only, students associate the L2 utterance with the actual situation or object. Dodson (1967) points out that this process is not that simple or direct, even in L1 acquisition. This association, as Dodson claims, happens only after a huge number of active oral contacts with the target item.

Whether we want it or not, the L2 learner will associate the L2 expression with what he is already familiar with, meaning the L1 equivalent "because he has already available a well established system of language which he did not have when as an infant he attached "labels" to things. The foreign language learner makes use of this possession, even if he/she learns his/her language in the foreign country" (Dodson 1967: 53). Association of the L2 with the real situation or object will happen over time and not all at once, without being affected by reference to the L1. Dodson comments that if the teacher wants to teach monolingually "he would first of all have to destroy the firm association the pupil has between his native language and the universe of things" (1967: 53). Even after a long time of natural exposure to the L1 children master the concrete concepts before the abstract ones (Weschler 1997). Adults cannot restart this process again from the beginning, and, if forced to, this will result in a 'cognitive gap', as has been shown in chapter 1 (p. 18) (Skinner 1985). Skinner quotes from Vygotsky that meaning results from connecting words and thoughts; the use of L2 only for explaining meaning will hinder this connection as the L2 learner, especially at the early stages, does not have enough L2 vocabulary to link to thoughts, especially with abstract words. On the other hand, relying on extralinguistic clues, although it can help at early stages, may put limits on the growth of meaning. "Thus, .... the use of L2 as the instructional language almost creates a dependency upon contextual clues for access to meaning; but this dependency soon evolves from an avenue to learning into an obstacle to higher proficiency in L2" (Skinner 1985: 380). Skinner concludes that the most direct and effective way to avoid cognitive disfunction is to link L2 words to L1 meanings.
In support of this, research shows that students remember L2 vocabulary better when they are presented with an L1 translation than when presented with other L2 equivalents (Oskarsson 1975). Also, more recently, Lotto & De Groot (1998) found that retention was better when L2 vocabulary was presented with L1 translation than when presented with pictures. Not only that, but, even in cases when L2 words were presented with pictures, students tended to resort to their L1 for help (Kroll et al. 1998). These retention rates, though, were observed in the short-term; in case of long-term retention, Hulstijn (2003) agrees with Lotto & De Groot (1998) in that frequent exposure or rehearsal, in other words, practice, is needed.

More recent research in psycholinguistics on lexical meaning provides further evidence that beginner or less proficient learners associate L2 words with their L1 equivalents. They are faster in translating words than in naming pictures; they are also faster in translating from L2 to L1 than from L1 to L2 (Kroll & Sunderman 2003). Only with increased proficiency, do L2 learners begin to relate L2 words directly to concepts. Yet, the link between words and concepts remains stronger in the case of the L1 than the L2, as the L1 is more activated in the L2 learners' minds. Learners will need more conscious effort to suppress the L1 activation (Kroll & Sunderman 2003). This may be because the L1, as Paradis (2004) indicates, is strongly integrated within learners' general communicative system. We also saw in chapters 1 and 2 that other methods of input simplification and modification do not guarantee understanding the input. Alternatively in (sections 1.3.3 and 2.2.3), we showed how the L1 can enhance the input for better comprehension and communication (This will be fully developed in chapter 7).

4.2.1.3 Use of the L1 helps to push the interaction
Some learners can learn from mere exposure to input, but some learners learn more from producing language themselves, testing their interlanguage (Hedge 2000). Interaction, as Tsui (2001: 121) puts it, "refers to the interrelationship between input and output". Brumfit (1980) argues that communication is all about negotiating meaning. Negotiation of meaning has always been considered an important aspect in the "interaction hypothesis" (see section 1.1.3.3). It helps to modify the input to make it more comprehensible, and sheds light on the relationship between form and function which consequently adds to language development, something which 'comprehensible input' alone cannot achieve (Long & Robinson 1998). Negotiation of meaning also helps to make the output more comprehensible through forcing
learners to try to make themselves understood, and giving them a chance to get feedback for their output (Swain 1985).

From a socio-cultural perspective, we have seen that use of the LI is a psycholinguistic process that facilitates initiating and maintaining the interaction (Brooks & Donato 1994, Villamil & Guerrero 1996). Additionally, allowing the use of LI eliminates the need for resorting to avoidance strategies, especially with L2 forms which could be problematic (Corder 1983b, Faerch & Kasper 1983, see section 1.3.4). On the practical level, Pellowe (1998) and Lynch (1996) argue convincingly that opportunities for the negotiation of meaning become less when students share the same LI and similar proficiency levels. Pellowe (1998) adds that negotiation is even less likely to succeed when it is among large groups of students, in which students may feel uneasy about speaking aloud or asking for clarification. The result is that they may pretend to understand rather than initiate negotiation. This applies to EFL students, especially less advanced students in large classes (such as is the case in Egyptian schools). Hence, Pellowe suggests the limited use of LI in order to guide negotiation and push it forward. He also adds that the teacher’s knowledge of the LI is an asset, as it helps him/her to know what his/her students need to say, detect any errors or gaps within their L2 knowledge, and thus can guide them to negotiate such aspects in the L2.

Pellowe (1998) also claims that excluding the LI from negotiation of meaning or from communicative interaction in general may trivialize discussion, while LI use allows students to be more productive. Mitchell in her study (1988: 168) makes a similar comment about classroom communication in general: “a commitment to operate through the L2 alone was a constraint on the type of content that might be communicated about” (my italics). Hancock (1997) adds that mechanical repetition of L2 words, on the other hand, will add nothing to the class interaction,

“some LI interjections are a natural by-product of charge in the interaction, and that charge could all too easily be defused by an inflexible insistence on the L2. On the other hand, some L2 contributions are simply recited, in some cases without comprehension, and thus lack any charge” (Hancock 1997: 233)

Brumfit (1980: 127) himself (an advocate of the communicative approach) recommended the use of LI with beginning learners (especially in monolingual settings) to encourage “frequent and rapid exchange”
4.2.2 Use of the L1 to aid explicit declarative learning of the language

We have seen, in chapters 1 and 2, how formal aspects of the language can play a positive role in language learning and, even, communicating in the L2. According to Lightbown & Spada (2000), relying on context and extra linguistic information for making the input clear is not enough for many students. They add that this is time consuming, and that in monolingual classes, in particular, some features need to be presented explicitly employing contrastive analysis techniques. Gregg (1984) and McLaughlin (1987), in the same way, confirm that rules such as those for the formation of yes/no questions, passive voice, etc. need explicit presentation. On the practical level, Heltai (1989: 289) points out that, in monolingual classes (as is the case in Egypt), “opportunities for naturalistic acquisition are few; thus formal teaching remains important”. Atkinson (1993b) agrees that some lexical and grammatical items can better be explained by contrasting them to the L1. In her empirical study, Mitchell (1988) reports that teachers believe that explicit techniques of teaching contribute to the development of the L2 beyond communicative competence.

According to the cognitive view of learning (section 1.2.2), when an interaction between newly acquired knowledge and old knowledge occurs in the students’ mind, this may lead to sudden discoveries which trigger progress (McLaughlin 1987, Lightbown & Spada 1993). This seems to apply to L1 use; learners may be exposed to certain information in the L2, but when they are exposed to this same knowledge in their L1 they seem to discover new aspects or components of meaning that they did not assimilate or missed when exposed to the L2 only. This will, in turn, lead them to review their former knowledge or, from a cognitive view, to ‘restructure’ it. Translation seems to be an effective activity in achieving this: “certain aspects of foreign language, both grammatical and lexical, tend to escape the attention of learners if translation is never used” (Heltai 1989: 290). Aarts (1968) and Cook (1998) also agree that, in translation activities, students will be obliged to deal with the difficulties that they may encounter in a text, and not avoid them, as happens when they write a free composition, or carry out a communicative activity, for example (see section 2.2.3).

4.2.3 Use of the L1 to aid affective aspects of learning

“The classroom is ... a unique social environment with its own human activities and its own conventions governing these activities” (Legutke and Thomas 1991: 2). Burden (2000)
confirms that prohibiting the L1 from the language classroom ignores the most important member, that is, the students themselves. It is claimed that the use of L1 minimizes students’ feeling that their L1 is criticized or seen as inferior to the L2 (especially in the case of English as a powerful global language) (Nation 1978, Schweers 1999, Widdowson 2001), and eliminates their feeling of alienation (Rinvolucri 2001), which makes them understand better. Joseph & Ramani (1998) used translation activities as a way of achieving this. Auerbach (1993) believes that the use of L1 for negotiating and solving the problems that students may encounter in their life is a tool to empower them. Through the use of L1 students can say what they want (Harbord 1992).

From a humanistic point of view, “learners are seen not so much as full-time linguistic objects at whom language teaching is aimed, but rather as human individuals” (Medgyes 1986: 109). As referred to in chapter 1 (section 2.2.4), one of the main themes in humanistic learning is respect for an individual’s subjective experience (Underhill 1989). If we agree that one of the most important subjective experiences for any individual is his native language, then the use of L1 could be an important tool in ensuring that L2 learning is a satisfactory experience from the affective point of view. The prohibition of the students’ L1 deprives them, and the learning/teaching process itself, of their valuable long-established experiences, and, thereby, hinders the learning process (Auerbach 1993). Hymes, who first emphasized the importance of ‘communicative competence’, even went further to talk of a state of ‘repression’ for students who were denied the right to use their L1 or, as he called it, “normal competence” in classrooms (Hymes 1972: xxi).

Burden (2000) claims that even in cases where students do not strongly support the use of L1 with some language aspects such as explaining grammar, giving instructions, or discussing the target culture, they strongly support the use of L1 for relaxation. So, as he comments: “when deemed necessary, the student has recourse to the language they are most comfortable serving the basic psychological needs” (Burden 2000: 146, 147). Auerbach (1993: 19) adds that L1 use gives learners “a sense of security and validates the learners’ lived experiences”. Schweers (1999: 2) found that almost 89% of his students expressed a need to use the L1 in the L2 classroom; they said “it helps them when they feel lost”. Medgyes (1994) and Spolsky (1989) agree with the view that adopting methods or strategies that students prefer benefits them. One of the strategies that writers agree that is preferred by most students is referring to the L1 (Atkinson 1987, Harbord 1992, Cook 1998). This is emphasized by Widdowson
(2001), who, as mentioned earlier, claims that however hard teachers try to establish a monolingual method of teaching, students resort to a bilingual strategy that conforms to their needs and preferences.

Nunan (1988) adds that learners will benefit more if they are provided with language aspects which they need and consider urgent to increase their motivation, and that could be within their proficiency level and, above all, to help them develop general learning skills besides the language skills. He suggests that:

"it would seem imperative to provide the maximum amount of information to learners, through bilingual assistance where necessary and/or possible, and set up mechanisms to facilitate the maximum amount of negotiation and consultation" (my italics). (Nunan 1988: 95, 96)

In line with this, Campbell & Kryszewska (1992) made a good use of their students' LI and native culture to compensate for the lack of good materials in the form of translation activities which learners themselves collected, and which centred on their own experiences. They thought that this had a double benefit: they learned in preparing the material, thus teaching themselves, and in working on it in the classroom with other students, thus teaching each other.

This real sense of ‘openness’ and ‘learner-centeredness’ fosters the belief that excluding such an important aspect as the LI use from the L2 classroom represents a mismatch with affective aspects of learning.

From the previous discussion, it seems clear that the LI can serve in establishing an affective relationship among students, and between them and their teacher. This might be indicated in Schweers’, in which he quotes one of his teachers’ answers to the reason he uses the LI saying: “.... To establish rapport with my students, and ... to serve as a model person who speaks both languages and uses each one whenever necessary or convenient” (Schweers’ 1999: 3).

4.2.4 Use of the LI to aid organizational aspects of classroom learning

In chapter 3, we have seen that many internal and external factors work to influence the teacher’s behaviour. Earlier in this section, it has been argued that managing interaction parallels managing learning. One of the skills a good teacher should have is to be able to
manage the interaction and the activities involved in it in an effective way.

According to Hedge (2000), managing communicative classes can be more demanding and challenging for teachers. He adds that putting more emphasis on learners' autonomy in recent communicative and learner-centred approaches does not mean less responsibility for teachers. "The teacher remains the ultimate organizer of activity, the one who must ensure positive learning outcomes for students" (Hedge 2000: 67). This involves clarifying to students what they need to do, and how and why they need to do it. According to socio-cultural interactionists (section 1.2.3), some tasks may have not been accomplished if the students did not refer to the L1 to support their understanding of them. Teachers' use of the L1 also can support students' understanding of different tasks and requirements. Managing the interaction also involves the ability to involve, monitor and guide students, and above all to eliminate or minimize disruption (Hedge 2000).

**Conclusion**

The chapter shed light on the potential force of the L1 use in L2 classrooms when used in a theoretically justified way that is based on sound teaching and learning principles (as informed by chapters 1 & 2), a sound understanding of the practical realities of the classroom context (as shown in chapter 3), as well as a sound study of the nature of classroom learning and interaction (as proposed in the first section of this chapter). Our theoretically based framework of L1 use shows that the L1 can be used in an optimal way to contribute positively to L2 learning and interaction in formal FL classrooms. The use of the L1 has been shown potentially to contribute to communicative aspects of classroom teaching in a way that helps to enhance comprehension of and interaction in the L2. The use of the L1 has been also shown to contribute to formal aspects of classroom teaching in a way that helps to enhance explicit aspects of learning. The use of the L1 has been shown to contribute to humanistic aspects of classroom teaching in a way that helps to enhance affective aspects of learning, which consequently enhances both implicit and explicit aspects of learning. The use of the L1 has been further shown to contribute to organizational aspects of the classroom teaching in a way that helps to enhance the management of the interaction and accordingly, the management of learning. In chapter 7, we will link the discussion of optimality in L1 use to real samples of teachers' uses of the L1 to see how and in what way the L1 can be used in an optimal way to ensure communication and/or learning as Macaro (2005) recommends. This will be aimed towards raising teachers' awareness of an optimal view of the L1 use.
instead of the dominant maximal view documented in the literature with the aim of helping them improve their teaching as suggested by Polio and Duff (1994) (section 3.3).

Chapter 5 will, now, set out an informative method of research, referring to these theoretical bases, to examine what actually happens in a typical EFL classroom, where the L2 is only encountered in the L2 classroom, and where teachers and students share the same L1. This theoretically justified framework will then guide a pilot study to collect evidence of possible functional L1 uses that have the potential to be used in an optimal way. This will be the basis for an empirical study that aims at finding out how teachers (and their students) perceive the value of L1 use in FL teaching, and how they actually use it (to what extent, and for what functions) in Egyptian EFL classrooms. Chapter 6 will present the results and interpret them. Chapter 7 will work as an awareness raising exercise, in the sense that it will offer examples of missed opportunities of L1 use from the study sample. These missed opportunities of L1 uses will, in turn, be contrasted with counterpart examples of potential optimal uses of the L1 to show how they could have contributed to different aspects of learning and interaction. These examples will contribute to raising teachers’ awareness of how and in what way the L1 can best be optimally used to offer opportunities for promoting aspects of learning of and interaction in the L2.
Chapter 5
Research Methodology

In chapter 3, the empirical data from L2 classrooms did not show that the L1 was used in accordance with theoretical bases or convictions. In other words, there was no evidence that the L1 was used to achieve learning purposes. Rather, the L1 was shown to be used mainly as a pedagogical tool that helps teachers to achieve instructional functions overcoming "inconvenient" teaching/learning situations. Classroom contextual realities figured as the major motivation and justification behind teachers' use of the L1. This resulted in inconsistent patterns of L1 use with no clear theoretical bases, and detected feelings of guilt on the part of teachers who used the L1 in the L2 classroom. In chapter 4, we established the need to implement an optimal view of L1 use that is derived from careful consideration of both the psycholinguistic justifications of its use and the classroom realities; in other words, from sound theoretical as well as practical bases. We set the principles for an optimal view of L1 use where the L1 was shown to contribute to interaction and learning purposes. In the next stage of our study, we will seek to examine the use of the L1 in actual classrooms in Egypt. Our intention is first to understand a) what perceptions about the use of the L1 are present among teachers and students, b) what uses of the L1 are made in Egyptian classrooms. Once we have this basic set of information, we will be able to compare the perceptions and the realities with each other, and with our more "idealized" view of what the use of the L1 could achieve. This will also help us to find out what motivations lie behind teachers' use of the L1. In addition, we will have acquired a set of examples of classroom interaction where the L1 has been used, and of examples where it has not been used but perhaps could have been used. These will then be used to examine the extent to which our views of the potential uses of the L1 can be justified.

In order to carry out such a study, we need to formulate operational research questions and devise instruments which will give us an empirical basis. These instruments will also need to be piloted in an environment which is, at least, comparable to that of Egypt in some respects. Although we referred to the research questions in the introduction it may be appropriate to replicate them in this chapter.

5.1 Research questions

1) What do teachers in Egyptian classes think of as the value of the use of the L1?
2) What do pupils in Egyptian classes think of as the value of the use of the L1?
3) To what extent do teachers in Egyptian classrooms make use of the L1?
4) What functions do these uses fulfil?
5) What does the relationship between the perceptions of 1 and 2 and the observations of 3 and 4 reveal about the motivations behind teachers' use of the L1?
6) On the basis of the discoveries related to 1 – 5, what could be done to ensure an optimal use of the L1 in Egyptian classrooms based on firm learning and teaching principles?

5.2 The study design
The central choice in the study design was between carrying out an experiment, controlling variables and adopting quantitative methods of analysis (interventionist/experimental research) and carrying out a naturalistic study, not interfering in the context or controlling variables, and adopting qualitative methods of analysis (descriptive/interpretive research). Lynch argues that designing experiments and adopting quantitative methods of analysis is more related to research aiming at confirming "specific, intended results" (Lynch 1996: 15). On the other hand, naturalistic qualitative research involves description, interpretation, and understanding of the phenomena to be studied.

Interventionist or experimental research, with its claims for high levels of control and replicability, concentrates on what can be rigorously measured. This tends to ignore or obscure the contexts and realities in which the process of teaching/learning takes place and which is important in understanding the act of teaching.

"The risk in such work is that only what can be rigorously measured is examined. Some argue that such procedures restrict us to examining the trivial and simple, and ignoring the complex but much more important real world in which teachers and learners have to operate" (Brumfit & Mitchell 1990: 12).

Teachers and learners have their own feelings, attitudes, and plans. The context in which they operate can affect these attitudes and plans. Interventionist research and quantitative methods of analysis, which are dependant on controlling variables and laboratory-like treatments, cannot capture such features.

Descriptive research, by comparison, as Brumfit and Mitchell (1990: 11) put it,
will aim at providing as accurate an account as possible of what current practice is: how learners do learn, how teachers do teach, what classrooms do look like, at a particular moment in a particular place. In itself such work will only be illuminating if the description is carried out with a particular intention in mind.

Since the issue of L1 use is controversial and not settled yet, and since, as has been shown (in chapter 3), there are many pedagogical and contextual factors that contribute to its occurrence, it was thought better for the study to focus on

"how to identify, describe and relate, in intersubjective terms, actions and contributions of participants in the L2 classroom, in such a way that their significance for language learning can be understood" (van Lier 1988: 47).

The logic or the justification behind the descriptive approach to research is that expectations of teachers, recommendations of teacher educators and theorists, and the demands of administrators, are often rightly concerned with what ought to be. However, there is little point in constantly pushing for an ideal without any understanding of what in fact happens (Brumfit and Mitchell 1990: 11, 12).

This is particularly relevant to the current study where theory (as has been shown in chapters 1 and 2) and official recommendations (see the discussion in chapter 6) sometimes push for an 'ideal' (Teach in the L2), ignoring or overlooking the realities of the classroom situation. Thus, a naturalistic, non-interventionist approach was seen to be more appropriate for describing, interpreting and understanding the phenomenon in its context.

Moreover, our commitment to establish principles or bases for ensuring a view of optimality in L1 use, rather than the mere description of the phenomena as it happens in the FL classroom, would require "an approach that respects the nature of the social world, which allows it to reveal its nature to us" (Hammersley & Atkinson 1983: 12). What is needed, then, is a method that helps further in discovering, interpreting, and understanding the possible variables that have an influence on the phenomena and the relationships between them, rather than a method that isolates or eliminates variables. Ethnography is a social research method that mainly employs participant observation, and collects data from as many resources as possible to understand the phenomena under research.

One of the distinctive characteristics and goals of ethnographic research is the development of theory (Hammersley & Atkinson 1983). Yet, Silverman (1993) objects that this ignores the fact that research explicitly or implicitly is guided at its earliest phases by some theory.
Ethnography can also help in testing theories, especially on the micro context level like in the case of controversial issues or claims. In our case, we have seen the controversy over the issue of L1 use; to use Silverman's (1993: 47) term, it is "theory-saturated". Throughout the first two chapters, we were involved in a process of theory-exploration to study and understand the theoretical debate around the issue of L1 use. In chapter 3, empirical evidence showed that the L1 is used in the L2 classroom regardless of the theories or ideologies adopted. In chapter 4, we managed to generate a theoretical framework to establish the potential value of L1 use. In the rest of the thesis, we will make use of this framework within an ethnographical approach to research in order to examine the attitude and practice of Egyptian teachers in comparison with our optimal view.

The study then is not intended to implement any controlled treatments or process-product investigations to test the value of the L1 use. This is not a case of testing predetermined hypotheses that are based on a priori theory or a certain ideology. The study sets out to describe L1 use through adopting a qualitative descriptive approach to examining how the L1 is viewed and actually used by L2 teachers in EFL classrooms. Further, the study attempts to examine and explain the factors behind teachers' practices with the aim of discovering and understanding any patterns, regularities or irregularities in teachers' L1 use. This is an important step in giving the research an explanatory force (Cohen et al. 2000).

In the following section, we will give more information about the ethnographic approach and the ethnographic methods of data collection adopted in this study.

5.3 Ethnographic research
Ethnography traditionally refers to the work of anthropologists studying unknown communities (living among them, taking field notes). Gradually, this work was extended to include studying groups of people (known or unknown) with distinguishing characteristics (van Lier 1990); it is in this sense that ethnography has been employed in education and linguistics. We saw in chapter 4 how the classroom has been defined as a distinct social context that has its own communicative potential and metacommunicative purpose.

Ethnographic research usually adopts naturalistic qualitative methods of research and is process-oriented (van Lier 1988). Thus, "the emphasis is on observing, describing, interpreting and understanding how events take place in the real world rather than in a
controlled laboratory-like setting” (Lynch 1996: 14). According to Lynch, a characteristic of this research is that it treats truth as a non-objective phenomenon; it is mainly qualitative in method.

Process-oriented qualitative researchers explore the intersubjective and context-dependent nature of classroom events as they occur, noting the regularities and idiosyncrasies in the events. In order for researchers to derive the implicit rules governing the participants' behaviour, however, regularity of particular events or sequences in the discourse must be observed. This regularity then will support reliable claims about rules of interaction. It also allows for counting and other quantitative analyses; the ultimate need for generality and for comparisons across classroom contexts inevitably requires such quantification of events (Chaudron 1988: 48, 49).

Thus, quantitative methods can also be adopted when needed for the benefit of the research and to address the issue of generalizability. Allwright & Bailey (1991) report that combining qualitative and quantitative techniques of research is most useful. Some qualitative analyses need to be complemented by some quantitative treatments, such as the frequency of units of behaviour (Chaudron 1988). The current study adopts mainly a qualitative approach incorporating quantitative treatments whenever applicable and useful, such as counting occurrences or correlating events. As Chaudron (1988: 15) puts it: “Almost every ethnographic or discourse analytical study refers to the frequency magnitude or proportion of occurrences of analytical units observed”.

What really distinguishes ethnography within naturalistic research is that it addresses the issues of watching, asking, and reviewing (Cohen et al. 2000). This makes ethnographic research open to a variety of research methods/designs, data collection tools, and data analysis techniques. The technique of using different resources to obtain information about the same data is known as triangulation. Triangulation is a method that helps in overcoming the bias in the observer’s perspective (Long 1983). Ethnography allows for what Denzin (1970) calls multiple triangulation; “the greater the triangulation, the greater the confidence in the observed findings” Denzin (1970: 472). In our theoretical discussion of the background of the issue of LI use in L2 teaching, we have employed theoretical triangulation (multi-theoretical views), from which, we derived our theoretical hypotheses about optimal LI use. On the empirical level, we also opted for triangulation in collecting and analyzing our data; this is called methodological triangulation (Denzin 1970). “Multiple methods are suitable where a controversial aspect of education needs to be evaluated more
fully” (Cohen et al. 2000). Methodological triangulation is claimed to facilitate internal validity (Seliger & Shohamy 1989, Cohen et al. 2000). “By using a variety of procedures and obtaining data from a variety of sources the researcher often obtains rich and comprehensive data. Such data usually provide an expanded and global picture of the phenomenon, as each source provides additional data” (Seliger & Shohamy 1989: 160). Thus, although each technique alone may not suffice, a combination of techniques all focussed from different angles on the same point may provide a convincing explanation of a given phenomenon and overcome the limitations and possible bias of using a single method.

As for methods of data collection, the criterion as Cohen et al. (2000: 146) set it is “fitness for purpose”. “In practice ethnographers employ a range of techniques which lie along a continuum from non-intervention to intervention and from unstructured to structured” (van Lier 1988: 56). These include (among other things) eliciting participants’ views (employing questionnaires and interviews), classroom observation (including recording and transcribing), and discourse analysis (including studying and analyzing transcripts, and coding segments of discourse into categories/analytical units). These three particular methods will represent, as will be shown later, the main ethnographic components that will be employed in the current study to help in collecting data about potential functions of L1 use.

Data analysis “involves organizing, accounting for, and explaining the data; in short, making sense of the data in terms of the participants’ definitions of the situation, noting patterns, themes, categories and regularities” (Cohen et al. 2000: 147).

The value of the qualitative insights lies in their power to alter perspectives on the variables of interest and to aid in the development of theoretical constructs or relationships (Chaudron 1988: 47, 48).

Thus, the qualitative analysis requires moving from mere description to understanding, explanation and theory generation (when applicable) (Cohen et al. 2000). To achieve this, Cohen et al. define in detail seven steps for qualitative analysis. These briefly are:

Step 1 Establish units of analysis of the data indicating how these units are similar to and different from each other.
Step 2 Create a ‘domain analysis’.
Step 3 Establish relationships and linkages between the domains.
Step 4 Make speculative inferences.
Step 5 Summarize.
Step 6 Seeking negative and discrepant cases.
Step 7 Theory generation. (Cohen et al. 2000: 148)

These steps will be employed in the analysis of our data in the next chapter; we will refer to them wherever relevant. As for the last step (theory generation), we made it clear earlier that we are not concerned with theory building; the current issue is theory-saturated and we, rather, sought guidance from multi-theoretical dimensions to set out the principles or bases for an optimal view of L1 use.

Ethnographic research has its own problems, though. An accusation levelled against the ethnographic approach is that it lacks the grounds for generalizability. Goetz & LeCompte (1993) argue that generalizability is not a goal for ethnographic research. Lincoln & Guba (1985) point out that in quantitative and experimental research, “the intention is to focus on similarities and to be able to make generalizations, whereas in [ethnography] the objective is informational, to provide such a wealth of detail that the uniqueness and individuality of each case can be represented”. Dobbert & Kurth-Schai (1992: 150), though, propose that ethnographic research can aim for generalizability in that the “task of ethnographers is to balance a commitment to catch the diversity, variability, creativity, individuality, uniqueness and spontaneity of social interactions ...... with a commitment to the task of social science to seek regularities, order and patterns within such diversity”. On the other hand Cohen et al. (2000: 138) suggest that “generalizability is interpreted as generalizability to identifiable, specific settings and subjects rather than universally” That is what the current study limits itself to with regard to generalizability; i.e. the study will claim to be generalizable to similar schools in similar contexts rather than to the FL context anywhere (in spite of the fact that our category coding scheme seems adequate to cover all possible L1 functions in both contexts of EFL in Egypt and MFL in England).

Van Lier (1990) also points out that ethnographic research has been criticized on two bases: it lacks strength in terms of reliability and validity and it may be done in a subjective irresponsible way. Van Lier suggests four conditions for overcoming these criticisms and validating ethnographic research. The following is a summary of these conditions:

a) Adhering to the “emic and holistic principles”. This requires a focus on the meaningfulness of the phenomenon to the participants (rather than to the observer)
and in relation to the context (rather than, for example, mere counting of the events or isolating variables).

b) Defining and making explicit the relevant contextual features.

c) Reporting with transparency on the processes used for inference and reasoning.

d) “Intensive immersion in the data” which requires “analysis of minute pieces of data”.

(Adapted from Van Lier 1990: 45)

Throughout the analysis and discussion of the data in this study, every effort will be made to ensure that these conditions are respected.

The nature of ethnographic research: the researcher’s and participants’ involvement, naturalistic observation, using low inference categories, thick description, as well as the richness of information achieved by triangulation allows it to claim a sufficient level of internal validity and reliability. These kinds of data collection and analyses necessitate and guarantee continuous reference and refinement to data (Goetz & LeCompte 1984). The fact that ethnographic research studies the phenomena in its natural context increases its ecological validity. “Since it investigates social processes in everyday settings rather than in those set up for the purposes of research, the danger that the findings will apply only to the research situation is generally lessened” (Hammersley & Atkinson 1983: 24). Some researchers even call for replacing the notion of validity by other concepts that are more relevant to qualitative data and ethnography such as ‘authenticity’ (Guba & Lincoln 1989), or ‘understanding’ (Maxwell 1992).

External validity is hard to achieve in ethnographic research as it is related to the degree of comparability and generalizability of the results to other contexts. In ethnographic research, it is hard to isolate or control variables, to pick a random sample for research, to separate humans’ behaviour from its context, and consequently to generalize results to other contexts. To help in providing grounds for comparability, transferability, and consequently generalizability, Lincoln & Guba (1985) recommend the provision of rich data (thick description) for others to consult and determine what is suitable for their own situations. Hence, the commitment of the current study to detailed description of the context and the sample.
Content validity concerns the instruments and how far they cover the area they are supposed to measure. We will show how our tools were extensively worked on to secure as maximal a representation as possible to the phenomena through the use of theoretically based hypotheses, participants' views, and actual exemplification of potential L1 uses within the context of classroom teaching. Reference to the validity of each of these instruments will be made in the relevant sections.

If validity means the accuracy of the findings, reliability refers to the replicability of these findings (Goetz & LeCompte 1984). As Goetz & LeCompte point out, determining reliability in ethnographic research is not easy; "ethnographic design may appear to baffle attempts at replication. The type of data and the research process itself may preclude the use of standardized controls so essential in experimental research" (Goetz & LeCompte 1984: 211).

They propose that:

replicability is impossible without precise identification and thorough description of strategies used to collect data. Similarly, adequate assessment of any ethnographic study requires explicit description of techniques used to acquire data: the varieties of observational and interviewing strategies, the range of noninteractive methods, and the strategies used in amplifying, modifying, and refining data during early stages of analysis while researchers are still in the field. In addition, descriptions should specify how observations were recorded, mechanically or by field notes, how any field notes were composed, in situ or post hoc, the circumstances under which interviews were conducted, and how materials from various sources were integrated into the study (Goetz & LeCompte 1984: 217).

Therefore, detailed description of how the research instruments were designed and used, and how data were analyzed are key factors in establishing both validity and reliability in ethnographic research. These techniques were thought to enrich and strengthen our data and our tools, which were derived from and embedded in the participants' views and the context, more than the use of other standardized reliability measures used in experimental research and that may be irrelevant, restrictive, or distorting.

Accommodating to the strictures of experimental control requires manipulation of phenomena that distorts their natural occurrence. Attempts at rigorous measurement may impede construction of powerful analytic categories if the phenomena observed are prematurely or inappropriately reduced or standardized (Goetz & LeCompte 1984: 211).

Two of the specific techniques that Goetz & LeCompte referred to for securing internal reliability are 'low inference descriptors' and 'mechanically recorded data'. The former
includes reporting accurately and intensively on raw data, giving examples and discussing discrepant data; the latter includes photographs, videotapes and audiotapes, including coding and classification. Audio recording, coding and classification will be employed in this study. As a guide for the classification work of the recorded material, we will utilize the four categories of the theoretical framework derived from the multi-theoretical discussion (see chapter 4). The importance of this adherence to our theoretical framework is to strengthen the reliability of the categorization system. “A primary safeguard against unreliability is assuring that concepts are derived from the theoretical framework that informs the study. It provides an anchor for consistency from which legitimate, well-explicated departures can be made” (Goetz & LeCompte 1984: 220). Furthermore, in our effort to strengthen the reliability and validity of our analyses, an effort will be made to refer in detail and with ‘low inference descriptors’ to data; a whole chapter (chapter 7) will be dedicated to giving examples from the recordings as “it is this material that provides reviewers, judges, and other readers with the means for accepting, rejecting, or modifying an investigator’s conclusions” (Goetz & LeCompte 1984: 218).

Now, we will discuss in some detail the ethnographic components or the triangulated methods that were employed in the current study. These will include: a) eliciting participants’ views, b) classroom observation, and c) discourse analysis.

