



The Influence of L1 on Second Language Learning of Teachers Trainees: A Case of St. Francis College of Education, Hohoe

Published in Kenya by Royallite Global in the:

**Journal of Education,
Curriculum and Teaching
Studies**

Volume 1, Issue 1, 2020

© 2020 The Author(s)

This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.

Article Information

Submitted: 11th March 2020

Accepted: 3rd April 2020

Published: 4th May 2020

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest was reported by the author

Funding: None

Additional information is available at the end of the article



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Alberta Aseye Ama Duhoe & Manfred Mawudoku 

Department of Languages, St. Francis College of Education

Correspondence: duhoe12@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aimed at examining the influence of L1 on second language learning of teacher trainees in St. Francis College of Education, Hohoe and the effect of this language on their academic performance in their training to get into teaching profession. Languages are unique to different sects of people found in any geographical location. This uniqueness of languages places identifiable marks around different groups of people and the effects are revealed in the learning, trainings and teaching of the second and foreign languages. Language acquisition is innate and once a child is exposed to a particular language right from birth, the language becomes the first language upon which henceforth second language is built. This practice reflects mostly in both speech and writing of learners in the process of learning the second language. English language in Ghanaian school system is the approved official and second language. The pure use of L2 in classrooms with minimal L1 is better in the teacher trainees of colleges. The article is a theoretical study that examines the role of the native language on teachers' trainees by identifying the data and opinions presented, through literature review of the past research studies. The study adopted a desktop literature review method (desk study). This study further used a humanistic approach to textual analysis while researching and writing this essay, compared to a behavioral approach, which would involve evaluating the influence of L1 on second language learning of teacher trainees.

Keywords: *language learning, native language L1, Second Language Learning L2, Teachers trainees.*

Introduction

In recent decades, numerous methodological developments have been identified in English Language Teaching (ELT) and a controversy has been developed on the use of L1 in foreign language courses and learners' mother tongue in English. Grammar Translation was commonly used in teaching both European and foreign languages and was a common form of educating in the years 1840s and the 1940s, while the native languages of students was (L1) as a means of instructions in learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2003).

In the 1900s, teaching began in using L1 as the medium of learning with the introduction of the direct approach as an alternative to translating grammar from mother tongue. Throughout the 19th century, however, the emphasis on the use of the language was a new method that extended monolingual dominance on the language teaching rather than writing (Tajgozari, 2017). Many strategies, such as behavioral techniques, have suggested that teachers need L2 or target language and use of L1 at all costs to convey to student's knowledge and increase the quality of teaching. The use of L1 in L2 classes was assumed to be one of the reasons why it inhibits second-lingual learning and contributes to some significant problems in the second-language learning method (Richards & Rodgers, 2003).

Analysis on teaching methods in second and foreign languages shows that the opinions of educators on the use of first language shift dramatically in L2 classroom context. The key cause of the change was the overtime switch in the popularity of the various methods and techniques. Early learning experience used L1 extensively in the teaching of every other language and even without the first language of learners it was assumed difficult to teach a second language. The strategy of grammar translating had for long been famous, encouraging a bilingual approach and frequent use of students' first language.

The system advocates claim that the instructions of teachers in L1 are simple to understand and saves communication failures. The definitions and lexical comparisons and similarities are often assumed to be very easy to describe in the first language (Richards & Rogers 2001). "monolingual" method became more common in the latter half of the last century, even though audio-lingual approaches had been in use since the early 19th century. Bilingual learning and

syntactic translation have had a strong influence on the learning experience and process and are perceived as negative. As a result, policymakers and educators focused more on using the target language for L2 and claimed it was the best way to understand and teach L2 (Howatt, 1984, Richards & Rodgers, 2001). They moreover believed that the direct language method to offer students full access to the target language instruction, offer them the ability to challenge themselves and to discuss with their fellow students about their meanings. Recent methodological advances indicate that, given its global influence, the use of only a single language cannot sustain its authority, and opposition and debate have always existed (Auerbach, 1993).

