

The Use of L1 by Native-English Instructors in the EFL Classroom: Student Perceptions and Oral Proficiency*

Randy Green^{**}

Gyeongnam National University of Science and Technology

Daekweon Bae

Gyeongnam National University of Science and Technology

Green, R., & Bae, Daekweon. (2013). The use of L1 by native-English instructors in the EFL classroom: Student perceptions and oral proficiency. *Modern English Education*, 14(4), 61-80.

During the past few decades, a number of studies have examined the use of L1 versus the use of L2 by non-native English instructors in the EFL classroom; however, there has been less discussion about the use of L1 by native-English instructors to facilitate learning in this setting. The purpose of this study is to identify the perceptions of adult English language learners at an institution of higher education in the Republic of Korea regarding the use of the Korean language (L1) in the EFL classroom by native-English instructors. In addition to measuring the students' perceptions, the study aimed at determining whether or not the use of Korean (L1) by the instructor had an effect on students' oral proficiency. The results of the study indicate that a majority of students were supportive of the limited use of Korean (L1) in the classroom by native-English instructors. The study also showed a higher level of improvement in English oral proficiency for students in classes where some Korean was used by the instructor. It is believed that this study has important implications for language educators, particularly regarding the role that L1 can play in promoting L2 acquisition.

[L1 use/language of instruction/oral proficiency/
모국어사용/수업언어/구어능숙도]

* This work was supported by Gyeongnam National University of Science and Technology Grant.

** First author: Randy Green, Corresponding author: Daekweon Bae

I. INTRODUCTION

The language of instruction in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom is a subject that has been investigated at length in the past (Gebhard, 2006; Nunan, 1991; Wright, 2010). Many studies related to this topic have focused on the use of L1 (the students' native language) versus the use of L2 (the target language) by non-native English instructors (Cook, 2001; Mahboob, 2010; Schweers, 1999). However, few studies have investigated the use of L1 in the classroom by native-English EFL instructors. This is especially the case in the Republic of Korea, where an "English-only" policy for EFL instructors has become increasingly emphasized. As the number of English language programs in Korea increases, it is reasonable to assume that the number of native-English EFL instructors with some Korean language proficiency is also increasing. This phenomenon raises the issue of whether or not native-English instructors might be able to better facilitate learning for their Korean EFL students by making use of Korean (L1) in the classroom.

According to Halasa and Al-Manaseer (2012), it is common for many teachers to ban the use of L1 in the EFL classroom. Several educators have supported this trend on pedagogical grounds, stating that the use of L1 can interfere with the process of L2 learning (Banos, 2009; Hitotuzi, 2006; Kahraman, 2009). EFL instructors often go to great lengths to invent games, signals and even penalty systems that ensure their students do not use their L1 in the classroom. It is possible that this approach has been influenced by Krashen's (1981) contention that there is close relationship between *comprehensible input* in L2 and proficiency in L2 and the belief that maximum exposure to the target language enhances L2 acquisition (Kahraman, 2009; Morahan, 2003). Perhaps for this reason and others, Banos (2009) reported that using the students' mother tongue in the language classroom was widely discouraged during the late 1970's and the early 1980's. Interestingly, scholars such as Atkinson (1987), Auerbach (1993), Canagarajah (2003) and Cook (2001) have proposed that the "L2 Only" movement stems more from particular historical, ideological, and political beliefs than from pedagogical rationale or empirical evidence.

In the last twenty years, however, the case has been increasingly made for the use of L1 in the L2 classroom. As Auerbach (1993) declares, "Evidence from both research and practice, however, suggests that the rationale used to justify English only in the classroom is neither conclusive nor pedagogically sound" (p. 5). Several recent studies have proposed that a limited use of L1 in the L2 classroom has several advantages (Banos, 2009; Carless, 2008; Cole, 1998; Halasa & Al-Manaseer, 2012; Hitotuzi, 2006; Kahraman, 2009; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Schweers, 1999). Suggested uses of L1 by ESL or EFL instructors include: to explain the meaning of vocabulary, to explain complex grammatical

structures, to give instructions on classroom activities, to confirm student understanding, to explain cultural concepts and background, to explain class goals and objectives, to correct students' mistakes, to reduce anxiety, to create empathy between instructors and students, and to motivate students (Cole, 1998; Cook, 2001; Halasa & Al-Manaseer, 2012; Hitotuzi, 2006; Kahraman, 2009; Schweers, 1999).