5.3.1 Eliciting participants’ views
Participants’ views are important in ethnographic research (Polio 1996). It is through this procedure that we can fulfil the emic principle referred to earlier, which contributes to the validity of the research (Van Lier 1990). Bell (1993: 6) indicates that qualitative research aims to “understand individual’s perceptions of the world. Seek insight rather than statistical analysis. Search whether social facts exist”. Van Lier (1988) adds that attending to teachers’ and learners’ concerns can help in minimizing the gap between research and practice.

According to Seliger & Shohamy (1989: 172), “questionnaires are used mostly to collect data on phenomena which are not easily observed, such as attitudes, motivation, and self-concepts. They are also used to collect data on the process involved in using language and to obtain background information about the research subjects”. Seliger & Shohamy (1989) show that questionnaires can be unstructured, in the sense that they include open questions, where participants give their own opinions, describe and comment, or they can be structured,
in which participants tick or choose from already designated answers. (The design of the
teacher’s questionnaire used in this study will be explained in section 5.8.1.1). Another tool
for collecting data about views and perceptions is the use of interviews, which, as Seliger &
Shohamy (1989) point out, is often related to the use of questionnaires. According to Seliger
and Shohamy (1989: 166) interviews “are personalized and therefore permit a level of in-
depth information gathering, free response, and flexibility that cannot be obtained by other
procedures”. Interviews can be structured or open. The latter allows for more freedom in
expressing views, and for novel and deep information. This technique is more related to
qualitative and descriptive research (Seliger & Shohamy 1989).

Learners’ views are also important in examining any teaching practice, as the whole process
of teaching, as shown earlier, aims for learning to take place (Malamah-Thomas 1987).
Students’ views about the L1 use and their expectations of their teachers’ use of the L1 were
thought to be important in helping to explain or justify some of the teacher’s uses of, or
beliefs about, the L1. So, a questionnaire was designed for this purpose (see section 5.9.1.2).

5.3.2 Classroom observation
In line with rejecting any pre-established method of teaching with definite prescriptions, or
taken for granted axioms, concern of research methodology shifted to classroom based
research as an attempt to describe what actually happens inside classrooms (Allwright 1988).
Observation became an essential tool in descriptive research; it was seen as:

“an alternative approach to classroom language learning research, an approach that
would no longer see the language teaching world in terms of major rival ‘methods’,
and one that would be more respectful to the complexities of the language teacher’s
task” (Allwright 1988: 10).

Classroom observation is thought to be useful either in mere description of what goes on
between the teacher and students or in evaluating the effectiveness of different styles and
techniques that teachers use in relation to learning outcomes, or learning theory-based
hypotheses. It is also important in evaluating different educational contexts (Chaudron 1988,
Allwright 1988). Seliger & Shohamy (1989: 162) agree with that, saying that the main
advantage of using classroom observations as a tool for collecting data is that “they allow the
study of phenomenon at close range with many of the contextual variables present, a feature
which is very important in studying language behaviours”. As Cohen et al. (2000) point out,
it provides first hand information; it helps in understanding the phenomena as they are not as
the participants perceive them or think they are.

Classroom observation can also range from unstructured to structured. In a highly structured
observation, the researcher works out his/her hypotheses and categories beforehand and goes
into the class with the purpose of testing (either confirming or refuting) them. By contrast, in
an unstructured observation, the researcher goes into the classroom with no previous plan
(full exhaustive ethnography). In between lies the semi-structured observation which “will
have an agenda of issues but will gather data to illuminate these issues in a far less pre­
determined or systematic manner”. It shares the approach of unstructured observation in that
it is hypothesis generating and in that it “will review observational data before suggesting an
explanation for the phenomena being observed” (Cohen et al. 2000: 305).

Chaudron (1988) points out that L2 researchers tend to concentrate their detailed analyses on
some particular aspects of classroom interaction rather than work on an exhaustive
ethnography of the whole classroom. The current study adopts semi-structured observation
(guided by the theoretical framework categories generated in chapter 4) with the aim of
collecting actual data for explaining the phenomenon of LI use as it happens in the L2
classroom.

Early observational studies concentrated on analyzing classroom verbal interaction (e.g.
They sought to code the verbal interaction in the L2 classroom according to predetermined
categories (systematic observation).

Yet, classroom observation of this type was criticized for relying on quick surface
observations of certain features to be noted on the spot according to predetermined
categories. They did not agree on the basic categories for classifying the same dimensions of
interaction as they were subject to the purposes of the researchers (Van Lier 1988).

The category-coding tradition is inescapably locked into a circularity, due to the
selection of categories that are deemed relevant. The criteria of their selection must
come from some theory or ideology ..... They must also be held to be clear and
unambiguous, directly observable and countable, and this inevitably excludes from the
sphere of operations some of the most interesting features of classroom interaction
....... Finally, when the time for counting arrives, it is unquestioningly assumed that
more (of whatever it is that is called relevant) is necessarily better (Van Lier 1988: 43).
This cast doubts on the objectivity and reliability of classroom observation and its neutrality as a research tool. "Neutrality in CR [classroom research] means studying the interaction as it occurs in the context, from the perspective of those that are being studied" (Van Lier 1988: 40). It has to be noted that "this context is not only a linguistic or cognitive one, it is also essentially a social context" (Van Lier 1988: 37).

The view that the classroom is a social context contributed to the adoption of ethnographic methods in classroom research. These include, in addition to observation, taking field notes, recording (video or audio), and eliciting participants' views (Van Lier 1990). Ethnography was seen as a more objective method of studying the classroom than systematic observation. Ethnography requires:

- a concern for the social context, or the whole picture, and the need to take the participants' perspectives as the basis for description. This means that classroom study cannot easily be conducted on the basis of one-shot, quick entry and exit observation, but requires considerable familiarity with the setting and intensive immersion in the data. The former argues for longitudinal observation, the latter for a programme of observing, recording and transcribing (Van Lier 1988: 41).

On-the-spot observation is helpful in that it gives the researcher a chance to take field notes and write down comments about contextual and other non-linguistic features that may affect the interaction and that could not be captured by a recording device. Yet, it can be intrusive and lead to selectivity on the part of the researcher; there is also the risk that teachers may alter their behaviour because of the presence of the researcher (Van Lier 1988). Hence, the importance of complementing on-the-spot observation with recording so that "it can be a rigorous method of classroom interaction analysis, one which allows the researcher to be both involved in the classroom and to take a detached, analytical stand for the purposes of description and interpretation" (Van Lier 1988: 40). This is particularly important in ethnographic research, as the researcher needs to maintain a balance between involvement (participation) and detachment (estrangement) (Van Lier 1988, Cohen et al. 2000). In this way, "a recording can mediate between the selectivity and subjectivity inherent in all on-the-spot observing, and the demand for detachment" (Van Lier 1988: 38). By using recording as an 'estrangement device', we can reach neutrality in classroom research and understand interaction better. This study will make use of audio-recording, transcribing, and coding; this helps in fulfilling the requirements of the holistic principle, which contributes to the validity and reliability of the data.
5.3.3 Discourse analysis

The work on interaction analysis in the 1960s and 1970s which focussed on systematic observation of classroom verbal behaviour, classifying the participants' discourse was criticized for being inconsistent, not validated; there were no clear theoretical or empirical underpinnings to the categories implemented; in other words, the categorization systems used were rather arbitrary and idiosyncratic (Chaudron 1988).

Discourse analysis draws on linguistic as well as ethnographic and sociolinguistic methods of studying interaction. Sinclair & Coulthard (1975) classified classroom discourse into five levels (lesson, transaction, exchange, move, and act). Thus, each level comprises a smaller level and so on until the discourse structure cannot be broken into any smaller segments. Although discourse analysis provided a more sound theoretical basis for studying classroom discourse than did the arbitrary categories in early observational instruments of interaction analysis (Chaudron 1988), the hierarchical structure of classroom discourse was also criticized for being unreliable, in that these levels do not provide an exhaustive account of the data; "not all sequences of actions can be explained on the basis of the hierarchical structure" (Van Lier 1988: 51). Besides, "the concern for classifying overtakes the concern for the overall patterns of action that occur in the setting, and reduces the sensitivity to the social world in which the actors realize their aims" (Van Lier 1988: 52).

Discourse can only easily be analysed once it has been described. Transcription, the process of converting the spoken data into a written code for purposes of analysis, is important in that it gives a clearer picture about the overall situation of interaction (micro-context), which is an important aspect of ethnography. This process would lead to a better understanding of the motives and purposes of teachers' uses of the L1. This, according to a discourse analytical view, is very important in analysing discourse in order not to misinterpret the participants' intention, and in order for the analysis to be powerful (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975). From an ethnographic view, contextual features are very important in any analysis of classroom interaction not only in the sense of the immediate preceding and following utterances (Chaudron 1988, Van Lier 1988, 1990), but rather the whole proceedings of a lesson (Chaudron 1988).
Although many verbal behaviors can be quickly and confidently identified as questions (one kind of elicit/solicit), evaluative reactions, or provision of information, there are frequently finer nuances of meaning and tacit rules of discourse implicit in even the simplest expression .......... This fact then requires that the analysis take account not only of the immediate context but the entire proceedings of a lesson. The history of the teacher-student relationships, developments in the lesson content, or the teacher’s explicit or implicit expectations for student responsiveness can influence the interpretation of virtually any expression ... (Chaudron 1988: 39).

In the course of data analysis within this study, such data was encountered where the tension increased gradually between the teacher and students as a result of the differences between the teacher’s expectations and students’ responses to eventually affect the interaction negatively. This could not be understood from the immediate interaction context without ‘immersion in the data’ and awareness of the proceedings of the lesson and the ‘history of the teacher-student relationships’ (see chapter 7).

Chaudron (1988) distinguishes between two kinds of coding which may be used for coding observed behaviours or events: the sign system, dividing the overall time into slots and recording if the behaviour occurs or not in each slot of time, and the category system, recording the behaviour each time it occurs.

A category system thus has a greater potential to identify every behavioral event that occurs, while a sign system would tend to avoid an extra weighting for events which occur very frequently (i.e. many times within the specified interval) and could enhance the weighting of relatively rare events (Chaudron 1988: 18,19).

As the present study does not confine itself to counting instances of L1 use but rather aspires to explain events in their context, and discover patterns and regularities, the category system was seen as more relevant. This would allow for noting down the event every time it happens, which allows for returning to it later on for studying and analyzing purposes. What is needed for this purpose is descriptive categories to code each event of L1 use. In ethnographic research, “the codes themselves derive from the data responsively rather than being created pre-ordinately” (Cohen et al. 2000: 148). In this way, as Cohen et al. maintain, the researcher would need “to go through a data set more than once to ensure consistency, refinement, modification and exhaustiveness of coding” (Cohen et al. 2000: 149). This would facilitate later analyses, including noting patterns, inconsistencies or contradictions between, for example, as is sought in this study, what people say or think they do and what they do.
In the current study, there was a need for converting the categories of the theoretical framework of L1 use into a practical and applicable list of actual functional L1 uses. Such a list was essential in order to allow for coding teachers' actual L1 uses in the FL classroom. These would give an indication of what kind of linguistic behaviour might be a manifestation of these theoretical categories. The above procedures and principles of ethnography were exploited for this purpose; i.e. whilst the overall framework was derived from the theoretical analysis, the sub-categories of how the uses were realized in the classroom were derived from the context and participants rather than pre-determined by the researcher. Therefore, the ethnographic data collection was launched by carrying out a pilot study, employing the methods of data collection discussed above. These data were analyzed thoroughly together with data from others’ related studies (see chapter 3) to prepare a list of potential functional L1 uses to be fitted under the relevant linguistic manifestation (i.e. within the theoretical categories of the framework) to be used as an observation schedule for the main study.

Thus, it has to be noted that the category coding scheme (CCS) or the observational schedule employed in this study is different from the categorization tradition that was employed in early interactional descriptive observations of the 1960s and 1970s. The category coding scheme (CCS) of the current study is not meant to explain or code general or overall classroom behaviour; it is rather centred on one aspect of classroom teacher practice with the aim of explaining and understanding it in the light of theoretical, pedagogical and contextual/practical considerations. The current CCS does not contradict the holistic and emic principles referred to above, as the categories were elicited from the real context where the phenomena occurs (through the pilot observation of a similar context) and from the participants (through piloting the questionnaires on teachers and students which asked them about activities they would or would not use the L1 with). Also agreeing with discourse analysis principles, the categories were set up in a way which should cover all instances of the phenomenon under study (L1 use) through the extensive survey of previous empirical and theoretical studies and having piloted them in a similar context (formal FL classrooms). The categories were not imposed upon the phenomena studied or derived from a certain theory or ideology; they were the result of an integrated theoretical view (or multi-theoretical views), previous empirical and theoretical studies, real samples, as well as participants’ views obtained through an ad-hoc pilot study, in which teachers and students contributed their perceptions about the value of L1 use. The latter particularly is an important feature of
ethnographic research which gives the categories “the potential of being much more psychologically valid than externally imposed constructs” (Chaudron 1988: 46).

In general, coding the L1 events according to the suitable categories was not an arbitrary process based on surface observation or predetermined decisions. Rather, it was a process based on a careful study of theoretical justifications as well as, context of interaction (micro-context), and thus would help in justifying and explaining the phenomenon. The aim of the categorization system adopted in this study was not to answer how much of the phenomenon was required (or deemed good or bad), but rather to contribute to showing how and in what ways it could help learning in the classroom.

Thus, the researcher started the ethnographic work early in a pilot study to understand the issue more as it happens in the classroom. The main purpose was to build more structured and rigorous observational tools to be used in the main study. The benefit of this, as Cohen et al. (2000: 306) point out, is that in studying the interactional setting, “if the observation is concerned to chart the incidence, presence, and frequency of elements ……, then it may be more efficient in terms of time to go into a situation with an already designed observation schedule”. The following section will explain the ethnographic procedures that were undertaken to design the observation schedule (the CCS) before moving to the procedures and context of the main study.

5.4 The role of the pilot study and ethnographic data in building the CCS of potential L1 uses

Collecting ethnographic information in order to enable tools to be created which would answer the research questions started by carrying out a pilot study that employed less structured research tools, with the aim of collecting as much contextual and informative information as possible in order to help, as mentioned above, to build up more structured and rigorous tools for the main study. Early in this study, a plan was formulated which would allow information to be gathered in an available environment which was as similar as possible to that of foreign language Egyptian classrooms. Two UK high schools were approached for that reason. Four Modern Foreign Language (MFL) lessons for four different teachers were audio-recorded with the aim of obtaining a classroom corpus. This represented, to a reasonable extent, a similar context to the context of the main study in that the language taught is a foreign language that students encounter only in the FL lesson and in
that teachers were non-native speakers of the FL who shared the same LI with their students, although the degree of the teachers' proficiency in the L2 may be more or less different. Overall those teachers were expected to have similar motivations to use the LI in their teaching (same shared LI with their students, mixed ability groups, potential for disruptive behaviour, desire to ensure comprehension on the part of their learners who would need to meet the requirements of public exams). There could be some differences in some aspects such as in school day, classroom equipment and available facilities, but these factors were not thought to impact directly on the likely similarities in classroom interaction.

The methods of data collection used included: questionnaires for both teachers and their students that elicited information about their views about teachers’ LI use in the L2 classroom (in terms of quantities and functions). The questionnaires contained multiple-choice questions about the quantities of LI use and possible uses of the LI that had been collected from previous literature (see chapter 3). There were also open questions that asked teachers about what purposes they might or might not use the LI to achieve, and asked students about what aspects they would like their teachers to use or not to use the LI for. A semi-structured observation, complemented with audio-recording, was also used. Before and after recording the lessons, the researcher had consulted the literature to note down all possible LI uses that were documented with the aim of classifying them under the relevant categories within our theoretically justified framework of LI use. These, as well as the evidenced uses from the pilot study (from teachers' and students’ questionnaires and the lesson recordings), were thought to yield a comprehensive and exhaustive list of LI uses.

The possibility of video-recording lessons was considered, but this was found to be inadvisable and unattainable on many grounds: the intrusiveness of using a video camera in classrooms, the need to change classroom organization, i.e. changing the way of seating students in order to cover them all, as well as students' reactions (one of the teachers in charge expressed her concerns and reservations about using video cameras because of that point, commenting on how students might react in an over-excited way). Another problem of using a video camera is the need for getting technical help, which was not available. Such problems are documented in Croll (1986: 52–54), besides other relevant problems such as the need for more space, lighting, and even wearing microphones on the part of teachers and students to have a good quality of voice. Croll also adds that a video camera would not be flexible or rapid enough to cover every situation or to get the whole class in one shot. He
claims that “video-recordings have been used to help develop observation systems and to train observers rather than as sources of data” (Croll 1986: 54). On the other hand, Croll recommends the use of tape recorders as being cheaper and less intrusive than videotaping especially with studies which deal with linguistic analysis. On practical grounds, when we are concerned with poor schools with limited resources (as is the case in Egyptian schools) the problems of having a video camera are even greater. Accordingly, audio-recording, as a more practical and less intrusive option was decided on. For the technique and time of recording, see section 5.8.2.2.

By getting the questionnaires, lesson recordings, field notes from the researcher’s observations, and a list of documented L1 uses from the literature ready, the ethnographic information was thus ready to analyze with the aim of preparing more workable observational categories (the CCS) and more structured questionnaires for the main study.

The recorded linguistic material from the pilot study was listened to carefully with the purpose of noting down all L1 uses. Only segments of talk that contained L1 use were transcribed; i.e. just the preceding and following contexts to the utterances that contained L1 use in order to help in recognizing their functions. What encouraged this technique of transcription was that the L1 use was not that common; besides, unlike the main study which aimed at full understanding and interpretation of the phenomenon and the motivations behind it, the pilot study’s main focus was to collect evidence of different possible uses in order to build up a list of potential L1 functions. Hence, there was no need to fully transcribe the whole data. All possible uses of the L1 that were given by teachers and students on their questionnaires were also noted down. (Methods used for transcription and analysis of the data will be discussed within the main study).

All L1 uses that were noted down were examined for their functions and coded initially under the relevant large-scale category that best illustrated their content and purpose out of the theoretically based categories of L1 use discussed earlier (communicative, declarative, affective, and organizational).

The rest of this section will show in more detail how the theoretically justified categories of L1 use as presented in chapter 4 were then converted into a usable exhaustive list of L1 functions. Whenever available, examples of functional L1 uses within each category will be
given, as not all functions were evidenced in the MFL context, but some, as aforementioned, were collected from theoretical evidence or previous literature. It is this combination which led to comprehensive a list of L1 uses as possible. The earlier discussion in previous chapters about theories of learning, teaching, and classroom realities will be referred to consistently in the analysis and classification of potential L1 uses under the four theoretically based categories of L1 use. Such classification was essential in order to allow for low-inference categories to be used in the main study's observation. In other words, these broad, theoretically justified categories about L1 use represented high-inference categories and needed to be broken into behavioural practices that could be observed in the classroom (low inference categories) (Chaudron 1988).

**Category I: Use of the L1 to aid communicative use of the language**

In the last chapter (section 4.2.1.1), we showed that, within communicative input, the L1 could be used to prepare for meta-communicative purposes, that is, to prepare for communicative tasks. This could happen by discussing some of the cultural features that could affect the communication, or giving background information about the content to be communicated about. This would help to improve the communication. The collected/ethnographic data (from the survey of the literature and the pilot study) showed that, within this category, teachers used the L1 in two ways, that is, to discuss cultural differences or general cultural points prior to carrying out a communicative task, or to talk about the communicative task to be done, e.g. ‘she will invite you to go with her to cinema, and you apologize’.

In 4.2.1.2, we argued for the potential use of the L1 as a way of enhancing the input to promote comprehension on the part of students. This was shown to enable them to produce language earlier. From our survey, teachers were found to use certain strategies that enhance the comprehensibility of their input. These included quick clarification of ambiguous meanings or expressions in the L2 by linking them directly to L1 equivalents, e.g. “this means which of them”. This was shown to be supported by theory and research (Dodson 1967, Skinner 1985, Lotto & De Groot 1998, and Hulstijn 2003).

Another strategy that teachers were found to use to enhance their input was comprehension checks, e.g. ‘OK?’, ‘understood?’, ‘is it clear?’, etc. It has been argued in chapter 1 that comprehension check is one of the interactional adjustments that teachers employ in their

Teachers were also found to use another strategy to ensure that their input is comprehensible, that is, summing up what was said or done, e.g. ‘so, he told him not to be late’. This may be considered a kind of repetition, one of the devices teachers were shown, in chapter 1, to use to simplify their input. This helps in giving students more chances and extra time to process the input (Gaies 1977). This LI summary that some teachers tend to give at the end of a task can be seen as a special kind of repetition in which teachers purposefully employ the LI to guarantee more and clearer comprehension, on the part of students, of the material given to them.

In 4.2.1.3, we argued that the LI could also be used for pushing and guiding the interaction. This was based on evidence presented in studies such as, Villamil & Guerrero 1996, Skiba 1997, and Pellowe 1998. Our data showed that teachers used the LI, within communicative interaction, to direct and negotiate the interaction in the L2 classroom, whether between the students and the teacher or between the students and each other. This was shown, earlier, to add to students’ comprehension of the input, and to allow students to try out using the language, testing their preliminary hypotheses about the L2. Directing and negotiating the input involved teachers using the LI for repairing communication breakdowns by giving clues to students to help them maintain their talk in the L2 if they were stuck or struggling, e.g. ‘look at your clothes’, ‘what did I say?’. This would help the teacher to recognize points of difficulty for students and to help them to take risks using the L2 instead of opting to use avoidance strategies. Teachers also used the LI for repairing communication breakdowns by asking students for clarification, so that they would try harder to make themselves clear, e.g. ‘this was not clear’, ‘can you say that again?’, ‘did you mean ....?’ etc. Clarification requests were also shown, in chapter 3, to be one of the devices teachers could use to adjust the interaction.

Teachers also used the LI to elicit L2 contributions from students, e.g. ‘how to say that in French/Spanish?’, ‘what is the meaning of .......?’ The LI was further used by teachers to prompt further L2 contributions from students, e.g. ‘which is’, ‘and then’, ‘give me a full sentence’, etc. We have seen in chapter 3 that use of the language, on the part of learners, gives them more opportunities of learning (practice opportunities) (Allwright & Bailey...
1991). Atkinson (1993b: 27) agrees, adding that it “gives the students the opportunity to show that they know. It also gives you, the teacher, a better idea of which students know what (this is especially in mixed level classes)”. These uses can extend the discussion, and encourage students to be more productive in their communication in the L2, instead of just pretending that they understood.

Teachers were also found to use the L1 for providing feedback to students, another important feature of interaction. This is important as it helps to reinforce or refute students’ hypotheses about use of the language, which can help them to modify their interlanguage. In this respect, teachers were found to accept what students said or did (positive feedback), modify or add to students’ answers or, simply, indicate understanding, e.g. ‘alright’, ‘I see’, ‘OK’. Teachers also tended to correct or clarify students’ mistakes (negative feedback), e.g. ‘not son’.

This analysis leads to the following sub and sub-sub categories:

Category I: Use of the L1 to aid communicative use of the language

a) L1 helps to prepare for communication
   1. L1 use helps to discuss cultural points prior to carrying out a communicative task.
   2. L1 use helps to give background information about the communicative task to be done.

b) L1 helps to enhance the input
   1. L1 use helps to clarify meaning.
   2. L1 use helps to check that students understand.
   3. L1 use helps to sum up what has been said or done.

c) L1 helps to push or direct oral interaction in the L2 classroom
   1. L1 use helps to repair communication breakdown in the L2.
   2. L1 use helps to elicit contributions from students.
   3. L1 use helps to prompt other or more contributions from students.
   4. L1 use helps to provide feedback to students.

Category II: Use of the L1 to aid explicit declarative learning of the language

We have seen in chapter 1 that students’ explicit knowledge improves their grammatical accuracy (Hawkins & Towell 1996); it helps them to improve their knowledge of the L2 (Skehan 1998). It has also been argued, in chapter 2, that grammatical accuracy is an integral
part of communicative competence (Hedge 2000). Explicit teaching of the L2 rules was shown above to compensate for the lack of opportunities for natural acquisition, and for the unavailability of the long time needed for developing implicit knowledge of the L2 (Lightbown & Spada 2000).

Within formal input, teachers were found to use the L1 for providing information about how the L2 works (metalinguistic information). Thus, they used the L1 for talking explicitly about L2 rules, e.g. ‘it ends with /e/ so it is feminine’. Gregg (1984) and McLaughlin (1987) supported such uses of the L1.

The literature shows that the L1 can also be employed in formal input for contrasting the L1 and L2 rules; such uses of the L1 are supported by Pellowe (1998) and Widdowson (2001).

The L1 was also used for highlighting pronunciation features (e.g. it is /ʃ/ not /v/); Hammerly (1973) believed that using the L1 in this way helps raising learners’ awareness of their mistakes and, consequently, improving their pronunciation.

This analysis leads to the following sub-categories:

**Category II: Use of the L1 to aid explicit declarative learning of the language**

a. L1 use helps to talk explicitly about L2 rules.

b. L1 use helps to bring into focus contrasts between L1 and L2 rules.

c. L1 use helps to highlight pronunciation features in the L2.

**Category III: Use of the L1 to aid affective aspects of learning**

As mentioned in chapter 4, the affective input is the humanistic dimension of achieving the purpose of learning. Affective factors were shown to influence learning on the abstract and performance levels (see 1.2.4); they were also claimed by Paradis (2004) to contribute to students’ implicit and explicit knowledge about the language.

In chapter 1, it was argued that students’ motivation is important in developing their knowledge of the L2; students learn better when they develop positive attitudes towards themselves and the language they learn. To enhance students’ motivation, the learning process needs to be enjoyable, supportive, and related to students’ needs. This has the big
advantage of converting the input into intake, which improves students' knowledge of the L2.

In line with this, teachers can use the LI to establish rapport between them and their students, e.g. joking, chatting, encouraging, solving problems students may encounter, showing care, etc. Such uses help in removing any feelings of alienation (Joseph & Ramani 1998, Rinvolucri 2001), empowering students (Auerbach 1993, Harbord 1992), and giving students some relaxation (Burden 2000, Schweers 1999). Atkinson (1993b) argues that students' motivation in monolingual classrooms depends, to a great extent, on the kind of relationship they have with their teacher.

Teachers may also use the LI as a response to students' initiations in the LI; this fits under the assumption that adopting strategies that students prefer benefits them (Cook 1998, Medgyes 1994, Nunan 1988, Spolsky 1989) (see section 4.2.3). Another theoretical assumption that justifies this use is that "the exposure of learners to language provided at a point of need and in a meaningful context which they have created for themselves in trying to express something is a good situation for acquisition" (Hedge 2000: 53).

The literature also shows that teachers use the LI to relate the content to students' real experiences, e.g. giving examples from students' own lives, referring to exams, etc. This 'personalisation', as Atkinson (1993b: 33) calls it, "helps to increase the students' involvement in the lesson and the language .......... It also helps to reinforce the fact that the L2 is a real, living language". This makes learning a more interesting and satisfactory experience which promotes the learning process on the part of students. As shown in 4.2.3, Campbell & Kryszewska (1992) used the LI in this way to compensate for the lack of good materials.

In the literature, we also found that teachers may use the LI as a one to one technique to help less proficient students. As claimed in 1.2.4, L2 learning can be a frustrating experience, as learners feel unable to express themselves or understand others as they used to in their LI (Rutherford 1987, Tudor 1996), or they may feel threatened trying to use the L2 (Schmann 1975). Thus, using the LI for one to one support can develop those students' self-confidence, which can improve their knowledge and use of the L2.
This analysis provides the following sub-categories:

Category III: Use of the L1 to aid affective aspects of learning
a. L1 use helps to build rapport between the teacher & students.
b. L1 use helps to respond to students’ initiations in the L1.
c. L1 use helps to relate the content to students’ real experiences.
d. L1 use helps to provide support for less proficient students

Category IV: Use of the L1 to aid organizational aspects of classroom learning

The last three categories referred to the actual opportunities of learning that the teacher could provide for his or her learners, through classroom interaction, to assist their internal learning. This category is more concerned with the teacher’s efforts to manage or manipulate the interaction, in a way that helps students to make the most from the learning opportunities available for them. It has been claimed earlier (section 4.2.4) that the teacher can manage the interaction and, consequently, learning in different ways such as, directing and involving students in different activities in the classroom with maximum clarity and minimum disruption. “A communicative approach also involves the teacher in a wider range of roles beyond that of providing and presenting new language. A good deal of time will be spent on managing learning: setting up activities, organizing material resources, guiding students in group work, encouraging contributions, monitoring activities .....” (Hedge 2000: 63).

The data we collected showed that teachers used the L1 for organizing the classroom setting; this involved disciplining students, taking the register, organizing seating, setting activities (group or pair work), etc, e.g. ‘no more shouting out’, ‘it is not your turn’, ‘you join Tara and Natalie’. These activities are important in the sense that they help in establishing cohesiveness within the class (Hedge 2000)

Teachers also used the L1 as a strategy to involve students and attract their attention, e.g. ‘listen’, ‘look at me’, ‘pay attention’, ‘where are you?’, etc. It has been shown in chapter 1 that attention is a very important component of learning (Schmidt 1990); only attended to input can be converted into intake (Hedge 2000)

Another important organizational activity that teachers used the L1 with was giving or clarifying instructions. Sometimes, even if teachers gave the instructions in the L2, they tended to translate them into the L1, especially more complex instructions, to guarantee full
understanding, on the part of learners, of what they are required to do, e.g. 'listen again this time focus on the conjunctions used'. We have seen in chapter 1 that students refer to the L1 to decipher the requirements of the tasks they have to work on (Villamil & DeGuerrero 1996, Anton & DiCamilla 1998); it has also been argued earlier that use of strategies that students prefer benefits them. Accordingly, teachers’ use of the L1 in clarifying instructions helps learners to understand and carry out the task better. Besides, use of the L1 for instructions saves time for conducting the task itself (Cook 2002). “The important thing is the new language item. It doesn’t make sense to spend a long time building up a situation exclusively in English and then find that you don’t have enough time to present and practise the language properly” (Atkinson 1993b: 26). Atkinson claims that use of the L1 helps to carry out the job quickly and efficiently without students getting bored or out of control.

The L1 was also used to direct students to do or notice things, e.g. ‘raise your voice’, ‘look at the answer’, ‘what is it saying here’, etc. These are more like a kind of quick procedural instructions that are more related to directing students to do or notice general things than to specific activity tasks. These uses of the L1 are justified by the same assumptions behind justifying learning tasks’ instructions.

This analysis provides the following sub-categories:
Category IV: Use of the L1 to aid organizational aspects of classroom learning
a. L1 use helps in organizing the classroom setting.
b. L1 use helps in calling for students’ attention (involving them).
c. L1 use helps in giving or clarifying instructions.
d. L1 use helps in directing students to do or notice something.

Within the data, there have been some uses of the L1 that did not fit under any of these theoretical categories. They were uses that did not seem to have any apparent linguistic or pedagogical purpose. This was not surprising, though, as we have noted in chapter 3 that teachers sometimes switched to the L1 for no obvious pedagogical purpose (Liu et al. 2004). In chapter 4, we concluded that as a bilingual context, the classroom interaction may trigger code-switching that in a way serves social, psychological, or individual purposes, as is the case in social bilingual contexts, rather than pedagogical purposes. Thus, for the sake of comprehensiveness in coding, a fifth category was added to our CCS under which we could
Category V: Use of the L1 for non-pedagogical functions

So far, we have discussed the pedagogical functions and roles allocated to teachers' code-switching into the L1 in the L2 classroom. This usually happens intentionally and purposefully with the aim of providing students with better learning opportunities. Yet, as just mentioned, not all teachers' codeswitches are deliberately aimed for pedagogical purposes, but they may achieve interactional or social purposes. These may be intentional or unintentional, and do not necessarily serve a pedagogical purpose or, as Liu et al. (2004: 624) point out, it is not expected that teachers' code-switching "has to be based on principles every time".

If we consider the fact that the FL classroom is a bilingual setting, code-switching may be employed in other ways that are similar to those employed in other social bilingual contexts. As bilinguals, teachers may switch to their L1 for social or individual reasons that may not have pedagogical implications. This use resembles code-switching in real life, and is thought to serve social and personal more than pedagogical purposes such as, feeling more comfortable with a certain code rather than the other, or for specific reasons that are related to individuals. This kind of code-switching tends to be intrasentential, namely, switching one or two words within a sentence. It can be hard for members from outside the classroom to understand clearly the rules of the teacher's code-switching (Simon 2001). This is also noted by Adendorff (1993) and that is why he considers code-switching in the classroom a contextualization cue or a meta-message.

On one hand, such code-switches may, simply, reflect a personal preference or teaching style (Simon 2001). On the other hand, it may reflect unintentional 'performance switches' due to lack of efficiency in the L2 (Poulisse & Bongaerts 1994). Alternatively, this kind of code-switching may be a communication strategy used by speakers to serve social and psychological purposes such as; "emphasize one's identity or group membership, mark a change of a subject, to specify a particular addressee, to draw the attention to a particular part of the message, to express certain emotions, or to mark 'asides' from ongoing discourse ........" (Poulisse & Bongaerts 1994: 36). Another function for such code-switches that Eldridge (1996: 307) proposes is to control conflict; "one of the main purposes of code-
switching is to create ambiguity in order to deal with situations in which there is a potential conflict”. These switches, as Poulisse & Bongaerts claim, are motivated either by contextual factors or by linguistic need, rather than serving a learning or pedagogical purpose. Although Poulisse & Bongaerts referred to learners with little L2 proficiency when talking about that kind of code-switching, yet, this may still apply to non-native teachers with different levels of proficiency in the L2.