Some researchers believe it is necessary for students to acquire L2 efficiently to expose themselves to a wide range of primary language information (Atkinson, 1987). A prerequisite for efficient language learning and effective languages is considered in simulating a L2 setting (Asher, 1993; Chaudron, 1988; Ellis, 1984; Halliwell and Jones, 1991; Krashen et al, 1984). However, some problems can arise from using L1 in L2 learning. One of the most common L1 issues is fear of excessive dependency (Atkinson, 1987).

L1 as it is used here applies to the second language teacher's first language or mother tongue. L1 is a problem which remains unresolved in second language (L2) learning environment, even after major changes have occurred in L2 teaching methods. Although teachers tend to use the L1(s) of students within the classroom, there can be a number of complexities because of many contributing problems (Tajgozari, 2017). Several examples of these problems include teacher values, practical issues, contradictions between the results of second language research and classroom realities, and policy and curricula. In that basis, teachers must take class decisions in accordance with L1 (Krashen et al, 1984). This reveals the importance of the knowledge of the impacts of L1 on L2 during the training of teachers in the colleges.

Within these areas, some basic questions include the teacher being able, capable and with the choice to handle the L1(s) of students in the school, the ability to maximize or minimize the use of L1, the capability to use L1 for L2 strategically, the ability to distinguish its acceptance by a larger pedagogical

community, the ability to predict the influence of L1 in school, standardized testing, among other abilities that the individual teachers have. Nevertheless, teachers should be quick to make sure L1 doesn't affect learners in their learning of L2, which have been a challenge in the recent days.

Languages are independently processed in the mind, and L1 would have detrimental effects on L2 learning, which is why L2 must be only taught, separated from L1 (Nzwanga, 2000). L2-word meanings are however not stored separately from L1-word meanings as shown by the code-switching, suggesting both languages are simultaneous in mind especially during speaking or teaching (Macaro, 2001). Also, the conceptualizer produces preverbal messages from all available tools-not just from language-specific sources, in the generally agreed model of the L1 speaker, suggesting that the first language processing processes at least may not be language-specific (Levelt, 1999).

Languages in Ghana

Ghana is a multilingual nation that speaks approximately eighty tongues. The national language and lingua franca is English, adopted from the colonial period. Akan is the most widely spoken of the native languages in Ghana. Ghana has over 70 ethnic societies, each of which has its' culture and language (Bernd & Walter, 2004). Mutual understanding is usually found in languages which belongs to similar ethnic society. For example, with the Frafra and Waali languages of the Upper West Ghana, Dagbanli and Mampelle languages of the Northern Region have a mutual intelligibility. The four languages of these communities are Mole-Dagbani. There are either eleven or nine languages government funded, based as to whether Akuapem Twi, Asante Twi and Fante are regarded to be a common language or not. The Bureau of Ghana Languages, founded in 1951, is funded and publishes resources in the language; these were dialects used during the time of Ghana languages in basic education. Such languages, however, come from different divisions of the Niger-Congo group of languages (NCC, 2006).

Beliefs in usage of L1 and L2 languages

The values of teachers and learners play a significant role in how the teaching and learning process takes shape. There are many assumptions about the use of L1 in L2 classrooms by teachers and learners. Some of them are detrimental towards L2 by considering the use of L1 as needed. Cook's (2001) recommendations for introduction of L1 into teaching require the authorization of L1 in the classroom for teachers. In addition, there is need to abolish the penalty for L1 use by learners. The views of teachers on L1 are significant. The conviction that L1 should be used for L2 learning for classroom management can be adopted. L1 can be used to establish conditions of learning that are socially and affectively favorable. In order to achieve this, L1 can provide instructions, feedback and clarifications. As we saw in Turnbull & Arnett (2002), professor trainees who assumed in the advantages of exclusive use of L2 have modified their faith after actual experience in bilingual situations. This suggests the value of early-stage teaching so that instructors may develop or change their beliefs through experience. Teachers need to evaluate their beliefs on L1 in the light of the observations and pedagogical perspectives of science. The use of Storch and Wigglesworth suggestion, as many of the studies cited here stress, must not be promoted too strongly, although its prohibition is not a reasonable pedagogical choice.