The purpose of this study is to identify the perceptions of undergraduate students majoring in English at a local university in the Republic of Korea regarding the use of the learners' L1 in the classroom by native-English instructors. More specifically, the study examined students' beliefs about whether meaningful learning is better facilitated by the use of some Korean or English only in the classroom on the part of the native-English instructor. In addition to measuring the students' perceptions, the study also tried to determine whether or not the L1 use by their native L2 instructor had an effect on students' oral proficiency. It is hoped that the findings of this study will have practical implications for both native and non-native EFL instructors and shed light on the possible role that the use of L1 might play in promoting language development in the classroom. Specifically, the study attempted to answer the following research questions:

- 1) Do students believe their native-English instructors can do a better job of helping them learn English if the instructors can speak and understand some Korean?
- 2) Do students believe it is beneficial if their native-English instructors use some Korean in the classroom?
- 3) Does the use of Korean on the part of native-English instructors in the classroom have an effect on the students' oral proficiency?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. L1 Use and L2 Acquisition

Recent studies that have provided rationale for the use of L1 in the L2 classroom include those that base their conclusions on pedagogical grounds, and a number of language teaching methods, including the New Concurrent Method, Community Language Learning (CLL), Dodson's Bilingual Method, and the Alternating Approach allow for and often encourage the use of L1 in the classroom (Cook, 2001; Halasa & Al-Manaseer, 2012; Hitotuzi, 2006; Kahraman, 2009). While not all of the related studies have focused specifically on the instructors' use of L1, a significant number of language instructors actively promote the use of the students' mother tongue in the process of L2 learning. Some of these educators have stressed the social and cognitive functions and scaffolded

assistance that the students' mother tongue can provide in the L2 acquisition process. Proponents of L1 use have also maintained that the use of L1 promotes an atmosphere of "collaborative dialogue" in the language classroom (Carless, 2008; Morahan, 2003).

Responding to the concern that L1 interference hampers L2 acquisition, Hitotuzi (2006) asks, "Why should interference be treated as a fiendish foe? Could interference errors not help learners in the process of L2 learning?" (p. 165) Chomsky (1964) in particular, when discussing the notion of *language universals*, suggests that interference errors can be beneficial for the development of the L2 learner's *interlanguage*. Shortall (1996), in speaking of the symmetrical, universal nature of languages, also suggests the important role L1 can play in the L2 learning process.

Related to the benefits of the use of L1 is the notion of code-switching, that is, switching between two or more languages. In order to facilitate the ability of students to code-switch smoothly and seamlessly, it is possible that a conscious and systematic effort to make L2 learners aware of similarities and differences between L1 and L2 and develop that skill through use of both languages in the classroom can be beneficial in the language learning process (Macaro, 2005). Ferrer (2005) addresses the belief that the use of both L1 and L2 can be beneficial when he writes:

A judicious and systematic use of cross-linguistic referencing may present the teacher with opportunities for equipping the learners with explicit knowledge of the target language systems. This in turn may help students to notice the gap between the state of their inner grammars and the target language and ultimately aid acquisition (p.1).

Although Krashen's ideas have been used to support the opinion of those in the "L2 Only" camp, the case can be made that his theory is not necessarily opposed to the use of some L1 on the part of the language instructor. If Krashen's definition of *comprehensible input* is input that is slightly beyond the learner's current level plus input that the learner can understand (Longscope, 2009), is it not possible that this latter form of input make use of the learner's L1? As Meyer (2008) explains, "Optimal acquisition will occur when the student of the language can understand most of the input" (p. 148). Expanding on this idea, Pica and Doughty (1985) discuss the notion of *input made comprehensible* in which addressees indicate they have not understood what is being said so that speakers can modify their language to make it more comprehensible. It also seems reasonable to suggest that this feedback on the part of addressees be, at least in part, in the learner's mother tongue.

Furthermore, a number of researchers have maintained that the use of L1 in the classroom can lower the learner's *affective filter* (Krashen, 1981) and encourage students to feel less anxious about learning and using L2 in the classroom (Auerbach, 1993; Kahraman,

2009; Meyer, 2008; Schweers, 1999). These proponents claim that the use of L1 can validate learners' experiences, promote a feeling of security, and encourage students to take risks by expressing themselves in L2. If this is indeed the case, it is possible that instructors do not need to make use of much L1 in the classroom in order to promote a more positive and secure learning environment; in other words, even a limited use of L1 on the part of the instructor could still play a role in reducing students' anxiety about using English. The issue of reducing student anxiety also has particular relevance to this study in light of S. Y. Kim's (2009) study of the anxiety levels of Korean university EFL students. In S. Y. Kim's study, the author reported that students taking conversation courses had higher levels of anxiety than those taking reading courses.

In addition to pedagogical rationale for the use of L1 in the L2 classroom, some educators have expressed opposition to the L2 only movement on socio-political grounds. Schweers (1999) introduces this notion by writing, "One's sense of identity as an individual is inextricably bound up within one's native language...If the learner of a second language is encouraged to ignore his/her native language, he/she might well feel his/her identity threatened" (p. 6). In other words, the use of L1 in the classroom is not merely a pedagogical matter but also a political one, and the manner in which we deal with this issue has implications in the broader society. The field of critical applied linguistics and educators such as Phillipson (1992), Pennycook (2001), and Canagarajah (2003) have been especially vocal in raising awareness about ways that English educators can resist the tendency to promote *linguistic imperialism*. Allowing and promoting the use of the learners' native language as part of L2 learning might be one manner of reinforcing students' cultural identities and empowering students to resist potential hegemonic influences.

