



# Osaka JALT Journal

Vol. 10 (2023)

<http://www.osakajalt.org/journal>

---

## Native Teacher L1 Use in the L2 Classroom: Demand and Supply

**Paul Joyce**  
Kindai University  
paulj@jus.kindai.ac.jp

---

### Article History

Received: March 12, 2023  
Published: May 11, 2023

---

### Keywords

L2 teaching  
L1 support  
teacher L1 use  
L2 proficiency  
reasons for L1 support

---

### Abstract

This paper investigated native teacher L1 use in the L2 classroom. Principally, the study explored the demand and supply of native teacher L1 use from the students' perspective. To address this issue, questionnaires were completed by 380 Japanese university L2 learners in regard to the classroom L1 practices of their 32 language instructors. Quantitative analysis of the data revealed that higher L2 proficiency was associated with both a reduced demand and supply of native teacher L1 use. Also, at all three levels of student L2 proficiency examined, demand for native teacher L1 support significantly exceeded supply. The principal reasons given for student desire for native instructor L1 support were to understand course requirements and difficult concepts. It was concluded that judicious teacher L1 use can be an effective strategy to facilitate classroom L2 learning.

↓

## Introduction

The use of the students' first language (L1) in second language (L2) teaching continues to be an issue of debate (Kim & Petraki, 2009). In language teaching pedagogy, the monolingual approach holds great sway, and this is reflected in L2 teaching materials and language syllabi (McGregor, 2017). From the monolingual viewpoint, the elimination of the L1 from the classroom maximizes the opportunity for meaningful engagement in the L2 (Ryan, 2002). However, banning the learners' L1 from the classroom has been heavily criticized (Auerbach, 1993; Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009). Advocates of L1 use do not deny the benefits of exposure to the L2 but point to the advantages of the judicious use of the native language to support and facilitate the learning of the L2 (see Rabbidge & Chapell, 2014). For instance, the L1 can be effectively used to explain grammar, check comprehension, and promote interaction among learners (De La Campa & Nassaji, 2009). When determining whether to employ the learners' L1 in their teaching, those seeking to embrace a student-centered approach will wish to consider their learners' preferences (see Auerbach, 1993; Barker, 2003). In this regard, students in a wide range of educational contexts have consistently expressed a desire for teacher L1 support (Norman, 2008; Stephens, 2006; Tajgozari, 2017). Likewise, teachers have regularly expressed a positive attitude towards the judicious use of their students' L1 (Prodromou, 2002; Rolin-Ianziti & Varshney, 2008). However, this does not necessarily mean that student expectations and teaching methods align. And when there is a mismatch, the result can be a frustrating classroom experience for all (Burden, 2001).

To investigate attitudes towards L1 use in the classroom, Schweers (1999) canvassed the views of 19 teachers and an undisclosed number of students at a university in Puerto Rico. Both students (88.7%) and teachers (100%) felt that the L1 should be used in the classroom. In terms of teacher L1 usage, students most commonly responded that it should be used *a little* (49.0%) or *sometimes* (28.2%). Students considered that the L1 ought to be mainly confined to explaining difficult concepts (86.2%). Although teachers agreed that explaining difficult concepts was the best use for classroom L1, few felt that it was necessary (22%). Some learners also expressed approval for the use of their mother tongue to define new vocabulary items (22.7%) and check comprehension (20.2%). And some teachers favored its use for joking around with students (15.0%) and defining new vocabulary items (12.6%).

In a similar but larger study, Burden (2001) surveyed 290 university students and 73 tertiary-level language teachers in Japan. While the vast majority of students (73%) favored teacher L1 use in the classroom, teachers assented even more strongly (86%). Regarding language functions, the two groups broadly agreed on the value of classroom L1 for relaxing the students (students, 61%; teachers, 78%), explaining new vocabulary (students, 50%; teachers, 70%), discussing differences between L1 and L2 grammar (students, 53%; teachers, 63%), and for talking about tests (students, 50%; teachers, 68%). They showed less agreement on the use of the L1 for creating human contact (students, 38%; teachers, 73%) and giving instructions (students, 30%; teachers, 65%). Nevertheless, in comparison with Schweers (1999), there was much greater interest in teacher L1 use. The difference in the results between Schweers (1999) and Burden (2001) likely reflects differences in their research participants. Neither study provides information on the proficiency of their learners. Nevertheless, since English is an official language in Puerto Rico, the learners in Schweers (1999) were likely much more proficient than the Japanese university students from Burden (2001). At higher levels of L2 proficiency, students have consistently been shown to prefer less L1 support (Carson & Kashihara, 2012; Joyce et al., 2020; Norman, 2008; Prodromou, 2002).