Storch & Wigglesworth (2003) observed that after express guidance, students who initially were hesitant to use L1 in the classroom sense started to use L1 to complete their assignment. They considered L1, if they were using it or not, as more beneficial in the classrooms (Wach & Monroy, 2019). Yet they thought that L1 would delay the completion of the task by introducing another mental translation process. In classrooms L2 is commonly used, with students assuming that they are only supposed to speak L2 in the classrooms. The belief that L1 use would help them carry out this task efficiently, particularly if this task was difficult is retained and exercised amongst students especially. This demonstrates how clearly the use of L1 in the classroom is important for students. Teachers must specifically advise students to use L1 for particular purposes in order to resolve the barrier of conventional beliefs against L1 (Wach & Monroy, 2019).

Second Language Acquisition (SLA)

Specialization in second language (SLA) is currently a well-established field reflected in both the designated graduate and applied language programs and in the academic programs in foreign language learning. In order to further translate the insights that have been found to make learning possible into practical activities of language learning, SLA was generating a felt desire by several teacher-cum-researchers (e.g. Corder, Hatch, Schumann) to consider learners learning the second language (L2) in both unschooled and tutored contexts. Thus, it was known from the start that the theory was related to SLA analysis and language pedagogy. During many years SLA has eroded the link, but as is evident in its continuing interest in formal education, the role theory and analysis function in SLA's promotion of approaches to language teaching including complete physical reaction, task-based teaching and in the development of a language education is still noticeable in its continued emphasis as discipline.

The significance of SLA for language teaching was progressively acknowledged by SLA researchers. For instance, Bardovi-Harlig (1995), speculated that "there is a traditional issue that not only the explanatory capacity of a theory but its relevance as a second-language pedagogy should be considered." SLA was seen as 'an important area of social influence for many people around the world,' in tandem with teachers and students. SLA researchers also wrote extensively about the association between second-language education and SLA.

Nevertheless, there is no resolution on the definition of the connection between SLA / Applied Linguistics and language education. The connection between pedagogy and second-language learning is, as stated out by Bardovi-Harlig (1995), a difficult relationship which applied linguists do not apparently agree. In addition, many roles can be defined that often are contradictory, from super-cautious not to relate to firmly' go and apply ', while suggesting the relationship should be interdependent.

Data from introspection are a significant further source of knowledge for SLA research (Cook 2001). A study of Krashen (1982) or McDonough (1981) asks L2 students about their own feelings, motives and tactics. Some of these data can be collected from L1 as the age of the child is almost impossible to conduct such

research. The grammaticality evaluations, the key methodology used in generative SLA analysis, were one key technology in SLA. L2 students are asked if they believe that such words are either grammatical or not and their responses are explicit or implied in contrast to those of native speakers, as in Mohebbi and Alavi (2014).

The main selling point of SLA study is the association of the two languages in a common sense, which leads to a wide variety of translations from L1 to L2, L2 to L1 (reverse translation), or L2 to another L2 (lateral transmission) (Stern, 1983). L2 is inherently different from L1 as all the learner gets and does includes both the first and second language. L2 learning Weinreich (1953) proposed that two of the modes bilingual education could take the form of cooperation between bilingualism, which essentially conserves the language in different compartments and composite bilingualism.

Problem Statement

Despite a growing emphasis on the skills of communication in second language schools, attention should be raised to the first language and the effects thereof (Durmuş, 2019). During L2 training during various organizations, a large number of claims and counter claims are made about L1 use (Mohebbi&Alavi, 2014). In language classes; as a language of verbal and written instructions explicitly provided by the instructor or in the teaching materials, questions to the instructor or to teachers ' explications on matters which are considered not to be understood, as well as learner questions and statements may be given in more than one language which tags along the native language in most instances Ellis (2010).

Literature on the subject demonstrates that English education teaching in both lower and tertiary education systems is highly dependent on the distinct competence of the teachers worldwide. Teachers affect curriculum and the practices of classrooms greatly. Such activities are primarily guided by their values, contrary to the organizational, systematic and government policy that they focus. There is a considerable discrepancy among practitioners and scholars with current research on the subject. The effectiveness of using L1 is criticized by some study community and L2 is the only way to increase the learner's access to the target language. Others reject the deletion of L1 from L2 learning classrooms and request

that L1 be used for particular purposes at least in a wise way to optimize the learning chance.