2. L1 as a Language of Instruction

As previously mentioned, many of the above studies (Cook, 2001; Halasa & Al-Manaseer, 2012; Hitotuzi, 2006; Kahraman, 2009) deal with the use of L1 in the L2 classroom by both students and instructors. A number of studies, however, have focused specifically on teachers' use of L1. For example, a study by Lynch and McKeurtan (2011) of EFL learners with a low English proficiency in Japan found that students in a class with an instructor who used L1 in the classroom outperformed other classes "in terms of the amount of vocabulary studied" and showed a significantly greater "study effort" (p. 113). It was the conclusion of Lynch and McKeurtan (2011) that the use of L1 in the classroom was an effective means of promoting language learning.

In a study of the perceptions of Greek students about the use of L1 in the classroom, Prodromou (2002) reported that a majority of beginning (53%) and intermediate students

(66%) recommended the use of the students' mother tongue during class although only a minority of advanced students (35%) supported its use. Ferrer's (2005) study of adult students in Prague mirrored these findings. After surveying students at all levels and teachers, the author found that while most groups favored L1 as a legitimate tool to use when exploring the workings of the target grammar system, advanced students were the least supportive of this idea.

In contrast to these results, Schweers (1999) reported that even though a high percentage of adult Puerto Rican EFL learners felt that Spanish should be used in the classroom, almost all of the students wanted their teachers to use only English. Teachers in the same study, however, were generally in favor of the discriminate use of L1. It was the author's recommendation that "the pedagogical and affective benefits of L1 use justify its limited and judicious use in the second or foreign language classroom" (p. 13).

One study related to the use of L1 by both students and instructors with Korean students was conducted by Y. Kim and Petraki (2009). Although this study took place at a Korean school in Vietnam and involved secondary students, it has relevance to the current study. The authors concluded that L1 plays a supportive role in the language learning process. It was interesting to note, however, that while the Korean students agreed with their Korean teachers about the use of L1 in the classroom, native English instructors that were interviewed emphasized the importance of using L2 exclusively (Y. Kim & Petraki, 2009). It is notable that while several of the studies related to the use of L1 in the L2 classroom investigate the non-native English instructor's use of L1, few discuss the use of L1 by native-English instructors, particularly in the Republic of Korea.

III. METHOD

1. Subjects

This study, which adopted a quantitative approach, was aimed at identifying the perceptions of a group of university students in Korea regarding the use of the Korean language in their EFL classrooms by native-English instructors. The participants were all undergraduate students whose verbal English skills were mainly at beginning and intermediate level. The university is sponsored by Korean government and located in a mid-sized local city in the Republic of Korea.

The study was conducted over a period of one academic semester (16 weeks). A total of 64 student participants, enrolled as either freshmen, sophomores, or juniors in the English department of the university, were involved in the study. The instructor was a full-time faculty member at the department in which the research took place and a native-English

speaker with some proficiency in the Korean language (TOPIK Level 4). This individual was also the sole instructor of all the classes in which the student participants were enrolled. The focus of all courses was the improvement of the students' English speaking abilities.

2. Design of Study

The participants were divided into either control or experiment groups. In the control courses, only English was used as the medium language of instruction. In other words, the instructor refrained from using any Korean in the classroom for the control group. In the experimental courses, however, the instructor used Korean as the language of instruction on a limited basis (approximately 5-10% of most class sessions). The decision to use Korean as the language of instruction for only 5 to 10% was based on a number of studies which were supportive of a minimal use of L1 in the classroom when using students' L1 to improve learning outcomes (Atkinson, 1987; Kahraman, 2009; Schweers, 1999). The use of L1 by native-English speaking instructors might be interpreted by students as an example of in-class risk-taking behaviors and thus can be conducive to promoting active participation.

In the experimental courses, the instructor kept detailed daily records of the Korean that was used as the language of instruction. These records included the verbatim record of Korean words or expressions used in class along with the purpose of their use. Based on examples from previous studies related to the use of L1 in the ESL/EFL classroom (Atkinson, 1987; Cole, 1998; Hitotuzi, 2006; Kahraman, 2009; Schweers, 1999) as well as comments made during two pilot studies, the Korean speech used in the classroom was classified as having one of the following purposes: to explain the meaning of English vocabulary, to explain difficult grammar, to give instructions on how to do activities, to check for students' comprehension, to explain words that are not easily translated from Korean to English and vice versa, to explain cultural concepts, to chat with students informally before or after class, to explain class goals and objectives, to correct students' mistakes, or others.