Tang (2002) conducted a study further exploring attitudes towards teacher L1 use. The research involved 100 intermediate-level Chinese EFL university students, 20 teachers who completed questionnaires, and three who participated in teaching

observations. Similar to Burden (2001), most students (70%) and teachers (72%) were in favor of L1 use in the classroom. The vast majority of students wanted their teacher to use the L1 either *a little* (45%) or *sometimes* (50%). In terms of language functions, there was broad agreement that the L1 was useful for practicing phrases and expressions (students, 45%; teachers, 56%) but not for giving instructions (students, 6%; teachers, 6%). On the other hand, there was less consensus on the value of the L1 for explaining complex grammar points (students, 72%; teachers, 39%) or defining new vocabulary items (students, 69%; teachers, 39%). However, the survey results differed from the classroom observations. Of the 29 instances of teacher L1 use observed, 13 (45%) were for defining words, 10 (35%) for giving instructions, and just two (7%) for explaining grammar rules. Similarly, Polio and Duff (1994) also found differences between reported and observed L1 use. This discrepancy between reported and observed use has been noted elsewhere (Copland & Neokleous, 2010; Edstrom, 2006). It has been argued that this is partly symptomatic of feelings of guilt as teachers attempt to reconcile their pedagogic beliefs with classroom reality (Littlewood & Yu, 2011; McMillan & Turnbull, 2009). As a result, it seems that teachers may not be the best guide to their own L1 usage.

In a more sophisticated study of teacher L1 use, Carson (2014b) surveyed the opinions of 1424 students and 32 teachers who were at universities in Japan. As was the case with many of the studies above, the instructors were a combination of native English-speaking teachers (19) and non-native teachers of English (13). The students were divided into four groups based on their L2 proficiency. After the participants completed a 40-item Likert-scale questionnaire, their responses were reduced to five unobserved pedagogical variables through factor analysis; emotions, grammar, tests, review, and comprehension. The least proficient group was collectively found to prefer L1 teacher support for all five factors, while the most proficient group only favored L1 teacher assistance for tests and comprehension. For each of the five factors, there was a statistically significant difference in the demand for L1 teacher support between the most and least proficient groups. In the second stage of the research, the student data was aggregated. The students were consistently found to be in favor of greater L1 use than the teachers. Both groups broadly supported teacher L1 use for tests and comprehension but not for emotions. However, while students favored L1 use for grammar and review, teachers did not. Nevertheless, since L2 proficiency was not considered at this stage, it is unclear whether teachers modified their use of the L1 depending upon the L2 proficiency of the students.

From a review of the literature, it is clear that progress has been made in determining the degree of correspondence between student and teacher views on L1 teacher support. However, substantial empirical gaps remain. As a result, in the absence of a clear pedagogical framework, decisions on teacher L1 usage are being made primarily through deduction (Ford, 2009; Grim, 2010). Building upon the previous research, this study seeks to shed light on the demand and supply for native teacher L1 use through the following research questions:

**Research question one:** At different levels of L2 learner proficiency, is there a significant difference in how much L1 use students desire from their native L2 teachers?

**Research question two:** At different levels of L2 learner proficiency, is there a significant difference in how much native L2 teachers use their students' L1 in the classroom?

**Research question three:** At different levels of L2 learner proficiency, is there a significant difference between how much native L2 teachers use the L1 in the classroom and how much their students desire that they use it?

Research question four: At different levels of student proficiency, is there a significant difference in the importance students place on the reasons for L1 use by their native L2 teacher?

## Method

For this study, students evaluated both their desire for teacher L1 support and the amount of L1 support their teacher provided. In addition to offering a new perspective on the L2 classroom, this approach was partly taken due to shortcomings in teachers' self-reported data. As has been discussed, teachers' accounts of their practice are often contradicted by their observed classroom behaviors (Burden, 2001; Copland & Neokleous, 2010; Polio & Duff, 1994). The data was collected with the data for another study (Joyce et al., 2020) towards the end of the participants' first year of study.