In Ghana, several local languages are spoken, yet not all are documented and studied in schools. The current language policy of Ghana states that, language of instruction in basic one to three should basically be the local language which the child can best speak and understand and later, a second language which is English can be introduced as the child progresses. The study of English language in Ghanaian school system as the approved official and second language is often interfered with the L1.

In an attempt to deal with the challenge of usage of L1 and L2 in the learning of students in tertiary institutions is a concern in the training of teachers. This study focused on examining the resultant influence of L1 on L2 in the training of teachers. Previous studies have been done to investigate the effect of L1 on second language learning and some on foreign language learning in instances of classrooms of second and foreign languages. Durmuş (2019) did a research on impact of L1 on foreign languages learning. Turnbull (2001) focused on the L1 effect in second and foreign languages teaching. Mohebbi and Alavi (2014) examined the use of first language by the teacher in a classroom in the process of teaching. Ellis (2010) focused on the acquisition of second language and the challenges thereof. This study, however, focused on the possible root of the problem which is the L1 effect on teachers training, that is, teachers' trainees.

Objective of the study

This study aimed at examining the influence of L1 on second language learning of teacher trainees in St. Francis College of Education, Hohoe.

Theoretical Review

Behaviorist Theory of Language learning

This theory of behavior suggests that "children learn oral language expression through emulation, incentive and practice of other models of the human role function. Human role models include stimulus and reward in the infant world "(Cooter & Reutzler, 2004). When a child begins to speak or mimic the sounds

or patterns of words, they are usually praised and thanked for their efforts. Therefore, passion and affection are the rewards.

The primary language communication techniques within the framework of behavioral science are mimic, reinforcement and imitation. But research on learning acquisitions has shown that children's conceptual imitation shows that they do not display innovation; children often "vary substantially in the amount that they imitate" (Bloom, Hood and Lightbown, 1974). Since children don't simultaneously mimic structures such as words, phrases, terms and phrases, they will naturally learn at different levels, while imitation is necessary when new vocabulary articles are acquired (Stern, 1983).

It can be argued that a learning cycle, which promotes a learned person, is structured to avoid the instinctive development of language in terms of a phrase, clause and sentence based on previously stipulated rules of the prior native language. Training activities will therefore obviously not encourage language teaching intrinsically focused (Stern, 1983). Hindrances of instinctive teaching are certainly detrimental to the imaginative way of learning. It takes a long time to be able to at least somewhat master a language to a satisfactory level. Language learning has a standard point. Therefore, learners must learn to develop an efficient linguistic intuition, which defines the threshold stage, through reinforcement and training. In new circumstances the language learner cannot use the language correctly in the real sense (Anton & Dicamilla, 1999). It is also evident that due to late attainment of a threshold level due to the previously defined collection of rules the intrinsic learning would be delayed. The theory of behavior seeks to find justifications of actions and construct language education, to be a center with other language lessons and learning theories have been learnt before. The development of various empirical languages in education have become very popular (Storch & Aldosari, 2010).

Mentalist learning theory of Language learning

The concept of mental learning discusses the role of the mind in language learning by claims that people come into being with an inherent and biological ability to learn languages. Noam Chomsky led this theory and came up with a reaction for

B. F. Skinner radical actions (Faarlund, 2008). The behaviorist theory of language training does not take into consideration the imaginative and inventive essence of the use of words, a phenomenon for which individuals are claiming to be responsible. The mentalists claim that language is internal, controlled by principles and abstract. The human body is innately predisposed to the learning of language, which is in some way "programmed" for speech. This predisposition is responsible for the speed and accuracy of learning the mother tongue (Ewing, 1972). Once the organism reaches physical maturity, its intrinsic capacity to process the input of language slowly deteriorates and appears to be completely ineffective. The mentalist theory encourages reassessment of existing learning and resources in the second language acquisition. In particular, the student's 'competence' must be stressed rather than his 'results' (Spino & Loewen, 2018).