3. Data Collection

In order to answer the first two research questions, student participants in both the control and experiment groups completed two identical questionnaire(see Appendix) twice during the semester: at the end of the third week of the semester and on the final week of the semester. The objective of this questionnaire was to identify the students' perceptions about the use of Korean on the part of native-English instructors in the EFL classroom. The first questionnaire was given at the end of the third week as opposed to the first week of the

semester so that an initial period of assessment of students' English proficiency could be conducted appropriately. These questionnaires were handed out to the students in English with Korean translation provided under each line.

In part one of the questionnaire, students were asked to provide some demographic information. In part two, students were asked to answer several multiple choice (some making use of a 5-point Likert scale) questions identifying their opinions. These questions included the following two questions related to the students' general perceptions about the research topic:

- 1) Do you believe your native-English instructor can do a better job of helping you learn English if she or he can speak and understand some Korean?
- 2) Do you believe your native-English instructor can do a better job of helping you learn English if she or he uses some Korean in the classroom?

In addition, students were asked to identify cases in which "it might be appropriate for native-English instructors to use Korean in English class" (i.e., to explain the meaning of vocabulary, to explain difficult grammar) and the percentage of class time they believed these instructors should use Korean in the classroom. Finally, the participants were given a series of statements and asked to check a number (1-5) that corresponded to their opinion of the statements. These statements were specifically aimed at delving more deeply into issues related to the first two research questions of this study.

The final research question of this study was aimed at identifying whether or not the use of L1 by native-English instructors affects the students' English language oral proficiency. For the purposes in this study, "proficiency" was defined as consisting of three factors: fluency, accuracy, and discourse strategy. As Bygate (2009) suggests, the construct of proficiency can be defined and operationalized in diverse manners considering the aspects of quantity and quality. In terms of quality, how students learned the target language to acquire a certain level of accuracy and fluency can be taken into account. In terms of quantity, students should be able to participate in language routines they mastered. It was recognized in the process of testing that the assessment tests utilized in this study were only partial measurements of each of these factors.

In an attempt to measure the fluency of each student, oral interviews were given to all students in both the control and experiment groups. All pre and post oral interviews were conducted in English on an individual basis with the instructor. During the interviews, students were asked to talk about themselves (i.e., their backgrounds, families, hometown, school, future plans, hobbies, and personalities) for up to five minutes in English. If students struggled to continue speaking, the instructor often prompted them with follow-up questions related to the topics above. An oral interview evaluation sheet designed by the

instructor was used to record students' scores in areas such as the clarity and appropriateness of their responses, the rate of speech, the naturalness of their speech (e.g., if responses sound memorized or not) and overall English fluency.

To measure the accuracy of all students, the participants were asked to give pre and post in-class oral presentations in which they talked about themselves (i.e., their backgrounds, families, hometown, school, future plans, hobbies, and personalities) in front of other students. The assessment tool used for these presentations was a rubric that specifically focused on the students' accuracy, including grammar, pronunciation and word use.

In order to get an assessment of the students' discourse strategy skills, the oral participation of each student was measured. Gumperz (1982) defines discourse strategies as verbal participatory strategies that interlocutors employ to engage in conversation on a particular context. The instructor designed and made use of a chart to record the daily oral classroom participation of each student in both the control and experiment groups. Oral participation in class is one of the major components lacking in Korean EFL students that they need to acquire to improve oral proficiency. Students' oral participation was recorded by the instructor during class time and coded based on a system originally devised by Seliger (1977) and later expanded on by Day (1984). Students' oral participation was coded as being either one of two types: (1) responses to teacher general solicits and (2) self-initiated responses. According to Day (1984), responses to teacher general solicits are those which occur when the teacher asks a question to the entire class, not to a specific individual student. On the other hand, a self-initiated response is one which a student would make "without having been called upon directly by the teacher and would not be in response to a teacher's general or personal solicit" (p. 74). Following each period of assessment, the number of both types of responses by each student were totaled and recorded.

4. Data Analysis

Collected data was coded and analyzed by SPSS 14.0. The results of the pre tests were used to confirm the homogeneity of experiment and control groups by an Independent Samples *t*-test. The improvement in English proficiency from each group was examined by a Paired Samples *t*-test. Regarding the questionnaires, Chi-square tests and co-relational analyses were implemented to explore meaningful statistical results.

IV. RESULTS

The following is a summary of the findings of both the questionnaires and assessment tests. Regarding the responses of the participants to Question 1 of the questionnaire (*Do*

you believe your native-English instructor can do a better job of helping you learn English if she or he can speak and understand some Korean?), a majority of participants in both the pre and post surveys said, “yes.” The percentage of students in the experiment group who responded with “yes” was higher (93.8% in pre survey) than those with the same response in the control group (84.4% in pre survey). Also of note is the fact that the percentage of students who responded affirmatively to this question decreased from the pre survey to post survey for both groups. In the experiment group, the percentage of students who responded with “yes” dropped from 93.8% in pre survey to 90.6% in post survey, and in the control group the percentage of those who responded with “yes” dropped from 84.4% to 81.3%.