Our data from the pilot study revealed that teachers produced L1 uses that achieved no obvious pedagogical purposes. Teachers used the L1 with speech markers, e.g. ‘well’, ‘then’, ‘OK’, etc.). These may reflect a strategy to mark a change of subject or to draw students’ attention to a particular message.

Teachers were also found to use the L1 with linking words (conjunctions), e.g. ‘and’, ‘or’, ‘the’, etc. This may again reflect the teacher’s desire to draw students’ attention to a particular part of the message.

The L1 was also used for nominating students, e.g. ‘you’, ‘come on’. These uses may imply the teacher’s desire to emphasize a ‘we-code’ attitude in the class and thus, highlighting his social role as a leading member, who has the same linguistic background, of the class community (Simon 2001). Eldridge (1996: 306) refers to such code-switches as “lexical symbols of group identity”

The data also showed idiosyncratic code-switching, namely, substitution of a single or two words in a sentence with no obvious purpose. This may again reflect the same social role, emphasizing the ‘we-code’ attitude.

Teachers also referred to the L1 for making asides, e.g. ‘talking to callers from outside the classroom’, ‘commenting on external events’, etc. These uses may help teachers to express certain emotions in a less formal attitude, further emphasizing their in-group membership (Sert 2005), or they may fit under what was referred to above as controlling conflict (Eldridge 1996).
Whether intentional or unintentional, these non-pedagogical code-switches fit under Poulisse & Bongaerts' (1994) above description of code-switching as a compensatory strategy that serves social and psychological purposes. They are a way of manipulating and modifying language for better enabled self-expression (Sert 2005). Skiba (1997) points out that such switches may serve as a compensatory strategy for speakers who lack the fluency to express themselves in one language. They are also “a tool for creating linguistic solidarity especially between individuals who share the same ethno-cultural identity” (Sert 2005: 2) and in this sense they may resemble and overlap with humanistic uses of the L1.

This analysis leads to the following sub-categories:

Category V: Use of the L1 for non-pedagogical functions
a. L1 use with speech markers
b. L1 use with linking words/conjunctions
c. L1 use for nominating students
d. Idiosyncratic code-switching (Substitution of a single or two words in a sentence with no obvious purpose).
e. L1 use for making asides

5.5 A final check list of potential L1 uses
This analysis of code-switching strategies that teachers were found to employ in the literature of previous studies and in our exploratory pilot study leads us to set our final list of potential functional L1 uses. This list, as previously mentioned, will serve as a category coding scheme (CCS) that will be used as an observational schedule for coding teachers’ actual use of the L1 in the main field study with the aim of describing, comparing and explaining their pattern of L1 use in the classroom. Thus, our coding scheme is distinguished from earlier schemes or functional lists of L1 use such as Mitchell’s (1988), Polio & Duff’s (1994), Dickson’s (1996), and Rolin lanziti & Brownlie’s (2002) in that it has its grounds not only in participants’ views and evidenced practice, but also in well reasoned multi-dimensional theoretical bases. The CCS in its final form looks as follows:

Category I: Use of the L1 to aid communicative use of the language
1a  L1 helps to prepare for communication
1a1. L1 use helps to discuss cultural points prior to carrying out a communicative task.
Ia2. LI use helps to give background information about the communicative task to be done.

1b) LI helps to enhance the input
1b1. LI use helps to clarify meaning.
1b2. LI use helps to check that students understand.
1b3. LI use helps to sum up what has been said or done.

1c) LI helps to push or direct oral interaction in the L2 classroom
1c1. LI use helps to repair communication breakdown in the L2.
1c2. LI use helps to elicit contributions from students.
1c3. LI use helps to prompt other or more contributions from students.
1c4. LI use helps to provide feedback to students.

Category II: Use of the LI to aid explicit declarative learning of the language
2a. LI use helps to talk explicitly about L2 rules.
2b. LI use helps to bring into focus contrasts between LI and L2 rules.
2c. LI use helps to highlight pronunciation features in the L2.

Category III: Use of the LI to aid affective aspects of learning
3a. LI use helps to build rapport between the teacher & students.
3b. LI use helps to respond to students' initiations in the LI.
3c. LI use helps to relate the content to students' real experiences.
3d. LI use helps to provide support for less proficient students

Category IV: Use of the LI to aid organizational aspects of classroom learning
4a. LI use helps in organizing the classroom setting.
4b. LI use helps in calling for students' attention (involving them).
4c. LI use helps in giving or clarifying instructions.
4d. LI use helps in directing students to do or notice something.

Category V: Use of the LI for non-pedagogical functions
5a. LI use with speech markers.
5b. LI use with linking words/conjunctions.
5c. LI use for nominating students.
5d. Idiosyncratic code-switching (Substitution of a single or two words in a sentence with no obvious purpose).

5e. L1 use for making asides.

In the next section, we will move to the context of the main study with the purpose of describing and explaining the use of L1 by Egyptian teachers against our proposed CCS, understanding the motivations behind their use, and finding out if they use it in an optimal way.

5.6 Context of the main study

In chapter 3, we saw how teachers' use of the L1 is, to a large extent, motivated by contextual realities of the L2 classroom. In this chapter, there will be reference to some of the specific local characteristics of the classrooms included in this study. This will help in understanding, explaining, and evaluating Egyptian teachers' views and behaviour regarding the use of the L1 in the EFL classroom. As Clarke (1994) argues, decisions or judgments about teaching practices are not, and should not be, only based on theory and research findings. Pennycook (1989: 606) states that “teachers make a whole series of decisions about teaching based on their own educational experiences, their personalities, their particular institutional, social, cultural, and political circumstances, their understanding of their particular students’ collective and individual needs, and so on”. Hence, the importance of studying the particular context teachers work in.

5.6.1 The background of the city

The study confined itself to El-Minia city; this is because the researcher used to live and work there. El-Minia is a small city situated in the south of Cairo. El-Minia is divided into three areas: North, South and West of the city. The north is known to be a privileged area attracting the most educated and financially advantaged people, the west and the south are known to be less privileged areas with low social, financial and educational backgrounds. Even if educated or socially privileged people live in such areas (as it is becoming more common nowadays), they tend to send their children to the more privileged schools in the North or to private schools.

5.6.2 The background of the schools within the city

The study confined itself to observing teachers who work in what is called the “Eadadi” cycle of the mainstream education. This is a middle intermediate stage between the primary
and secondary stages, and it includes three year groups which are parallel to years 7-9 in English high schools. Thus, unlike the English context wherein years 7-9 are part of the secondary school that leads to colleges then universities, in the Egyptian context these year groups represent a separate school cycle that leads either to General Secondary Education that leads to universities or to technical schools that do not necessarily lead to universities.

Because of economic as well as space problems, most schools in the city work on a double occupation basis, meaning that two schools are run simultaneously in the same building. So one 'Eadadi' school, for example, may work in the morning from around half past seven a.m. with its own staff, then the building is given over in the afternoon to another primary or secondary school with its own staff who start working from between twelve and one o'clock up to between four and five o'clock in the evening. However, most of 'Eadadi' schools work in the morning period, and consequently, most of the schools included in this study worked in the morning period except for one school in the south area that worked in the afternoon period from one to five o'clock.

All the Eadadi schools within the city are single sex, except for one school which is not involved in this study. The reason is that this school is a Languages School in which students study a wider range of English material than the rest of the schools (drama, novel, poetry, etc.). Besides, all or most of the other subjects are studied in English as well (a sort of immersion school). Thus, all schools involved in this study are single sex schools.

5.6.3 Classroom context
The study was carried out in formal EFL classrooms, in which the L2 classroom is the only setting in which learners have exposure to the L2 (English), and in which the teacher (a non-native) and peer students are the only informants/sources of the L2, and who all share the same L1 (Arabic). All teachers follow the same curriculum and the same textbook and workbook in their teaching.

The study sample included teachers of English teaching final year students of 'Eadadi' schools who were aged 13-14 years, and who could be considered low-intermediate. Only teachers teaching final year students were included in the study as those students were expected to have been learning the English language for four years (the first two years in the 'Eadadi' school as well as the last two years in the primary school). In addition, the final
year of ‘Eadadi’ school is a critical stage as students’ average scores in the end of year exams are used as a basis for classifying them to go either to general secondary schools, which lead them directly to university, or to technical schools which do not necessarily lead them to university, and which are considered inferior to general secondary education.

5.6.4 Teachers’ training background and Method adopted
Most of the teachers’ graduation dates ranged from 1983 – 1993 with one in 1998. It was found out that half of the teachers graduated from ‘The Faculty of Arts’, in which they studied English language, history and literature; the other half graduated from ‘The Faculty of Education’, in which they studied, in addition to language and literature, psychology, learning theories, curricula, and methods of teaching. Teachers are usually required to attend in-service training sessions held by the inspectorate and, sometimes, university staff.

The English Department in the Education Authority adopts a kind of a weak version of the communicative approach, or what we can call a kind of an eclectic approach, for the teaching of EFL in Egyptian ‘Eadadi’ schools. In-service training is held every now and then for teachers, sometimes in cooperation with university staff. Appendix I shows a copy of the guidelines of the English Department for the aims and purposes of teaching EFL for the ‘Eadadi’ cycle of education, in general (i.e. years 1, 2, and 3), and for each year individually, including year 3 which is the target of our study. The guidelines show a focus on communicative, formal, and affective aspects of learning, and on the four skills of language learning, listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

5.6.5 Evaluation system/exams’ background
The evaluation system in Egyptian schools is generally traditional, in the sense that the exams usually test students’ knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, and written skills in general. There is no space in these exams for testing students’ listening or speaking skills (See appendix II for a copy of an end of year exam).

5.6.6 The background of the timing of the study
The study was carried out between the 14th of February and the 6th of March 2003. This represented the beginnings of the second and last semester in the school year after the end of the mid-year holiday in January.
5.7 Procedures/limitations of the study

The study sought to include schools from different areas in the city. Written permission was gained from the Local Educational Authority to record lessons at schools within El-Minia city (see appendix III). Twenty lessons for twenty different teachers in seven different schools, which covered the three areas, were involved in the study.

The researcher tried to include schools from different areas; this was sought randomly, but another factor that interfered, to some extent, with the choice of schools was the head teacher's and the staff's willingness to co-operate. In some schools, the staff were not helpful and in one school the head teacher herself did not agree with audio-recording the lessons. Within the schools included, the researcher sought to choose the lessons to be observed randomly but again some of the teachers were unwilling to be observed or, more specifically, to be audio-recorded. Thus this sample is of the type that Cohen et al. (2000) refer to as a convenience sample (choosing from whoever is available). This does not contradict with ethnographic research as generally in that research, there is no claim of representing or being able to cover the characteristics of the wider population. Besides, generalizability of the results (which requires a representative sampling) is not an aim of this research. We claimed before that the results are to be generalizable only to similar contexts (and that is why it was important to provide an extensive description of the context and the sample).

The recording process resulted in three schools in the north area of the city which, as mentioned above, had a higher standard of living, three in the south area, and one in the west area which were less privileged. Out of the twenty lessons recorded, only sixteen recordings were of usable quality (audible). There were seven male teachers and nine female teachers. The usable lessons covered two areas only; the north and the south; the tapes recorded in the school located in the west area were excluded for their bad quality. This did not represent a problem in the local representation as the south and the west have similar standards of living; besides, the west area contained only two 'Eadadi' schools. Thus, the final sample comprised of 16 teachers within 6 different schools. They are 3 boys' schools with 1 school in the North privileged area and 2 in the South unprivileged area, and 3 girls' schools with 2 in the North privileged area and 1 in the South unprivileged area.
Table 5.1
Information about the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Teachers working within the school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>North/Boys/privileged</td>
<td>Ts: 2, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>North/Girls/privileged</td>
<td>Ts: 4, 7, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>North/Girls/privileged</td>
<td>Ts: 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>South/Boys/unprivileged</td>
<td>Ts: 1, 8, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>South/Boys/unprivileged</td>
<td>Ts: 3, 10, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>South/Girls/unprivileged</td>
<td>Ts: 5, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.8 Data collection

Similar tools as those that have been used in the pilot study, but in a more structured form, have been used to collect data in the main study. These included: questionnaires for both teachers and students, as well as informal interviews with teachers to elicit the perceived value of the L1, a semi-structured observation with a preliminary observation schedule against which behaviour would be checked and lesson audio-recording followed by transcription and discourse analysis to collect data about the actual use of the L1. Although the tools are more structured than they were in the pilot study, the ethnographic work continued more extensively with data analyses, employing detailed descriptions and comparisons, establishing relationships and linkages, making inferences, looking for patterns and irregularities, and checking theoretical hypotheses.

5.8.1 Perceived value of the L1

We have seen earlier that less structured questionnaires with more open questions were used in the pilot study to elicit teachers’ and students’ views about the L1 as this would allow for richer data. The information obtained together with the list of functions in the CCS were utilized to build more structured questionnaires for both teachers and students. Structured questionnaires are more convenient with large samples and for analytical purposes (Cohen et al. 2000).

5.8.1.1 The teachers’ questionnaire

The teachers’ questionnaire was intended to provide further data about how teachers perceive
the use of the L1. As mentioned above, classroom teaching is influenced by many external and internal factors that affect the teacher’s behaviour. So, for example, in a self motivated or high ability class, the teacher may behave or react in a different way than in a low motivated or low ability class. There are also the pressures of the curriculum, examinations, and the official policies which may affect the practices of the teacher inside the classroom. These practices may or may not reflect the teacher’s views or beliefs. Hence, it was important to supplement the data obtained from lesson recordings by eliciting teachers’ views about the use of the L1. A questionnaire was designed, by the researcher, for that purpose. After the questionnaire was trialled in the pilot study, this resulted in extending the items of the questionnaire to cover more L1 uses that came up in teachers’ answers on the pilot questionnaire and that was picked from the audio-recording or documented from the previous studies. The questionnaire, in its final form, consisted of two parts. (See appendix IV for a copy of the teachers’ questionnaire). The first part was a replication of the pilot questionnaire and consisted of nine questions, which covered a variety of general quantitative and qualitative information about the issue. Few of the questions were open, requiring notes or comments from teachers, but most of them required the teachers to mark one of many answers. The second part was an attitude scale that was not included in the pilot questionnaire, but was added as a result of the L1 uses collected from the previous literature and the pilot study. The attitude scale consisted of 26 statements; teachers had to tick one out of five points on a scale (ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree) that indicated their attitude towards a certain statement about the use of the L1. This form of questions is called Lickert scale (Seliger and Shohamy 1989, Cohen et al. 2000). The statements of the attitude scale were derived from the categories of potential functional L1 uses coded in the CCS, and were organized in the same order as the CCS categories. This was thought to facilitate coding and analyzing teachers’ answers on the questionnaire and achieve ‘content validity’ of the questionnaire. Moreover, this dependency of the questionnaire’s items on the observation schedule (the CCS), which is derived from multi-dimensions (theory, context, and participants’ views), increases the internal validity of the questionnaire (Goetz & LeCompte 1984). That is, the items of the questionnaire cover and represent the proposed L1 functions to be checked in the observation. After the questionnaire was ready, it was translated into Arabic before giving it to the teachers. (See appendix V for the Arabic copy of the teachers’ questionnaire). As for administering the teachers’ questionnaire, teachers were given their questionnaires in the same lesson and had the choice of either returning them at the end of the lesson or later on.
5.8.1.2 The students' questionnaire

Students' views about teachers' use of the L1 were obtained by another questionnaire designed for that purpose. After the students' questionnaire was trialled in the pilot study, this resulted in making the questionnaire shorter so that it could be answered within the limited time of the lesson. This was thought to reduce the chances of students not answering the questionnaire or not returning it. Thus, students' questionnaires were given to them in the last ten minutes and collected at the end of the lesson. The students' questionnaire consisted of nine questions (see appendix VI for a copy of the students' questionnaire); the first six concentrated on general aspects of using the L1, such as who uses it, and how much it is used or required. Question seven asked students if they thought the teachers' use of the L1 helped them to engage in oral interaction in the L2. Question eight asked students if they thought the teachers' use of the L1 helped them to learn about the L2 rules better. Question 9, in turn, involved statements about teachers' uses of the L1 that generally, and in simple terms, covered the four theoretical categories about the L1 in the CCS. Statements a and b referred to teachers' L1 use for communicative functions. Statements c, d, and e referred to L1 uses for formal functions. Statements f, g, and h referred to L1 uses for affective functions. Statements i and j referred to L1 uses for organizational functions. This, as in the teacher's questionnaire, helped to increase content and internal validity. Again, the questionnaire was translated into Arabic before giving it to students. (See appendix VII for the Arabic copy of the students' questionnaire).

5.8.1.3 Informal interviews with teachers

The problem with interview is that it "might be seen as an intrusion into private worlds, or the interviewer might be regarded as someone who can impose sanctions on the interviewee, or as someone who can exploit the powerless (Cohen et al. 2000). In this study, informal interviews with open-ended questions rather than formal structured interviews were opted for. This was thought to help in getting more insight, in a non-threatening way, of how teachers perceived the value of L1 use, or more specifically, of any personal or formal factors that might influence teachers' views or use of the L1. The information that could be elicited through the use of this technique could add to, explain, or adjust the knowledge that is developed from classroom recordings and the questionnaires. As for the procedures of the interview, all teachers whose lessons were recorded were meant to be interviewed, but because most teachers were busy in exams or other commitments only five teachers out of
the whole sample were available for an interview. The interview centred on two main questions, that is, whether they thought the use of the L1 would help and, consequently, what they thought it would help to do in the L2 classroom, and how the official policy regarded teachers’ use of the L1 in the L2 classroom. The researcher thought it would help more not to monitor the interview by recording it, or interrupt it by taking notes in order to guarantee maximum degree of informality so that teachers express their views more freely. Instead, a summary of the participants’ responses were written down after each interview.

5.8.2 Actual use of the L1
Views need to be supported by first hand data about how the phenomenon is used in practice. Similar procedures for collecting observed data were used as in the pilot study, this time with an observational schedule to check against.

5.8.2.1 Classroom observation
With a preliminary coding list of potential L1 functions available, the classroom observation in the main study was more guided. The researcher now went into classrooms with a clearer idea about the phenomenon to be observed. Although this did not lead to any changes or interventions within the procedures of the on-the-spot observation, it helped in focusing on points of interest, similarities and contrast and noting them down for helping and guiding later analysis. We have shown earlier how the categories and subcategories were validated.

5.8.2.2 Lesson recordings
For the purposes of recording, a small cassette player was used. It was put in the teacher’s pocket, with a little microphone that was pinned to clothes close to his/her mouth. In addition, another cassette player was put on a table at the front in some cases, but in some classrooms there was no electricity supply. Each lesson was recorded from the beginning leaving ten minutes at the end for students to complete their questionnaires. Field notes were taken during and after each lesson observed.

5.9 Methods of data analysis
As mentioned earlier, both qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis can be employed in descriptive studies. While quantitative analysis is concerned with numbers and statistics, “Qualitative data analysis techniques deal with non-numerical data, usually linguistic units in
oral or written form” (Seliger & Shohamy 1989: 201). In this study both techniques were employed. This will now be developed.

5.9.1 Perceived value of the L1
This section will include the methods of analysis applied for the teachers’ and students’ questionnaires. This involves quantitative analysis to get numerical information about how teachers and their students perceive the L1, and the aspects of teaching it can contribute to.

5.9.1.1 Teachers’ questionnaire
Each section of the teachers’ questionnaire was analyzed separately. The first section consisted of general questions with options to choose from. For analysis purposes, each question with the options following it were coded and distributed in order in a column within a table, e.g. 1a, b, c, d; 2a, b and so on. Teachers were also coded and distributed in one row as: T1, T2, T3, and so on. Two questions and two sub-questions in section 1 required free answers by teachers; the two sub-questions were the second part of question 2 which asked teachers to give some details about inspectorate policy regarding the L1 use. This sub-question was not included in the quantitative analysis; it was analyzed qualitatively. The other sub-question was 3a, which none of the teachers answered as it was built on justifying option ‘c’ in the main question 3, which nobody chose. Thus, it was not, either, included in the quantitative analysis. The two main questions which required open answers were questions 5 and 6. Question 5 asked teachers what activities they thought the use of the L1 could help with, and question 6 asked them what activities they thought should not be carried out using the L1. When analyzing teachers’ answers to these two questions, it was found that teachers confined their answers to question 5 to two activities only: teaching grammar, teaching vocabulary, or both of them. For analysis purposes, these answers were coded respectively as 5a, b, and c, and were included in the quantitative analysis. As for question 6, the answers ranged between one or more of the following: dialogues, reading, grammar, vocabulary, presentation of the lesson, and any activities. These answers were again coded respectively as 6a, b, c, d, e, f, and were included in the quantitative analysis. After distributing the questions in rows and the teachers in columns, the chosen answer for each teacher was ticked. Then, the total and percentages of teachers who chose each answer were calculated.
As for the second part of the questionnaire, it was, as said earlier, an attitude scale, which consisted of 26 statements. The attitude scale was analyzed by coding each statement with the 5 scales following it in a column; teachers were coded and distributed in one row. A tick was put under each teacher in front of the option he/she chose. Again, the total number of teachers who chose each option for each statement was calculated, and percentages were given. This was thought to give a quantified picture of teachers’ beliefs about the L1 use, in other words, which aspects of L1 use are perceived by teachers as valuable, and which are not.

5.9.1.2 Students’ questionnaire

The same method of analysis was used to analyze the students’ questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of 9 questions. All questions were multiple choice; questions 1 – 8 had either 3 or 4 choices. The last question (9) had 10 statements for students to choose from. Students had the freedom to choose any number of statements they thought were true. Just as was done with teachers’ questionnaires, the questions were coded and distributed with their answers following them in a column. It was noted that some questions were left unanswered, so after each group of choices following each coded question, an extra code was added which referred to ‘no answer’. So, for example, question 1 had four options that were coded: a, b, c, d, on the analysis sheet; an extra code (e) was added after them that represented non-answered items. In case of question 9, the question number was followed by the 10 choices coded a – j, then k to represent non-answered items. Classes were numbered to match the numbering of the teacher, so C1 is T1’s class, C2 is T2’s class, and so on. The number of students who answered each question in each class was inserted, and then calculation of the total number of students who answered each question was made, and a percentage was given at the end. A measurement of internal reliability was calculated for the students’ questionnaire using Kuder-Richardson formula (see Hatch & Lazaraton 1991); this yielded a reliability score of (0.82) for questions 1 – 8 (see table 5.2). Question 9 was measured on its own as it was different from the rest of the questions in that it had 10 options, and students were free to choose as many options as they wanted; the reliability score for this question was (0.75) (see table 5.3).
5.9.2 Actual use of the L1

This section will discuss the methods of analysis applied to the lesson recordings. Both qualitative and quantitative analyses were employed in the analysis of the lesson recordings. Qualitative analyses were used in the transcription of tapes, defining the unit of analysis, coding L1 utterances, and comparing L1 use across categories and across groups of teachers. Quantitative analyses were used in providing percentages of total L1 use for all teachers, group of teachers, or individual teachers, as well as frequencies of L1 use within each category, or for each teacher or group of teachers.

5.9.2.1 Content of the lessons

After recording the lessons, and going through them, they were found to vary in type. As it was thought that type of the lesson would have an impact on how much L1 was used and/or what purposes the L1 would be used to achieve (Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002), the lessons were classified into three groups according to the dominant activity. As Malamah-Thomas (1987: 26) puts it: “It is important to know what is to be taught and learned in any lesson and not only what kind of interaction takes place”. This resulted in three main groups of lessons. Group A: Grammar based lessons; this involved teachers: 1, 2, and 3. Such lessons included topics centred around rules of the language not in the form of separate or explicit pieces of grammatical explanation, but rather in contexts using short interactions, or sometimes with

---

Table 5.2
Reliability of questions 1 – 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance of the test score</th>
<th>Sum of the variance of all items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.627</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3
Reliability of question 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance of the test score</th>
<th>Sum of the variance of all items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.5275</td>
<td>2.1475</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pictures as clues (e.g. the use of *enough, much, many,* etc.). Group B: Communication based lessons; this involved teachers 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8; these lessons included topics about functional uses of the language of everyday life (e.g. *inviting, agreeing and disagreeing, likes and dislikes,* etc.). Group C: Reading based lessons; this included two types of reading contexts: short to medium reading passages in the main textbook about a certain topic followed by comprehension questions, or story reading. In the first, the reading is done in the class; in the second, students are supposed to read a chapter at home, then answer questions and discuss in class, but teachers, in many cases, did some reading in the class, at least reading a few extracts. In any case, the reading lessons contained a lot of discussions and oral exchanges; there was no prolonged reading especially by the teacher, hence there was no need to exclude any segments of the teachers’ talk. This group involved teachers 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16. (See appendix VIII for a sample of the lessons taught).

5.9.2.2 Transcribing the lessons
The next step was to convert teachers’ talk into written data to facilitate analysis. For transcription purposes, each cassette tape was played for few seconds then paused to allow for writing what was said. As mentioned earlier, there were sixteen lessons valid for analysis (i.e. audible) out of twenty recorded lessons. Unlike the pilot study, each lesson was fully transcribed, i.e. all teachers’ and students’ talk whether in Arabic or English was written down. This would help in providing a micro-context for analyzing the data.

Only teachers’ talk was taken into consideration, i.e. counted and coded. The importance of students’ talk was seen in the sense that it provided a linguistic context for teachers’ talk as the value or meaning of any discourse unit relies on its relation to what precedes it, and what follows it (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975 and Chaudron 1988). Thus, students’ talk was important as a guide to interpreting and, consequently, coding teacher’s talk by clarifying the context for the teacher’s shift to the L1. The following examples show the value of teacher language in context (note: L1 utterances are written in *italics*):

Example 1
Abdallah: said-
T: Said or told?
Abdallah: said
T: Why?
Abdallah: *Because it stays as it is.*

T: *Because said stays as it is.*

In this example, the teacher's last utterance by itself may give the impression that it is explaining or talking explicitly about L2 rules, but when examined in relation to students' talk (the whole linguistic context) it becomes clear that it is no more than feedback (repeating the student's answer).

Example 2

T: *What shall I put?*

Few students: *Full stop.*

T: *Full stop. What shall I put?*

Wh class: *Full stop.*

In this example, although the teacher asked the same question twice using the L1, the purpose was different in each case. In the first utterance, the question was meant to check students' comprehension of how to end the sentence. In the second, the question was meant to involve all students. Again, this cannot be decided without looking at the whole context.

e.g.3

S31: *The past perfect tense consists of –*

T: *I am not asking what it consists of.*

The teacher's comment in this example, which was categorized as feedback, could not be classified without referring to the student's talk.

Also, remarks and notes were always taken, while transcribing and while observing the lessons in the classroom, as mentioned previously, to refer to any extra-linguistic contextual clues or incidents that could help in clarifying or explaining certain contributions by the teacher. In a few cases, there was difficulty in deciphering a certain word; many attempts were made to decipher it from the cassette player; help was also sought from other people to try. If all attempts to decipher the word failed, there were attempts for sensible guesses relying on the linguistic and extra-linguistic context. If this was not possible, it was left blank on the paper. Simple techniques for transcription were followed: for example, if the teacher
was interrupted in the middle of his talk a sign of + was used; when the teacher paused (end of a sentence or an utterance) a full stop was used; if the teacher did not complete his utterance on purpose, waiting for students to complete it (eliciting) two dots ‘..’ were used; if the teacher was asking a question a question mark (?) was put at the end of the question; if he cut his speech to change topic or something like that a hyphen (-) was used.

5.9.2.3 Unit of analysis

After transcribing all data, it was necessary to settle on a basic unit for analysing teachers’ talk. This would include quantifying teachers’ L1 use in general, coding their L1 uses against the CCS according to the functions they fulfil, and quantifying the amount/percentages of L1 use for each category.

"Discourse analysis refers to a variety of procedures for examining chunks of language ....... In the case of classroom, discourse analysis usually involves the analysis of spoken language as it is used in classrooms among teachers and learners ......... It covers many analytic processes, from coding and quantification to more qualitative interpretations" (Allwright & Bailey 1991: 61).

Similar studies were surveyed to find the most suitable method for quantitative and qualitative analyses. In fact, two different methods were employed; one for the mere purpose of counting individual and total teachers’ L1 use; and one for coding these uses against the CCS according to their function, and for calculating the frequency of L1 use within each category. The purpose of that was to guarantee maximum accuracy for each kind of analysis. Details of that will be given in the next sections.

5.9.2.3.1 Quantitative Analysis

Different methods for quantitative analysis were explored. Duff & Polio (1990) and Macaro (2001) used time intervals to quantify language use in their studies. The former listened to the language used using a digital watch that they stopped every 15 seconds. They coded the utterance they heard in the 15 seconds as either fully in the L1, mostly in the L1 (with one word or phrase in the L2), or a mixture of both. Macaro (2001) used an audio-recorded bleep that played every 5 seconds. The advantage of this method, as Duff & Polio (1990) express it, is that the tapes do not need to be transcribed, but a major disadvantage is that it does not give a clear accurate quantification of the language used. Macaro (2001) agrees that a method like word count can yield higher percentages of L1 use. Liu et al. (2004) and Rolin-lanzitie & Brownlie (2001) used the word count in their studies.
The word count was then seen as the best option in the sense of accuracy. This was also thought to be more convenient to the main purpose of the study, which is to document possible functions of L1 use rather than to calculate how much L1 use is required or how much time is thought to be taken from the L2 interaction. In other words, "the salience, effectiveness or meaningfulness" of this verbal behaviour which we are looking for "has no intrinsic relationship to the duration of the event" to borrow Chaudron's (1988: 20) terms. The time interval method would be more useful if the duration or the occurrence of the behaviour was an issue in itself. Using time intervals or even another linguistic unit that is longer than the word could distort the final amount of L1 use; namely it would either over- or under-rate it.

Thus, the entire talk of every individual teacher, whether English or Arabic was counted word by word to have a number of total words used. Then the Arabic words were counted in order to get the percentage of L1 use in each lesson. The few words that could not be deciphered at all were not counted so that they would not distort the percentage of L1 use. This proved to be a highly accurate method of calculation, but it was not unproblematic, though. Arabic is different from English in typology and writing features. For example, there are no indefinite articles in Arabic, thus the equivalent of 'a book' in Arabic will be one word /kitab/; similarly, many pronouns (e.g. possessive and object pronouns) and articles (e.g. the) in Arabic are joined to the main word in writing. A result of this is that what could count as up to two or three words in English would count as one word in Arabic.

Thus, the word count method was used in a limited way to calculate the exact amount of L1 talk used by teachers in the L2 classroom as it was thought to be the best method to get accurate percentages of L1 talk. Yet, both Liu et al. (2004) and Macaro (2001) warn against equating words spent in speaking L1 and L2 with time spent speaking L1 and L2. "A teacher may spend less time using the L1 or more time exposing students to the L2 than the word counts would suggest" (Liu et al. 2004: 614). Or, in Macaro's words:

the communicative content of an utterance in the L1 can be delivered in a very short time compared to the lengthy sequences that are a feature of the L2 interaction in which many types of input modification techniques and repetition techniques are used (Macaro 2001: 537).
5.9.2.3.2 Qualitative analysis

For qualitative purposes (i.e. classifying teachers' L1 talk according to purposes of use) the word-by-word method which was used for quantification purposes would obviously be of no use. We now need a functional unit to describe samples of L1 use against.

Guthrie (1984) used conversational acts to code teachers' utterances. He describes the conversational-act as follows: "C-acts represent a taxonomy of speech act types which code utterances according to (1) the grammatical structure of the utterance, (2) its illocutionary properties, and (3) its general semantic or propositional content" (Guthrie 1984: 43).

In their empirical study, Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie (2002) used "the passage" as the basic unit for coding the functions of teachers' uses of the L1. They used phonetic features to identify the passage which centred on one linguistic item/problem.

Criteria to determine the beginning and the end of passages included the discursive notion of utterance (when a teacher starts and finishes her turn of speech) as well as prosodic features of speech (falling intonation indicating the end of a teacher's speaking)......... In those cases, each interaction focuses on one specific item of linguistic content (one vocabulary item, one pronunciation problem, or one grammar question) (Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002: 409).

Swain & Lapkin (2000) used the turn as the basic unit for analyzing students' uses of the L1. The turn consisted of brief exchanges of two or more turns. They counted turns that fully or partially included use of the L1.