The Role of L1 in L2 Teaching and Classrooms

Teachers and not students are the main consumers of the L1 in the L2 classrooms (Chaudron, 1988). While L1 work has increased in recent years in the L2 classroom (Ellis & Shintani, 2014), most of ESL teacher trainings do provide little to no details about L1 usage in the L2 teaching and learning (Lasagabaster, 2013) classroom and little work has been done in relation to the ESL teacher's opinions of the matter. Second-language acquisition work shows the essential role of the first language of the learner in L2 learning. A number of scholars have researched principles of inter-language communication and identified major impact on the L2 learning by the first language. Learners create and use second or foreign language by applying previous linguistic experience. The findings give clear explanations for their use and theoretical proof. Ellis (2008) argues that learners appear to construct their interim standards in the process of target language learning with their L1 information. Ellis (2008) argued that student thinks in L1 and then translates his thoughts into the second language.

Cook (2002) indicated that there is no justification why it should be omitted in the L2 classrooms, because the learners' L1 is still present in their minds and constantly accessed during the L2 learning cycle. The analysis of 36 university-level Arabic EFL students, by Storch and Aldosari (2010), found that L1 fulfills a varied social, cognitive and pedagogical function and that its elimination or prohibition

in L2 limits the ability to teach L2; it effectively blinds the eye to a useful teaching and an important learning instrument.

Krashen (1982) also considers that the L1's exterior structure has a significant impact on the L2 structure. Identically (Cook 1992) states that, when processing L2, second-language students usually reach their L1 for better understanding. He emphasized that teachers ought not to ignore L1 in L2 learning because it can isolate some students and it often remains in the mind of L2 learners for good whether or not their teachers use it. In comparison to Cook 1992, Auerbach (1993) says that L1 provides a sense of security and validates student perceptions, so that they can express themselves. The principle also gives a good sense of security.

The L1 pattern is undoubtedly the underlying and predominant source of error, according to Lightbown and Spada (1999). The focus on Krashan and Terrel's' feedback and context (1983) also includes full exposure in classrooms in L2 with respect to the target language. Recent work indicates, however, that L1 cannot be removed from the theoretical frameworks of language education, given the broad prevalence of the monolingual model and the direct methods inspired by these studies. Such later experiments show that it is very difficult to use L1 L2, without at least allowing partial use of L2.

Jadallah and Hasan (2011) warn of strategic use of L1 only at reasonable times and in suitable areas. To this end, Mohebbi and Alavi (2014) suggest that careful, selective and concept code shifting should be viewed as a representation of the activities of bilingual and multilingual learners in everyday life. The L1 was considered to be an important tool in the production of expertise in each of the main language fields.

The challenge as a result of over-simplification is also generated by translating, because many languages and cultural aspects are not specifically and explicitly translated (Harbord, 1992). "It's so cool, for example, that word in English means "Everything is fantastic or great". This sentence is the result of the continuing development of the English language, which at one time was influenced by the language culture. For instance, a direct translation of this phrase into Ghanaian would not have similar and exact meaning; indeed. Although the point

on both sides is just as persuasive, it is evident that, while learners use their L1 in English, they may not outweigh their drawbacks.

Thornbury (2010) also identified reasons against the use of L1 in L2 classes, mainly in order to have a detrimental effect on the process of learning for students when interpreting L2 in another language. He said that using L1 would lead to learners having a cognitive dependency on their mother language at the cost of increasing TL learning independence. However, in many ways the both language structures are not identical, students can recognize the notion that translations express meanings if they are to compare the two languages. Some people claim that translation is more effective and memorable to express the meaning of the TL. The opposite is seen by Thornbury (2010). He said that L2 information would become less memorable due to the quick and straightforward way of translation because of no mental effort is applied to achieve significance.

A great deal of maturation is transition. In the words of Gleitman, when you know a second language, frogs don't go back to becoming tadpoles. The facets of language learning related to transformation are irrevocable; the L2 learner begins with the maturation characteristics according to his age, not those of the L1 infant, emotionally, conceptually, or with any other changes that grow up. To get to maturity is seldom not an action of a sudden transition, but an ongoing operation.

Learning and Teaching in L1 and L2

Strict use of only the target second language in monolingual classrooms is practiced in some instances. The use of L1 is thought to result in a detrimental transfer of the language and would negatively impact L2 learning and language use (Swain and Lapkin, 2000) through monolingual approaches. The effect of some variants of Communicative Language Teaching that aimed to optimize L2 usage by restricting L1 use can be attributed to such aversion towards using L1 during the 20th century (Moore, 2013; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003). For factors such as immigration and homogenization policies, monolingual schools in some countries like the USA were focused on after the First World War (Auerbach, 1993). Students can only use monolingual approach of L1 alone when they know that they don't have the capacity to conduct the language features in L2, when they are practicing to perform a complex task that takes a lot of knowledge and logical organization,

when explaining significance and grammar to peers, the link with classmates / teachers and when they have uncertainties about L2 language use (Stern, 1983).