Similarly, a majority of students in both the experiment and control groups responded affirmatively to Question 2 (*Do you believe your native-English instructor can do a better job of helping you learn English if she or he uses some Korean in the classroom?*) (See Table 1). However, the percentage of those who said “yes” to this question was lower than the percentage of those who responded with “yes” to Question 1. Of note is the fact that the percentage of those who agreed with the use of Korean in the classroom increased from the pre to the post surveys in the experiment group (59.4% to 65.6%) whereas the percentage of those in the control group who supported the use of Korean in the classroom decreased from 75.0% to 56.3%.

TABLE 1
Can Instructors’ Use of L1 Help Students Learn English?

	Experiment Group		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	59.4%(19)	65.6%(21)	75.0%(24)	56.3%(18)
No	40.6%(13)	34.4%(11)	25.0%(8)	43.8%(14)

Students were also asked: *When do you think it might be appropriate for native-English instructors to use Korean in English class?* For both the control and experiment groups, the most common response was “to explain words that are not easily translated from Korean to English and vice versa” (41.09% in experimental post survey, and 56.7% in control post survey). Other common responses were “to explain difficult grammar” (35.5% in experimental post survey and 43.3% in control post survey), “to explain the meaning of English vocabulary” (25.8% in experimental post survey and 13.3% in control post survey), and “to explain cultural concepts” (12.9% in experimental post survey and 16.7% in control group post survey). Other responses receiving mention were: “to give instructions

on how to do activities,”“to correct students’ mistakes,”“to check for students’ comprehension,” and “to chat informally with students before and after class.”The least common response was “to explain the class goals and objectives” (0% in experimental post survey and 3.3% in control group post survey).

When asked *what percentage of the class time they believed their native-English instructors should use Korean*, the most common response was “1 to 5%”(53.1% in experiment group post survey and 50% in control group post survey) followed by “6 to 10%” (31.3% in experiment group post survey and 25% in control group post survey).

In addition, the participants were given a series of statements and asked to check a number (1-5) that corresponded to their opinion of the statements. These statements were specifically aimed at delving into issues related to the first two research questions of this study. The first of these statements was: *If my native-English instructor uses some Korean in class it makes me feel less anxious about speaking English in class*. The rationale for this question was directly related to the contention that using L1 in the classroom lowers the students’ affective filters or reduces their anxiety in using L2. This question is aimed at examining the contention made by Auerbach (1993), Cole (1998), Hitozuki (2006), Kahraman (2009), and Schweers (1999) that the use of L1 reduces learners’ anxiety. The question is also especially relevant if, as S. Y. Kim (2009) states, speaking in English produces the most anxiety for Korean foreign language learners. Students in the experiment group agreed slightly more with the above statement. Students in the control group, on the other hand, disagreed slightly more with this statement. However, neither of these opinions was statistically significant ($p=0.904$ versus $p=0.407$).

TABLE 2
Instructors’ L1 Use Can Help Reduce Learner Anxiety

		M	SD	<i>t(p)</i>
Experiment Group	Pre	2.34	1.13	-0.122(0.904)
	Post	2.38	1.29	
Control Group	Pre	2.66	1.07	0.841(0.407)
	Post	2.50	0.89	

In response to a statement related to motivation: *I am less likely to speak some English in my English class if I know my native-English instructor can speak Korean*, both groups slightly disagreed (M (post) = 2.69 for the experiment group and M (post) = 2.81 for the control group). This statement directly addresses the issue of motivation. Are Auerbach (1993), Banos (2009), and Schweers (1999) correct in asserting that the use of L1

motivates students to work harder or, in this case, attempt to speak more English in class? This is particularly true if instructors play an important role in motivating students.

In a study reported by Schweers (1999), EFL students strongly favored the use of L1 in the classroom by students but were opposed to the use of L1 by instructors. The statement: *I would like to be able to speak some Korean to my native-English instructor, but I don't want my native-English instructor to speak Korean to me* investigates whether or not the participants in this study share this opinion. The results indicated that both groups slightly disagreed with this statement (M (post) = 2.5 for the experiment group and M (post) = 2.38 for the control group).

Regarding the statement: *It slows down my progress in learning English if my native-English instructor uses some Korean in class*, the experiment group (M (post) = 2.8) and the control group slightly agreed (M (post) = 2.56). This question addresses the issue of whether or not the use of L1 “impedes” or “interferences” with L2 acquisition, as some educators maintain (Auerbach, 1993; Cole, 1998). This also attempts to determine if students have the perception that their progress in learning English is “slowed down” if their native-English instructor uses Korean.