These methods for coding language use seem to be broad or loose, in the sense that other uses can be obscured and overlooked by the emphasis on the overall linguistic item. Coulthard (1977: 7) states that "discourse analysis must be concerned with the functional use of language". He then continues "the unit of analysis is not the grammatically defined 'clause' or 'sentence'". Hamers & Blanc (2000) comment that it is hard to define the clause or sentence in oral discourse, as spoken language tends to be dominated by incomplete clauses or sentences. Turnbull (2000: 2) used, as the basic unit of analysis, what he called 'a qualitative like approach'. He divided teachers' talk into discourse units, in which each unit had a communicative function. No additional details about the nature of that functional unit were given. Macaro (1998), on the other hand, used two units of analysis: the "Transaction", and the "instance of Recourse to L1 (RL1)". The "transaction" represented a kind of
pedagogic interactional exchange within which the RL1 occurred, as Macaro was examining L1 use within a broader study of classroom interaction.

In an attempt to reach the smallest unit of analysis, Bellack et al. (1966) defined the move as the smallest basic unit of analysis. Sinclair & Coulthard (1975) disagreed with this. They gave the following example of what can be classified as a move to show that the move cannot be satisfactory as a basic unit in discourse analysis:

“Now I’m going to show you a word and I want you-anyone who can—to tell me if they if they can tell me what the word says. Now it’s a bit difficult. It’s upside down for some of you isn’t it? Anyone think they know what it says?
(Hands raised)
Two people. Three people. Lets see what you think, Martin, what do you think it says?
(Sinclair & Coulthard 1975: 23).

Sinclair & Coulthard thought that such a move needed to be structured further into smaller units or ‘ranks’ as they call it. The ‘act’ was what they thought to be the basic unit in discourse analysis. They illustrated the relationship between acts and moves as following:

“Acts and moves in discourse are very similar to morphemes and words in grammar. By definition, move is the smallest free unit although it has a structure in terms of acts. Just as there are bound morphemes which cannot alone realize words, so there are bound acts which cannot alone realize moves” (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975: 23).

Fanselow (1977) and Chaudron (1988) agree that the act is a discourse unit that has ‘a specific discourse function’. As the purpose of this study is to find out what functions teachers use the L1 to achieve, it was thought that the act, as the smallest functional unit, would be the most suitable and effective basic unit to be used for analyzing teachers’ talk. This is to guarantee maximum coverage of teachers’ functional uses of the L1. The length of the act could vary from one word (e.g. good) to up to more than a line depending on the function it fulfils, as supported by Coulthard (1977: 8). Each act that contained L1 use (whether fully or partially) was counted and coded against the CCS for the function it fulfils.

“The main problem in analysing code-switching in functional terms is that many switches may be either multi-functional, or open to different functional interpretations” (Eldridge 1996: 305). Rolin-lanziti & Brownlie (2002) coded some passages under more than one category (up to three sometimes). This seemed to be attributed to the unit of analysis they used (the passage), which included more than one function (one act) within it. As the act, the
smallest functional unit, was chosen for analysing discourse in the current thesis, the possibility of such multi-coding was minimized. The act seemed to be more reliable and consistent in covering all possible functional units in our analysis. In the few cases where an act seemed to be open to different interpretations, an effort was made to look for contextual clues (verbal and nonverbal) to code it in the most closely related function. Without the availability of another coder, the researcher tried her best to guarantee consistency in coding. Two of the lessons which contained high levels of L1 use were coded first, then after a few days they were coded again to check consistency in coding. The results indicated that the procedures were being used in a consistent way. The researcher then went on with coding the rest of the sample. The following extract illustrates the method used for transcribing and defining the acts

e.g. 4

T: The pilot said we are lost 1

O.K. 2

This is called reported speech 3

This means that speech which happens between two persons is called direct speech 4

When reported to a third person it is called indirect speech 5

It is called .. 6

Whole class: Indirect speech

.............after a while..............

T: First step 7

Take away the inverted commas and replace them with the word that 8

Then we will change .. 9

Few students: The pronouns

T: The pronouns 10

In this example, the teacher’s talk involved ten acts plus two acts for students, but only the teacher’s talk was counted and analyzed. The length of acts, as shown, varies according to the function fulfilled within each segment of speech. Thus, ‘O.K.’ was counted as one act, and the whole string of ‘This means that speech which happens between two persons is called direct speech’ was also counted as an act. As just mentioned, each act that contained use of Arabic, even one or two words out of a long string of words, was counted and coded
against the CCS. Thus, if the Arabic used within the act contributed to fulfilling the main function of the act, such as acts 3 and 5, it was coded against the relevant category and subcategory in the CCS; thus acts 3 and 5, for example, were coded as 3a (talking explicitly about L2 rules), and acts 6 and 9 were coded as 1c2 (eliciting contributions from students). Some acts contained non-pedagogical uses of Arabic such as a linking word (e.g. the, and), a speech mark (e.g. well, then, etc.), or idiosyncratic use, in which one word was used for no obvious reason. In this case, the L1 use was coded against the relative subcategory under category 5, for example act 10 was coded as 5b (a linking word).

**Conclusion**

This field study seeks to collect data about how teachers and students view the L1 use in the FL classroom, and how teachers actually use the L1 in the FL classroom. The study also aims at describing and explaining teachers’ use of the L1, finding regularities and irregularities, and drawing patterns. The research employs an ethnographic approach in collecting and analyzing data. This involves mainly the use of qualitative methods of analyses to code, describe, and interpret the L1 events, still making use of quantitative methods to count occurrences and frequencies of L1 use by teachers. The next chapter will then present the results and interpret them in light of the theoretical and contextual realizations as discussed in earlier chapters and concretized in the CCS, and as identified in the local context of the study.
Chapter 6
Results and Discussion

As indicated at the beginning of chapter 5, this study, then, aims at examining the perceived value of LI use as seen by teachers and students (questions 1 & 2); describing teachers’ actual use of the LI within the FL classroom (questions 3 & 4); comparing the perceived value and the actual use with each other (question 5), and looking for the factors or justifications behind teachers’ use of the LI. The purpose of this is to find out if teachers’ use of the LI is based on any theoretical or pedagogical base. Depending on the answers found, a comparison with our account of the potentially useful uses of the LI begun in Chapter 4 and to be continued in chapter 7 will allow us to answer our 6th research question: what could be done to ensure an optimal use of the LI in Egyptian classrooms based on firm learning and teaching principles?

6.1 Perceived value of LI use

If we agree that the main purpose of the classroom is to achieve learning, and that this is what really directs teachers’ behaviour in the classroom, then it is sensible to know how students view the teachers’ use of the LI, and how they expect that this will help them in their learning. This knowledge of students’ preferences may help in understanding teachers’ views.

As outlined in chapter 5, a questionnaire was given to teachers to elicit their views about LI use. The first part of the teachers’ questionnaire elicited general information about teachers’ and their students’ use of the LI. The second part was an attitude scale that tested teachers’ agreement or disagreement about different uses of the LI that covered the five categories in the CCS. The scale required teachers to choose one out of five points on a scale ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. Another questionnaire was designed for students that was parallel to the first part of the teacher’s questionnaire in order to have extra supporting information, from members of the class to whom the process of teaching is directed, about how the LI is used in the FL classroom. Teachers’ answers on the first part of their questionnaire and students’ answers on their questionnaire will be dealt with simultaneously and compared to find out similarities and differences to form a principal idea about how the LI is used in the FL classroom, as reported by the participants (section 6.1.1). The second
part of the teachers’ questionnaires, which elicits the teachers’ attitudes towards the use of the L1, will be dealt with separately in section (6.1.2). As for the informal interviews, quotations from teachers’ comments will be given whenever applicable. They will mainly help in discussing the factors behind teachers’ perception or actual use of the L1.

The final data included 16 teachers’ questionnaires and 506 students’ questionnaires (See appendices IX and X for the distribution of students’ and teachers’ answers on the questionnaires in numbers and percentages).

6.1.1 The reported use of the L1 in the FL classroom

The analysis of students’ answers on their questionnaire and teachers’ answers on section I of their questionnaire showed the following facts/findings:

6.1.1.1 How far teachers and students use the L1 in the EFL classroom

All teachers agreed that they used the L1 in their classes. This was supported by a majority of students (92.89%). More than half of the teachers (9 teachers out of 16) said they used the L1 less than 10% of their talk, 5 said 10% - 20%, and 2 said 20% - 50%. None of the teachers said that they used the L1 for more than 50% of their talk. Thus, a majority of teachers (87.5%) reported they did not use the L1 for more than 20%. This value of L1 use is much less than the average value of (40%) reported by the intermediate group teachers (which is parallel to our group) in Kharma & Hajjaj (1989). Again, all teachers reported that they allowed their students to use the L1, which was supported by a majority of students (96.84%). This finding is consistent with Kharma and Hajjaj’s (1989) finding that 95% of students use the L1 in L2 classrooms.

6.1.1.2 How teachers and students feel about teachers’ language use

When asked whether they should be allowed to use the L1 in the FL classroom, students were divided (39.92% agreed, 26.88% disagreed, 31.42% did not know). Yet, they showed more agreement about teachers’ use of the L1. Almost half of the students (48.62%) thought that teachers should use the L1 in the L2 class. Turnbull (2001) found that most students thought that teachers should use the L1. This might be attributed to awareness among students that the L2 is the subject of study, and that they are the ones who are supposed to learn the L2, so they were not sure about the validity of using any means other than the foreign language on their own part. On the other hand the teacher is the source of
information and the facilitator of their learning process, so he/she is expected, from their point of view, to use any means, including the L1, to help them use and understand the L2 better. In other words, the students' views imply a tendency to view the L1 as an aid to be used by the teacher to facilitate their understanding and use of the L2, and hence they support the teacher's use of the L1 more than they do their own use.

In line with Duff and Polio (1990), who found that their students understood most of their teachers' L2 talk, 81.25% of the teachers in this study thought that their students understood 50% or more of their L2 talk. This agreed with their students' answers, as a majority of students said they understood their teachers' L2-only talk (33.20% said all of it, 43.87% said most of it, 12.45% said some of it). This paralleled with more than half of the students (59.68%) compared with more than two thirds of the teachers (68.75%) who expressed satisfaction with teachers' amount of L1 use. This is in line with Duff & Polio (1990) who also found that their students expressed satisfaction with their teachers' amount of L1 use.

6.1.1.3 What activities teachers and students prefer using the L1 for

When asked if teachers' use of the L1 helped them engage in interaction in the L2 (question 7), or learn about the L2 rules (question 8), 88.74% said it helped them engage in oral interaction, and 83.60% agreed it did help them in learning about the L2 rules. In question 9, which required students to choose uses of the L1 that helped them most, the frequencies of students' answers showed the order of their preferences. An average of 38.84% of students chose a) and b) which referred to teachers' use of the L1 in communicative input. 34.26% chose c), d), and e) which referred to teachers' use of the L1 in formal input. 31.41% chose i) and j) which referred to teachers' use of the L1 in organizational input. A lower percentage of 24.11% of students chose f), g), and h) which referred to teachers' use of the L1 in affective input. Thus, students showed a higher preference for uses of the L1 for communicative purposes, followed by cognitive declarative purposes, then organizational purposes, whilst affective purposes came last in priority. This shows a particular concern, on the part of students, with using the language and learning about its rules, and the role of the teacher in supporting them in this respect. It seemed that students gave less priority to affective aspects of L1 use by the teacher, as they didn't see that they directly contribute to their learning or use of the L2.
As for teachers’ preferences, in an open question that asked teachers about which activities they thought the use of the L1 was most appropriate for, all teachers’ answers centered on grammar, vocabulary or both. This seemed to match with students’ agreement on question 8 that teachers’ use of the L1 helped them learn about the L2 rules better (83.60%). This meant that both teachers and students valued the use of the L1 for cognitive declarative purposes.

On the other hand, when asked about the activities which should not be carried out in the L1, a majority of the teachers (81.25%) said dialogues. This showed a discrepancy with the majority of students (88.74%) who agreed that use of the L1 by teachers helped them engage in oral interaction. This also showed discrepancy between teachers’ and students’ priorities in perceiving the value of the L1. Whereas students gave more importance to use of the L1 in communicative input, then in formal input, a majority of teachers gave importance to the use of the L1 with formal input, while rejecting it with communicative input. The following section will turn to teachers’ answers on section II of their questionnaire which covers all possible pedagogical and non-pedagogical L1 uses as documented in the CCS.

6.1.2 Teachers’ attitudes towards the potential uses of the L1 (Section II)
In section II of the teachers’ questionnaire, teachers’ attitudes towards the potential uses of the L1 that are identified in the CCS were elicited by an attitude scale. The questions in that section were organized in order to cover the five potential categories of L1 use.
Questions 1 - 6 covered the use of the L1 for communicative functions
Questions 7 - 10 covered the use of the L1 for formal functions
Questions 11 - 17 covered the use of the L1 for affective functions
Questions 18 - 20 covered the use of the L1 for organizational functions
Questions 21 - 26 covered non-pedagogical uses of the L1
(See appendix X for a detailed distribution of teachers’ answers on the questionnaire).

6.1.2.1 Teachers’ attitudes towards use of the L1 for communicative functions
Referring to the distribution of teachers’ answers on questions 1 - 6 on section 2 of the teachers’ questionnaire, a majority of teachers did not agree with any of the uses of the L1 for communicative functions. This attitude matched with their previous agreement on question 6 in the first section of the questionnaire that the L1 was not appropriate with dialogues, and mismatched with their students’ preferences.
6.1.2.2 Teachers’ attitudes towards use of the L1 for formal functions
Questions 7 - 10 centered on potential uses of the L1 for formal functions; a different attitude among teachers appeared here. There was more agreement about uses of the L1 in formal input such as, explaining difficult grammar points and difficult L2 vocabulary explicitly. This, again, seemed to match with teachers’ earlier answer on question 5 in section 1 of the questionnaire, where all teachers mentioned only grammar and vocabulary as the most appropriate activities to use the L1 with. It also matched with their students’ perceptions, although the latter gave more importance to communicative uses, as discussed earlier. The only function that more teachers disagreed with was overcoming pronunciation problems, which was understandable, as the L1 has not got much to do with pronunciation.

6.1.2.3 Teachers’ attitudes towards use of the L1 for affective functions
Teachers’ answers on questions 11 - 17 on section 2 of the questionnaire showed that most teachers did not support uses of the L1 for affective functions, except with questions 12 (joking or chatting with students) and 16 (supporting less proficient students). This matched with students giving LI uses for affective purposes least importance.

6.1.2.4 Teachers’ attitudes towards use of the L1 for organizational functions
Questions 18 - 20 covered uses of the L1 for organizational functions. Again, a majority of teachers did not support uses of the L1 for reasons such as reinforcing instructions, managing students’ behaviour, or even attracting students’ attention to involve them. This again matched with students giving such uses of the L1 second least importance.

6.1.2.5 Teachers’ attitudes towards use of the L1 for non-pedagogical functions
Questions 21 – 26 covered uses of the L1 for non-pedagogical functions. Unlike previous questions, some of those questions expressed negative reasons for using the L1 (24 and 25); and some expressed reservations about the use of L2-only (22, 23, and 26). Most of the teachers again refused the use of the L1 for non-pedagogical functions. A majority of them even thought that the use of the L1 reflected the teacher’s laziness or lack of proficiency. The only value that they were divided over was the fact that L2-only might sound unnatural when teachers and students shared the same L1 (7 teachers agreed and 7 disagreed out of 16 teachers).
6.1.3 What influences teachers' perception of the L1

The answers of teachers' and students' questionnaires show that both teachers and students use the L1 in the L2 classroom to some degree, and that they are happy with their current practice of L1 use. Students expect their teachers to use the L1 to support their learning more than they expect that they themselves should be allowed to use the L1. Teachers' views of L1 use matched, to some extent, students' expectations both in agreeing about the use of the L1 for cognitive reasons, while rejecting or having reservations about its use for affective and organizational purposes. They differed in viewing the L1 for communicative purposes; while teachers rejected the value of L1 use with communicative input, students valued the use of the L1 in that respect.

When we compare teachers' views about the value of L1 use against the CCS we find that teachers do not support any of the potential uses of the L1, except for the use of the L1 for cognitive declarative purposes. Thus, what appears at this stage is that teachers' perception of L1 use does not fit with our theoretically justified framework of L1 use. They do not see much usefulness or value in the L1 use except that it facilitates explicit teaching of the language rules. The question that presents itself accordingly is what, then, shapes teachers' perception of the L1 use?

Question number 2 in section I of the teachers' questionnaire asked teachers if their department/school had a policy regarding the use of the L1 in the FL class. 81.25% of the teachers (13 Ts) said that there was a policy regarding the use of the L1, while 12.5% (2 Ts) said there was not. One teacher did not give any answer. All 13 teachers who said that there was a policy commented that the inspectorate (who were responsible for evaluating teachers and promoting them) usually prescribed to them to use the L1 only as a "final resort" or "when urgently needed".

When informally interviewing some of the teachers, they all referred to the inspectorate policy and how they, constantly, urged them to use the L2 for all class activities. Even one of the two teachers who said, on the questionnaire, that there was no policy regarding the use of the L1 said the same as the other 13 teachers in the informal interview. He said that the inspectorate viewed the use of the L1 by the teacher as a drawback or a negative point in the
lesson, and that they usually indicated to them that if the L1 had to be used it ought to be a “final resort”.

This gives the impression that those teachers’ views about the use of the L1 in the classroom were influenced by the official policy, represented by the inspectorate body, especially that their career promotions depended on the reports written about them by the inspectors. According to Malamah-Thomas (1987), teachers are influenced by what is prescribed for them as desirable practice or good teaching to an extent that they may behave in a way that is completely different from their true personalities. “The pressure to conform to externally set standards and prescribed categories .... leads to many teachers exhibiting what they consider to be the most desirable performance in the circumstances” (Malamah-Thomas 1987: 75). Hence, teachers’ perception of the value of L1 use seems to be shaped by what is dictated to them, by officials, as most desirable. Thus, to be fair, as L2 use is the current orthodoxy, we should perhaps have expected these responses.

The next section will, in turn, examine teachers’ actual use of the L1 in the L2 classroom, and what functions/purposes they tend to achieve through their use of the L1.

6.2 Teachers’ actual use of the L1

As mentioned in the last chapter, 16 lessons for 16 different teachers in Eadadi schools were recorded to collect data about teachers’ actual use of the L1 in Egyptian FL classrooms. The aims included calculating the quantity of the L1 use and coding individual uses against the CCS according to the functions they achieve in the teacher’s input.

6.2.1 The quantity of L1 use

As mentioned in chapter 5, teachers’ lessons were divided into three groups according to the dominant activity in each lesson. Thus, we have Group A whose main activity is learning about the language (Grammar based lessons), Group B whose main activity is communication skills (Communication based lessons), and Group C whose main activity is reading (Reading based lessons). The analyses showed that the total average of teachers’ actual use of the L1 when calculated word by word was 17.04%. This is a middle percentage between Macaro’s (2001) 4.8% and Liu et al’s (2004) 40% in similar contexts (formal high
school classes). This means that teachers in the current study used the L2 for an average of about 83% of their total talk in the classroom (calculated in words and not in time), a percentage that is higher than the value of 70% and 79% that Chaudron (1988: 124) describes as "respectably high" in formal FL contexts (even though the calculation methods might be different). This strengthens the argument/proposal that it is not the amount of L1 use that should be the main source of concern for L2 practitioners, but rather the nature and characteristics of that use and its significance for interaction and learning in the FL classroom. The following table shows how much LI use was scored by individual teachers and the average in each group.

Table 6.1
Quantity of teachers' talk in words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A:</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(%) of L1 use</td>
<td>(47.60)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(23.01)</td>
<td>(29.47%)</td>
<td>(14.63)</td>
<td>(24.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
<th>T8</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(%) of L1 use</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>5.85%</td>
<td>(5.29)</td>
<td>(14.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>T9</th>
<th>T10</th>
<th>T11</th>
<th>T12</th>
<th>T13</th>
<th>T14</th>
<th>T15</th>
<th>T16</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(%) of L1 use</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>54.91</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>41.07</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>36.70</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>(20.95%)</td>
<td>(19.26)</td>
<td>(54.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, group A, with main activity learning about the L2, showed the highest average of LI use. Group B, with main activity communication skills, showed the lowest average of LI use. Group C, the reading group, showed a use (20.95%) just above the average of all teachers (17.04%). This might seem to be a high percentage for reading lessons, but as mentioned in chapter 5 these lessons did not contain prolonged segments of reading by the teacher as might be expected from reading lessons. They contained a lot of question/answer exchanges and oral discussions.

A total average of 17.04% LI use meant that teachers' average percentage of actual LI use matched with the averages reported in the questionnaire (see 6.1.1.1), where a majority of teachers said that they used the LI either less than 10% (9 teachers), or between 10% and 20% (5 teachers). In other words, an actual percentage of 17.04% LI use supported the majority
of 14 teachers (87.50% of teachers) who reported that they used the L1 for less than 20% of their talk in FL lessons. Yet, the following table shows that on the individual level, still many teachers were not aware of the extent to which they really used the L1 in actual teaching.

Table 6.2
The quantity of teachers' L1 use (reported and actual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>How often</th>
<th>Reported use</th>
<th>Satisfaction with own use</th>
<th>Actual use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.1</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>&gt; than 10%</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.2</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>&gt; than 10%</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.3</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>10% - 20%</td>
<td>Want a bit less</td>
<td>23.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.4</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>&gt; than 10%</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.5</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>&gt; than 10%</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>14.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.6</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>10% - 20%</td>
<td>Want a bit less</td>
<td>4.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.7</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>&gt; than 10%</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.8</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>&gt; than 10%</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.9</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>&gt; than 10%</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.10</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>20% - 50%</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>54.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.11</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>10% - 20%</td>
<td>Want a bit less</td>
<td>7.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.12</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>20% - 50%</td>
<td>Want a bit less</td>
<td>41.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.13</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>&gt; than 10%</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.14</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>&gt; than 10%</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.15</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>10% - 20%</td>
<td>Want a bit less</td>
<td>36.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.16</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>10% - 20%</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>14.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that most teachers tended to describe their L1 as occasional whatever quantity of L1 was actually used or even reported to be used. Thus, teachers who reported that they used the L1 less than 10%, 10% - 20%, and 20% - 50% all described their uses as occasional (apart from T3 who described his reported use 10% - 20% as quite a lot). There were also a number of contradictions in how teachers felt about their reported use of the L1. Some of the
teachers who reported they used the LI 10% - 20% wanted to use it a bit less (e.g. T3, T6, T11, and T15) while T16 was satisfied with that percentage. Also, the two teachers who reported they used the LI 20% - 50% differed; one of them was satisfied (T10), whereas the other wanted a bit less (T12). This indicates a loose interpretation, on the part of teachers, for how much LI can be viewed as occasional or a lot, satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

Moreover, when this is compared to the actual amounts of LI uses by the teachers, we will find more contrasts; for example, some teachers reported that they used the LI less than 10% while, in the classroom, they used higher actual percentages, e.g. T1 (47.6%), T2 (12.8%), T5 (14.78%). Similarly, some of the teachers who reported they used the LI 10% - 20% also used more LI than they reported, e.g. T3 (23.01%), and T15 (36.70%). Even one of the teachers who reported they used the LI 20% - 50% scored a higher percentage of 54.91%. On the other hand, some teachers used the LI less than they reported, e.g. T6 and T11 reported that they used the LI 10% - 20%, but in real classroom interaction they used less LI (4.58% and 7.78%). Thus, half of the teachers were not aware of the extent to which they used the LI.

As argued in chapter 3, it is the interaction that happens inside the classroom that really affects or directs learning. Thus, whatever the main activity of the lesson may be, investigating the interaction inside the classroom, with its four pedagogical (communicative, formal, affective and organizational), and one non-pedagogical aspects will give a more accurate picture about how teachers use the LI. The next section will show how far teachers employ the LI with each of these different types of functions, and find out if the type of the lesson has a role in this. Namely, the next section seeks to find out if the dominant activity in the lesson will motivate or direct teachers to use the LI with certain aspects of the input rather than with others.

6.2.2 The distribution of LI uses within groups and categories of the CCS
As mentioned in chapter 5, the word count method was suitable for quantification purposes, but not for coding teachers' LI uses against the CCS or, in other words, for understanding the function which determines the use of the LI. As the coding process related to the functions of LI use, the act was seen to be a basic and suitable functional unit of analysis. Thus, from now on, all percentages describing distribution of LI uses among groups or categories are calculated in acts not words.
The total number of acts that contained L1 use, either partially or fully, was 1531 acts for all groups with an average of 95.7 acts for every teacher. The three teachers in Group A produced 371 L1 acts with an average of 123.7 acts for each teacher. The five teachers in Group B produced 257 L1 acts with an average of 51.4 acts for each teacher. The eight teachers in Group C produced 903 acts with an average of 112.9 acts for each teacher.

6.2.2.1 Comparing L1 use in each category across groups

In this part, we will examine how much L1 was used within each category in the CCS to find out which aspects of the input teachers tend to use the L1 most with. This will, in turn, be compared with their attitudes as reported on the questionnaire to find out how far their actual use matches with their reported use. Table 6.3 shows the distribution of L1 uses within each category across groups.

Table 6.3
Comparing L1 use within each category across groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of L1 use</th>
<th>Groups of teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of L1 use in each categ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of L1 acts used</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. A</td>
<td>G. B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categor1 Use of L1 to aid communicative use</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. L1 to prepare for communication</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a1. Discuss cultural points</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a2. Give information about the task</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. L1 to enhance the input</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b1. Clarify meaning</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b2. Check students' understanding</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b3. Sum up what has been said/done</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. L1 to push oral interaction</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c1. Repair communication breakdown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c2. Elicit contribution from students</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c3. Prompt more contributions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c4. Provide feedback for students</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Categories of L1 use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categori Use of L1 to aid declarative learning</th>
<th>G. A</th>
<th>G. B</th>
<th>G. C</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of L1 use in each categ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a. Talk explicitly about L2 rules</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Contrast L1 and L2 rules</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Highlight pronunciation features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categor III Use of L1 to aid affective aspects</th>
<th>G. A</th>
<th>G. B</th>
<th>G. C</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of L1 use in each categ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Build rapport with students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.703%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Respond to students' initiations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Relate content to students' life</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Provide support for less proficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categor IV Use of L1 to aid organization</th>
<th>G. A</th>
<th>G. B</th>
<th>G. C</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of L1 use in each categ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a. Organize classroom setting</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>58.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Call for students' attention</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. Clarify instructions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d. Direct students' to do something</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categor V. Non-pedagogical code-switching</th>
<th>G. A</th>
<th>G. B</th>
<th>G. C</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of L1 use in each categ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Use L1 with speech markers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>31.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Use L1 with linking words</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Use L1 with nominating students</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Idiosyncratic code-switching</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>28.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e. Use L1 for making asides</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The percentages in bold are calculated within the total use in all categories, i.e. within the 1531 acts. The percentages in normal writing are calculated within the subcategories, e.g. the percentages of 1a, 1b, 1c are calculated within the 690 L1 acts of Categ. I, the percentages of 2a, 2b, 2c are calculated within the 50 L1 acts of Categ. II, and so on. The percentages between (brackets) are calculated within the sub-subcategories, e.g. the percentages of 1b1, 1b2, 1b3 are calculated within the 291 L1 acts of subcateg. 1b.

Category I

Category I coded L1 uses that contributed to communicative aspects of the teacher's input in the classroom interaction. Table 3 shows that category I had the highest percentage of L1 use out of all categories; it had close to half of the total L1 use in the sample (45.07%). This is in line with Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie's (2002) results where they found 48.62% of the L1 used was for communicative purposes. All three groups scored similar percentages of L1 use within this category regardless of the difference in the type of the lesson; Group A made 171...
out of 371 (46.09%); Group B made 119 out of 257 (46.30%); Group C made 400 out of 903 (44.30%). The category was divided into three subcategories, and each subcategory was further divided into sub-subcategories (see the CCS in chapter 5). 1c, which referred to teachers’ uses of the L1 to push oral interaction, had more than half of the L1 uses within this category (56.23%). Providing feedback to students (1c4) had almost half of teachers’ L1 uses, and eliciting contributions from students (1c2) had more than one third of the L1 uses within this subcategory. 1b also had a high percentage of 42.17% L1 use; it coded uses of the L1 by the teacher to enhance the comprehensibility of the input. Rolin-lanziti & Brownlie’s (2002) also found high percentages of L1 use for the purpose of increasing the comprehensibility of the input (30.94% of the total L1 use; they referred to these uses as translation (see section 3.3)). The highest percentage of L1 use in this subcategory was for clarifying meaning (64.95%) (these seemed to be closest to what Rolin-lanziti & Brownlie referred to as translation), followed by checking students’ understanding (29.55%); and at the end, with a low percentage of 5.50%, came the use of the L1 to sum up what has been done previously. Use of the L1 to prepare for communication (1a) came at the end with a very small percentage of 1.59% exclusive to the use of the L1 for introducing communicative tasks. Discussing cultural points did not occur in our data whether in the L1 or even the L2, although some lessons contained communicating in the L2 using speech acts such as inviting, accepting and rejecting invitations, agreeing, accepting, etc. This might be attributed to lack of knowledge of social and cultural norms in English, on the part of the teachers (who may have never been to a target language community), or to the difficulty of handling such aspects in the L2 only without the use of the L1, which teachers were trying to avoid.

Category II

Category II included/coded L1 uses that contributed to formal aspects of the teacher’s input in the classroom interaction. Category II scored the lowest L1 uses across groups in general (3.27%) (although Groups A and B made more use of the L1 in this category than in category III). This disagreed with Rolin-lanziti & Brownlie’s (2002) who found that metalinguistic purposes came third, after communicative purposes and translation for increasing comprehensibility, with a percentage of 20.44% of the total L1 used. The category was divided into three subcategories; 2a, which referred to talking explicitly about L2 rules, had most of the L1 uses in this category (96%). No reference to the L1 was made in 2b, which referred to L1 uses for contrastive purposes, i.e. comparing L1 and L2 rules whether
grammatical, lexical, semantic, or phonological. Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie's (2002) found that comments on L2 rules (grammatical and communicative) represented 16.02% of metalinguistic L1 uses, while contrasts represented only 4.42%. Category 1c, in turn, had only 2 uses out of 50; one by Group A and one by Group B; it referred to using the L1 for highlighting pronunciation features in the L2.

Category III
Category III included/coded L1 uses that contributed to affective aspects of the teacher's input in the classroom interaction. The table shows that category III had a very low percentage of the total L1 use (second lowest after category II). The category was divided into four subcategories. 3b, which referred to teachers' uses of the L1 to respond to students' initiations in the L1, had close to half of the total L1 uses within this category (47.30%). This was followed by category 3a, that is use of the L1 by teachers to build rapport with students (27.03%), and then 3c, relating the content to students' own experiences (21.62%). Supporting less proficient students (3d) had the lowest percentage of L1 uses within this category, scoring only 4.05%.

Category IV
Category IV included/coded L1 uses that contributed to organizational aspects of the teacher's input in the classroom interaction. The category had 21.16% of the total L1 use in all categories. This represented a middle percentage between categories I and V, as the highest and categories II and III, as the lowest. This category was divided into four subcategories. Category 4a, which involved use of the L1 to organize the classroom setting, had more than half of the L1 acts within that category (58.02%). Similar percentages of L1 use were made in the subcategories 4c, giving instructions (16.36%), and 4d, directing students to do or notice something (16.98%). They together represented exactly one third of the total number of L1 acts within that category. 4b, that is use of the L1 to involve students, scored the least L1 use within the category (8.64%).

Category V
Category V included/coded L1 uses that were not thought to contribute to the learning process, but represented a feature of any bilingual contact; they seemed more like natural unorganized, and sometimes unconscious, code-switching. Surprisingly, this category had the second highest percentage of L1 use across all groups. It was divided into five
subcategories; 5a that refers to use of the L1 with speech markers scored the highest percentage (31.04%), followed by 5d, idiosyncratic code-switching (28.75%). They both had more than half of the L1 uses made in this category. Then came the subcategories 5b, 5c, and 5e in order.

6.2.2.2 Comparing L1 use in each group across categories
In this section, we will try to find out how the use of the L1 was distributed among categories of L1 use within each group. The purpose is to find out if the type of the lesson affects the way or the purpose for which teachers use the L1.

Group A
Table 6.4 shows the detailed distribution of L1 use in Group A across categories and subcategories.

Table 6.4
L1 use in Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of L1 use</th>
<th>Teachers in Group A</th>
<th>No. of L1 acts used</th>
<th>Average of each category within the same group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a1</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. II</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td></td>
<td>2c</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. III</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td></td>
<td>3c</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td></td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td></td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td></td>
<td>4c</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. V</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td></td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td></td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td></td>
<td>5c</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d</td>
<td></td>
<td>5d</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e</td>
<td></td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a detailed description of categories and subcategories of L1 use refer to chapter 5; for a quick reminder of what they are about refer to table 6.3.

Group A had three teachers who taught grammar as the basic activity in their lessons. The total LI acts made by the group were 371. The range of acts produced by teachers within the group varied from 191 for T1 to 83 for T3, with teacher 1 scoring more than half the LI acts within the group (51.48%). A majority of his uses (88%) were for pushing oral interaction. The group had their highest use of the LI in category I; 71.93% of these uses were for pushing oral interaction in the L2 classroom (Ic), particularly for eliciting L2 contributions from students (Ic2) and providing feedback to students (Ic4). 28.07% of the LI acts were used for enhancing the comprehensibility of the input (Ib), particularly for clarifying meaning and checking that students understand. In spite of the high percentage of LI uses in communicative input, none of the teachers in this group used the LI to prepare for communication.
The second highest LI use within the group was for non-pedagogical compensatory code-switching (category V). Teachers made 18.33%, of their LI acts in that category, more than half of which were produced by teacher 2.