The direct approach (Larsen-Freeman, 2000) is an outstanding example of a monolingual pedagogic method, in which the target language is exclusively taught in this language and in no additional language. This strategy calls for teachers to limit the use of L1, so that they are exposed to the target language as much as possible. The natural method by Krashen & Terrel (Krashen 1982) limits the use of mother tongue language as it decreases the amount of understandable input that can be obtained from students. The use of L1 as elimination of opportunities to communicate or immerse the students in the language they are interested in is a single-lingual approach to teaching.

Students are expected to take advantage of all language opportunities students have in bilingual classrooms. One example is CJ Dodson's bilingual approach in the 1960s and 1970s (Dodson, 1985). He notes that second or third language learning can only take place in the sense of bilingual language learning, where both the first and second languages are transmitted naturally, enabling the learner to utilize the language system to express concepts and deal with multiple communications language systems, and that the use of both languages is sufficient to achieve a natural understanding of second language. Task-based language courses also include situations in which students are required to use whatever tools are available, including the mother tongue for completing their tasks (Ellis, 2010). Task execution and constructive engagement in these classrooms are the targets regardless of resources.

Another case is where the trainees are given a chance to have a balanced learning and teaching experience, that is, a key strategy between having exclusively monolingual classrooms and moderated multilingual classrooms. You adhere to a teaching philosophy that allows / invites teachers using other languages than the target language under condition, where it is appropriate. Macaro (2001) demonstrates three minimum, virtual and average positions for the use of L1 in the L2 learning. Optimally, the use of L1 in the L2 classroom sees pedagogical benefit and assumes that certain dimensions of learning can be improved by using L1. This stance encourages the continuous quest for pedagogical explanations for the use

of L1. The best position of Macaro is an example of the use of L1 as having an educational meaning. This position requires an ongoing analysis of pedagogical concepts concerning the practical use of L1. The principle of equal use of the L2 and L1 in classrooms is supported by Littlewood and Yu (2009). They promote strategic use of L1 to accommodate for what L2 is not able to do to deliver effective interpersonal support and tools for class management.

In all of the above three positions, the student is on the edge and the teacher takes the choices and instructions. The paper states that other than the knowledge of the instructor on L1 use, the L2 learner should also make educated decisions on where, how and how much L1 should be used in L2. The use of L1 with sensitivity makes it purposeful and goal-oriented rather than accessory and negative. The classroom is an area where students can play with their own language tools to optimize their learning output (Storch & Aldosari, 2010).

In interpersonal communications L1 functions critically as the creation and maintenance of collaboration and intersubjectivity which externalizes internal communication for learning, mental activity control, skirmishing, etc. (Anton & Dicomilla, 1999; Moore, 2013). Intersubjectivity reflects mutual awareness, which is important to the preservation of the Proximal Development Zone and which is mutual by participants in cooperation.

The pupils co-create L2 and construct L2 in a coordinated dialog (Swain & Lapkin, 2000). Scaffolding is the instructors' encouragement so that they can reach higher levels of learning which would not have happened without the support of educators. Therefore, L1 in L2 classrooms from a socio-cognitive perspective is a valuable and indispensable device. A socio-cultural and bilingual method by Vygotsky questions the role of 'English classrooms only' (Moore, 2013) by supporting and facilitating a wise and regulated use of L1. In reality, the principle-based and wise use of L1 may help the learner, especially when the task calls for complex processes (Storch & Aldosari, 2010).

Conclusion

Although the trainees are primarily learning in English, some researchers think L1 should not be banned fully in L2 as it helps to minimize concerns and create a student learning-centered classroom with socio-cultural aspects taken into

account (Auerbach 1993). The teachers sometimes require their students to translate, which can be a successful language learning experience often (Duff, 1989). Moreover, L1 will quite rarely be used for comprehension tests by their students (Schweers, 1999).