### Participants

The research population was drawn from a university in Tokyo, Japan. Each of the 380 participants was enrolled in the university's first-year language program. At the start of the year, the students were placed into three proficiency levels based on their performance on an in-house placement test (see Sick, 2008). To provide a more widely recognized estimate of the students' ability, the learners' performance on the TOEIC was estimated from their *Computerized Assessment System of English Communication* (CASEC) scores (see Maruzen 2003 for more details). The three proficiency levels can broadly be described as containing students at false-beginner ( $mean = 296, SD = 55$ ), lower-intermediate ( $mean = 407, SD = 71$ ) and intermediate levels ( $mean = 574, SD = 71$ ). There were 186 false-beginner, 132 lower-intermediate, and 62 intermediate students that participated in this study. As part of their university requirements, the participants were all required to take four 90-minute classes of English each week. Two of these lessons focused on listening and speaking, and two on reading and writing. The students each had two native-speaker teachers; one for each of these courses. To control for possible differences in students' expectations of native and non-native teachers' classroom behavior (see Polio & Duff, 1994; Stephens, 2006), the provision of L1 support from native teachers was the sole focus of this study. Twenty-three intact class groups participated in the research, and they were taught by a total of 32 different instructors. In terms of their qualifications, the teachers had at least a Master of Arts degree in TEFL or a closely related field, and a minimum of five years of teaching experience. Student participation was anonymous and voluntary. As the selection of the participants was based upon the cooperation of their instructors, a convenience sample was used.

### Materials

Student opinions were gathered using a questionnaire (see Appendix). The responses from two sections of this survey were used in this study. The first part related to eight different language functions that teachers have been found to deliver in the L1. For each of these language functions, the participants recorded the proportion of L1/L2 use that they desired and received from their teacher on a five-point Likert scale. The scale was comprised of *only in English* (1), *mostly in English* (2), *about half in English/Japanese* (3), *mostly in Japanese* (4), and *only in Japanese* (5). For four of the eight teacher language functions, students were asked about their listening-speaking teacher's language use. These functions were giving instructions (De La Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Rolin-Ianziti & Varshney, 2008), explaining course requirements (Chavez, 2003; Rolin-Ianziti & Varshney, 2008), giving feedback to the whole class (Inbar-Lourie, 2010; Macaro, 1997), and talking to you individually about your studies (Cook, 2013; Macaro, 1997). They were also asked about the language in which their reading-writing

teacher delivered four classroom functions; teaching grammar (Copland & Neokleous, 2010; Duff & Polio, 1990), talking to you individually about everyday things (Debreli, 2016; Grim, 2010), essay feedback (Macaro, 1997), and teaching new vocabulary (Copland & Neokleous, 2010; Sali, 2014). The learners were also asked to rank from a list of the three strongest reasons for receiving L1 teacher support. These reasons were Japanese keeps me on task (Copland & Neokleous, 2010; Norman, 2008), Japanese saves time (Cook, 2001; Duff & Polio, 1990; Zulfikar, 2018), I can appreciate the teacher as an L2 learning role model (Stephens, 2006), I can understand difficult concepts (Carson, 2014a; Schweers, 1999), I can talk to my teacher more easily (Debreli, 2016; Norman, 2008), I can clearly understand the course requirements (Carson, 2014a; Rolin-ianziti & Varshney, 2008), and Japanese is easier for me so I don't have to try hard (Ford, 2009). To ensure that the questionnaire could be easily understood by the participants, a Japanese translation was provided.