Then came category IV, using the LI with organizational input, in the third position with a percentage of 17.52%. Use of the LI for organizing the classroom setting had close to two thirds of the total LI acts made in this category.

Before the last, came category II with LI use in formal input aiming for developing students’ cognitive conscious knowledge of the L2. The category had 10.24% of total LI acts made by the group. An overwhelming majority of 97.37% of the LI uses within this category aimed at talking explicitly about the L2 rules. Only one use, produced by teacher 1, was employed to highlight pronunciation features, while none of the teachers made any use of the LI for contrastive purposes (2b).

At the end came category III, use of the LI with affective input, with the lowest percentage of LI use within the group (7.82%). Responding to students’ initiations had more than half of the total LI use in this category (51.729%). Only teacher 1 made use of the LI for building rapport with students (3a) and for relating the content to students’ real experiences (3c). None of the teachers made use of the LI for providing support for less proficient students.

Thus, teachers in Group A made extensive use of the LI with communicative aspects of the input, while made little use of it with formal and affective aspects of the input.

**Group B**

Table 6.5 shows the detailed distribution of LI use in Group B across categories and subcategories.
Table 6.5

L1 use in Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories Of L1 use</th>
<th>Teachers in Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of L1 acts used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lb</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lb1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lb2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lb3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lc</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lc1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lc2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lc3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lc4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. II</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. III</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. IV</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group B had five teachers who taught communication in the L2 as the basic activity in their lessons. The total L1 acts made by the group were 257. The range of L1 utterances produced by teachers within the group varied from 118 for T5 to 3 for T8 (teacher 8 made use of his 3 L1 acts with communicative aspects of the input).

Group B had their highest LI use in category I as well, with almost the same percentage as Group A (46.30%). Similarly to Group A, Group B had the highest percentage of LI use for pushing oral interaction (64.71%). 96% of the LI acts within this subcategory were for eliciting L2 contributions from students (Ic2), and providing feedback to students (Ic4). Enhancing the input had 34.45% of the total LI acts made in this category, with almost three quarters of them for clarifying meaning. Only teacher 8 made one out of his 3 L1 acts for preparing for communication.

The second highest LI use within the group was again category V (non-pedagogical compensatory code-switching) which scored much higher than the remaining three categories altogether (31.91%). About one third of the LI uses within this category occurred in 5a, speech markers (32.93%), and more than one quarter occurred for idiosyncratic code-switching (5d).

Then came category IV with a percentage of (14.40%). Most of the uses occurred in 4a, organizing the classroom setting, and 4c, clarifying instructions. None of the teachers made use of the L1 in 4b, for involving students.

Category II came before last with a percentage of (4.28%). Most of the LI uses within this category aimed for talking explicitly about the L2 rules (90.91%). One act was made by teacher 4 for highlighting pronunciation features in the L2, while no L1 was used for contrasting L1 and L2 rules. Teachers 6, 7, and 8 made no L1 use within this category.
At the end came category III with a percentage of (3.11%) of the total L1 use within the group. Most of these uses occurred in 3a, building rapport with students, and 3b, responding to students’ initiations in the L1. No L1 uses were made to support less proficient students (2d). Teachers 7 and 8 made no use of the L1 in this category.

Thus, as was the case with Group A, teachers in Group B made extensive use of the L1 with communicative aspects of the input, while made little use of it with formal and affective aspects of the input.

**Group C**

Table 6.6 shows the detailed distribution of L1 use in Group C across categories and subcategories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of L1 use</th>
<th>Teachers in Group C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of L1 acts used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group C had eight teachers who taught reading as the basic activity in their lessons. The total L1 acts made by the group were 903. The range of acts produced by teachers within the group varied from 235 for T10 to 9 for T9.

Just as Groups A and B, group C had their highest L1 use in category I with a percentage of (44.30%). Teacher 10 alone made more than one third of the L1 uses within this category (38.75%). The group had the highest use in the subcategory Ib, enhancing the comprehensibility of the input, which had half of the total L1 use in this category (50.5). Uses of the L1 for pushing oral interaction in the L2 classroom came second with a percentage of (47%). Teachers 9 and 14 who had 4 uses each in category I used all their L1 acts for pushing oral interaction. Teachers made a low percentage of 2.5% L1 use in the subcategory la which referred to use of the L1 in preparing for communication.

The group had their second highest L1 use with non-pedagogical compensatory code-switching with a percentage of (26.91). About one third of the L1 acts made within this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categ. II</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>2c</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0.11%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>2c</td>
<td>2c</td>
<td>2c</td>
<td>2c</td>
<td>2c</td>
<td>2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. III</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>3c</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. IV</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>4c</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>24.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>59.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. V</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>5c</td>
<td>5d</td>
<td>5e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
category occurred with speech markers. Then came idiosyncratic code-switching in the second place.

The third highest L1 use was in category IV with a percentage of (24.58%). Teacher 9 made no L1 use at all in this category. More than half of the L1 uses in that category were made for organizing the classroom setting (59.56%).

In the fourth position came category III with a low percentage of (4.10%). Teacher 9 again made no L1 use in this category. The highest number of L1 acts in this category was made for responding to students’ initiations in the L1 (43.24%).

At the end came category II with a very low percentage of (0.11%). Only one L1 act was made in this category, by teacher 15, for talking explicitly about L2 rules.

Again, as was the case with Groups A and B, teachers in Group C made extensive use of the L1 with communicative aspects of the input, while made little use of it with formal and affective aspects of the input.

6.3 Discussion and interpretation of the results
Interpreting the results will refer to the quantitative and qualitative analyses of both the questionnaires and the lesson recordings. Referring back to the steps of qualitative analysis defined by Cohen et al. (2000) (see section 5.4), up to this point we have been particularly involved in the first two steps, namely, establishing units of analysis and creating domains of analysis. Now, we are moving a step further in our analysis process where we will seek to ‘establish relationships and linkages between the domains’, ‘make speculative inferences’, and ‘seek discrepant cases’. The interpretation will seek to explain, understand, and find relations between what the teachers perceive or say they do, what they actually do in the classroom, and what their students say about, or expect from, their teachers’ LI use. We will also seek, through ‘immersion in the data’, to discover what motivations appear to be behind teachers’ use of the L1.

This is an important stage, for it moves the research from description to inference. It requires the researcher, on the basis of the evidence, to posit some explanations for the situation, some key elements and possibly even their causes. (Cohen et al. 2000: 149).
The context where learning is taking place is very important in such an analysis. Guba & Lincoln (1989: 45) also confirm that “phenomena can be understood only within the context in which they are studied”. In the same vein, van Lier confirms that, in classroom ethnography, “any findings will have to be made relevant to the possibilities and limitations of the classroom” (van Lier 1988: 14, 15). This, as mentioned in chapter 5, will give enough description for other researchers to compare the similarities and differences between the research context and their contexts for purposes of generalizability and replicability. Chaudron (1988: 5) adds that:

“Classroom-oriented research .......... must adopt the secondary goal of understanding the nature of the contextual demands on learners and teachers. In this way, research would derive principles for instructional decision making that are valid across contexts”

6.3.1 The extent to which teachers’ reported use matched with their actual use

We have seen that the type of lesson influenced the amount of L1 use in general. Grammar based lessons, which involved explicit talk about the L2 rule, required the most L1 use (which matched with Neil’s 1997 findings) whereas communication based lessons, which involved communicative use of the language, required the least L1 use. This matched with teachers’ answers on the questionnaire that use of the L1 was appropriate with grammar and vocabulary teaching, but not appropriate with dialogues (communicating in the L2).

On the other hand, when we examined the distribution of L1 acts across categories and groups, we found that there were no real differences in the use of the L1 in classroom interaction. In other words, teachers tended to use the L1 in the same way for the same purposes of interaction regardless of the main type or purpose of the lesson. Thus, it was found that teachers in the three different groups of lessons used the L1 most with communicative input, then for non-pedagogical compensatory code-switching, then with organizational input. It was used least for affective and formal purposes.

The analysis of teachers’ uses of the L1 shows a lot of contradictions between teachers’ reported use of the L1 and their actual use of it inside the L2 classroom. An average percentage of 45.07% of L1 use for communicative functions among all groups shows an extreme degree of contradiction with a majority of teachers rejecting all uses of the L1 within that category in the questionnaire (see section 6.1.2.1). Again, teachers on the questionnaire did not support use of the L1 as a compensatory strategy (for non-pedagogical
purposes) (see section 6.1.2.5); they even agreed that such uses of the L1 might reflect teachers' laziness and lack of proficiency. Yet such uses of the L1 made the second highest percentage in real classroom interaction (25.67%). The use of the L1 for organizational functions, such as reinforcing instructions, managing students' behaviours, and attracting students' attention, was also rejected by a majority of teachers on the questionnaire. In real classroom interaction, such uses had the third highest percentage of L1 use.

Using the L1 for declarative functions in formal input shows the contradiction the other way round. Whereas a majority of the teachers agreed with most uses of the L1 within that category on the questionnaire (see section 6.1.2.2), in real practice, these uses had the lowest percentage of L1 use (3.27%).

As for use of the L1 for affective purposes, teachers' rejection of such uses of the L1 matched their actual use. Out of 7 uses of the L1 for affective purposes, teachers rejected 5. In real classroom interaction, teachers made a very limited use of the L1 for affective purposes. The only two aspects of affective input that teachers agreed they used the L1 with were building rapport with students (joking, chatting, showing care), and supporting less proficient students. Real classroom interaction showed that unlike teachers' reported preferences, a high percentage of the L1 acts in this category (47.30%) were for responding to students' initiations in the L1. Building rapport with students came in the second position with a percentage of 27.03%. As for supporting less proficient students, there were only 3 acts out of 74 made by two teachers from group C (T10 and T12).

Thus, if we briefly compare how teachers' actual use of the L1 matched or mismatched their and their students' views about the L1 use, we find that while most students supported use of the L1 for communicative purposes, most teachers did not. Contrary to that, in real interaction inside the classroom, a majority of teachers used the L1 most for communicative purposes. A majority of students again supported L1 uses for formal purposes, which was supported by a majority of teachers. Another contradiction manifested itself in teachers using a very minimal percentage of L1 in that category. Even though there were few lessons that contained explicit talk about the L2 rules (3 out of 16), L1 use for formal purposes still received a low percentage of L1 uses even in these lessons. As for uses of the L1 for organizational purposes, students put them third, and before last, in order of importance before affective purposes, and a majority of teachers did not support them. Yet, teachers
made a reasonable percentage of L1 use in this category, higher than the categories for formal and affective uses.

As for the category of non-pedagogical uses of the L1, students were not asked about them as they were thought to be too young to understand the implications of such uses; besides, these uses were not relevant to students’ learning needs. Most teachers disagreed with such uses of the L1. Yet, they made their second highest percentage of L1 use within that category. This was the case even with those teachers who used low L1 averages overall, e.g., T6, 7. Teachers 4, 9, 11, 13, and 14 even used more L1 acts within that category than within the category of communicative purposes.

The only case in which teachers’ actual use seemed to be consistent with their and their students’ views about the L1 was the use of the L1 for affective purposes. Such uses did not receive much support either from teachers or from students. They also received low percentages in classroom interaction.

Thus, teachers’ actual L1 use in the L2 classroom was not always consistent with their own views, as they expressed them on the questionnaire, whether in terms of quantity or quality. This supports Polio & Duff’s observation that: “there seems to be a lack of awareness on the part of the teachers as to how, when, and the extent to which they actually use English [the L1] in the classroom” (Polio & Duff’s 1994: 320).

Teachers’ perception of the L1, as discussed earlier, seemed to be based on prescriptions from the ‘best Method’, on one hand, and the official policy, on the other hand. These sources formed a kind of imposed ideology that teachers, implicitly or explicitly, willingly or unwillingly, adopted. Teachers’ practice on the other hand did not seem to conform to their ideology; it did not either seem to be based on an alternative ideology or theory. We have seen above the contradictions that showed that they were not aware of either the quantity or the quality of their L1 use.

The question now is, what, then, motivates teachers to use the L1 in this way that contradicts their views? The next section will examine the local internal and external contextual factors thoroughly, in an attempt to answer this question.
"Once we decide that context is essential in the examination of interactional data we engage ... in explanatory work. And we describe to explain, and explain to understand .... The essential methodology therefore includes 'common sense' as one of the tools-of-trade" (van Lier 1988: 11).

6.3.2 Factors behind teachers' use of the L1

In this section, we will try to further understand the implications of teachers' actual use of the L1, and why it differed from their reported use of the L1. The discussion will seek to find relations or patterns of behaviour through which we can reveal or infer the reasons behind teachers' code-switching. This will be sought by investigating whether certain factors, that have been claimed earlier (section 3.4) to influence the use of the L1, did or did not play a role in influencing teachers' behaviour regarding the use of the L1.

6.3.2.1 Factors related to the students

Unlike teachers in Franklin's (1990) and Dickson's (1996) studies, 62.5% of the teachers in this study did not agree that use of the L1 could help with large classes. The results of actual L1 use also confirmed that the size of class did not affect teachers' use of the L1. Some teachers with larger classes tended to use lower or more moderate percentages of L1 use than some teachers with smaller classes, and vice versa. Yet, this study agrees with Franklin's (1990) and Dickson's (1996) in that disruption and lack of motivation influence teachers' behaviour regarding L1 use. Although, in the questionnaire, teachers did not agree that use of the L1 could help in managing students' behaviour, it was found in actual interaction that teachers who had more disruptive or less motivated students tended to use more L1 in general. It was further noticed that boys' classes were more disruptive and/or less motivated than girls' classes. This might be the reason why most teachers who taught boys tended to use more L1 than teachers who taught girls. The following two tables show the differences in L1 use between the boys' teachers and the girls' teachers.
Table 6.7

Use of the L1 by teachers of boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T8</th>
<th>T10</th>
<th>T11</th>
<th>T12</th>
<th>T15</th>
<th>T16</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Ss</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%) L1 use</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>23.01</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>54.91</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>41.07</td>
<td>36.70</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>26.59</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>54.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. I</td>
<td>52.88</td>
<td>35.05</td>
<td>43.37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65.96</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>54.08</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>56.58</td>
<td>50.97</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>76.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. II</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>15.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. III</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. IV</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>27.71</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>48.21</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>48.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. V</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>40.21</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>53.45</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>40.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noticed from the tables, teachers of girls tended to have larger classes than teachers of boys, yet they tended to use less L1 on average. Teachers 1, 3, 10, 12, and 15 had the most disruptive classes; these classes were medium or small in size (two of them had 14 students each). Teachers 8 and 11 made the lowest L1 use among boys' teachers, these two classes

Table 6.8

Use of the L1 by teachers of girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
<th>T9</th>
<th>T13</th>
<th>T14</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Ss</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%) L1 use</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>14.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. I</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>53.39</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>36.74</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>58.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. II</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. III</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. IV</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>25.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categ. V</td>
<td>37.04</td>
<td>28.81</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>81.94</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were the least disruptive; this seemed to be the reason behind the teachers' low percentages of L1 use.

Furthermore, the group of boys' teachers scored higher than the group of girls' teachers in all categories (as much as double in organizational input) except for category V, which referred to compensatory code-switching. In this category, the girls' teachers made twice as much use of the L1 as the boys' teachers (see section 6.3.2.4).

It was noticed that the behaviours of the teachers in each group had a similar pattern regardless of other contextual factors. It was just shown that the size of the class did not play a role in teachers' use of the L1. By the same token, the catchment area (the socio-economical background of the students) did not seem to play a role in teachers' use of the L1 either. The classes of Ts 1, 3, 8, 10, 11, and 12 were in an unprivileged area, while Ts 2, 15, and 16's classes were in privileged areas (refer to table 5.1). Yet T15's class was among the most disruptive to the extent that the teacher made 48.21% of his L1 use for organizational purposes, and especially for organizing the classroom setting and calling for students' attention (84% together). On the other hand, T8's class was one of the least disruptive classes; the teacher made only 3 L1 acts that were for communicative purposes. Also in teachers of girls' classes, T6 whose class was in an unprivileged area made almost as half L1 use percentage as T4 whose class was in a privileged area.

Thus, low ability, less motivated, and disruptive students, generally, put more demands on teachers to refer to the L1 than well motivated and well behaved students. A high percentage of teachers' L1 acts for organizational functions (47.30%) were for responding to students' initiations in the L1, albeit, as pointed out earlier, on the individual level, teachers did not tend to give one to one support for less proficient students (only 4.05%).

6.3.2.2 Factors related to the teacher
More teachers, on the questionnaire, agreed that use of the L1 reflected teachers' lack of proficiency which agreed with Liu et al.'s (2004) findings; this was supported to some extent in real practice. Overall, teachers who sounded more proficient and fluent used less L1 than others, e.g. teachers 2, 7, 9, 13, 14, and 16 (although Ts 2 and 16 made a relatively higher percentage than the others which was attributed to the fact that they had disruptive boys' classes). Yet they used more L1 for compensatory code-switching (apart from T16). An
exception to this rule, or in ethnographic analytic terms, a discrepant case was T11, who used a relatively low percentage of L1 use (7.78%), yet more than half of her uses were for compensatory code-switching. Although this teacher actually had limited proficiency that was clear in lexical, grammatical and phonological aspects of his L2 use in the class, he insisted on the use of the L2 most of the time, even when he struggled to deliver his message or his students could not understand him. What made it worse was that the students were not responding most of the time. With his insistence on L2-only most of the time regardless of his students’ reactions, and his students feeling lost, the communication broke down more than once in that class. The teacher seemed to prioritize the official prescribed rule to avoid using the L1 over responding to the arising problems and lack of understanding on the part of his students. This resulted in obvious tension, on the part of the teacher, and suspicious silence, on the part of students (real examples from that lesson will be presented in chapter 7). In the end, this resulted in the teacher’s unexpected behaviour, switching off the cassette player and rebuking the students for their ‘stupidity’.

The behaviour of T11 reflects the state previously described by Medgyes (1986) that non-native teachers are so overloaded by the linguistic demands of CLT that they are too exhausted to attend to their students’ problems (see section 6.3.2.4).

6.3.2.3 External factors

Referring to external factors in chapter 3, we talked about factors such as time constraints, final exams, official policy, and language distance. Most of these factors were not easy to detect, but still some of them, explicitly or implicitly, showed influence on teachers’ behaviour to different degrees.

We suggested earlier that the official policy played a major role in shaping teachers’ perception of the value of L1 use. As for time constraints, a majority of teachers rejected the use of the L1 to save time (see statements 23 and 26 in the teachers’ questionnaire). Yet, the concern about time can be reflected in certain behaviours, e.g. the low percentage of L1 use for supporting less proficient students, although more teachers supported that use on the questionnaire. This category had only 4.05% of the teachers’ L1 acts made for affective functions in classroom interaction. This reflects non-concern about individual students, on the part of the teacher. In countries like Egypt, all students have to learn the same material (the prescribed curriculum) at the same time; they all get tested in the same material at the
same time in the end of the year exams. If the teacher tries to provide support to individual low ability students this will take from his time, which means he may not be able to finish the curriculum before exams. This will be an unwise risk for the teacher that can make him liable to questioning. Thus, the pressures of time, the prescribed curriculum, and the unified end of the year exam stop the teacher from paying attention or giving time to individual less proficient students.

When asked about use of the L1 for preparing students for exams, teachers were divided which meant that a considerable number of teachers admitted the influence of exams on their use of the L1. In Liu et al. (2004), exams were reported to be one of the reasons that motivated teachers to use the L1. In actual interaction inside the L2 classroom, it was hard to detect the influence of such a factor on teachers' behaviour regarding L1 use. Yet, one of the teachers (T5) referred explicitly to exams in his lesson. He directed his students (using the L1) to how a question, related to the topic he was teaching (accepting invitations), can be formed in the exam. This may refer to the teacher's concern about preparing students for the exams. Besides, we have seen above the implicit pressures of testing all students in the same material in the end of the year exam, and how this does not give the teacher a chance to concentrate on individual needy students.

6.3.2.4 Factors related to the nature of classroom interaction

We talked in chapter 4 about the nature of the interaction in formal FL classrooms. It has been claimed that the FL classroom is a bilingual context which aims for intensified learning, and that code-switching is authentic to such a context. Although a majority of teachers rejected the L1 use with communicative input, an overwhelming majority of teachers used high percentages of their L1 uses for communicative purposes (reaching in one case to 100%, and in many cases to around 50%). We have claimed earlier that the official policy emphasized the principle not to use the L1 unless as a final resort; this formed a kind of a main rule that was imposed on teachers (imposed ideology). Yet, the nature of the interaction in the language classroom seems to influence teachers to refer to the L1 to facilitate communication. Macaro (1998) found that in FL classrooms, teachers were preoccupied with comprehension and pushing communication forward at the expense of learning. As he put it, "FL classrooms feature very little new information (in the sense of world knowledge) being passed on from teacher to learner. Instead what they feature is a continuous attempt (almost exclusively by the teacher) to keep interaction going" (Macaro 1998: 67). This explains the
high percentages of L1 use for comprehension and pushing interaction in our data regardless of the dominant activity in the lesson. In reality, teachers seemed to find it hard to pass messages effectively to students, guarantee their comprehension, and maintain a smooth effective communication in the classroom without referring to the most common knowledge they shared with their students, that is, the L1. This fact is supported by the pedagogical claim that teachers communicate most effectively with their students when they refer to their most common knowledge (Malamah-Thomas 1987) (c.f. section 2.2.2).

On the other hand, teachers seemed to confuse communication as an end with communication as a means. Even if on the perceptual level teachers conceived of direct communication in the L2 as an end, on the practice level, there is "a need to convey metalinguistic information about the structure and functioning of the foreign language as a system for the purpose of learning" (Simon 2000: 317). Without referring to the L1, teachers could have difficulties in conveying their messages to their students, comprehension could suffer, and communication could have struggled in the classroom. Evidence of that is to be found in T11's lesson which suffered many breakdowns, as mentioned above (section 6.3.2.2) because of the teacher's insistence on the use of the L1, regardless of the requirements of the interaction or the needs of her students. This ended up with lack of comprehensibility on the part of students, and exhaustion and frustration on the part of the teacher (examples of this lesson will be shown in the next chapter).

The very nature of classroom interaction which aims and caters for opportunities of intensified learning, rather than natural exposure, seemed to challenge teachers' perception that use of the L1 is not suitable for communicative input. In real interaction inside the classroom, CLT practices, as claimed earlier, could be linguistically demanding for non-native teachers (Hedge 2000, Medgyes 1986), especially when dealing with mixed ability classes, which urged teachers to use the L1 as an explicit tool and a shortcut to achieve the purpose of learning.

Thus, out of the teachers' genuine and conscientious desire to transmit knowledge comprehensibly and effectively to their students, they made use of the limited licence given to them by inspectors to 'refer to the L1 only as a final resort'. Teachers also seemed to intelligently exploit this limited licence for adapting to the organizational demands of managing the interaction in the classroom, which helps in creating a better context of
learning. This is reflected in making their third highest percentage of L1 acts in organizational input. As for using the L1 in formal and affective inputs, teachers did not seem to prioritize making use of this exceptional licence over adhering to the prescribed main rule (always teach in the L2). In other words, whereas the two aspects of communication and the management of the interaction represented a high priority for teachers to overlook or challenge the main rule, the formal and affective aspects did not. The low percentage of L1 use in the formal input may not be because it was not really challenging for teachers; rather it might be due to the small amount of formal input in our data. As for the affective aspect, the case might be either that teachers did not give much importance to that kind of input because of the many other pressures on them, or that teachers did not find the language needed for that kind of input really challenging or demanding. Simple words or expressions could do the job, e.g. 'good boy/girl', 'excellent', 'well done', 'great', etc.

As for the use of the L1 for non-pedagogical functions, these can either be unintentional uses that refer to teachers' deficiencies in the L2, or a preferred interactional strategy that serve social and psychological purposes, as discussed earlier in this chapter. Surprisingly, as shown above, most of the teachers who generally produced low percentages of L1 use, and who, in most cases, worked in girls' schools with highly motivated students (refer to tables 7 and 8), tended to use the L1 most for that purpose. Many of those teachers (from classroom observations and the recordings) sounded very confident of their language use, and their teaching style, and seemed to make their L1 uses on a deliberate and conscious basis. The interpretation for this seems to be that teachers viewed such uses of the L1 (most of which were intra-sentential) as unthreatening to their image as professional foreign language teachers either in front of authorities, themselves, or even their students. In other words, this kind of use seemed to be viewed as peripheral to the main rule (always teach in the L2) or, in Macaro's (2001: 541) words, "external to methodology", and thus teachers felt secure enough to overlook it. On the contrary, this sort of L1 use seems to be interpreted as revealing their capabilities as bilinguals who have control over the two languages, and who can switch smoothly from one language to another, just as is the case in natural social code-switching. It seems as if the teacher implies, "I can do it in the L2 only, I just switch as a natural procedure". The teacher doesn't feel that he or she is being tested or subject to criticism in such uses. This may indicate that teachers have a hunch of what constitutes
pedagogical code-switching and requires them to stick to the general rule, and what constitutes a non-pedagogical code-switching and thus will not require justification.

A discrepant case, as mentioned in section 6.3.2.2, was T11. In spite of his deficiencies, he adhered to the L2 most of the time, and more than half of his LI uses were for compensatory code-switching. Unlike the motivation behind more proficient teachers' use of that kind of code-switching (as peripheral to the general rule), such uses by less proficient teachers seem to reflect more their deficiencies with the L2. This fits under Eldridge's (1996) previous comment (on learners' code-switching) that code-switching by more proficient speakers tends to be a strategy of preference, while code-switching by less proficient speakers tends to be attributed to competence problems.

6.3.3 The conflict between teachers' views and practices regarding the use of the LI

Thus, we can distinguish two sets of factors that influenced the use of the LI by these EFL teachers. The first set of factors influenced teachers' perception of the value of the LI use; this included prescriptions from the official policy. We have seen earlier (see 6.1.3) that a majority of the teachers agreed that the official policy towards the LI use in the L2 classroom was to avoid it as far as possible or refer to it only as a final resort. They expressed that influence more explicitly and frankly in the informal interviews. In other words, the official policy prescribed teaching the L2 through the means of the L2 as a desirable practice for teachers. As we claimed earlier, this worked as a kind of imposed ideology on teachers. The other set of factors influenced teachers' actual practice using the LI inside the classroom. These factors included local factors related to the teacher, students, and contextual limitations of the EFL context (e.g. time, traditional exams), as well as the nature of the classroom as a bilingual context that aimed at and catered for intensified learning rather than natural acquisition.

These two sources of influences seemed to create a kind of conflict on the part of the teacher. On one hand, they are taught that use of the LI is not recommended or accepted in the FL classroom; on the other hand, classroom realities motivate and necessitate the use of the LI. This conflict was shown, generally, in the contradictions between what teachers reported about the use of the LI and what they actually did with the LI. For example, although teachers, according to our proposed framework of LI use, employed the LI with communicative input and organizational input for eligible and theoretically sensible
purposes, they seemed to be unaware of their pattern of use or the extent to which it is supported by theory. Alternatively, although they thought use of the L1 could particularly, and for most, help with formal input, they used only a minimal percentage of L1 in this category; they hardly made use of any contrastive techniques for the sake of assisting students' knowledge about the L2. The other way round, in the case of non-pedagogical code-switching, which was not supported by theory to improve learning and which teachers themselves rejected on the questionnaire, teachers used a high percentage of L1. As claimed earlier, the imposed ideology did not seem to be threatening or worrying teachers over this kind of use which seemed to be assessed as 'external to methodology'. Generally, teachers seem to be hung up on the imposed ideology to the extent that they claim to do what they are told they should do rather than what they really do.

The following anecdotes, some of which have been noticed by the researcher during observing the classes and some that have been related by teachers in the informal interviews, may give further evidence of the kind of conflict between the two sources of influence that teachers undergo (the imposed ideology and classroom realities). The importance of such kind of evidence is that, as Clarke 1994 believes, it contributes to reducing the gap between research and practice. "We come to understand things when we can situate them in an experience we have lived or in the virtual reality created by a narrative that makes sense for us" (Clarke 1994: 22).

e.g. 1 In one case, the teacher kept asking his students the same question in English for several times waiting for an answer but no student could understand, then he began to make ambiguous gestures to explain the meaning of a single word in the question “underground” until one student was finally able to get the meaning (after about four minutes). Then he looked at me and sighed deeply in relief as if making an achievement by not using Arabic under any conditions (although he did not have any idea about what I wanted to examine in the lesson).

e.g. 2 In another case the teacher, after finding it difficult to explain the meaning of the word “fossil” in English, translated it into Arabic, then he looked at me saying “Excuse me for having to say that in Arabic” (again that teacher did not know previously that I was investigating the use of Arabic). At the end of the lesson, when that same teacher knew that I was evaluating the use of Arabic by the English language teacher, the first thing he said was
“Thank God I didn’t use much Arabic”. Yet when I talked to him in an informal way he began to mention the benefits of using Arabic.

**e.g. 3** Another teacher, who used a lot of Arabic in his lesson, when he knew after recording the lesson that I was investigating the use of Arabic by English language teachers began his comments by saying “I could do an English lesson with no Arabic at all for you but the students would not understand a word”. When I asked him what would be the point of that he said “everyone who visits us whether from the university or from the inspection tells us we should not use Arabic, but in real practice students, particularly in that school, are coming from poor non-educated backgrounds, nobody helps them at home. So it is very difficult to talk to them in English only while they never hear it outside the school”.

**e.g. 4** One of the teachers who was convinced that the use of Arabic is helpful to some extent, told me that in one of his lessons, which was observed by the inspector, he had to introduce “question tags” for the first time to his students. He thought that giving similar “realistic” examples in Arabic might be helpful, so he started the lesson by giving Arabic examples and then told his students that this is called in English “question tag”. Then, he began to proceed in English after students got the idea. He said he hardly used Arabic any more in that lesson. Yet, as he said, the inspector commented by saying that he was shocked by his use of Arabic so simply just at the beginning of the lesson.

**e.g. 5** In another case, after students finished answering the questionnaire (this usually happened in the last ten minutes of each lesson in the presence of the teacher), the teacher collected them and handed them to me saying: “Only stupid students answered that we use Arabic in the English lesson”. (Note: this teacher used Arabic for 8.47% of his total talk in his lesson).

These incidents may directly or indirectly show the influence of the inspectors’ policy, in particular, upon teachers. They even show that teachers were preoccupied with this issue to the extent that most of their reservations focused on the use of the L1 even before they knew the purpose of the observation. This supports the belief that teachers seemed to have formed
a conception (based on received ideology) that an ideal lesson was one with no LI, or with minimum L1 use. This reflected what Macaro (2001) called:

a situation where a single pedagogic principle would have hegemony over all others. That is to say, all other pedagogical considerations are subordinated to one simple principle: The L1 must be avoided at all costs. The hegemony of this principle would appear to stifle reflective practice. Moreover, use of this principle means the teacher has less complex decision making to carry out. Every time the question of whether to proceed with a classroom activity occurs (which is often), the yardstick is simply: Can it be done entirely in L2? (Macaro 2001: 545).

This was clearly reflected in teachers’ comments in examples 3 and 4 above. It was also implied through the unjustifiable reservations by the teachers in examples 2 and 5. Teachers developed a negative attitude towards the use of L1 to the extent that a ‘feeling of guilt’ was sometimes revealed when using the L1, which is in line with Mitchell (1988) and Macaro (2001).

It also seems that some teachers had in their minds that anyone (including researchers) who visited their classes was related, in a way or another, to that official policy. In that sense, Malamah-Thomas (1987) and Polio (1996) agree that although classroom observation is descriptive, teachers perceive all research as prescriptive and intrusive. They are cautious of being implicitly or explicitly evaluated, which leads them to be engaged by what, as officially dictated, they should be doing rather than by what is actually going on. In our case, it seemed that the presence of the cassette player even increased the feelings of caution and tension with some teachers. From the beginning, when approaching teachers to obtain agreement to record lessons, some said they did not mind if I attended the lesson but not record it, and some changed their minds after they agreed. Two of the teachers whose lessons were recorded refused to talk to callers from outside the class either by ignoring them or by using gestures (such as pointing at me or at the microphone or the cassette player). One of them even talked to the cleaner, who had no idea about foreign languages, in English.

Conclusion
Thus, out of the five categories of L1 use presented in the CCS, teachers in this study concentrated on three categories, two of which were pedagogical (communicative and organizational functions), and one was for non-pedagogical purposes (compensatory code-
switching). Teachers gave less attention to two aspects of L1 use (formal and affective uses). Teachers were also found to be unaware of either the quantity or the quality of their code-switching. Their practices compared to their perceptions revealed a kind of conflict between an imposed ideology that dominates their perception of the L1 and a different reality that faces them and challenges their perceptions.