Ellis (1984) also acknowledges that L1 use necessarily depends on the educational context, among the advocates of a second language in college. However, in the case of the teacher who thinks it may be useful to use L1 for a specific reason, he or she may use L1 situationally or encourage his or her student to use L1, particularly in the case of a learner with low English skills, who feels anxious, and is therefore unable to convey something comfortably. Statistics show that students would prefer more L1 to be used, despite the ease they feel, but teachers think that more L1 usage maximizes learners' access to the second language, so that they can learn the target language more rapidly (Ellis, 2005). However, the students should be encouraged to work on low dependence on L1 since it has lasting effects in the future days.

Class may be regarded as the target language in a nation; without even seeing a pedagogical interest in the use of native language; striving for the total exclusion of the mother tongue from classroom because the class is recognized as an area for the target language of regular and normal communication (Anton & Dicaquilla, 1999). The instructor is appropriate to the virtual role which assumes that the native language can be excluded from the second language classroom.

Therefore, it is possible to acknowledge the deliberate and restricted use of the native language in monolingual lessons composed of learners in that same native language with the instructor by the teachers who do not understand the target language as the native language to some degree with their deviation from the linguistic output of native speakers in the chosen language. The interest assigned in the learner performance by teachers to proficiency and precision can also differ depending on the monolingual–multilingual learning situations and the instructor's connection to the second language. Instructors who emphasize consistency in second language students who, due both to their lectures and to natural communication ability, are highly exposed to the target language (since their own perceptions and specifications can be guided in that direction). Tolerance

may be targeted at encouraging fluency to minimize anxiety, improve self-esteem and encourage most monolingual classes to reach a higher level of success (this may not necessarily apply for refugee groups, migrants, members of the guest society where target language is the mother tongue).

However, trying to avoid L1 allows students to get full exposure to L2 in classrooms. Many researchers think that extensive L1 use is negatively influencing the acquisition and success of L2 by students and that L2 prevents thought (Shabir, 2017). Some researchers are united in their conviction that the use of L1 should be as minimal as possible, given conflict of opinion on the usage of the native and second languages (Atkinson, 1987). Some researchers find English to be the key means of communication in classrooms because it could provide enough opportunities to practice English and to assist them in learning English through understanding (Schweers, 1999). Excessive use of English has adverse effects on the process of learning. This implies that a total prohibition of the natural use of L1 may not be beneficial for learning the target second language.

It is important to make sure that the target language is the primary, or even the only, language of communicating in the teachings phase in international and second language education. The advantages can be listed below. In the target language, further improve communication skills. The flexibility of communicating in the target language enhances the excitement of the student during the learning process. The learner will handle their own cycle of learning and start taking more initiatives in the process of learning.

It is only this form of trend, however, that may lead to teachers and students being over-dependent on the mother language of learners (Harbord, 1992). As a result, learners lose confidence in their capability to read and write in English: they can believe that only after it has been translated for them to understand something, or use their native language even though they are able completely to express the same concept in English. This can greatly reduce the opportunities for students to learn English and they fail to understand that it is necessary to develop their language ability to use English in learning operations.

L2 students begin with the position that all this has been done once. They are mature and more advanced than the L1 children and hence have whatever

benefits the age offers for cognitive ability, intellectual growth and social development, speech control, etc (Stern, 1983). More precisely, once a child has learned to claim they're not the same person anymore and can't go back to the point where they don't know how to mean anymore: language itself is accessible for the L2 student, even if not the same second language. The pure use of L2 in classrooms with minimal L1 is better in the teacher trainees of colleges. This will boost the language confidence of teachers and their capacity to explain and fully express themselves or a concept in the process of teaching students. This will help the students even in future to use the official language which is needful across the organizations, state and international communication.

Methodology

This study used a humanistic approach to textual analysis while researching and writing this essay, compared to a behavioral approach, which would involve studying the effects of the first native language in the learning of the second language and foreign language. The drawing and interpretation of research findings and sense which is not a quantitative impact evaluation, was important in this context, which implies that qualitative and thematic analysis was most suitable in this study. This method doesn't need to have training the algorithm of analysis as the case for quantitative.

