
L1 vs. L2 in the Foreign Language Classroom: New Findings

Mark K. Warford, Buffalo State College

Abstract

Teaching in the target language is a time-honored pedagogical value in foreign language instruction that was recently reaffirmed in the publication of standards for foreign language teacher licensure (National Council on Accreditation in Teacher Education Foreign Language Teacher Standards Writing Team, 2002; Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, 2002). Research on teacher use of the target language (L2) versus the native language (L1), however, suggests that this standard is not being met. In order to contribute to the overall empirical portrait of how teachers navigate between L1 and L2 in the classroom, the Foreign Language Teacher Talk Survey (Rose and Warford, 2003, 2007) was administered to those in attendance (N=27) at a state foreign language teacher association pre-conference workshop on the topic of teaching in the target language. Statistical analyses were examined in comparison to previous studies on teacher code switching. Results suggested a less than maximal picture with regard to teaching in the L2.

Introduction

The notion of teaching in the language is a time-honored pedagogical value among foreign language educators. Recently published standards for teacher preparation (NCATE, 2002; INTASC, 2002) and second language acquisition (SLA) research have reconfirmed the value of interpreting and negotiating meaning in the classroom as two tools for acquiring a second language. In spite of such apparent support for teaching in the target language, there is a growing sense of ambivalence about teaching in L1 and L2 that pervades second language (L2) integration into North American foreign language teaching, with estimates of teaching in L2 averaging at around 50% of the time (Allen, 2002; Warford, 2007; Wing, 1980; Wong, 2005) or less (Calman & Daniel, 1998; Shapson, Kaufman, & Durward, 1978). While research on teacher code switching between L1 and L2 is far from conclusive, it suggests a major discrepancy between ideals and practices.

A central focus of this article is the classroom discourse preferences of *foreign language* teachers, defined as the classroom language of teachers of a non-socially dom-

Mark K. Warford (Ph.D., The University of Tennessee) is an Associate Professor of Spanish and Foreign Language Education at Buffalo State College (SUNY). In addition to his experience at the post-secondary level, Warford also taught Spanish and English at the K-12 level for five years. He has published in this and other major refereed journals on the topics of language teacher development and educational innovation. His current research projects center on discourse analysis in the language classroom and language learning motivation.

inant language. The research presented does not speak to *second* language settings, in which the teacher is instructing speakers of other languages in a socially dominant language. Neither does the investigation that will be reported reflect *bilingual* settings, which center on moving a group of learners whose first language is a common non-dominant language toward proficiency in a dominant language. It is important to recognize these particularities in studying how foreign language teachers code-switch between a first and second language in the classroom.

Background

In studies of teachers' use of L1 vs. L2 in the classroom, even those researchers who are critical of the notion of excluding L1 from classroom discourse (Cook, 2001; Macaro, 2001) concede that L2 use should be maximized. Still, in the absence of definitive classroom-based SLA research on the topic of language teacher code-switching and its impact on students' language acquisition, there is no definitive, principled position upon which to posit an optimal balance between teacher use of L1 vs. L2 (Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). Consequently, the thrust of the discourse on L1 vs. L2 in the classroom is subject to ideological debate. Those in favor of teaching (nearly-) exclusively in L2 argue that L1 undermines the currency of the L2 in foreign language settings (McShane, 1997) and may contribute to students' tuning out L2 (Wong-Fillmore, 1985). The virtue of authenticity has been invoked on both sides of the discussion on teacher use of L1 and L2. For example, while Cook (2001) argues that code-switching is an artifact of any bilingual discourse, others have adopted what Macaro (2001) refers to a *virtual* position, arguing that the language classroom can approximate authentic settings to the extent that the L2 and second culture (C2) prevail in the classroom.