## Results

**Research question one: At different levels of L2 learner proficiency, is there a significant difference in how much L1 use students desire from their native L2 teachers?**

Overall, the vast majority of students indicated that they preferred to receive some L1 teacher support. The false-beginner group revealed the highest interest (98.9%), followed by the lower-intermediate group (93.2%), and then the intermediate students (82.3%). These results were reflected in the degree of L1 teacher support that the students wanted. As shown in Table 1, the students who recorded the greatest desire for L1 support were in the false-beginner group ( $mean = 2.88, SD = .64$ ). For the individual functions, the average response of these students lay between 2.77 and 2.96. The lower-intermediate learners wished for less L1 support ( $mean = 2.30, SD = .68$ ) with demand for the individual functions between 2.25 and 2.39. On average, both the false-beginner and lower-intermediate groups wanted their native L2 teachers to deliver key classroom language functions at a level between *mostly in English* and *about half in English/Japanese*. The average response for the intermediate students lay between *only in English* and *mostly in English* ( $mean = 1.93, SD = .62$ ) with average responses to the different functions between 1.85 and 2.00. The responses to the survey were found to be highly consistent (Cronbach alpha = .95).

**Table 1**

*Demand for L1 native teacher support across proficiency levels*

	Mean	SD	min.	max.
False beginner	2.88	.64	1	5
Lower Intermediate	2.30	.68	1	3.63
Intermediate	1.93	.62	1	3.13

To explore the relationship between proficiency and desire for L1 support further, an ANOVA was conducted. Since Levene's F test revealed that the homogeneity of variance assumption had not been met ( $p = .02$ ), Welch's F test was used. The results indicated that the proficiency level of the class had a significant effect on the desire for L1 support from the native English teacher ( $F(2, 164.47) = 64.62, p < .001$ ). When Games-Howell post hoc comparisons were made, the results showed that false-beginners wanted significantly more L1 teacher talk than the lower-intermediate ( $p < .001$ ) or intermediate learners ( $p < .001$ ). There was also found to be a significant difference between lower-intermediate and intermediate students ( $p < .01$ ).

**Research question two: At different levels of L2 learner proficiency, is there a significant difference in how much native L2 teachers use their students' L1 in the classroom?**

As displayed in Table 2, native English teachers were found to infrequently use the students' L1. On average, teachers in false-beginner classes were reported to communicate with the students at a level between *mostly in English* and *about half in English/Japanese* ( $mean = 2.44, SD = .71$ ). In lower-intermediate ( $mean = 1.87, SD = .63$ ) and intermediate classes ( $mean = 1.58, SD = .54$ ), the average communication style was between *only in English* and *mostly in English*. In terms of the individual language functions, the participants were very consistent in their views. For the false-beginner students, the desire for teacher L1 support across the different language functions ranged between *mostly in English* and *half in English/Japanese* (2.25 and 2.60), for the lower-intermediate group it declined to between *only in English* and *mostly in English* (1.81 and 1.93), with the same results for the intermediate group (1.53 and 1.61). The Cronbach alpha internal consistency of the items used to measure teacher L1 usage was highly satisfactory at .93.

**Table 2**

*Supply of L1 native teacher support across proficiency levels*

	Mean	SD	min.	max.
False beginner	2.44	.71	1	5
Lower Intermediate	1.87	.63	1	3.25
Intermediate	1.58	.54	1	3

To further address the research question, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The independent variable was student proficiency and the dependent variable was reported teacher L1 use. Levene's F test revealed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was not met ( $p = .02$ ). As a result, the Welch's F test was used. The one-way ANOVA revealed a statistically significant main effect, Welch's  $F(2, 179.05) = 55.45, p < .001$ , indicating that the proficiency level of the class had a significant effect upon teacher L1 usage ( $F(2, 377) = 46.74, p < .001$ ). Games-Howell post hoc comparisons were undertaken to determine which class proficiency levels differed significantly. The results indicated that teachers used the students' L1 in false-beginner classes significantly more than in lower-intermediate ( $p < .001$ ) and intermediate classes ( $p < .001$ ). Likewise, there was also found to be a statistically significant difference between native instructor L1 usage with lower-intermediate classes compared to intermediate ones ( $p < .01$ ).

**Research question three: At different levels of L2 learner proficiency, is there a significant difference between how much native L2 teachers use the L1 in the classroom and how much their students desire that they use it?**

To answer this research question, a factorial repeated measures ANOVA was used. There was found to be a significant difference between the degree of L1 use that was desired by learners and the amount that native English teachers were reported to employ  $F(1.00, 377.00) = 143.87, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .28$ . This means that the amount of teacher L1 use that students wanted was significantly higher than the amount they reported receiving, and the effect size was very large (Cohen, 1988). However, a significant interaction with proficiency level  $F(2.00, 377.00) = 0.65, p = .52$  was not found. That is, the L2 proficiency level of the participants did not matter to the difference between their desire for L1 teacher talk and how much they reported receiving.