A qualitative textual evaluation method was used in this research. The article is a theoretical study that examines the role of the native language on teacher trainees by identifying the data and opinions presented, through literature review of the past research studies. Textual analysis consists of review and interpretation of scripts and articles (Durmuş, 2019). As a tool of interpretation and significance, an observer is likely to misunderstand the original intent of the message writer. Ellis (2010) reaffirmed its reliability and adequacy, in particular when the researcher pays attention to text itself. In this regard, more interpretation of the texts and their targeted audience in view of the time and environment in which they were written is crucial.

References

- "The Bureau of Ghana Languages-BGL". National Commission on Culture. 2006. Archived from the original on 12 November 2013. Retrieved 18 March 2013.
- Anton, M., & Dicamilla, F. J. (1999). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interactions in the L2 classroom, *The Modern Language Journal*, 233-247.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT journal*, 41(4), 241-247.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586949>
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1995). The interaction of pedagogy and natural sequences in the acquisition of tense and aspect. In Eckman et al. (eds.), 151–168.
- Bernd K. Walter D.G. (2004). [*A handbook of varieties of English. 1. Phonology, Volume 2.*](#) Oxford University Press.
- Bloom, L.M. (1974). "Imitations in Language Development: If, When, and Why", "Cognitive Psychology", pp. 380-420.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). Teacher talk in second language classrooms. In M. H. Long, & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Second language classroom* (pp. 50-87). Hawaii: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom, *The Canadian Modern Language Review*.
- Dodson, C. J. (1985). Second language acquisition and bilingual development: a theoretical framework. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 6(5), 325-346.
- Duff, P. A., & Polio, C. G. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(2), 154-166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1990.tb02561.x>
- Durmuş, M. (2019). The Role of L1 in Foreign Language Teaching Classrooms. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 9(3), 567-576.
- Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.12.006>
- Ellis, R. (2010). Second language acquisition, teacher education and language pedagogy. *Language teaching*, 43(2), 182-201.

- Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research. London, UK: Routledge.
- Ewing, W. K. (1972). The mentalist theory of language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 5(4), 455-462.
- Faarlund, J. T. (2008). A mentalist interpretation of grammaticalization theory. *Grammatical change and linguistic theory: The Rosendal papers*, 221-244.
- Halliwell, S., & Jones, B. (1991). On target: teaching in the target language. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.
- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.12.006>
- <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586949>
- Krashen, S. D., Terrell, T. D., Ehrman, M. E., & Herzog, M. (1984). A theoretical basis for teaching the receptive skills. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17, 261- 275.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford University.
- Levelt, W. (1999). Producing Spoken Language: A Blueprint of the Speaker, In C. Brown, & P. Hagoort (Eds.), *The Neurocognition of Language* (pp. 83-122). Oxford: Oxford Press.
- Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2009). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom, *Language Teaching*, 64-77.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making, *The Modern Language Journal*, 531-548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1990.tb02561.x>
- Mohebbi, H., & Alavi, S. M. (2014). Teachers' first language use in second language learning classroom context: A Questionnaire-based study. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 7(4), 57-73.
- Moore, P. J. (2013). An emergent perspective on the use of the first language in the English-as-a-foreign-language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(1), 239-253.
- Nzwanga, M. (2000). A study of French-English codeswitching in a foreign language college teaching environment. (Electronic Thesis or Dissertation), Retrieved March 17, 2020, from <https://etd.ohiolink.edu/>
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.
- Schweers, W. Jr. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 37(2), 6-7.

- Shabir, M. (2017). Student-Teachers' Beliefs on the Use of L1 in EFL Classroom: A Global Perspective, *English Language Teaching*, 45-52.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (1999). Instruction, first language influence, and developmental readiness in second language acquisition. *The modern language journal*, 83(1), 1-22.
- Spino, L. A., & Loewen, S. (2018). Mentalist Learning Theory. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1-6.
- Stern, H.H. (1983). "Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching". Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2010). Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class, *Language Teaching Research*, 355-375.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL quarterly*, 37(4), 760-770.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: the uses of the first language, *Language Teaching Research*, 251-274.
- 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.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but.... *Canadian modern language review*, 57(4), 531-540.
- Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' use of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 204-218.
- Wach, A., & Monroy, F. (2019). Beliefs about L1 use in teaching English: A comparative study of Polish and Spanish teacher-trainees. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819830422>