The next chapter will work as an awareness-raising exercise to illustrate, through examples and evidence from EFL classrooms (including others’ and mine), that the L1, as presented in the theoretically justified framework of L1 use, can be used in an optimal way to enhance interaction and/or learning in the FL classroom. This is hoped to encourage an optimal view of the L1 use based on firm learning and teaching principles on the part of teachers and teachers’ trainers in Egyptian classrooms instead of viewing the L1 as a final resort.
Chapter 7

Illustrations of how the LI could be used optimally

In the previous chapter, our results established that the teachers we studied held the view that the L1 should not be used with most aspects of classroom interaction, as revealed by the teachers’ questionnaire. Yet, these same teachers were found to use the L1 with almost all aspects of the interaction to different degrees. Although the teachers generally reported that they used the L1 to some degree, they sometimes either over-estimated or under-estimated the amount of their L1 use. Moreover their perceptions of how they used the L1 did not always match with their actual use of the L1. We concluded that teachers were not always aware of the quantity and quality of their L1 practice. This revealed a broader lack of awareness of the role the L1 could play in L2 learning in the FL classroom.

What was seen in these classes was not an implementation of a pure method, it was rather a kind of intuitive eclecticism based, in part, on attempts to keep to the official policy and, in part, to meet their commitments towards their students in assisting interaction and learning in the L2 classroom. The official policy prescribed limitations to the use of the L1 as a final resort. In practice, teachers found it impractical to fulfil the requirements of the interaction or aid students’ understanding and use of the language without the help of the L1. This contradiction between official dictates and the requirements of classroom teaching seemed to limit teachers’ use of the L1. They took advantage of the limited licence given to them to use the L1 as a final resort to ensure students’ comprehension, maintain communication, and create an organized learning context in the FL classroom. They also used it in a more casual way for social and individual purposes rather than pedagogical purposes. They did not seem to find that formal and affective aspects of teaching would be enough to justify their use of the L1. This reflected a pattern of “maximal view of LI use” whose main characteristics, as Macaro (1998: 111) noted, are that it “has a more socio-cultural dependence than a linguistic one”, and is more determined by “learner ability and class predisposition”.

In this chapter, real excerpts from classrooms from others’ and our data will be presented to re-examine how the L1 might be used by teachers in a principled way, that is theoretically justified, and which can contribute to an optimal view of L1 use, which can positively contribute to both interaction and learning in the FL classroom. This may, in addition, raise teachers’ awareness of other possibilities. Hence, the discussion will cover the pedagogical
uses of the L1, namely the communicative, formal, affective, and organizational aspects of the interaction.

This will be discussed both "negatively" and "positively" under each category of L1 use; a few examples will be presented, from my own data, of missed opportunities that show how the avoidance of L1 use, where it was needed, may have negatively influenced learners, in the sense that it deprived them from possible learning opportunities. This will be followed by positive examples, from others' and my own data, which show how the L1 can, in similar situations, contribute to enhance learning.

Category I: Teachers' use of the L1 to aid communicative use of the language

1a) The L1 helps to prepare for communication

According to the CCS, the L1 could help to prepare for communication; this could happen in two different ways, either by discussing cultural points that relate to the task, or by giving background information about the task, what it is about, its purpose, etc. As shown in chapter 6, none of the teachers in our sample made use of the first (whether in L1 or L2), and few teachers made only little or limited use of the L1 in the latter. Use of the L1 in this way enriches students' knowledge and makes the task more accessible and interesting.

N.B. Throughout the examples, the L1 utterances will be written in *italics*; even in cases where we borrow examples from others who used different techniques (e.g. brackets). We will write them in *italics* unless indicated otherwise.

Missed opportunities

Let us examine the following example from the data. The teacher sounds lengthy and boring in preparing for a communicative task (inviting, accepting and refusing invitations).

Example 1:

T: What's your name?

S1: ______ <indecipherable>
T: I am going to give her an instruction, yes. Sit down. Yes, you. <The student sits> This instruction. Stand up, you. <The student stands up> This is an instruction. Go to the blackboard please, yes. <The student goes to the blackboard> This is an instruction. Instruction means ..
S1: Order.
T: Instruction, yes, good. Instruction, I ask her to do something. This is an instruction. Thank you, go back. She obeys my instructions. Thank you, sit down. OK. Repeat after me, instructions.
Wh class: Instructions.
T: These are instructions <referring to the instructions in the book for the communicative activity about invitations> and you are going to obey them like your friend who obeys my orders. Yes. Repeat after me, instructions.
Wh class: Instructions.
T: The first exercise, exercise D, page 7 says follow the instructions in the boxes and make the dialogue. The communication skills section on student book pages seventy and seventy two will help you. Page seventy and seventy two. Open your student book page, student books, open page seventy and seventy two. You choose expressions for this. Page seventy and seventy two please. Make revision, make revision to help you. Now let's reading our dialogue. Here I have boxes and each box has an instruction. Read, read them silently. Please you read them silently. Please read them, read them silently. Read these instructions silently please, quickly and silently <After about twelve seconds> Read quickly please and silently, read page seven <After a few seconds> It is OK. Thank you. Of course I think that the first term of them, the first term you may need some expressions like this. You may – Heba, in the morning what do you say?
Few students: Good morning.
T: Good morning, OK. You need something like that at the first question on the ur- on that paper, in that paper you make this question. You meet an old friend what do you say? I say how old are you or ur- sorry, how are you ..................... Now the first one, say hello to your friend under you, you ha what do you say? Say hello, I may say hello.

(My data)

Potential uses of the L1

This lengthy confusing introduction, which sounds irrelevant at some points, can be compared with following examples, which are quoted from Liu et al. (2004), to see how the use of the L1 can make the task clearer, more meaningful, and more interesting.

Example 2 (L1 = Korean, L2 = English):

T: How do you say guessing in English?
Ss: Guessing
T: That's right. Guessing. Okay, guessing. So the key expression of the number 1 is guessing. There are so many expressions about guessing but the exact expression of today is must have plus past participle. You have to use must have plus pp. Must have plus past participle. Must have plus pp expresses strong guessing. Let's have a sentence. "You must have practiced a lot". Must have plus pp. So we can use the expression when we express with strong guessing. Okay? Strong guessing. We can use a strong expression. Okay, repeat after me: "You must have practiced a lot."
Ss: "You must have practiced a lot." ... (Teacher and students repeated one more time.)
T: Please say your sentence to your partner, together. I want to, I want to remind you, uh, the essential etiquette of English. Okay, do you know what it is?
S1: Okay.
T: What "okay"?
Ss: (Laughing).
T: [What is the essential etiquette?]
S2: Eye contact.
T: Okay, eye contact. Eye contact.

(Liu et al. 2004: 618)

In this example, the teacher introduced the activity by explaining the meaning and the structure of the expression in the L1 to help his students understand the expression clearly. Not only that, the teacher also wanted to reinforce a non-verbal norm of communication in English, that students seemed to know beforehand, but they did not seem to understand his question in English when he asked 'what is the essential etiquette?', as one of the students gave an irrelevant answer. The teacher quickly translated it into students’ L1, which triggered a quick response in the L2 from one of the students. Thus, the teacher, by the help of the L1, made sure he prepared his students well enough for the activity; he gave them enough lexical, grammatical and cultural information.

The following example, which is again quoted from Liu et al. (2004) shows how the L1 can be used to give students cultural background information about the content of the task.

Example 3:

T: Okay. This is a stamp, stamp. What is this stamp printed? Where is this stamp printed? Idaho. Idaho is the name of the state in America. The one of the state in America. It is the name of a state. So, in the state of Idaho, it was printed. For what? To celebrate Arbor Day. But this stamp is, was printed a long time ago. Stamp. Doesn’t this look old? Long time ago, it was printed to celebrate Arbor Day. That’s all for Arbor Day in America.

(Liu et al. 2004: 620)

Thus, the teacher made use of the L1 to give information about a stamp issued in the U.S. (the occasion and the place). Giving such a background helps to enrich students’ learning experience, and make them understand what they are talking about. As mentioned in chapter 6, there were no such uses of the L1 in our data; one of the reasons we suggested was that such information would have required teachers to use the L1 which they were trying to avoid. If this was the case then refraining from the use of the L1 could deprive students from learning such useful information.
1b) The L1 helps to make the input more comprehensible

It has been claimed that the L1 helps to make the input more comprehensible in different ways; these include clarifying meaning, checking that students understand, and summing up what has been taught.

The following examples show missed opportunities for T2 in my sample, where the teacher did not do enough to clarify the meaning of certain words in spite of students’ direct inquiry about what they meant.

Missed opportunities

Example 4:

T2: Look at the picture. How many pictures do you have?
S19: Five
T2: Five pictures, and you have also five bubbles, bubbles OK?
Ss: Bubbles? <Ss did not understand the word>
T2: The word th- they are saying bubbles, OK? <No answer> Number one is done for you as a model answer. Look at your book.

(My data)

It is clear in this example that students did not understand, or at best, were not sure what the word “bubbles” meant. The teacher could give just one-word equivalent to make it clear to students. Of course, the teacher could even use other methods to clarify the meaning of the word ‘bubble’ such as simply pointing to one in the book, or drawing one on the board. Yet, the teacher just skipped the problem and moved to the next stage without even trying to check if they understood the meaning of the word. This might be because he was over-cautious: he might have had to resort to the LI if he went further in clarifying the meaning of the word, or checking students’ understanding.

Example 5:

T2: Look at number one. Oh, this tea is horrible. This tea is horrible. There isn’t enough sugar in it.
S9: Sugar means what?
T2: There isn’t enough sugar in it. Listen again, listen. Listen number one again. Oh, this tea is horrible. This tea is horrible. There isn’t enough sugar in it, so we can’t drink it. It’s horrible, so we can’t drink it, because there isn’t enough sugar, enough sugar. The register, OK. <Taking the register book from one of the students to sign it>

(My data)
This example as well shows that the teacher tried to clarify the meaning in the L2, but he did not make the effort to check whether his students really understood the meaning or not. He then took the register book to sign and left the point without further clarification or an attempt to see if the student understood the meaning of the word “sugar”.

A similar example of a missing opportunity for T11 reflects the same keenness of some teachers to avoid the use of the L1 in making their input comprehensible, even when students did not show understanding of what the teacher said. (We referred to this teacher in chapter 6, sections 6.3.2.2 and 6.3.2.4 as a discrepant case who insisted on L2 use most of the time in spite of his apparent limited proficiency in the L2 and his students’ lack of comprehension).

Example 6:

S8: My hobby is rowing,

T11: Rowing, OK. Everybody everybody has hobby. Everybody has a hobby. I like reading, someone like painting, pai- you know painting? <No answer> Paint, OK? <No answer> Paint the door, paint the room <Making gestures with the hand> <No answer> Say after me: Flat

Ss: Flat.

(My data)

In this example, the students did not understand the word “paint”. The teacher tried to show the meaning through the use of gestures, but it was ambiguous. Surprisingly, the teacher found that ignoring the problem completely was better than clarifying the meaning in the L1, so he left the first word he was drilling without any indication that students understood its meaning and moved to drilling another word ‘flat’. That extreme tendency of avoiding the use of the L1 by T11 will result, as will be seen in examples 11 and 12 which happened about ten minutes after this example, in a further problem and breakdown of communication.

**Potential uses of the L1**

Alternatively, the following examples show the potential role of the L1 in clarifying ambiguous meaning, and checking students’ understanding.

N.B. In the following example from Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie (2002), the authors did not offer a translation of the L2 utterances, so, it was decided to leave them as they were in the L2.
Example 7 (L1 = English, L2 = French):

T1: Ecoutez bien la meme chose. Enfin + PRESQUE tout le monde est la. PRESQUE tout le monde. Tout le monde + PRESQUE tout le monde. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20. Normalement (dans) cette classe il y a euh 26 + 26 etudiants. Aujourd'hui 20 etudiants sont la + presents. Presque tout le monde. Il y a 5 absents + il y a 20 presents. Presque tout le monde est la. Oui?? Seulement un petit peu d'absents. Quelques-uns. Quelques-uns. Oui?? D'accord? Presque tout le monde? Ca va?? Ca va ou ca ne va pas??
S1: xxx
S1: Everybody.

(Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002: 413, 14)

In this example, the teacher tried to convey the meaning of “presque” in French to students by giving an example using the L2 only, but the students did not understand. So, the teacher gave the meaning of the word in the L1. This helped students to understand and the teacher to go forward with the lesson.

Example 8 (L1 = English, L2 = French):

M: International telephone ... excellent ... What is it ... no, What do you say when you want to say ... when you pick up the telephone, when you pick up the telephone, number four ... what do you do ... quickly ... yes?

(Macaro 2001: 541)

("M" stands for the teacher).

As teacher M mentioned in that study, he did not think it was easy for his students to understand “prend le telephone”; he said it “doesn’t match with pick up”. So, he decided to use the L1 equivalent to help students understand (Macaro 2001: 541).

Example 9 (L1 = English, L2 = French):

T2: Une dame SANS mari + une dame + le mari est mort + et la dame + est [la toujours]. Elle est + VEUVE. En anglais? En anglais?
S1: (She is old)
T2: No, more than old widow + widow. Elle est veuve. She is a widow. Ca veut dire que le mari est mort. Mort vous comprenez?
Ss: Oui
T2: Oui.

(Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002:414)

(Again the L2 is written without translation)
In this situation, the students did not understand the exact meaning of the word “veuve”, but the teacher soon did not allow a breakdown in communication. He gave the right meaning in the L1 straight away, and he made sure that his students understood it by asking them directly. This helped in pushing the interaction forward without problems.

Example 10 (L1 = Chinese, L2 = English):

Student 11: Little …
   Like …
   Likes …
Mrs. W: What does “likes” mean?
Student 11: Light.
Mrs. W: What?
Student 13: Turn on lights.
Student 11: Lights.
Mrs. W: No. No.
   It’s not lights.
   Likes.
   He likes the dog.
Student 11: I like.
Mrs. W: Okay.
   I like.

(Guthrie 1984: 46)

In this example, while students were reading, the teacher wanted to check that they understood the meaning of “likes”; then she found out that they were confusing “likes” with “lights”. She then clarified the meaning of “likes”. This shows that checking students’ understanding can help teachers to know what their students know and what they do not. It also helps them to remove any confusion as early as possible.

In examples 8 and 11, teachers also tend to repeat students’ answers in the L1; this repetition (or summing up) serves to confirm and reinforce the right answer, by providing students with more time to process the input, as was claimed in chapter 4.

1c) L1 helps to direct oral interaction in the L2 classroom

It has also been claimed that teachers can use the L1 to direct and negotiate oral interaction in the classroom. This can take many forms such as repairing communication breakdowns, eliciting and prompting contributions from students, and providing feedback to students. The following examples of missed opportunities are from T11 who earlier avoided the use of the L1 to clarify meaning in example 6.
Missed opportunities

Example 11:

S12: The kitchen.
T11: In the kitchen, very good. Three rooms, kitchen, a kitchen and what? A bathroom.
Sit down, clap <No response> OK? Do you know clap? Clap? <No response> What’s the meaning of clap? <No response> Three rooms, kitchen, and bathroom. Hmm, say after me, taxi driver <In an irritated tone>.

(My data)

This next situation, again, shows an extreme attitude of ignoring the help of the L1 use in spite of the breakdown in communication. The teacher here, by his insistence on avoiding the use of the L1, missed a good opportunity to encourage her students by rewarding the student who gave the answer (the kitchen), and soothing the learning situation in the class. Instead, this situation left both the teacher and the students more frustrated. The teacher, again, leaves the situation unresolved, and moves on to a new drill.

Example 12:

T11: Thank you, thank you, sit down. Hmm + painting, I have to paint <doing gestures raising her hand up and down>. My hobby is + yeah painting yes.
S21: Painting?
T11: Yes, my hobby is painting, painting, yeah. What does it mean painting? <doing gestures> Yeah, yeah Ok.
S22: Drawing
T11: OK, is it drawing? No, that’s wrong. Painting the- you can’t paint the picture. I draw p- I draw picture, OK? And paint it paint with colours, paint, yeah Emad.
Emad: Colour (verb)
T11: Noun, yeah, OK, OK? Hmm + what? <No response> I don’t know what I shall do to you <The teacher suddenly switches off the cassette player himself and starts shouting and rebuking the students in the L1, and at the end he gives the meaning of ‘painting’ in the L1. Then he asks me to switch on the cassette again>.

(My data)

In this example, the earlier avoidance of using the L1 by that same teacher (in examples 6 and 11), in spite of the obvious lack of comprehension by his students, manifested itself in this situation in a major learning problem and communication breakdown. The teacher here not only refrained from giving the L1 equivalent to proceed smoothly with the communication, he did not even try to negotiate or direct students’ proposals which were very close to the required answer. One of the students said “drawing”, which was near to the answer, and the other almost gave the answer when he said “colour”, yet the teacher insisted
on the noun; he asked for that in English. Alternatively, he could either ask for the noun in the L1 or gave any L1 prompts to the students, or accept the students’ answer and modify it, giving a brief explanation in the L1.

The teacher’s determination not to refer to the L1 in the previous related example (example 6) left the meaning of the word ‘paint’ unclear, and his insistence, in this example, not to negotiate or give a clue in the L1 led to a communication breakdown. The teacher did not give any help, apart from the use of ambiguous gestures; he insisted on a certain grammatical form, “noun”, which did not sound clear to students, and the students did not know what to do. This created a kind of tension in the learning situation. With every failure, on the part of students, to get the right meaning of the word “paint” the tension increased to the extent that the teacher lost his temper, switched off the cassette and started shouting at the students. That same teacher did the same thing again a while later.

Example 13:

T11: Thanks, thanks. Say after me; farming
Wh class: farming
T11: Ha, farm yeah is a place where, where we can plant, where we can plant crops yeah? We can bring up chicken, chicken yeah. The farm, but farming? This job which the farmer do er.. does, farmer does. The farmer does what? Does farming farming?
The farming yeah? Pickaxe, farming in the field? Yes Shaaban.
Shaaban: Farming means planted.
T11: No, the noun hmm..noun of this word yeah .. Hmm?
S18: Farming means farmer.
T11: Farming is a farmer? What’s farmer then? What about those sleeping mates? The sleeping mates? <rebuking one row in the class>

(My data)

The teacher again insists on not using the L1 to help students get the right meaning although they were very close; a clue in the L1 would have helped them, or simply the teacher could accept students’ answers and modify them. This would have saved time and energy, and given a boost to the communication in the classroom. This leads us to agree with Macaro (1998) in that the claim that teachers’ use of the L1 takes from the class time that should be spent in L2 interaction is not true; rather, the L1 can repair communication breakdown and encourage students to produce L2 themselves.

Ridiculously, the teacher ended up rebuking the students, using the L1. Not only that, he even gave the meaning of ‘painting’, in example 12, in the L1 at the end; this poses questions
about the quality rather than the quantity of L1 use. The L1 was employed after all but in a negative way, after a series of situations which really required the positive contribution of the L1 at the right time. Thus, this teacher gave an example of how to view and employ the L1 negatively. The L1 cannot be employed for learning or teaching purposes, yet it can be employed for rebuking and blaming students for their lack of understanding or for their 'stupidity'. This last term was used by T4 in describing students from his class who reported on the questionnaire that they and their teacher used the L1 in the L2 classroom. Teachers like those need to know that the L1 can alternatively be used positively in the L2 classroom to contribute to students' comprehension and elicit their contributions in the L2.

Potential uses of the L1
Alternatively, look at the following examples where teachers use the L1 to negotiate and direct the communication, and how, in doing this, they employ the L1 to elicit, negotiate, and modify students' contributions.

Example 14 (L1 = Chinese, L2 = English):
Mrs. W: What does I lost my pencil mean?
Student 23: I don't see my pen.
Mrs. W: Okay
Where does, uh ... 
Student 25: Doesn't see pencil.
Mrs. W: I was lost in the park.
Does it mean you don't see yourself?
Does it mean that?
Student 23: I can't be seen in the park.
Mrs. W: Can't be seen means got lost.
Okay?
It doesn't mean don't see.

(Guthrie 1984: 46)

As Guthrie (1984) points out, the students in this study seemed to confuse the transitive and intransitive uses of this verb, as in Chinese there are two different words for each meaning. The L1 use by the teacher helped him to negotiate the differences in meaning between these two uses of the verb. Doing this in the L2 could have been confusing and not as clear to students. In other words, use of the L1 made things clear to students and helped the teacher to elicit the required answers from her students; this helped the communication to proceed smoothly and successfully unlike the situation with T11 (example 10).
Example 15 (L1 = English, L2 = French)

T1: Qu’est-ce que c’est?
S1: xxx
T1: Careful. <<pointing at shoes in the classroom>> Chaussures xxx You put it in the plural. It’s not c’est it is x they are ce sont ce sont. Tell me tell me they are my shoes. Ce sont?
S1: C’est [mon]
T1: Non non non non non. Tell me they are your shoes. So you say. They are MINE they are MINE
Ss: <<laughing>>
S1: Ce sont [ma] chaussures
T1: MES MES + because plural mes plural plural ce sont mes chaussures.

(Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002: 416)

The teacher, in this situation, used the L1 to direct the student’s answer. This helped the student to modify his answer. When one bit of the student’s answer was still not right, the teacher did not pick on that, instead he gave the right word and justified it to maintain the flow of the communication.

Example 16 (L1 = English, L2 = French):

M: So ... Alex ... what did you do ... what did you do yesterday ...?
S1: I went to the beach (with mistake in preposition) <The preposition was “au”>
M: I went ... nearly ... I went ... once more ... almost there ... (hand gesture) 95%.
S1: I went to the beach (mistake corrected) <The preposition was “a la”>
M: I went to the beach ... correct ... very good ... and finally ... Richard.

(Macaro 2001: 541)

Note: The words between brackets ( ) are the author’s comment. The words between small brackets <> are my comment.

In this situation, the student gave the wrong preposition, so the teacher gave him a clue in the L1, besides hand gesture. This resulted in the student giving the correct preposition. If the teacher relied only on the hand gesture it might have been ambiguous to students just as happened in examples 6 and 12 above, and communication might have suffered as a result. Unlike how examples 6 and 12 ended, the current learning situation went smoothly and fluently and ended in both students’ and teacher’s satisfaction.

Example 17 (L1 = Korean, L2 = English):

T: Okay. I appreciate everything trees gives us. For example, the things trees gives us?
Ss: Oxygen.
T: Okay. Oxygen. in English?
S: O₂ (chemical symbol for oxygen that the student might have learned in chemistry class)
T: O₂ (laughs). Oxygen in English? Oxy ...?
S: Oxyclean.
T: Right. You can think of Oxyclean. Oxygen. Repeat after me.
Ss: Oxygen.
T: Trees gives us oxygen, and other things?
S: Paper.
T: Okay, paper, wood, wood which you can make furniture of and fruit? In English, fruit. Okay many kinds of fruit. Right? They are the things trees give us.

(liu et al. 2004: 623, 24)

As the authors themselves comment on that situation, "the teacher was quite skilful in eliciting responses from students and encouraging their learning. When one student replied "Oxyclean" (a word the students might have learned from commercials) for the word oxygen, she did not correct the student. Instead, she responded positively saying that the student could use the word Oxyclean to prime for oxygen, an excellent example of the teacher scaffolding the students' learning" (Liu et al. 2004: 624). Thus, the L1 was positively used to help students' learning and give them feedback.

**Category II: Teachers' use of the L1 to aid declarative learning of the language**

It has also been claimed that use of the L1 by the teacher enhances students' knowledge about the L2 rules. This includes talking explicitly about L2 rules, contrasting L1 and L2 rules, and highlighting pronunciation features in the L2. We saw, in chapter 6, that there were only a few uses of the L1 for that function in our data.

In this part, a few examples will be cited which show how the deliberate avoidance of LI use may negatively influence students' comprehension of and knowledge about the language. In other words, students may miss a good deal about how the language works (its syntactic and lexical system) if it is not explained to them in a direct explicit and accessible way. The following examples will show the lack of comprehension or ambiguity that can be caused as a result of avoiding or ignoring the use of the L1.

**Missed opportunities**

**Example 1:**
Mostafa: <working out an exercise, in a book, with the help of pictures> I can't open the door, I carry er.. I carrying er.. too er.. too many books.
T2: Very good. Too many books
S11: Isn't it the books *oh* miss? <Oh is the nearest translation of the calling article used in Arabic /ya/>  
T2: Books, *why* the books *why*? Why should we say the books?  
S11: *Because it was written.* <He meant in the book>  
T2: *I say* look at the picture and finish the sentences. What can you see in this picture? What can you see?  
S12: Woman carry a lot of books.  
T2: Yes, so she can't open the door because she is carrying too many books. Can you try to say too much books? <directing her talk to the whole class>.  

(My data)

As seen in this example, the teacher avoided answering the main question of S11 in order to avoid talking explicitly about L2 rules, which would require the use of the L1 to make it understandable. “The books” was written under the relevant picture in the students’ textbook just as a clue to produce a sentence using ‘many’ or ‘much’ “I can’t open the door because I’m carrying too many books”. Instead of explaining this somehow in a simple way, the teacher shifted the talk again to the difference in use between “many” and “much”. This left student 11’s question unanswered. This deprived the student of a precious learning opportunity, that is, “providing language at the point of need” (Hedge 2000: 53).

Example 2:

Samar: I wish I could but er.. because er.. because I am ill.  
T7: I wish I could + but or because?  
Samar: Because  
S6: I wish I could but  
T7: There is something wrong in your sentence Samar. I wish I could because I am ill? What’s the meaning of I wish I could because I am ill? I wish I could go but +  
Samar: But I have er.. but I have er..  
T7: But I am ill. I wish I could go with you but + not because.  

(My data)

In this situation, the literal translation of Samar’s wrong utterance could be the most accurate method that could make her aware of her mistake and more convinced of the right answer, because the way of expressing this function in Arabic is similar to the English expression. The literal translation or contrast could have helped the student to recognize her mistake. Instead, the teacher gave the student the right answer without explaining what was wrong about her answer.

Example 3

Asmaa: I afraid com +
In this situation, it seemed that most students were not sure about what was wrong in the utterance "I afraid". Yet, all that the teacher did was to give the right utterance. He overlooked the obvious lack of understanding of the rule in that utterance. He needed to make it explicit to students that "afraid" was an adjective that had to be preceded by the verb 'to be'. Such a mistake is common among Egyptian students, because in the Arabic language, there is no equivalent to the verb 'to be' in that sense. An equivalent to the verb 'to be' can be used in the past and future tenses, but not in the present. Thus, in the present tense, the right form of the sentence is like that: "I afraid", "I tall", "I ill", etc. A little comparison between LI and L2 forms could make the students aware of the problem. "It's absurd to operate all the time in a new second language, and ignore the many rich and valuable points of comparison there may be with their own" (Deller & Rinvolucri 2002: 94 citing Andrew Morris).

b) Potential uses of the LI
Unlike the earlier examples, the following examples will show how the use of the LI by the teacher can help to develop students' conscious knowledge about the language they use. In some examples, teachers use the LI to raise students' awareness of their grammatical mistakes in order to avoid them. In other examples, teachers compare the L2 and the LI lexical and syntactic differences to make them aware of these differences, and consequently avoid negative interference. Sometimes teachers even use the LI to talk about phonological features of the L2.

Example 4
T1: Begin with the officer said
Mohamed: Said that they hadn't er..
T1: Said that they + Why did you say that here?
Mohamed: That oh sir because we remove the brackets <Again oh is a translation of the Arabic calling article /ya/> T1: Yes, that because we remove the brackets. We can keep it, or we can.?
Mohamed: We can remove it.
T1: We can keep it or remove it. That's right
Mohamed: The officer said they hadn't found flight nineteen.
T1: Why did you use the word hadn't?
Mohamed: Hadn't because we changed oh sir from the ..
T1: Present perfect
Mohamed: *I mean* haven't *oh sir changed into* hadn't.

T1: *Then from the* present perfect *to the +
Mohamed: Past perfect

T1: *To the past perfect. Thanks a lot, thanks a lot.*

(My data)

As obvious, this interaction was full of talk about L2 rules; it proceeded fluently with no
tensions or difficulties. Instead of the avoidance strategies, which were used in the earlier
situations, the teacher here asked and checked about students' understanding of the rule.
When the student answered the teacher's question about why he used 'that', the teacher
accepted his answer and added to it to show more than a possibility. He then used the L1 to
check that the student understood the rule of changing from direct to reported speech. He
even elicited metalanguage from the student (past perfect).

Example 5:

T1: *This verb here, what did we say about it?*
S1: She er.. She had

T1: *What kind?* <meaning tense>
S2: Past perfect tense.

T1: Past perfect tense. *Then, what was it in the first place?*
Ss: Past simple tense.

(My data)

Again in this situation, the teacher used the L1 to check students' comprehension of the rule,
and elicit metalanguage from students.

Example 6:

T4: I think it is very interesting. Hmm.. I think *becomes what?*
S34: He thought

T4: That he thought, yes? It is, it is hmm..

S34: Is very interested.

T4: It is? It is?
Few students: *{was }*
   *(It was)*

T4: It was?
S34: It was very interested.

T4: Very interested? Very interested? *How is it written above?*
S34: Interesting

T4: Interesting *hasn't got a past.* Interesting we *can't call it a verb because this is*
   *adjective*

(My data)
In this situation, the teacher made it clear, through explicit talk about the L2 using the L1, that interesting is an adjective not a verb. So it is not to be changed in indirect speech.

Example 7

Nashwa: He is a funny.
T5: Aha, he is funny. He is a funny man, he is a funny man. When you put the “a” before the adjective then you have to put the described noun after it. Funny, he is A funny +
Ss: Man
T5: Hmm?
Ss: Man
T5 He is A funny .. you have to mention the described noun which is man. Alright? Well, if we want to omit this “a” then we say; he is ..
Ss: Funny

(My data)

In this example, the teacher explained in a very direct simplified way, with the help of the L1, when students can put “a” in front of the adjective and when they cannot. This was more helpful than it sounded especially if we know that in the Arabic language there is no indefinite article such as “a” or “an” in English. This really represents a problem to Egyptian learners of English, as they often get confused about when and when not to use that article. By explaining the use of the indefinite article to the students in this way, the teacher has been very informative.

Example 8 (L1 = English, L2 = French):

T1: Oui? Ca va? Vous comprenez? Now the important thing is that ... what you need to know is the gender of the word + not who it belongs to because I am saying to him + SON stylo I am saying to her + SON stylo I am saying to her SES chaussures I am saying to him SES chaussures. So it doesn’t matter if [it’s + belonging] to a male or a female: it’s what the actual object is, masculine or feminine.

(Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002: 416)

In this example, the teacher used the L1 to explain an important grammatical rule in French, which is different from English. That’s how to match possessive pronouns with the gender of the possessive object and not the owner. If this was not explained in a simple and explicit way by the help of the L1, it could have remained ambiguous or caused confusion to students.

Example 9 (L1 = English, L2 = French):

S1: How come they don’t use the reflexive like + il s’est marie?
T4: Parce que ca <<pointing to il est marie on the board>> c’est comme un adjectif + he is married.
S1: How come when you say + I am married + you use the reflexive there?
T4: That’s <<pointing to je me marie on the board>> like I’m getting married + the action + it’s more an action this one here + l’action de se marier.
S2: What’s the second word there actually?
T4: It’s a reflexive verb se SE marier + with the infinitive you have se + it’s a reflexive verb. Literally it’s I marry myself + but you don’t translate it like that in English + but that’s what it is. So this <<pointing to je me marie on the board>> is an action whereas this <<pointing to il est marie>> is something already done + il est he is married.

(Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002: 417)

Obviously, if the teacher insisted on explaining such a confusing difference in forms that triggers difference in meaning in the L2 only, this might have left students confused or uncertain about the difference in meaning. The use of the L1 by the teacher helped in simplifying the rule and making it accessible to students. Unlike the missed opportunity in anecdote 2 earlier, the literal translation of “I marry myself” also made the difference clear and understandable, and made the students aware of the rule and the difference in the meaning.

Example 10 (L1 = English, L2 = French):

Notice again that M stands for the teacher; the comments between brackets ( ) are the author’s.

M: What did you do on the Monday (writing on board) … what does that mean … in English what is it in English … what is it in English … Colin?
S1: uhm what you done … no, what have you done on Monday.
M: What did you do on Monday (with stress on “did you do”) ok and for example the reply is … I went … (starts writing on the board).

(Macaro 2001: 542)

In this example, the teacher modifies the student’s English translation of the L2 utterance, putting it in the proper form. This seems to help raising students’ awareness of the lack of equivalence between the L1 and L2 forms (such as the lack of verb to be in the present tense in Arabic).

Example 11 (L1 = Korean, L2 = English):

T: Okay. You can say how about. “Would you like some more coffee?” “How about some more coffee?” Okay. Would you like or how about. How about. “How about some more dessert or how about some more coffee?” “How about some more cake?”
“How about some more steak?” How about. Two ways. We can say it in these two ways. “How about some more dessert?” Be careful to dessert, okay?
Ss: Dessert (in chorus).
T: Dessert. Dessert.
Ss: Dessert (sounding like desert, the noun).
T: Dessert. Dessert. If you read it like desert (accenting first syllabus). Okay, it means desert. Desert is a place where only much sands or like desert. Right. If you read like this, like desert (accenting second syllable) what do you mean by that? It means that, abandon or leave, okay? If you desert some place, you will, you leave some place. Okay? Understand? (No response.) If you use desert as a verb, it means leave.
Ss: There are three meanings.
T: Leave, go away. It can be used this way. (Liu et al. 2004: 619)

In this example, the teacher resorted to the L1 to explain the difference in pronunciation between ‘desert’ as a noun and ‘desert’ as a verb, and how they refer to different meanings. He tried to do that in the L2 first, but when he found that his students did not get it he switched to the L1 to clarify the difference.