The final Likert-scale statement was: *My native-English instructor should not use Korean in my English class unless she or he is fluent in Korean*. In this question, students are being asked if their native-English instructor should have fluency in their mother tongue before attempting to use Korean as a language of instruction. This question stems from a similar one raised by both Auerbach (1993) and Cole (1998) about the L1 language proficiency of the instructor. Since the instructor in this study did not have “advanced fluency” in the Korean language, this question was perceived to have particular importance. The results showed that the majority of students in both experiment and control groups slightly agreed (M (post) = 2.81 for the experiment group, M (post) = 2.69 for the control group).

In relation to the final research question, the homogeneity of both groups was confirmed through a test based on the Levene value (see Table 3). The F value was equal to 3.100 and the p value was equal to 0.083. In addition, the fact that both groups had more than 30 participants showed that the groups were statistically large enough for the study.

TABLE 3
Homogeneity Test in Pre Test Results

	Levene						
	N	F	p	M	SD	t	p
Experiment Group	32	3.100	0.083	21.69	5.07	-0.087	0.931
Control Group	32			21.78	3.42		

In the comparison of scores of all pre and post assessment tests consisting of three sections (accuracy, fluency, and discourse strategy), both the experiment group ($p=0.000$) and the control group ($p=0.027$) showed statistically significant improvement (See Table 4). There was no statistically significant difference between the two groups when analyzing the total scores of all three sections. (See Table 5, $p=0.159$)

TABLE 4
Pre and Post Test Results for Improvement in Proficiency

		N	M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Experiment Group	Pre	32	21.69	5.07	-6.259	0.000**
	Post		24.38	3.77		
Control Group	Pre	32	21.78	3.42	-2.320	0.027*
	Post		23.03	3.76		

** $p<0.01$, * $p<0.05$

A more detailed analysis of this data, however, revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in the improvement of the two groups in the areas of fluency ($p=0.047$) and discourse strategy ($p=0.026$) (See Table 5). On the other hand, there was no statistically significant difference in the area of accuracy ($p=0.725$).

TABLE 5
Post Test Results Comparison in Accuracy, Fluency, and Discourse Strategy

		M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Accuracy	Experiment	8.19	1.50	-0.354	0.725
	Control	8.31	1.33		
Fluency	Experiment	8.03	1.33	2.026	0.047*
	Control	7.34	1.38		
Discourse Strategy	Experiment	8.19	1.28	2.276	0.026*
	Control	7.38	1.56		
Total	Experiment	24.38	3.77	1.426	0.159
	Control	23.03	3.76		

* $p<0.05$

V. DISCUSSION

An analysis of the results of this study provides insight into the issue of the use of L1 by native-English instructors in EFL classrooms. To begin with, the findings indicate that a majority of students felt that their native-English instructors can do a better job of helping them learn English if the instructor can speak and understand some Korean. This sends the message to native-English EFL instructors that learning the students' mother tongue might foster positive perceptions on behalf of students, even if instructors choose not to use L1 in the classroom.

The study also revealed that a majority of students supported the use of some Korean on the part of their native-English instructors. Students in classes where some Korean was used by the instructor were more supportive of the use of Korean than students in classes where no Korean was used by the instructor. This tendency is perhaps an indication that students were generally positive about the educational experiences they received and that their responses were manipulated by those experiences. In other words, if students in classes where Korean was used were generally positive about that class, they seemed to be more supportive of the use of L1 by the instructor; if students in classes where only English was used were generally positive about that class, they seemed to be more supportive of the use of only L2 by the instructor. This suggests that other variables besides the language of instruction itself, for example, learners' tendency to recognize their own experiences positively, influence students' perceptions about their educational experiences.

Another finding of relevance was the fact that students felt L1 could be used by their native-English instructors for a variety of purposes, the most common being to explain words that are not easily translated from one language to another, to explain the meaning of English vocabulary, and to explain difficult grammar. Also, based on the fact that the majority of participants felt that L1 should be used by the native-English instructor only 1 to 5 (53.1% in experiment group and 50% in control group) and 5 to 10 (31.3% in experiment group and 25% in control group) percent of class time, students in the study seemed to prefer for most of the language of instruction in the classroom to be in L2.

This study was unable to find any statistical significance in students' responses regarding questions 12-1 (learner anxiety), 12-2 (motivation) and 12-4 (interference). In addition, most students responded that the degree of fluency in L1 on the part of the instructor was an important factor in determining whether or not the instructor should use L1 in the classroom. However, this issue, addressed in 12-6, could not be supported by statistically significant evidence.

A major finding of this study is the fact that students in classes where some Korean was used by the instructor made more overall statistically significant improvement in their English oral proficiency than those in classes where only English was used as the language

of instruction. More specifically, the study revealed that this improvement came in the areas of fluency and discourse strategy; there was no statistically significant difference in improvement of the students' accuracy scores. This finding is a strong argument in favor of the use of some L1 by native-English EFL instructors.