**Research question four: At different levels of L2 learner proficiency, is there a significant difference in the importance students place on the reasons for L1 use by their native L2 teacher?**

Across the three proficiency groups, the relative importance given to the seven reasons for native teacher L1 use was found to be consistent. The two reasons that were given the highest priority stood out from the rest. On average, for the students in all three proficiency levels, the most important reason for teacher use of Japanese was so *I can clearly understand the course requirements* (false-beginner, 5.66; lower-intermediate, 4.81; intermediate, 6.32), followed by so *I can understand difficult concepts* (false-beginner, 5.17; lower-intermediate, 4.77; intermediate, 5.27). For all three groups, the third most important reason was, *I can talk to my teacher more easily* (false-beginner, 4.03; lower-intermediate, 4.11; intermediate, 4.45).

**Table 3**

*Importance given to reasons for native teachers to use L1 support*

	False beginner	Lower intermediate	Intermediate
I can clearly understand the course requirements	5.66	4.81	6.32
I can understand difficult concepts	5.17	4.77	5.27
I can talk to my teacher more easily	4.03	4.11	4.45
Japanese keeps me on task	3.95	3.88	3.37
Japanese is easier for me and I don't have to try hard	3.12	3.33	3.06
Japanese saves time	3.09	3.11	2.84
I can appreciate the teacher as a L2 learning role model	2.98	3.00	2.68

To determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in the learners' selections, further analysis was undertaken. Since the distribution of the data was non-normal, the students' responses were analyzed using Friedman's 2-way ANOVA by ranks. For all three proficiency groups, there was a statistically significant difference in the importance ascribed to the seven reasons (false-beginner,  $\chi^2(6) = 342.04$ ,  $p < .001$ ; lower-intermediate,  $\chi^2(6) = 262.25$ ,  $p < .001$ ; intermediate,  $\chi^2(6) = 102.74$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

## Discussion and Conclusion

This study investigated the relationship between the demand for L1 teacher support amongst Japanese L2 learners of English and the supply of L1 teacher support from native L2 teachers. As was the case with previous research in the field (see Burden, 2001; Schweers, 1999; Tang, 2002), the vast majority of the students in this study desired L1 teacher support. There was also found to be a clear inverse relationship between the demand for L1 assistance from students and L2 proficiency. This finding matched that of previous studies (see Carson & Kashihara, 2012; Joyce et al., 2020; Norman, 2008; Prodromou, 2002) in showing that as L2 proficiency increases, students likely have less need for L1 support to understand classroom discourse.

This study also found that native L2 teachers provided greater L1 support to students of lower L2 proficiency. However, when looking at the results for the different L2 functions, the demand for native teacher L1 use was significantly higher than the supply of such support. This finding broadly matched that of Schweers (1999) but had less in common with Burden (2001) and Tang (2002). The discrepancy in the results could be due to the language background of the teachers in these studies. When students share an L1 with their language teacher, they expect and prefer more teacher L1 use (Kim & Petraki, 2009; Stephens, 2006) and non-native L2 teachers tend to meet this expectation (Balabakgil & Mede, 2016; Hosoda, 2000). However, in Burden (2001) and Tang (2002), both native and non-native teachers participated. Therefore, compared to this study, the supply of teacher L1 use in those studies could have been increased by the participation of non-native L2 teachers.

This study also found L2 students most desire native teacher L1 support to help them understand course requirements. This was unsurprising. Without a clear understanding of teacher demands for reports and tests, students fare poorly. This finding was also reported by Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney who noted that students preferred L1 support for vital information like assessments (2008, p. 260). Likewise, Carson (2014b) found that tests were a variable that students at all levels agreed to be worthy of L1 teacher support. The only other variable that Carson (2014b) found to achieve this widespread level of support among students was comprehension. This study provided similar findings in the form of great interest in L1 teacher support to understand difficult concepts. In both studies, students seem to place value on understanding as it is when discussing complex topics that comprehension is most challenged. This finding also corresponds with that of Schweer (1999) who found explaining difficult topics to be the primary reason students wanted L1 support.