**Category III: Teachers’ use of the L1 to aid affective aspects of learning**

It has also been claimed that use of the L1 by the teacher with affective input contributes to affective aspects of students’ learning. This can take different shapes such as, building rapport with students, responding to students’ initiations in the L1, relating the content to students’ real experiences, and providing support for less proficient students.

As usual, we will first refer to situations from my data that show how refraining from the use of the L1 can negatively influence the relationship between teachers and students. This may, in turn, inhibit students’ motivation, ‘block’ their learning of the L2, and discourage them from taking risks with the L2. Then, we will show alternative examples of how the L1 could have been a potential positive resource.

**Missed opportunities**

I will refer again to examples 11, 12, and 13 in category I for T11 (page 209 - 211). These examples reflect a relationship of tension and mutual frustration. It has been claimed in chapter 4 that people communicate more effectively when they have something in common. Thus, a teacher who shares the same background as his/her students is more likely to communicate better with students. What happened with T11 is that he dispensed with that common knowledge that he shared with his students; in other words, he disarmed himself...
from the most valuable tool that he could use to activate students’ participation and lubricate communication in the classroom. This ended up as has been shown, in more than one incident, in communication breakdown, as students felt lost and refrained from talking. This simply meant depriving students of valuable learning opportunities on both levels of reception (exposure) and production (practice).

The situation was even made worse by the teacher, at the end, using the L1 in a negative way to rebuke and blame the students. This example shows how the teachers still use the L1 sometimes, but not in a way that is conducive to language learning. Thus, the L1 was employed as an easy tool for punishment and rebuking, instead of using it as a valuable resource for supporting, encouraging and motivating students’ learning.

**Potential uses of the L1**

Unlike the earlier example, the following examples will show how the use of the L1 by the teacher can help building rapport between the teacher and students. L1 use can create a relaxed atmosphere in the L2 class through the use of encouraging comments, showing care, joking, responding to students’ initiations in the L1, relating the content to students’ real experiences, etc.

Example 1

S10: Please, please Mr.
T1: Yes Mostafa, come here. Come on hero, let’s hear your voice.

(My data)

Doubtless, such a little remark by the teacher can do a lot in encouraging the student; such comments make the student feel confident and secure and consequently motivate him to take risks with the L2.

Example 2 (L1 = English, L2 = French):

T4: Qui veut faire le dialogue? + Qui veut faire le dialogue? Des volontaires? + Volunteers? + I don’t like to force people to do it in front of the whole class. So that’s why I only ask for volunteers. I don’t pick people. O.K. Ecoutez + ecoutez su 1 avec su 2.

(Rolin-Ianzitie & Brownlie 2002: 416)
In this example, the teacher is trying to create an unthreatening environment to encourage students to participate. She explains her policy in the L1, and when students volunteer she switches to the L2.

Example 3 (L1 = English, L2 = French):

T2: Ils ont combien de petits-enfants?
S1: Ils ont ...
T2: Ils ont ...
Ss: Cinq.
T2: Ils ont cinq petits-enfants. Grandchildren. O.K.? French is a little more logical with grands-parents and petits-enfants instead of grandchildren. I don’t know what’s grand about grandchildren «laughing»
(Rolin-Ianzitie & Brownlie 2002: 416)

In this example, the teacher compares the lexical difference between ‘petits-enfants’ in French and ‘grand children’ in English in a witty way. Such uses of the L1 can result in reducing the tension in the L2 classroom, and creating a relaxed atmosphere that motivates learning.

Example 4

T2: Il a quel age?
S1: Quatre-vingt—cinq ans «perfect pronunciation, fluent»
T2: Hey you’ve been working on the numbers there Su.
Ss «laughing»
T2: Bravo non non ça c’est tres bien.
(Rolin-Ianzitie & Brownlie 2002: 418)

In this example, the teacher is happy with the student’s response. He expresses his satisfaction in a positive and encouraging way using the L1 to reduce the distance or the formality of the learning situation.

Example 5 (L1 = Korean, L2 = English):

T: Have you seen the movie, science fiction movie, Gataca? The movie was very, very scientific movie. So other science teacher recommended the movie to me and to other students. The movie was recommended by many people. The movie shows a future world where human DNA is manipulated. There is a future society called Gataca where all the people were born with altered DNA.
(Liu et al. 2004: 620)
In this example, the teacher was trying to explain a scientific fact (that DNA might be manipulated), so she relates the content to a scientific fiction movie that students seem to know. This is a good humanistic way of relating the taught material to students’ real experiences.

Example 7 (L1 = English, L2 = German):

T: *Rent*. Rent is *rent*. I pay more rent than you.
S: ((has a fit of coughing))
T: *Are you OK?*
S: ((continues coughing))
T: *Are you all right?*
S: xxx
T: And number seven.

(Polio & Duff 1994: 318)

In this example, the teacher, who was in the middle of explaining a rule, stops to show care about one of his students who had a fit of coughing.

Example 8 (L1 = English, L2 = German):

T: Then a strong economy. And then a strong economy.
S1: *I thought you just said* ‘then’.
T: *I just did.*
S1: *No, you said* ‘then’ first, *not* ‘and then.’
T: yes, no. I was just about to with the total sentence.

(Polio & Duff 1994: 320)

This example shows how, sometimes, teachers switch to the L1 in response to students’ initiations in the L1 as a result of being influenced or directed by students’ comments or questions in the L1.

**Category IV: Teachers’ use of the L1 to aid organizational aspects of classroom learning**

It has also been claimed that teachers’ use of the L1 helps in managing the interaction, and, consequently, learning. This happens by creating an organized and disciplined context of learning. This involves organizing the classroom setting, involving students, giving or clarifying instructions, and directing students to do or notice something.
Missed opportunities

The following is an example of how long it can take a teacher to clarify instructions in the L2.

Example 1

T4: Our lesson will go go around exercise D exercise D. We are going to + Or our lesson today on exercise D in your workbook, yes. We are going to follow the instructions given in the book, yes, OK. Hend stand up, did you make a dialogue today? Did you speak with any one?
Hend: Yes.
T4: Yes who did you speak to? Who did you speak to? Who did you speak to? <No answer> Did you come silent to the school? Did you come si- silent to the school? <No answer> Of course you did a dialogue with your brother, with your sister at home, with your mother, with your father, and if you come to school with your friend you may make a dialogue with her OK? Dialogue meaning- dialogue means conversation. Dialogue means conversation. The dialogue means I may ask and the other may answer. I may ask and the other may answer.

(My data)

In this example, students did not seem to be responding to the teacher, and the teacher tried to avoid the use of the L1 as much as he could. L1 was resorted to, at last, as a final resort. This example refutes the arguments which claim that the use of the L1 takes up class time which should be spent in using the L2. This example shows that a lot of time has been spent to teach the meaning of a single word (which was not even part of the activity itself) without students producing any L2 in return. Atkinson (1993) and Cook (2002) warn of such cases where teachers might spend more time in explaining the instructions for an activity than in carrying out the activity itself. Similarly, Deller & Rinvolucri (2002: 94 citing from Andrew Morris) makes the point that “in many activities the instructions needed to carry out the task may be more linguistically complex than the language of the task itself”. Moreover, if we take into consideration that it is students who are supposed to spend a lot of class time using the L2, as even shown in students’ answers on the questionnaire, this will make it hard to believe that avoiding the use of the L1 in the above example was successful in any way. If the teacher had used the L1 earlier in the above example he would have saved time for students to use the L2 themselves in the activity, or for more rewarding L2 uses on his part that could be more effective.
Potential uses of the L1

Alternatively, the following examples show how teachers effectively use the L1 to have better control of the learning situation, and of managing learning opportunities.

Example 2 (L1 = English, L2 = French):

M: So you were like inspectors ... you’re going to look and you’re going to find out what these people have done what did they do what did they do what did each one do ... so let’s find out first of all ... first question ... is there a day on which they all did the same thing ... a day in which they all did the same thing when they were all doing the same thing? Yes? (several pupils bid)

(Macaro 2001: 542)

In this situation, the teacher was using the L1 to explain how the students would carry out the activity. As teacher M commented in Macaro’s study, he didn’t tell them what to say, rather he translated the procedure for them, i.e. how to do it. This, as the author commented, reflected a “preoccupation with ensuring comprehension of procedural instructions in order to facilitate learner use of the L2” (Macaro 2001: 542).

Example 3 (L1 = Korean, L2 = English):

T: Okay, enough. They are the last students. No more. No more. Stop! Please take a seat, take a seat! Sit down.

(Liu et al. 2004: 622)

In this example, the teacher was trying to stop students from competing to write words they learnt previously on the board. She resorted to the L1 to sound more effective.

Example 4 (L1 = English, L2 = Korean):

T: Worksheet, worksheet number three. Do you have any questions about this pattern? Do you have any questions so far? Everything’s clear? OK, worksheet number three please come to the blackboard

(Polio & Duff 1994: 318)

In this example, the teacher gave directions to students in the L1 to help to proceed smoothly and quickly to a new task.

Example 5 (L1 = English, L2 = German):

T: Who wants to have a review section after class today? Today after class at 10:00.

(Polio & Duff 1994: 317)
Example 6 (L1 = English, L2 = Korean):

T: OK. Your midterm. Midterm, midterm – The midterm will be on February 21.

(Polio & Duff 1994: 317)

In examples 5 and 6, the teacher used the L1 with one term in particular in an attempt to highlight it for its importance; in other words, by highlighting that particular term, the teacher tries to involve students and attract their attention to the importance of what she is talking about.

Conclusion

It was shown earlier that teachers in the current study tended to refer to the L1 only as a final resort; they used it with some functions rather than others. They used it mostly intuitively for assisting students’ comprehension, maintaining communication, and managing learning. This was mostly motivated by learning conditions, i.e. less motivated disruptive students (mainly boys’ classes). In classes with more motivated students (mainly girls), teachers, unexpectedly, scored high uses of the L1 in non-pedagogical code-switching. Teachers’ practices regarding the use of the L1 needed to be re-adjusted in a way that helps them to employ the L1 in a more reasoned way. This chapter sought to raise teachers’ awareness of the possibility of using the L1 in a principled way as was presented in our proposed theory of optimal L1 use. This was done by displaying actual excerpts from L2 classrooms to show the potential the L1 could have to offer to the L2 classroom if used to enhance aspects of interaction and learning in the FL classroom. The examples included missed opportunities where the L1 could have been effectively used, but wasn’t, and potential uses, where the L1 was used in a way that assisted aspects of interaction and learning as was proposed in our optimal theory of L1 use. The discussion in this chapter sought to illustrate the potential role of the L1 in enhancing communicative, declarative, affective, and organizational aspects of learning.

Hence, we agree with Eldridge (1996) that the assumption that decreasing L1 use will lead to improving L2 use on the part of students, whether in quantity or quality, is misleading. As Eldridge put it,

If we want students to speak more English in the classroom, we should concentrate on that issue, with all the precision and energy at our disposal. Debate about how to stop or decrease mother tongue use is in the last instance sterile, simply because it does not actually address the problem (Eldridge 1996: 311).
This is also supported by Macaro (1998) as he did not find evidence in his study that teachers’ increased use of the L2 resulted in increased use of the L2 on the part of students. The evidence in this chapter also shows that use of the L1 by the teacher can help the quantity and quality of students’ L2 use in many respects. Specifically, it shows that use of the L1 can help in eliciting and prompting further L2 contributions on the part of learners. This can give them an opportunity to test their hypotheses about the L2, refine their interlanguage and thereby improve the quantity and quality of their L2. We have seen above that teachers’ adherence to the L2-only (e.g. T11) can result in depriving students of potential opportunities of output and interaction. This can lead to tension and negative attitudes in the classroom. Moreover, avoiding L1 use for explicit teaching of grammatical features deprives learners of understanding important L2 rules that can enhance their knowledge about the L2 and improve accuracy, which ultimately contribute to more effective communication.
Chapter 8

Conclusion and recommendations

8.1 Summary and recommendations for teacher training

Throughout this thesis, we have seen that the L1 has been viewed negatively in FLT for different reasons, theoretical, methodological, and even ideolological. Theories of learning played a major role in promoting this view from the behaviourist view to the naturalistic view. From different perspectives, all these theories viewed L2 learning as proceeding in the same way as L1 learning. Unfortunately, language teaching, at different times, seemed to be readily prepared to adopt these views of L2 learning without any real critical examination of their applicability to the teaching of adult (including older children) learners in FL classroom contexts. This consistently led to an insistence on a monolingual L2 approach to FLT. This thesis has sought to show that the arguments that led to this view, whether theoretical or ideological, are either questionable in themselves or inappropriate for use in the FL classroom context.

We argued that recent L2 learning theories and research do not in fact justify monolingual learning because of the many differences which are now understood between children learning their L1 and FL learners learning an L2. We have sought to show how recent theories rather justify the use of the L1 on the part of learners in so far as it contributes to different aspects of their learning and use of the L2 (communicative, declarative, and affective).

We also argued that recent L2 methodology does not justify monolingual teaching because of the recent emphasis on a dual focus and on humanistic teaching in the field of FLT. Thus, there have been more invitations that call for the use of the L1 in the FL classroom, but these have not developed into a coherent view that could justify the use of the L1 on sound theoretical and pedagogical bases. We have shown that the L1 can contribute to communicative, declarative, affective, and organizational aspects of teaching. The review of literature showed that, in practice, teachers usually referred to the L1 in FL classrooms regardless of what learning or teaching theories prescribed. Yet this use of the L1 has in many cases been accompanied by a feeling of guilt, as it was viewed as a non-professional practice.
The argument developed into an attempt to replace the hesitant, unprincipled view of the use of the L1 in L2 teaching by a view which re-integrates the L1 into FL classrooms in a positive and principled way. The argument is based not only on the developments in learning and teaching theories, but also on a sound understanding of the realities of classroom interaction, and the specificities of the FL classroom context. The L1 use by the teacher was positively justified within a proposed optimal theory of L1 use as a potential pedagogical and psycholinguistic resource that could assist and contribute to interaction and learning in the foreign language classroom. The L1 was claimed to be a more natural and authentic resource that conforms to the nature of the classroom as a bilingual context of intensified learning, rather than as an imitation of natural acquisition contexts. It is a more attainable resource that suits teachers’ bilingual competence, rather than the largely unattainable native-like competence. In addition, it assists the preferred explicit learning strategy employed by older and adult learners that helps them to take declaratively based strategies to learning, as well as implicit natural acquisition employed by small children.

Our proposed optimal theory of L1 use, informed by our multi-dimensional theoretical approach (in chapters 1 and 2) led to the construction of a theoretically justified framework of L1 use that included four theoretical hypotheses about the value of L1 use in L2 learning. The L1 was claimed to aid communicative use of the language, declarative learning of the language, affective aspects of learning, and organizational aspects of classroom learning. This theoretical framework was then developed, through the use of ethnographic methods of data collection, into a list of potential L1 functions to be used as an observation schedule (a category coding scheme) in the main study to describe and understand teachers’ use of the L1 in Egyptian EFL classrooms.

The results of the field study showed that teachers were not aware either of the quantity or the quality of their L1 use. Teachers tended to use the L1 mostly for communicative, non-pedagogical and organizational purposes respectively. Formal and affective purposes had only a minimal percentage of teachers’ use of the L1. Teachers seemed to be dominated by two contradictory influences; on the one hand, their behaviour was dictated to them by official prescription that the L1 should be used only as a final resource. This represented a kind of ideology imposed upon them. On the other hand, teachers were confronted with various contextual factors that conflicted with this ideology which led them to adopt pragmatic solutions which mostly required the L1.
The anecdotal data from classroom observations and informal interviews showed that the official policy of prohibiting the use of the L1 and exemplifying teaching by the means of the L2 exerted a kind of pressure on teachers that limited their practice and decision making inside the FL classroom. Teachers were led to avoid the L1 at all costs.

Moreover, the data we got from classroom recordings showed that most teachers sought to resolve their conflict and adapt to circumstances. Thus, although they did not make use of the L1 in a principled optimal way, they seemed, consciously or unconsciously, to distinguish between pedagogical and non-pedagogical code-switching. They used pedagogical code-switches consciously to ensure students' comprehension and the effectiveness of communication, as well as to create a disciplined organized context of learning, which represent legitimate targets in any learning situation. These aims seemed to be justifiable enough for them to deviate from the main rule (always teach in the L2) for the sake of the exceptional licence (refer to the L1 only as a final resort). They used non-pedagogical code-switches, as a social, psychological, or remedial strategy, more freely as they seemed to be viewed as peripheral to the main rule. Formal and affective purposes of teaching, though, did not seem to be justifiable.

We would wish to argue, from this evidence, that imposing rules and prescriptions that are not really based on a sound understanding of the nature of learning, the FL classroom situation, and the relationship between the participants in such a context hinders rather than helps learning. Such prescriptions, especially when they come from an authoritarian body that directly affects teachers' careers, unnecessarily add to the complexity of classroom life. This limits teachers' behaviours and minimizes the chances available for them to provide better learning opportunities for their students. Besides, this influence places teachers in an unfair position, in which they have either to adhere to the rules and prescriptions regardless of any other considerations or problems that may arise, or give more attention to their classes' problems and try to resolve them, regardless of what the authorities demand. Our findings agree with Liu et al. in that "teachers resort to L1 when they believe circumstances (difficult points, students' low L2 ability, etc.) call for it, even though the practice runs against their curriculum guidelines" (Liu et al. 2004: 624).

The findings in this thesis endorse the argument presented by Simon (2000) and:
invite teachers and teacher educators to reconsider the role of codeswitching in the classroom. The traditional view of codeswitching as a reprehensible practice in the foreign language classroom clearly has to give way to a phenomenon that is identifiable and recognizable as one of a large panoply of pedagogical strategies at the teachers’ and learners’ disposal to facilitate the learning process. The tacit agreement between learners and teachers is not the exclusive use of the foreign language, but rather that of letting the teacher exploit all the potential means available to facilitate the learning process (Simon 2000: 338).

A greater responsibility therefore lies on teacher trainers and decision makers to achieve the purpose of integrating the L1 as a positive potential resource in the FL classroom. We have seen that the pressures and limitations imposed on teachers led to them forming a negative view of the L1 role. Yet when involved in real practice, teachers, with their intuition, felt it was necessary to carry out certain tasks in the classroom. They used it in an intelligent but 'ad hoc' way to adapt to the demands and requirements of communication and organization in the classroom context. Although this is sensible in itself, it is not enough to leave teachers to their common sense; they need to be made aware of the significance of using the L1 as a deliberate teaching strategy that is conducive to learning. They need to develop an awareness of the positive contributions which use of the L1 can add to their classrooms, and the range of possibilities of L1 use; this would refine and enhance their intuition. Teachers can do better, if they learn that the L1 can positively improve their students’ learning and use of the L2 in the FL classroom. Not only can it facilitate comprehension, improve communication, and provide a better organized learning setting, but it can also improve students’ knowledge about the L2 rules, and enhance their attitudes towards learning and using the L2. They also need to distinguish between communicative ability as an end in itself and communicative practice as a means for carrying out classroom activities (Widdowson 1987, Hedge 2000), which involve communicative, declarative, affective, and organizational aspects of language use. This can help to empower teachers, and make them more confident and innovative in teaching the L2, using their natural attainable bilingual competence instead of being exhausted by seeking a prescribed unattainable monolingual communicative competence.

As just mentioned, a big responsibility lies on teacher trainers and decision makers. Developing teachers’ awareness of the positive role of the L1 requires in the first place that teacher trainers and decision makers be made aware themselves of the theoretical and pedagogical role of the L1 as presented in the context of this thesis. They also need to develop a sound understanding of the implications of CLT in local contexts, and the role of
the teacher in enhancing and promoting students' communicative ability as an end, and using communicative practice as a means or a classroom procedure for achieving that end. Thus, it is more logical and profitable to start from the top of the hierarchy; the official policy itself should be guided to develop an alternative view of teachers' use of the L1 in FL classrooms. They need to be aware of and appreciate that:

codeswitching is an extremely valuable resource. It should therefore not be legislated away ................., such legislation would cut teachers and pupils off from a crucial communicative resource. Such a policy would be disempowering. Teacher trainers need to understand that they are the ones, ultimately, who formulate and monitor school ........ Language policy and their decisions must be rational and informed by sociolinguistic understanding of languages and their statuses in the school and the community (Adendorff 1993: 155).

8.2 Limitations of the study and recommendations for further research

On the basis of this study it seems legitimate to make the recommendations presented in 8.1. However, more research is needed and the present research could have been improved in the following ways, had circumstances permitted.

First, the study could only present information related to a small number of classes in a specific environment within Egypt. In addition, due to socio-political reasons, we could not give evidence to the statuses of the classes covered in the study in the sense of them being high ability or low ability, socio-economically privileged or unprivileged. In a country like Egypt, schools' results are not displayed to the public, and it was not possible for the researcher to access them. The sample on which the study is based is therefore rather narrow and incompletely described in socio-political terms. The study would have been improved by a large sample and more detailed background information.

Second, in this study, the act count was carried out by a single individual. Whilst it is believed that this produced sufficient consistency, the study would have been improved if more than one coder had been available, thus enabling cross checking and greater reliability.

Third, the study was carried out within a limited period of time (between the 14th of February and the 6th of March) due to practical reasons. More time to prepare the schools for their participation in the research e.g. by getting to know the teachers better prior to recording might have made access to the classroom easier. The study would also have been improved if there had been time or a chance to interview some members of the inspectorate to ask them
for the justifications behind their policy regarding the L1 use, and their evaluations of teachers who use it in the FL classroom. Further research can, particularly address this point.

Fourth, the study made use of simple techniques for recording the data. Whilst most of the data could be adequately transcribed, the transcriptions do have limitations in terms of completeness and some lessons had to be discarded because the quality of the recording was insufficient. Better recording techniques might have produced more data to work from.

Fifth, as the current study did not find real differences in the distribution of L1 and L2 within the main categories between different types of lessons among different teachers, it would be useful for further research to seek to record different types of lessons for the same teacher to see if the type of the lesson can really affect the teacher's behaviour regarding the L1 use. It may also be useful for further research to investigate the effect of teachers' use of the L1 on students' contributions in the FL classroom.
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1. Introduction

English is the principal international language of diplomacy, trade and tourism. Thus, it has a dominant position in international media, in science, and in modern technology. A high percentage of world publications in science, technology and commerce are published in English. That is why learning English as a foreign language is assuming an increasing importance in Egypt both within and outside the school system.

The EFL syllabus for the Preparatory Cycle is designed to consolidate and build on the achievement of learners based on the first two years of English in Primary 4 and Primary 5, and to equip pupils with the necessary English language skills to pursue their studies in the Secondary Cycle or to enter the labour market. Since the Preparatory Cycle could be the terminal cycle for a proportion of the school population, it is essential that those completing Preparatory 3 achieve an acceptable level of competence in the four basic language skills in English.

2. General Aims for TEFL in the Preparatory Cycle

1. To develop positive attitudes towards learning foreign languages.
2. To enable pupils to appreciate the importance of English in the progress of Science and Technology at both national and international levels.
3. To encourage openness to foreign cultures.
4. To develop the skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing in an integrated way, with the focus on the development of communication skills.
5. To develop the ability to extract information from a listening or reading text or through different forms of mass media.
6. To train pupils in the skills of logical and critical thinking.
7. To provide for self-realization focusing on this concept through assigning tasks to pupils which contribute to this purpose.
8. To train the pupils to participate positively in dialogue and to respect the opinions of others e.g. through debate and discussion and the exploration of concepts.
9. To train the pupils in problem-solving, collaborative learning, and the use of different learning resources.
10. To develop skills for learner-autonomy by enabling pupils to acquire a set of learning strategies e.g. problem-solving, discovery-learning, creative thinking and critical reading.
11. To encourage the development of pupils' creativity.
12 To develop moral and social values in pupils by encouraging attitudes of tolerance, cooperation and teamwork.

3. Behavioural Objectives for the Teaching of English in the Preparatory Cycle

Year 1
By the end of year 1 of the Preparatory Cycle, pupils are expected to be able to:
1 provide answers to three questions based on a listening text which assesses the pupil’s:
   • general understanding;
   • knowledge of vocabulary and structure;
2 describe orally or in writing a set of items relating to their surroundings (classroom and local environment);
3 participate positively with teachers and classmates in dialogue and discussion;
4 read a sentence aloud, clearly and correctly following the rules of correct pronunciation, and proceed to reading a whole paragraph;
5 read a text silently and answer a set of different questions which assess:
   • general understanding of the text;
   • knowledge of vocabulary and language structure;
   • the ability to extract a specific piece of information.
6 write correctly sentences dictated to them by the teacher (ranging from 3 to 4 sentences of about 20 words);
7 use appropriate punctuation marks when writing (i.e. full stops, comma, question mark, capital letters);
8 use an illustrated English dictionary to look up the meanings of some words;
9 write two or three sentences on a familiar topic relating to themselves.

Year 2
By the end of year 2 of the Preparatory Cycle, pupils are expected to be able to:
1 provide answers to questions based on a listening text which assess the skills of understanding, application and analysis;
2 express themselves orally in three or four sentences and proceed to a short text of about five sentences;
3 participate in dialogue with teachers and classmates in greater depth than in year 1;
4 read a text aloud using the appropriate skills;
5 read a text silently and answer a set of questions that assess the reading skills of understanding, analysis and inference;
6 express themselves on topics relating to their own lives in writing in three or four sentences, and proceed to a short paragraph of about 5 sentences;
7 use some punctuation marks accurately in writing;
8 write correctly sentences dictated to them by the teacher (ranging from three to four sentences of about 25 words).

**Year 3**

By the end of year 3 of the Preparatory Cycle, pupils are expected to be able to:
1 answer questions based on a listening text which assess the skills of understanding, application, analysis, evaluation, and the ability to extract the gist of a text;
2 use the language functionally in different life-situations, following the rules of spoken English;
3 master reading a text aloud following the rules of correct pronunciation and intonation;
4 answer a set of questions based on a reading text which assess the skills of understanding, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and the ability to extract the gist of a text;
5 extract and note down the main points of a listening or reading text;
6 differentiate between what is right and what is wrong in the context of what they listen to or read with regard to language accuracy, and be able to select what accords with appropriate societal values;
7 express orally their own ideas and interests, clearly and accurately (in about five sentences);
8 express themselves in writing clearly and accurately in a topic relating to their own individual interests in a paragraph of about seven sentences or in a letter to a friend or a relative;
9 use different styles of writing appropriate to the topic provided;
10 show imagination and creativity when writing by producing new ideas and non-traditional solutions to simple human problems;
11 appreciate the role of writing as an instrument which focuses on self expression and communication with others;
13 use effectively the different resources for learning (e.g. a dictionary, educational multi media, etc.)
Third Year (Hello! 5)

Specific Objectives:
The aims of Hello! For the preparatory stage are to achieve a sort of logical integration to build upon the language and skills learned at previous levels to encourage the intellectual development of the student to enhance the critical thinking and to promote the self learning motivation.

Syllabus:
1 Containing the fun element which has been dealt with in the primary stage.
2 Dealing with more serious factual topics taken from history, geography and technology.
3 Enabling the students to get in touch with the environmental areas.
4 Developing the students’ awareness of grammar through the item of learning through language.
5 Communication skills are also developed in Hello! 5, Students are taught in Hello! 5 how to use appropriate expressions for various communicative situations.

The syllabus includes a great deal of revision of the work done over the five years of Hello! Series.

Listening: Listening to the cassette and the teacher enables the students to:
- identify topics of situational dialogues.
- be in contact with the native speakers of the language.
- respond to a range of question forms
- improve the pronunciation of the students.

Speaking: The aim is to enable students to:
- form simple requests and offers
- state their opinion on different topics.
- respond to invitations or suggestions.
- apologize for not being able to accept an invitation or suggestion or for doing something wrong.
- hold an argumentary discussion on various topics.
- express worry or sympathy.
- seek information.

(Such things stress the importance of language functions)

Reading: The aim is to enable students to:
- scan and skim texts.
- understand various topics.
- learn how to learn
- widen the scope of knowledge through reading "the reader".

Writing: The aim is to enable students to:
- form a simple paragraph with guidance or through a picture.
- transform information from a table or fill in gaps in a table from information given in a paragraph.
- train in using the correct writing mechanism (e.g. punctuation).
Appendix II

A Sample of an End of Year Exam
A- Language Functions

1- Write what you would say in each of the following situations: (4 Marks)

a- Your little brother spilled water on your trousers. You are not angry.

b- You meet one of your neighbours for the first time.

c- Soha lent you her dictionary and you've lost it.

d- You would like to use your friend's telephone.

2- Supply the missing parts in the following dialogue: (3 Marks)

(Between Mona and an interviewer).

Interviewer: Hello! Mona. Can I ask you some questions about your English?

Mona: Yes, of course.

Interviewer: Mona, What is important for you?

Mona: Well, I think it's important for me to learn English. You know I want to be a doctor.

Interviewer: When did you start learning English when I was at the primary school.

Mona: I started learning English when I was at the primary school.

Interviewer: Do you always speak English with your friends?

Mona: Yes, I do. I always try to speak English with my friends.

B- Vocabulary and Structure

3- Choose and write the correct word: (5 Marks)

Many developments have taken place in Egypt over the past ten years. In the field of transport, the metro lines have been extended to different areas of Egypt. In the past our telephone system was terrible! Now businessmen can talk to their trading partners round the clock very easily. The government has been building new roads all over the country.

1- a) extend b) extended

2- a) system b) set

3- a) round b) about

4- a) builds b) building

5- a) together b) all

6- Choose the correct answer from a, b, c or d: (4 Marks)

1- Although Samy had a lot of courage, he was afraid of my dog.

a) courage b) control c) coach d) safety

2- Mona was very pleased with the gold necklace.

a) pleasantly b) pleasure c) pleased d) pleasant

3- Our teacher's handwriting is very surprising.

a) surprise b) surprising c) surprised d) unsurprised

4- I left the cinema because I didn't like the film.

a) but b) where c) so d) because

5- He was watching TV when they switched the electricity off.

a) was watching b) watching c) watched d) watches

6- If you come here, I will show you my new book.

a) show b) will show c) would show d) showed

7- Ahmed was doing his homework so he can't come out to play.

a) show b) would show c) showed d) showing

C- Reading Comprehension

5- Read the following, then answer the questions: (7 Marks)

One day last week my brother Ahmed went shopping in the city center. He wanted to buy a T-shirt and a pair of shoes. It took him a long time to do all the shopping. He caught the bus home late in the evening. It was very dark when he got off the bus. He had to walk a long way through the town before he reached his house. Suddenly he heard a noise. He began to run home very quickly and the man behind him caught him and held him. It was a strange man. He begged to go home with him. The man said he had gone to join the army.
"I followed you to give you this bag. You forgot it in me bus." he said. "Thank you very much." Ahmed laughed. "You are very kind."

A- Choose and write the correct answer from a, b, c or d:

1- Ahmed was frightened because ....................... .
   a) he was walking home b) he got off the bus
c) he went shopping d) it was dark

2- Ahmed went to the city centre ...................... .
   a) alone b) with his friend
c) with the strange man d) with his father

3- The strange man gave Ahmed ............... .
   a) some money b) a bag
c) a piece of chocolate d) a blow

B- Answer the following questions:

1- Why did Ahmed come back home late?
2- Who does the underlined word "he" refer to?

5- Read the following and complete the table: (3 Marks)

Soha and Dalia have just arrived in Benha to visit their Uncle Kamal. They have been living in Alexandria for six years where their father works as a doctor. They were excited to see their cousins Maha and Ramy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of visitors</th>
<th>Place of departure</th>
<th>Place of arrival</th>
<th>Father's job</th>
<th>Number of cousins</th>
<th>Time spent in Alexandria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soha and Dalia</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Benha</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D- Writing

7- Write a paragraph of six sentences on: "A trip to the seaside"

- When did you go on the trip to the seaside?
- How did you go there?
- With whom did you go?
- What did you do there?
- Did you return back home?
- How did you spend your time?

- When did you return home?
- How did you spend your time?

- When did you go on the trip to the seaside?
- With whom did you go?
- What did you do there?
- Did you return back home?
- How did you spend your time?

- When did you return home?
- How did you spend your time?
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Letters for Getting Permission for Recording
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

This is to confirm that Mrs Salwa Sadek is a registered full time PhD student in the School of Languages, University of Salford. She is engaged in research into the use of the mother tongue in the teaching of English as a Foreign Language, and her research requires her to carry out observation of English classes in Egyptian preparatory schools.

As her PhD advisor I would be very grateful for your cooperation in providing Mrs Sadek with the opportunity to carry out the necessary classroom observation. I am confident that Mrs Sadek will approach the observation with tact and sensitivity, with the minimum inconvenience to staff and students.