As with all academic studies, the fact that this study had certain limitations must be taken into consideration when reviewing the findings. In particular, the fact that students' oral participation was seldom videotaped or observed by someone other than the instructor should be taken into account. Some of each class was occasionally videotaped to collect in-depth data even though the data collected is small. Instead, the majority of data collection was implemented by instructor's manual record keeping. The decision to strictly limit the recording or observing students in this manner was made in this case out of the belief that the presence of a camera or observer would make students more hesitant to participate in class, a fact that might have influenced the study's results, especially regarding oral participation. Future studies related to oral participation in the classroom might avail themselves of such means of observation. In addition, it should be recognized that the assessment tests used to measure language proficiency in this study were only partial measurements of the three elements of proficiency discussed. Further in-depth research related to the assessment of language proficiency in related studies is recommended.

VI. CONCLUSION

The findings of this study are a strong indication that adult EFL students are positive about the role that L1 used by native-English instructors can play in the L2 classroom. In addition, the study suggests that the limited use of L1 by those instructors can promote oral proficiency, particularly in the areas of fluency and discourse strategy, as measured by interviews and oral participation in the classroom.

Although the study has particular relevance to native-English instructors who teach adult EFL students in the Republic of Korea, these findings also have implications for all language educators and students and add to the general debate about L1/L2 use in the language classroom. It is the authors' hope that, as language instructors consider which "pedagogical tools" at their disposal to use in order to facilitate meaningful learning for their students, an open-mindedness and flexibility regarding the language of instruction is adopted.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, E. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ETL Journal*, 41 (4), 241-247.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32.
- Banos, M. O. (2009). Mother tongue in the L2 classroom: A positive or negative tool? *Revista Lindaraja*, 21, Retrieved July 21, 2013, from the World Wide Web: http://www.realidadyficcion.es/Revista_Lindaraja/revistalindaraja.htm.
- Bygate, M. (2009). Teaching and testing speaking. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The Handbook of language testing* (pp.412-440). Singapore: Blackwell Publishing.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2003). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Carless, D. (2008). Student use of the mother tongue in the task-based classroom. *ELF Journal*, 62(4), 331-338.
- Chomsky, N. (1964). Current issues in linguistic theory. In J. A. Fodor & J. J. Katz (Eds.) *The Structure of Language: Reading in the Philosophy of Language* (pp.334-352). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Cole, S. (1998). The use of L1 in communicative English classrooms. *JALT Journal*, Retrieved June 13, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/files/98/dec/cole.html>.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3).
- Day, R. R. (1984). Student participation in the ESL classroom or some imperfections in practice. *Language Learning*, 34(3), 69-102.
- Ferrer, V. (2005). *The mother tongue in the classroom: Cross-linguistic comparisons, noticing and explicit knowledge*. Retrieved May 2, 2013, from the World Wide Web: http://www.teachenglishworldwide.com/Articles/Ferrer_mother%20tongue%20in%20the%20classroom.pdf.
- Gebhard, J. G. (2006). *Teaching English as a foreign or second language: A self-development and methodology guide* (2nd ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halasa, N. H., & Al-Manaseer, M. (2012). The use of the first language in second language learning reconsidered. *College Student Journal*, 46(1), 71-81.
- Hitotuzi, N. (2006). The learner's mother tongue in the L2 learning-teaching symbiosis. *Profile*, 7, 161-171.
- Kahraman, A. (2009). The role of the mother tongue in fostering affective factors in ELT

- classrooms. *English as an International Language Journal*, 5, 107-128.
- Kim, Sung-Yeon. (2009). Questioning the stability of foreign language classroom anxiety and motivation across different classroom contexts. *Foreign Language Annuals*, 42(1), 138-157.
- Kim, Yuri, & Petraki, E. (2009). Students' and teachers' use of and attitudes to L1 in the EFL classroom, *Asian EFL Journal*, 11(4), 58-89.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Longscope, P. (2009). Differences between the EFL and the ESL language learning contexts. *Studies in Language and Culture*, 30(2), 303-320.
- Lynch, G., & McKeurtan, M. (2011). Supporting low ability learners in a tertiary level compulsory English programme using CEFR based online language software. *The EUROCALL Review: Proceedings of the EUROCALL 2011 Conference*, 20, 111-113.
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Lurda (Ed.), *Non-native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges, and Contributions to the Profession* (pp. 63-84). New York: Springer Science Business Media.
- Mahboob, A. (2010). *The NNEST lens: Non native English speakers in TESOL*. Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- McMillan, B., & Rivers, D. (2011). The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes toward "English Only." *Science Direct*, 39, 251-263.
- Meyer, H. (2008). The pedagogical implications of L1 use in the L2 classroom. 147-159. Retrieved May 17, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://kyoai.ac.jp/college/ronshuu/no-08/meyer1.pdf>.
- Morahan, M. (2003). The use of students' first language (L1) in the second language (L2) classroom. Retrieved May 17, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://citesudan.org/teflWide/MorahanL2inL1class.pdf>.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Hertsfordshire, England: Prentice Hall.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985). Input and interaction in the communicative classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 115-132). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Prodromou, L. (2002) The Role of the mother tongue in the classroom. *International*

- Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (April-May)*, 6-8.
- Schweers, C. W. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 6-13. Retrieved January 14, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/usia/E-USIA/forum/acrobat/P6.pdf>.
- Seliger, H. W. (1977). Does practice make perfect? A study of interaction patterns and L2 competence. *Language Learning*, 27, 263-278.
- Shortall, T. (1996). Language knowledge in language acquisition: Universal grammar and second language reading. In J. Willis & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching* (pp. 31-41). Oxford: Heinemann.
- Wright, W. E. (2010). *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy, and practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.

APPENDIX

Questionnaires on the Use of Korean by Native-English Instructors In the EFL Classroom at a University in Korea

Part One – Please fill out the following information about yourself.

Sex(M/F)_____ Major _____ Age _____ Year in School (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th) _____

- How long have you taken English classes with native-English teachers?
a. less than 6 months b. 6-12 months c. 12-18 months d. 18-24 months e. more than 2 years
- Have you ever been to an overseas county where English is used as the main language?
Yes _____ No _____ If you have, how long was it? _____ months
- On a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (good), how would you rate your current English speaking ability?
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
- On a scale of 1 to 5, what do you expect your English speaking ability to be at the end of this class?
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
- Have you ever taken the TOEIC test?
Yes ___ No ___ If so, when did you last take the test? _____ What was your highest score? ___

Part Two – Please give your opinion about the following questions.

- Do you believe your native-English instructor can do a better job of helping you learn English if she or he can speak and understand some Korean?
Yes ___ No ___ If so, why? If not, why not? _____
- In your opinion, how beneficial is it to you if your native-English instructor can speak and understand some Korean? Check the number below that corresponds to your belief.
0(not at all) _____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5(very helpful) _____
- Do you believe your native-English instructor can do a better job of helping you learn English if

she or he use some Korean in the classroom?

Yes ___ No ___ If so, why? If not, why not? _____

9. In your opinion, how beneficial is it to you if your native-English instructor uses some Korean in the classroom? Check the number below that corresponds to your belief.

0(not at all)___ 1___ 2___ 3___ 4___ 5(very helpful)___

10. When do you think it might be appropriate for native-English instructors to use Korean in English class? Put V next to each of the following tasks in which you feel this might be appropriate?

___ Never

___ To explain the meaning of English vocabulary

___ To explain difficult grammar

___ To give instructions on how to do activities

___ To check for students' comprehension

___ To explain words that are not easily translated from Korean to English or vice versa

___ To explain cultural concepts

___ To chat with students informally before and after class

___ To explain the class goals or objectives

___ To correct students' mistakes

___ Others(please explain)_____

11. What percentage of the class time do you believe your native-English instructor should use Korean in the classroom? Put V next to one of the following choices.

0%___ 1-5%___ 6-10%___ 11-20%___ 21-30%___ 31-40%___ above 40%___ Others___

12. Please check the number that corresponds to your opinion of each of the following statement:

1) If my native-English instructor uses some Korean in class, it makes me feel less anxious about speaking English in class. 1(strongly disagree)___ 2___ 3___ 4___ 5(strongly agree)___

2) If my native-English instructor uses some Korean in class, it makes me want to speak more English in class. 1___ 2___ 3___ 4___ 5___

3) I would like to be able to speak some Korean to my native-English instructor, but I don't want my native-English instructor to speak Korean to me. 1___ 2___ 3___ 4___ 5___

4) It slows down my progress in learning English if my native-English instructor uses some Korean in class. 1___ 2___ 3___ 4___ 5___

5) I am less likely to speak some English in my English class if I know my native-English instructor can speak Korean. 1___ 2___ 3___ 4___ 5___

6) My native-English instructor should not use Korean in my English class unless she or he is fluent in Korean. 1___ 2___ 3___ 4___ 5___

13. Do you have any other comments or opinions about this topic? If so, please write them below.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Randy Green
Department of English
Gyeongnam National University of Science and Technology
33 Dongjin-ro, Jiinju, Gyeongnam
South Korea, 660-758
Tel: (055) 751-3447
Email: rgreen@gntech.ac.kr

Daekweon Bae
Department of English
Gyeongnam National University of Science and Technology
33 Dongjin-ro, Jiinju, Gyeongnam
South Korea, 660-758
Tel: (055) 751-3446
Email: bdk@gntech.ac.kr

Received 15 September 2013
Revised 5 November 2013
Accepted 16 November 2013