As has been discussed, the results from both this study and others have revealed teacher L1 support to be a “learner-preferred strategy” (Atkinson, 1987: 422) especially for students of lower L2 proficiency. Likewise, this research and others show that native L2 teachers consider the students’ L1 a useful classroom resource, especially for lower L2 proficiency learners (e.g. De La Campa & Nassaji, 2009). The convergence between students’ learning styles and teachers’ instructional methods augers well. However, the utilization of the L1 resource should not simply be viewed in terms of quantity of usage. Instead, a principled approach should be taken to its deployment. As has been discussed in this study, one important area for native teacher classroom L1 usage is the understanding of difficult concepts. For instance, as noted by Storch and Wigglesworth, the L1 can provide “additional cognitive support that allows them [students] to analyze language and work at a higher level than would be possible were they restricted to sole use of their L2” (2003, p. 760). In addition, on complicated topics, teacher L1 use can catalyze the process of input becoming intake. In this way, the L1 can sustain collaboration and increase engagement. While the monolingual view of teaching deems L1 use to be a missed opportunity for L2 processing, selective teacher L1 use can improve the quantity and quality of classroom target language use. Thus, rather than being incompatible with communicative language teaching, this approach can assist in the development of communicative competence (McMillan & Rivers, 2011).

As has been discussed, teacher L1 use can help facilitate L2 learning. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that exposure to the L2 provides the driving force for language acquisition. It should also be borne in mind that teacher L1 use is primarily only possible in an EFL classroom as this is where students share a native language. However, this is also the same learning environment that offers limited access to the L2 outside the classroom. Therefore, for EFL students, it is particularly important that L2 instructors offer a learning experience that is rich in natural and comprehensible input. As such, while this study is supportive of judicious teacher L1 use, instructors should provide as much exposure to the L2 as possible. To achieve this, teachers can increase the comprehensibility of their speech by paying attention to



verbal modifications. This includes slowing down their speech rate, repeating utterances, simplifying the syntactic and lexical difficulty of their language, and paraphrasing (Duff & Polio, 1990). Also, while the findings from this study reinforce that L1 support can be useful, it should dwindle as learner L2 proficiency increases, especially since excessive L1 use can lead to student demotivation (Macdonald, 1993). In addition, instructors should seek to wean learners from L1 support. There is no reason to repeatedly use the same classroom language in the L1 when it could soon be valuable L2 exposure. In this study, the significant difference in the demand for L1 support compared to its supply could be reflective of teachers wishing to maximize L2 exposure. By providing students with some L1 support, but also challenging them to comprehend more of the L2 than they would prefer, teachers could skillfully be encouraging L2 acquisition.

To ensure native L2 teachers have an informed understanding of the issue of L1 classroom support, they would benefit from training. As has been discussed, this should include when L1 support can most effectively be employed and that L2 proficiency is a strong indicator of demand. However, the opportunity for verbal native teacher L1 support is contingent upon instructors acquiring a working knowledge of the language. As part of this, the development of some classroom-specific L1 terms, such as low-frequency grammar forms would be particularly helpful. It should also be recognized however that L1 support does not have to be exclusively delivered through teacher talk. Student L1 needs can also be met through their learning materials. This can be done by selecting bilingual textbooks and handouts and encouraging bilingual dictionaries. Also, students can provide one another with L1 support by being allowed to verify their understanding in their native language (see von Dietze & von Dietze, 2007). Nevertheless, by acquiring some L1 proficiency, teachers can better monitor their students' native language usage to differentiate between constructive application of the L1 and its blatant overuse.

Several limitations to this study should be kept in mind. The research was based on the respondents' perceptions rather than classroom observations. The selected approach greatly increased the quantity of data that could be collected and avoided the presence of a researcher influencing the behavior of the teacher, but it also reduced the precision of the figures. Also, the participants were all Japanese university students with an L2 proficiency from a false-beginner to an intermediate level. To increase the generalizability of the findings, it would be fruitful to survey a more heterogeneous sample. As well as addressing the homogeneity of the population, further studies should explore the reasons why native instructors opt to use or not use the L1.