Ms S.M.Bromby
Associate Head of School
سلام الله الرحمن الرحيم

رجب تشياني

السيد المدير،

أصبحز مكافئًا في رئاسة مدرستي، يرجع إلى موعدًا جمعت بين طيبتي ومجال

سعته لي أراك صاحب ودورًا كبيرًا في الرؤية والمدارس الحاضرة فلتجدني في

المشا. صنعت أنا أقوم للدروس لتصورًا عن رؤية الدكتور صلاح سلامة فان

يوضع دراسة عامة في استفادة اللذن ملقى في تدوين الدروس الإلزامية.

كلدنا أن يكون بمدارس الإعدادية مسر، ينجز أرشب في الباب سجى مربع

بعض دروس اللغة البرتغالية بمدارس الإعدادية بمدرسة المنازل، ودرمت لازم

قطاب رمزًا نهضتي ورغمه بالعبري،

ناريا له إにとっては تقريبًا من داخل المدارس لذا الفزع.

رجب تشياني

مقدمة رجب تشياني

 squeezes 13

السيرة المطلوبة

1877

المسرحي 1936

الاسم: رجب تشياني

المؤهلات: دكتور

أعمال ميدانية:

 расположен أ حاجية جماعية للاستعمال

بعد أن أعطيت للأعمال المحلية

لم عادة / مدرستي رئاسة مدارس الإعدادية للعمل على تنفيذ تغييرات لسيدتي، لدلوقتي في مدارس إعدادية، راجع أيضاً لورش لطرق و

أعمال ميدانية تتعلق بالتعليم، عاجبهم بعد إكمالهم، بعد تفتيشهم، اتصلون

بهم إلى إعدادية مرحلة الإعدادية، وسأدرك مدرستي بمساعدتهم.
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Teachers’ questionnaire
Teachers’ questionnaire

Please spend some time answering the following questionnaire

Date: 
Name: 
Qualifications: 
Place of work 

Section I

1) How would you describe your (oral) proficiency in the English language?  
   a) Low  b) Adequate  c) Fairly fluent  d) Native-like

2) Does your department/school have a policy regarding the use of Arabic in the English class?  
   a) Yes  b) No

3a) Do you use L1 in the L2 class?  
   a) quite a lot  b) Occasionally  c) Never

3b) If (a) or (b), what is the approximate percentage of LI use?  
   a) > than 10%  b) 10% to 20%  c) 20% to 50%  d) < than 50%

4) Circle the statement that best reflects your view of your use of the LI.  
   a) I think I use far too much LI.  
   b) I would like to use the L1 a bit less.  
   c) I would like to use more LI.  
   d) I am happy with my current practice.

5) Which tasks/activities do you think the use of LI is most appropriate for?  
   ..............................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................
6) Which tasks/activities do you think should not be carried out in the L1?


7) Do you allow your students to use their L1 in the L2 classroom?
   a) At all times  b) Sometimes  c) Never

8) How would you evaluate your students’ ability in the L2?
   a) Low  b) OK  c) Good  d) Very Good

9) When you speak in the L2 only, how much do you think your students understand?
   a) 75% or more  b) 50% to 75%  c) 25% to 50%  d) > than 25%

**Section II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you agree that:</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to discuss cultural differences before carrying out a communicative task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to clarify meanings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to check that students understand what is going on in the English lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Use of Arabic by the teacher helps to familiarize students with ambiguous expressions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5- Use of Arabic by the teacher can push the oral interaction in the L2 classroom.

6- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to repair communication breakdowns that might occur while communicating in English.

7- Use Arabic by the teacher can help to explain difficult grammatical points explicitly.

8- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to explain difficult L2 vocabulary.

9- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to overcome some pronunciation problems.

10- Use of translation activities can increase students' awareness that there is not necessarily an Arabic equivalent to every English item.

11- Use of Arabic by the teacher in praising students can make them more motivated.

12- Use of Arabic by the teacher in joking or chatting with students can make them more motivated.

13- Use of Arabic by the teacher is sometimes necessary to respond to students' initiations in Arabic.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Use of Arabic by the teacher can help in responding to students’ requests for clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Use of Arabic by the teacher helps to recognize students’ learning problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Use of Arabic by the teacher gives support for less proficient students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Use of Arabic by the teacher can make English language teaching more related to students’ own experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to reinforce instructions in the English language class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Use of Arabic by the teacher can involve students who may switch off or refrain from talking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Use of Arabic by the teacher can help in managing students’ behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Use of Arabic by the teacher can save classroom time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Use of English only by the teacher with large classes is difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>It sounds unnatural to talk in English only when teachers and students share the same L1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Use of Arabic by the teacher results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from teacher’s laziness.

25- Use of Arabic by the teacher results from teacher’s lack of proficiency.

26- Relying on English only all the time can be time consuming
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Arabic Version of the Teachers’ questionnaire
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
وبه نستعين

من فضلك أجب عن الاستفتاء التالي علماً بأن جميع الأسئلة تفرض البحث فقط ولن يطلع عليها أحد
باستثناء الباحث، ونسانكم جزيل الشكر ..
التاريخ :
الاسم :
المؤهل :
مكان العمل :

الجزء الأول :
من فضلك أجب عن الأسئلة التالية :
1- كيف تقيم كفاءتك النظيفة في اللغة الإنجليزية؟
(أ) ضعيفة
(ب) ملائمة
(ج) طلقاً
(د) في مستوى المتحدث الأصلي
2- هل تتبنى المدرسة أو التوجيه سياسة ما تجاه استخدام اللغة العربية في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية؟
إذا كان الأمر كذلك الرجاء إعطاء بعض التفاصيل ..

3- هل تستخدم اللغة العربية في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية؟
(أ) كثيراً
(ب) أحياناً
(ج) مطلقاً
- إذا كانت الإجابة "ج" فلماذا ؟
- إذا كانت الإجابة "أ" أو "ب" فما هي النسبة التقديرية للغة العربية التي تستخدمها؟
(أ) أقل من 10% .
(ب) 10% : 20%
(ج) 20% : 50%
أختر العبارة التي تعكس رأيك حول استخدام اللغة العربية في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية:
أـ) أعتقد أنني استخدمت اللغة العربية بقدر كبير.
بـ) أرغب في استخدام اللغة العربية بقدر أقل.
جـ) أرغب في استخدام اللغة العربية بقدر أكبر.
دـ) أشعر بالرضا عن اساليبى الحالى.
(5) أي الأنشطة (مثال: تدريس قواعد، كلمات، محادثات.. الخ) تعتقد أنه من المناسب معها استخدام اللغة العربية؟
(6) أي الأنشطة تعتقد أنه من غير المناسب معها استخدام اللغة العربية؟
(7) هل تسمح لطلابك باستخدام اللغة العربية في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية؟
أـ) دائما
بـ) في بعض الأحيان
جـ) طلقا
(8) ما هو تقييمك للكفاءة الطلابية في اللغة الإنجليزية؟
أـ) ضعيفة
بـ) مقبولة
جـ) جيدة
دـ) جيدة جدا
(9) ما القدر الذي بفهمه طلابك حين تتحدث باللغة الإنجليزية فقط؟
أـ) 75% أو أكثر
بـ) ما بين 50% و 75% (ج) 25% : 50% (د) أقل من 25%
أختار العبارة التي تعكس رأيك حول استخدام اللغة العربية في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية:

أ) أعتقد أنى استخدام اللغة العربية يقترب كبير.
ب) أرغب في استخدام اللغة العربية بقدر أقل.
ج) أرغب في استخدام اللغة العربية بقدر أكبر.

(و) أشعر بالرضا عن أسئلتي الحالي.

5) أي الأنشطة (مثال: تدريس قواعد، كلمات، محادثات، .. الخ) تعتقد أنه من المناسب معها استخدام اللغة العربية؟

6) أي الأنشطة تعتقد أنه من غير المناسب معها استخدام اللغة العربية؟

7) هل تسمح لطلابك باستخدام اللغة العربية في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية؟
(أ) دائماً
(ب) فحسب الإجابات (ج) طلباً

8) ما هو تقييمك للفعاليات الطلابية في اللغة الإنجليزية؟
(أ) ضعيفة
(ب) مقبولة
(ج) جيدة جداً

9) ما القدر الذي يفهمه طلابك حين تتحدث باللغة الإنجليزية فقط؟
(أ) 75% أو أكثر
(ب) ما بين 50% و 75% (ج) 25% : 50% (د) أقل من 25%
الجزء الثاني:
من فضلك اختر الإجابة التي تعكس رأيك حول العبارات التالية:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>لا أوافق بشدة</th>
<th>لا أوافق</th>
<th>غير متأكد</th>
<th>أوافق</th>
<th>أوافق بشدة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>استخدام المعلم للغة العربية يساعد في توجيه التعليمات في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>استخدام المعلم للغة العربية يساعد في جذب الطلاب من شاردى الذهن أو المحجومين عن الحديث.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>استخدام المعلم للغة العربية يساعد في تهذيب سلوك الطلاب.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>استخدام المعلم للغة العربية يساعد في عدم اهدر وقت الفصل.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>يصعب استخدام اللغة الإنجليزية فقط مع الفصول المكتوبة.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>عندما يشترك المعلم والطلاب في اللغة الأم يكون من المصطنع التحدث باللغة الإنجليزية طوال الوقت.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>استخدام المعلم للغة العربية يعكس التراثي من جانب المدرس.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>استخدام المعلم للغة العربية يعكس قصوراً في كفاءة المعلم.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>الاعتماد على اللغة الإنجليزية فقط يستهلك الكثير من الوقت.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI

Students’ questionnaire
1) Do you use Arabic in the English language classroom?
   a) A lot  b) Some  c) not very much  d) None

2) Do you think you should be allowed to use Arabic in the English language classroom?
   a) Yes  b) No  c) I do not know

3) Do you think the English language teacher should use Arabic in the language classroom?
   a) Yes  b) No  c) I do not know

4) How much Arabic does your teacher use in the English language classroom?
   a) A lot  b) Some  c) not very much  d) None

5) How much of your teacher’s English language speech do you understand in class?
   a) All  b) Most of it  c) Some of it  d) Very little

6) How much Arabic would you like your teacher to use in the English language class?
   a) More Arabic than now  b) About the same as now  c) Less than now

7) Do you think use of Arabic by the teacher helps you engage in oral interaction?
   a) Yes  b) No  c) Not sure

8) Do you think use of Arabic by the English teacher helps you learn about the language rules better?
   a) Yes  b) No  c) Not sure

9) If the teachers’ use of the L1 helps you learn or use English better, then in what ways?
   a) When the teacher clarifies ambiguous meanings.
   b) When the teacher directs us while talking in English.
   c) When the teacher explains to us difficult grammar points
   d) When the teacher explains to us new vocabulary
e) When the teacher discusses with us how to pronounce unfamiliar sounds
f) When the teacher praises us
g) When the teacher chats with us
h) When the teacher jokes with us
i) When the teacher organizes the class
j) When the teacher clarifies instructions about what we have to do.
e) When the teacher discusses with us how to pronounce unfamiliar sounds
f) When the teacher praises us
g) When the teacher chats with us
h) When the teacher jokes with us
i) When the teacher organizes the class
j) When the teacher clarifies instructions about what we have to do.
Appendix VII

Arabic Version of the Students’ Questionnaire
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
وبه تستعين
***

من فضلك أجب عن الأسئلة التالية :

الاسم :

الصف :

السن :

المدرسة :

1- هل تستخدم اللغة العربية في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية؟
أ ( نعم ) 
( ب ) لا
رجاءً أجب ( ج ) ليس كثيراً ( د ) مطلقًا

2- هل تعتقد أنه من الضروري أن يسمح لك باستخدام اللغة العربية في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية؟
أ ( نعم ) 
( ب ) لا
رجاءً أجب ( ج ) ليست متأكدًا

3- هل تعتقد أنه يجب على مدرس اللغة الإنجليزية أن يستخدم اللغة العربية في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية؟
أ ( نعم ) 
( ب ) لا
رجاءً أجب ( ج ) ليست متأكدًا

4- ما هو كم اللغة العربية التي يستخدمها مدرس حصة اللغة الإنجليزية؟
أ ( كثير ) 
( ب ) قليل
رجاءً أجب ( ج ) ليس كثير ( د ) لا يستخدمها مطلقًا

5- ما هو مقدار ما تفهمه من حديث معلمة باللغة الإنجليزية؟
أ ( أكثر منه ) 
( ب ) أغلبه ( ج ) بعضه
رجاءً أجب ( د ) القليل منه

6- ما هو كم اللغة العربية الذي ترغب أن يستخدم معلما في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية؟
أ ( أكثر مما هو الآن ) 
( ب ) تماماً كما هو الآن
رجاءً أجب ( ج ) أقل مما هو الآن

7- هل تعتقد أن استخدام معلم للغة العربية يساعدك على المشاركة في الحديث في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية؟
أ ( نعم ) 
( ب ) لا
رجاءً أجب ( ج ) ليست متأكداً

8- هل تعتقد أن استخدام معلم للغة العربية يساعدك في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية بشكل أفضل؟
أ ( نعم ) 
( ب ) لا
رجاءً أجب ( ج ) ليست متأكداً

9- إذا كان استخدام المدرس للغة العربية يساعدك في تعلم أو استخدام اللغة الإنجليزية بشكل أفضل، اذكر كيف؟
أ ( عندما يوضح المدرس المعاني الصعبة )
( ب ) عندما يوجهنا المدرس أثناء حديثه باللغة الإنجليزية.
ج) عندما يشرح لنا المدرس القواعد الصعبة.
د) عندما يشرح لنا المدرس الكلمات الجديدة.
ه) عندما يشرح لنا المدرس كيفية نطق الأصوات الغير مألوفة.
و) عندما يمتدحنا المدرس.
ز) عندما يقوم المدرس بتبادل الإحاديث معنا.
ح) عندما يمزح المدرس معنا.
ط) عندما يقوم المدرس بتنظيم العمل في الفصل.
ى) عندما يوضح لنا المدرس التمثيلات الخاصة بالأنشطة التي نقوم بها.
Appendix VIII

Samples of Lessons Taught

The following samples are taken from:


F Inviting, accepting and refusing

Look up Inviting, accepting and refusing on page 72 of the Communication Skills section. Then practise with a partner. Use the situations below and add some ideas of your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you like to see a film?</th>
<th>Thanks, I'd love to.</th>
<th>I'm afraid/sorry I can't because</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What about meeting Hassan?</td>
<td>That's very nice of you.</td>
<td>I have to...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How about going to the park?</td>
<td>Great idea!</td>
<td>I wish I could, but I have to...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Invite somebody to meet your friends.
2. Invite somebody to watch a video with you.
3. Invite somebody to come to the cinema.

G Read and answer letters

Read this letter of invitation and the two replies.

Great! I'm free on Monday afternoon!

Oh dear! What a pity! I've got to go to the dentist.

Dear Ahmed and Soha,

Would you like to come to my birthday party on Monday 5th April? The party will begin at four o'clock.

Yours,

Hassan

54 Mohammed Hussein St
Nosr City

1st April

Dear Hassan,

Thank you for inviting me to your birthday party. I would love to come. I will arrive at about four o'clock.

Yours,

Ahmed

Flat 12
24 Sinai St
Baudak

30th March

Dear Ahmed and Soha,

Thank you for inviting me to your birthday party. I wish I could come but I have to go to the dentist on Monday afternoon.

Thank you for inviting me. I'm sorry I can't come.

Yours,

Soha

Write a letter of invitation to your friend in your exercise book. Then read your friend's invitation and write a reply.
C Reported speech

Look up reported speech on page 56 of the Grammar Review again, then look at the picture examples on the left. Change the sentences on the right into reported speech in your exercise book.

Reported instructions
1 “Do your homework, Ahmed,” Mrs Ragab said.
2 “Don’t talk, Soha,” the teacher said.
3 “Don’t cross that road,” Soha said to the little girl.

Reported requests
4 “Can you explain something to me, Mona?” Azza asked.
5 “Please don’t be late, Hesham,” the teacher asked.
6 “Pass me the sugar, please, Omar,” said Soha.

Reported yes/no questions
7 “Do you study Arabic at your school, John?” Amr asked.
8 “Are you going to buy that book, Hesham?” asked Tariq.
9 “Have you ever been abroad, Taher?” asked Azza.

Reported Wh- questions
10 “When did you arrive in Egypt, Robert?” Soha asked.
11 “How long have you lived in Imbaba, Reem?” asked Mrs Ragab.
12 “What are you going to do at the weekend, Magdy?” asked Ali.
Robert Johnson told his mother and father about his meeting with Ahmed and Soha. Write their questions and his answers in reported speech.

1 “Have you tried any Egyptian food yet?” asked Soha.
   Soha asked me if I had tried any Egyptian food yet.

2 “Yes, I’ve tried ta’mia and konafa.”
   I told her that I had tried ta’mia and konafa.

3 “Where have you been in Egypt?” asked Ahmed.
   Ahmed asked I had been in Egypt.

4 “I’ve been to the Pyramids and the Egyptian Museum.”
   I told I had been to the Pyramids and the Egyptian Museum.

5 “Have you heard any music by Egyptian singers?” asked Soha.

6 “No, I haven’t.”

E Listening

Mr Ragab is in London on business. He is in the office of an English businessman, George Green. Listen to their conversation twice and then complete the report of their meeting in your Workbook, page 6.
F  Agreeing and disagreeing

Look up Agreeing and disagreeing on page 73 of the Communication Skills section, then look at the table. Work with a partner. Your partner should agree or disagree with what you say. Think of more examples of your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think we should stop work now.</td>
<td>I agree.</td>
<td>I don't agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't think he's very friendly.</td>
<td>That's right.</td>
<td>I don't think so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She's very intelligent.</td>
<td>That's what I think.</td>
<td>No, I disagree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. You think that Egypt has the best football team in the world.
2. You think swimming is more fun than rowing.
3. You don't think that Maths is difficult.
4. You don't think that History is very interesting.

G  Word formation: Prefixes

A prefix is a group of two or more letters joined to the beginning of a word to change its meaning. Look at these two sentences.

This new car is very safe. This means that it is not dangerous.
This car is very unsafe. This means that it is dangerous.

Write the correct prefix above each column. Look up any words you are not sure of in the Dictionary Skills section or your Hello! Dictionary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dis-</th>
<th>un-</th>
<th>im-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>possible</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td>appear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>tidy</td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polite</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now choose five words with prefixes and write sentences in your exercise book.
H  More work with connectors

Look up connectors again on page 65 of the Grammar Review. Then look at the examples and complete the sentences below.

I went to Spain to learn Spanish.
I went to Spain in order to learn Spanish.
I went to Spain so that I could learn Spanish.

The house didn't cost much because it's made of wood.
The house didn't cost much, so we bought it.

I don't have much time for hobbies. However, I enjoy painting.
Although I don't have much time for hobbies, I enjoy painting.

Complete the sentences. Use each connector once.

1. ................................ I was tired, I couldn't go to sleep.
2. He telephoned me .................... invite me to his party.
3. We arrived late .................... the traffic in town was very heavy.
4. I don't think I can do this sum .................... , I'll try.
5. He's learning English .................... get a better job.
6. He has broken his leg .................... he can't walk.
7. I climbed the ladder .................... I could pick the fruit.

I  Add connectors

Complete Rashid's composition about his friend, Emam. Use the connectors in the box to fill the gaps. There is sometimes more than one possible answer.

My friend's name is Emam. He is fourteen years old ............ he lives next door to me.
I like Emam ............ he is very funny ............ he tells me lots of jokes. I also like him ............ we help each other with our homework. I am not very good at Maths ............ Emam is a very good mathematician ............ he helps me a lot.

I also like Emam............ we have fun together. Yesterday was a holiday ............ we wanted to go swimming. We went to the beach ............ the sea was very rough ............ we couldn't swim ............ , we flew our kites ............ went to a café ............ have a hamburger. Then we went home ............ listen to my new cassette ............ the weather was bad, we had a good time in the end.
A Quick silent reading: Just like me

Read quickly the descriptions of some foreign students' lives and find the answers to these questions.

1 Which students live in cities?
2 Which student goes to a small school?
3 Which student would like to travel?

1 Wong Shuang comes from China and is fifteen years old. She lives with her family in Shanghai, a big port on the east coast of China. Her family name is Wong, and her other name means 'big and happy'.

Shuang lives in a small flat with her mother and father. Shuang's father is a taxi driver and her mother is a cook. She hasn't got any brothers or sisters, but she has got a lot of friends. Shuang goes to a large school near her home. However, not many of her friends go to the same school. Shuang thinks that this is a pity.

After school, Shuang has a lot of homework, therefore she doesn't have much time for hobbies. But although she's a very busy girl, she finds time to make a lot of her own clothes.

2 Suchart, aged fourteen, comes from Thailand. He has got a brother and a sister. His father is a policeman and his mother is a housewife. The family have a very nice house, although Suchart's father doesn't earn much money. It didn't cost much because it is made of wood and has a grass roof. The house also has a big garden where the family grow a lot of vegetables. They also keep a few animals.

There are not many students in Suchart's school and there are only ten in his class. School begins at eight o'clock in the morning. When it finishes, Suchart usually helps in the family's garden. He loves growing things and looking after animals. He wants to study farming, so that he can keep more animals in the future.
Sarah comes from New York in the United States. She is fifteen and a half and she lives in a flat with her parents and younger brother. Sarah's father is an engineer who travels all over the world. Her mother is a university professor.

Sarah likes learning foreign languages. She speaks Spanish very well and she also speaks a little French. She would like to go to France in order to improve it. She knows a few words of Arabic, but she doesn't speak it well. Sarah's favourite hobby is painting, and she has recently come first in an art competition. She also likes going to the cinema, especially to see Spanish and French films, so that she can hear foreign languages.

B  Reading: Just like me

Read the passage again carefully and answer the following questions.
1. Not many of Shuang's friends go to her school. How does she feel about this?
2. Do you think her parents are rich? Why/Why not?
3. What does Shuang do in her spare time?
4. How many people live in Suchart's house?
5. Would Suchart prefer to live in a city?
6. Which language is Sarah very good at?
7. What does Sarah do in her spare time?
8. What has Sarah recently won?

C  What do the words refer to?

Read these sentences and say what the words in bold refer to in the passage.
1. Shuang thinks that this is a pity.
2. It didn't cost very much.
3. They also keep a few animals.
4. There are only ten in his class.
5. She would like to go to France in order to improve it.
Journey to the Centre of the Earth

By Jules Verne

Egyptian International Publishing Company-Longman
Late one Sunday afternoon in May 1863, my uncle, Professor Lidenbrock, came home from his scientific expedition. He was very excited.

I entered his room. My uncle was sitting at his desk. He was reading an old book.

"Axel, come here!" he shouted.

I entered his room. My uncle was sitting at his desk. He was reading an old book.

"What a wonderful book! It's more than six hundred years old. It's wonderful," he exclaimed. "Look at this! It's incredible. This fantastic book!"

I looked at the book. He continued to read it, and I went back to the kitchen. I told Martha not to worry and she went back to the kitchen.

But my uncle kept talking about the book. He was very excited. He was very excited.

I was a young boy who lives with his uncle, Professor Lidenbrock.
A piece of parchment fell out of the book. There were strange letters written on it. My uncle picked it up and looked at it. He became even more excited.

'Look! It's written in runes.'

'What are runes, Uncle?' I asked.

'Runes are the letters of the old Icelandic alphabet, of course,' my uncle replied impatiently. 'I can read runes, but I can't understand this. What does it mean?'

And he began to talk to himself again. I was used to that because my uncle Otto was a little strange sometimes. He gave lectures at the University of Hamburg. He was a famous geologist: he knew more about the Earth than any other scientist.

When my parents died, I came to live with him. I often helped him in his work. I was proud to be the assistant of such a famous man.

He started to walk up and down the room with the parchment in his hand. He looked puzzled. When he was puzzled, he usually became angry. He was getting angry now.

Martha opened the door of the study.

'The soup is ready, Professor,' she said.

Martha closed the door and ran back to the kitchen.

'OK!' shouted my uncle.

Martha opened the door of the study again.

'I'm going to eat,' he said. 'I'm hungry. I was just finishing my dinner when I followed her and sat down to dinner. Martha was a very good cook and I was hungry. I was just finishing my dinner when...

Martha closed the door and ran back to the kitchen.

'What are runes, Uncle?' I asked.

'Runes are the letters of the old Icelandic alphabet,' my uncle replied again. 'I was used to that because my uncle Otto was a little strange sometimes. He gave lectures on runes. He was a famous

And he began to talk to himself again. I was used to that because my uncle Otto was a little strange sometimes. He gave lectures on runes. He was a famous
'I don't know,' my uncle replied, 'but I am going to find out. I will neither eat nor sleep until I have discovered the secret.'

My uncle guessed that the message was written in Latin and not Icelandic. Scientists of the sixteenth century always wrote about their discoveries in Latin. He tried reading the letters forwards, then backwards, but they still made no sense. He was still thinking about the secret when did not see me. He was still thinking about the secret when I had time to put the parchment back on the table. My uncle opened the door and my uncle appeared. I took the parchment over to the fire. I was just going to burn it.

'I read, 'My uncle must not find out about this. When Martha had gone, I picked up the parchment and studied it. I tried to arrange the letters so that they formed Latin words. But I was still unable to make any sense of it. I became more and more excited. How could it be possible? Had this really happened? Had some man really been brave enough to do this? And then I jumped up out of my座位. I was frightened by what I had read. Was it possible? Had this really happened? Had some man really broken the secret code? I had no idea what it says, I said to myself. At least I can read it now. I picked up the parchment and studied it. I spread the parchment on the table. I read the Latin words which I knew: 

\textit{ceteran a crater, terrestris, creterem, terrestre.}'}
Appendix IX

Distribution of Teachers’ Answers on their Questionnaire
### Teachers' answers on their questionnaire

#### Section I

1) How would you describe your (oral) proficiency in the English language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(81.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly fluent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Does your department/school have a policy regarding the use of Arabic in the English class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(81.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3a) Do you use LI in the L2 class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(93.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3b) If (a) or (b), what is the approximate percentage of LI use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; than 10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(56.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% to 20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(31.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% to 50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; than 50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Circle the statement that best reflects your view of your use of the LI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think I use far too much LI.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to use the LI a bit less.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(31.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to use more LI.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy with my current practice.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(68.75%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Which tasks/activities do you think the use of L1 is most appropriate for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Which tasks/activities do you think should not be carried out in the LI?
a) Dialogues  
13  
(81.25%)

b) Reading  
3  
(18.75%)

c) Grammar  
3  
(18.75%)

d) Vocabulary  
1  
(6.25%)

e) Presentation  
1  
(6.25%)

f) All activities  
1  
(6.25%)

7) Do you allow your students to use their L1 in the L2 classroom?  
a) At all times  
0  
(0%)
b) Sometimes  
16  
(100%)
c) Never  
0  
(0%)

8) How would you evaluate your students’ ability in the L2?  
a) Low  
1  
(6.25%)
b) OK  
4  
(25%)
c) Good  
11  
(68.75%)
d) Very Good  
0  
(0%)

9) When you speak in the L2 only, how much do you think your students understand?  
a) 75% or more  
8  
(50%)
b) 50% to 75%  
5  
(31.25%)
c) 25% to 50%  
3  
(18.75%)
d) > than 25%  
0  
(0%)
### Teachers' answers on their questionnaire

#### Section II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you agree that:</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to discuss cultural differences before carrying out a communicative task.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to clarify meanings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to check that students understand what is going on in the English lesson.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Use of Arabic by the teacher helps to familiarize students with ambiguous expressions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Use of Arabic by the teacher can push the oral interaction in the L2 classroom.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to repair communication breakdowns that might occur while communicating in English.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SA</strong></th>
<th><strong>A</strong></th>
<th><strong>NS</strong></th>
<th><strong>D</strong></th>
<th><strong>SD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Use Arabic by the teacher can help to explain difficult grammatical points explicitly.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
<td>(18.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to explain difficult L2 vocabulary.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(18.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to overcome some pronunciation problems.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(43.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Use of translation activities can increase students’ awareness that there is not necessarily an Arabic equivalent to every English item.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(43.75%)</td>
<td>(18.75%)</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Use of Arabic by the teacher in praising students can make them more motivated.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(37.5%)</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
<td>(18.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Use of Arabic by the teacher in joking or chatting with students can make them more motivated.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(56.25%)</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
<td>(18.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- Use of Arabic by the teacher is sometimes necessary to respond to students' initiations in</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help in responding to students’ requests for clarification.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- Use of Arabic by the teacher helps to recognize students’ learning problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- Use of Arabic by the teacher gives support for less proficient students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- Use of Arabic by the teacher can make English language teaching more related to students’ own experiences.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to reinforce instructions in the English language class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19- Use of Arabic by the teacher can involve students who may switch off or refrain from talking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help in managing students’ behaviour.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help in responding to students’ requests for clarification.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- Use of Arabic by the teacher helps to recognize students’ learning problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- Use of Arabic by the teacher gives support for less proficient students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- Use of Arabic by the teacher can make English language teaching more related to students’ own experiences.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help to reinforce instructions in the English language class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19- Use of Arabic by the teacher can involve students who may switch off or refrain from talking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- Use of Arabic by the teacher can help in managing students’ behaviour.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- Use of Arabic by the teacher can save classroom time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
<td>(43.75%)</td>
<td>(37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22- Use of English only by the teacher with large classes is difficult.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(43.75%)</td>
<td>(18.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23- It sounds unnatural to talk in English only when teachers and students share the same L1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.75%)</td>
<td>(31.25%)</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
<td>(18.75%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24- Use of Arabic by the teacher results from teacher's laziness.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31.25%)</td>
<td>(37.5%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25- Use of Arabic by the teacher results from teacher's lack of proficiency.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
<td>(18.75%)</td>
<td>(18.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26- Relying on English only all the time can be time consuming (This is a distracting question for number 20).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(18.75%)</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(43.75%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix X

Distribution of Students’ Answers on their Questionnaire
### Students' answers on their questionnaire

1) Do you use Arabic in the English language classroom?
   - a) A lot: 25 (4.94%)
   - b) Some: 322 (63.64%)
   - c) not very much: 143 (28.26%)
   - d) None: 12 (2.37%)
   - e) No answer: 4 (0.79%)

2) Do you think you should be allowed to use Arabic in the English language classroom?
   - a) Yes: 202 (39.92%)
   - b) No: 136 (26.88%)
   - c) I do not know: 159 (31.42%)
   - d) No answer: 9 (1.78%)

3) Do you think the English language teacher should use Arabic in the language classroom?
   - a) Yes: 246 (48.62%)
   - b) No: 156 (30.83%)
   - c) I do not know: 99 (19.57%)
   - d) No answer: 5 (0.99%)

4) How much Arabic does your teacher use in the English language classroom?
   - a) A lot: 24 (4.74%)
   - b) Some: 331 (65.42%)
   - c) not very much: 115 (22.73%)
   - d) None: 31 (6.13%)
   - e) No answer: 5 (0.99%)

5) How much of your teacher’s English language speech do you understand in class?
   - a) All: 168 (33.20%)
   - b) Most of it: 237 (46.84%)
   - c) Some of it: 65 (12.85%)
   - d) Very little: 30 (5.93%)
   - e) No answer: 6 (1.19%)

6) How much Arabic would you like your teacher to use in the English language class?
   - a) More Arabic than now: 83 (16.40%)
   - b) About the same as now: 302 (59.68%)
   - c) Less than now: 103 (20.85%)
   - d) No answer: 18 (3.88%)
7) Do you think use of Arabic by the teacher helps you engage in oral interaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) Yes</th>
<th>b) No</th>
<th>c) Not sure</th>
<th>d) No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>449</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>88.74%</td>
<td>4.94%</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) Do you think use of Arabic by the English teacher helps you learn about the language rules better?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) Yes</th>
<th>b) No</th>
<th>c) Not sure</th>
<th>d) No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>423</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.60%</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>7.51%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*9) If the teachers’ use of the L1 helps you learn or use English better, then in what ways?

- a) When the teacher clarifies ambiguous meanings. 253 (50%)
- b) When the teacher directs us while talking in English. 140 (27.67%)
- c) When the teacher explains to us difficult grammar points 162 (32.02%)
- d) When the teacher explains to us new vocabulary 196 (38.74%)
- e) When the teacher discusses with us how to pronounce unfamiliar sounds 162 (32.02%)
- f) When the teacher praises us 146 (28.85%)
- g) When the teacher chats with us 108 (21.34%)
- h) When the teacher jokes with us 112 (22.13%)
- i) When the teacher organizes the class 123 (24.31%)
- j) When the teacher clarifies instructions about what we have to do 195 (38.54%)
- k) No answer 4 (0.79%)

* Statements a and b referred to uses of the L1 with communicative input and had an average of 38.84% of students answers. Statements c, d, and e referred to uses of the L1 with formal input and had an average of 34.26% of students answers. Statements f, g, and h referred to uses of the L1 with affective input and had an average of 24.11% of students answers. Statements i and j referred to uses of the L1 with organizational input and had an average of 31.41% of students answers.
Thanks be to ALLAH