The results from this research study shed light on the demand and supply for native teacher L1 use. As has been discussed, the vast majority of students were found to prefer some L1 support from their native teachers. Also, L2 proficiency has been confirmed to be an important variable in both the desire for native teacher L1 support and its provision. While the L2 provides the impetus for language acquisition, instructors should not feel guilty about the judicious use of the L1 as a teaching strategy. As has been discussed, based on student feedback, teachers should consider the timely use of the L1 to clarify course requirements and improve comprehension of difficult concepts. However, based on their students' needs, teachers would also benefit from a degree of flexibility and pragmatism in their approach to L1 usage whilst being wary of excessive use by either themselves or their students. In this way, native teacher L1 use can effectively facilitate and enrich students' classroom learning experience.

## References

- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241-247.
- Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32.
- Balabakgil, B., & Mede, E. (2016). The use of L1 as a teaching strategy by native and non-native EFL instructors at a language preparatory program in Turkey. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(6), 15-35.
- Barker, D. (2003). Why English teachers in Japan need to learn Japanese. *The Language Teacher*, 27(2), 9-11.
- Burden, P. (2001). When do native English speaking teachers and Japanese college students disagree about the use of Japanese in the English classroom? *The Language Teacher*, 25(4), 5-9.
- Butzkamm, W., & Caldwell, J. (2009). *The bilingual reform: A paradigm shift in foreign language teaching*. Tübingen: Narr Studienbücher.
- Carson, E. (2014a). L1 in the EFL class: Student preferences and teacher beliefs. *The 2013 PanSIG Proceedings*, 203-213.
- Carson, E. (2014b). Teachers and students: At L1 odds in the EFL class. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (Eds.), *JALT2013 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 248-258). Tokyo: JALT.
- Carson, E., & Kashihara, H. (2012). Using the L1 in the L2 Classroom: From the Students' Perspective. In A. Stewart & N. Sonda (Eds.), *JALT2011 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 713-724). Tokyo: JALT.
- Chavez, M. (2003). The diglossic foreign-language classroom: Learners' views on L1 and L2 functions. In C., Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, near-native and the non-native speaker* (pp. 163-208). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: Academic Press.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Cook, V. (2013). *Second language learning and language teaching* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Copland, F., & Neokleous, G. (2010). L1 to teach L2: Complexities and contradictions. *ELT Journal*, 65, 270-280.
- De La Campa, J. C., & Nassaji, H. (2009) The Amount, Purpose, and Reasons for Using L1 in L2 Classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42, 742-759.
- Debreli, E. (2016). Perceptions of non-native EFL teachers' on L1 use in L2 classrooms: Implications for language program development. *English Language Teaching*, 9(3), 24-32.
- Duff, P., & Polio, C. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 74, 154-166.
- Edstrom, A. (2006). L1 use in the L2 classroom: One teacher's self-evaluation. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(2), 275-292.
- Ford, K. (2009). Principles and practices of L1/L2 use in the Japanese university EFL context. *JALT Journal*, 31(1), 63-80.
- Grim, F. (2010). L1 in the L2 classroom at the secondary and college levels: A comparison of functions and use by teachers. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 7(2), 193-209.
- Hosoda, Y. (2000). Teacher code switching in the EFL classroom. *JALT Journal*, 12, 69-93.
- Inbar-Lourie, O. (2010). English only? The linguistic choices of teachers of young EFL learners. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 14(3), 351-367.
- Joyce, P., von Dietze, H., von Dietze, A., & McMillan, B. (2020). RESEARCH IN PROGRESS: Desire for L1 support in the English as a foreign classroom: Exploring

- connections with L2 proficiency, L2 ambiguity tolerance, L2 learning motivation, and gender. *Language Teaching*, 53(3), 387-390.
- Kim, Y., & Petraki, L. (2009). Students' and teachers' use of and attitudes to L1 in the EFL classroom. *Asian EFL Journal*, 11(4), 58-89.
- Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44, 64-77.
- Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- MacDonald, C. (1993). *Using the target language*. Cheltenham: Mary Glasgow.
- Maruzen. (2003). Internet o riyoshita kojintekiogata communication noryoku test no goteian [Proposal for computerized assessment system for English communication]. Maruzen, 1-14.
- McGregor, R. (2017). The vicious triangle: CLT, native speakers, and "English-only" classrooms. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Transformation in language education*. Tokyo: JALT.
- McMillan, B., & Rivers, D. R. (2011). The Practice of Policy: Teacher Attitudes toward "English Only". *System*, 39(2), 251-263.
- McMillan, B., & Turnbull, M. (2009). Teachers' use of the first language in French immersion: Revisiting a core principle. In M. Turnbull, & J. Dailey-O'Cain, (Eds.), *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 15-34.
- Norman, J. (2008). Benefits and drawbacks to L1 use in the L2 classroom. In K. Bradford Watts, T. Muller, & M. Swanson (Eds.), *JALT2007 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 691-701). Tokyo: JALT.
- Polio, C., & Duff, P. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 313-326.
- Prodromou, L. (1992). From mother tongue to other tongue: What is the place of the student's mother tongue in the EFL classroom? *TESOL Newsletter Greece*, 67, 7-8.
- Rabbidge, M., & Chappell, P. (2014). Exploring Non-Native English Speaker Teachers' Classroom Language Use in South Korean Elementary Schools. *TESL-EJ*, 17(4), 1-18.
- Rolin-Ianziti, J., & Varshney, R. (2008). Students' views regarding the use of the first language: An exploratory study in a tertiary context maximizing target language use. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 65(2), 249-273.
- Ryan, S. (2002). Maximising L2 communication: The case for caution in the use of L1 in the classroom. *On CUE*, 10(1), 20-21.
- Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System*, 42, 308-318.
- Schweers, C. W. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 37(2), 6-9.
- Sick, J. (2008). Employing Rasch Analysis to Develop and Improve the ELP Placement Test. *Obirin studies in English language and literature*, 48, 185-199.
- Stephens, M. (2006). The use and abuse of Japanese in the English university class. *The Language Teacher*, 30(8), 13-17.
- Storch, N. & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4): 760-769.
- Tajgozari, M. (2017). Factors contributing to the use of L1 in English classrooms: Listening to the voice of teachers and students in Iranian institutes. *International Journal of research in English Education*, 2(2), 63-75.
- Tang, J. (2002). Using L1 in the English classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 40(4), 36-43.
- von Dietze, A. & von Dietze, H. (2007). Approaches to L1 use in the EFL classroom. *The Language Teacher*, 31(8), 7-10.
- Zulfikar, Z. (2019). Rethinking the use of L1 in L2 classroom. *Englisia*, 6(1), 42-51.

## Appendix

For each situation, please circle the answer that is most true for you.

Usually, in which language does your English listening/speaking teacher...

	English only	Mostly in English	Half in English, half in Japanese	Mostly in Japanese	Only in Japanese
give instructions?	1	2	3	4	5
explain course requirements?	1	2	3	4	5
give feedback to the whole class?	1	2	3	4	5
talk to you individually about your studies?	1	2	3	4	5

Usually, in which language does your English reading/writing teacher...

	English only	Mostly in English	Half in English, half in Japanese	Mostly in Japanese	Only in Japanese
teach grammar?	1	2	3	4	5
talk to you individually about everyday things?	1	2	3	4	5
give essay feedback?	1	2	3	4	5
teach new vocabulary?	1	2	3	4	5

Usually, in which language would you like your English listening/speaking teacher to...

	English only	Mostly in English	Half in English, half in Japanese	Mostly in Japanese	Only in Japanese
give instructions?	1	2	3	4	5
explain course requirements?	1	2	3	4	5
give feedback to the whole class?	1	2	3	4	5
talk to you individually about your studies?	1	2	3	4	5

Usually, in which language would you like your English reading/writing teacher to...

	English only	Mostly in English	Half in English, half in Japanese	Mostly in Japanese	Only in Japanese
teach grammar?	1	2	3	4	5
talk to you individually about everyday things?	1	2	3	4	5
give essay feedback?	1	2	3	4	5
teach new vocabulary?	1	2	3	4	5

Overall, what are the strongest reasons for your teacher to use Japanese? Please choose the three most important reasons for you. Write a number "1" next to the most important reason, a number "2" next to the second most important reason, and a "3" next to the third most important reason.

Japanese keeps me on task

Japanese saves time

I can appreciate the teacher as an L2 learning role model

I can understand difficult concepts

I can talk to my teacher more easily

I can clearly understand the course requirements

Japanese is easier for me, and I don't have to try hard