Another dimension of the debate centers on the well-established fact in SLA that L1 is used to process L2. Vygotskian researchers argue that, in this light, L1 functions as a semiotic tool to help learners negotiate meaning and language learning tasks in L2 (Antón, 1999; Antón & DiCamilla, 1999). While recognizing the utility of L1 for students, Wells (1999) has cautioned against the application of this 'fact of L1 processing' (author's quotes) position to the promotion of L1 in teacher discourse, particularly since the teacher's L2 may be the students' main, if not only, source of input for acquisition. Finally, researchers have explored the socio-political implications of L1 vs. L2. Here, a clear distinction emerges between foreign, second, and bilingual language learning environments. In second (Auerbach, 1993; Schweers, 1999) or bilingual (Pufahl, Rhodes, & Christian, 2001) learning settings, students who are often economically and/or socially marginalized may feel further disempowered in a classroom environment in which their first language is subjugated to a culturally dominant L2 either in an immersion or bilingual setting. To the contrary, we encounter foreign language learning (McShane, 1997) or indigenous language preservation contexts

“...there is no definitive, principled position upon which to posit an optimal balance between teacher use of L1 vs. L2”

“...L1 was preferred for building empathy, disciplining/reprimanding, explaining classroom procedures, teaching culture, and offering feedback. L2 was used mainly for modeling and, as would be expected, for leading mechanical drills.”

(Hinton, 2002). Under both conditions, the L2 under study is most often non-dominant, and the L1 of the students is most often the dominant language of the social context. Under such circumstances, extensive use of L1 implicates the perpetuation of linguistic and cultural hegemony by the dominant culture.

Though the question of when to use L1 vs. L2 is impossible to address in a way that definitively speaks for all classroom contexts, research on teacher preferences for L1 vs. L2 has established some trends in terms of which areas of classroom discourse tend to favor L2 and which areas most often lead to the teacher's falling back on L1. In a previous administration of the survey used in this study (Warford, 2007), L1 was preferred for building empathy, disciplining/reprimanding, explaining classroom procedures, teaching culture, and offering feedback. L2 was used mainly for modeling and, as would be expected, for leading mechanical drills. There were

only two major departures from prior studies: grammar teaching was weighted more heavily in the direction of English and vocabulary teaching was demonstrably more weighted toward L2.

Methods

In order to fully understand just how much of the target language foreign language teachers prefer to use in the classroom and which categories of classroom discourse favor L1 vs. L2, I administered the Foreign Language Teacher Talk Survey (Warford and Rose, 2003; see Appendix A), which classifies 40 areas of foreign language teacher talk and asks respondents to rate preferences for L1 vs. L2 on a Likert scale, which ranges from “Almost exclusively in English” (a score of 1) to “Almost exclusively in the target language” (a score of 4). While scores between 1 and 2 suggest almost always or mainly preferring English, scores from 3 to 4 indicate a preference for L2 mainly to almost exclusively. Because teachers tend to exaggerate the extent to which they use L2 (Kalivoda, 1983; Mollica, 1985) scores at 2.5 to 3 suggest ambivalence about L1 or L2. A full description of the survey and its development can be found in Warford (2007). Respondents to the survey included those in attendance at a pre-conference workshop on the topic of teaching in the target language at the annual meeting of a state foreign language association. The total number of those who attended the workshop was between 40 and 45, and from that total, 27 questionnaires were collected. While most of the surveys were collected prior to the start of the workshop, several were submitted at its conclusion, so there is the intervening possibility of bias stemming from the content of the workshop, which centered on ways to maximize use of L2 in the classroom. There are two further sources of bias in the sample represented: (1) the bias represented by choosing to attend a state conference, which

suggests a significant predisposition toward professional development; and (2) the bias represented by the selection of a workshop on teaching in the target language. While bias #1 would suggest prior exposure to — or at least interest in — the pedagogical value of teaching in L2, bias #2 suggests these were subjects who felt strongly enough about their need to use more L2 in the classroom that they would devote three hours on a Friday afternoon to educate themselves on that topic.

Results

A total of 27 usable responses were obtained out of a population estimated at around 45 (62% response rate). Two questionnaires were discarded because they were either missing the core survey or the demographic information. The group was overwhelmingly female, with only two respondents checking “Male,” a tendency that has been noted to lesser degree among K-12 teachers in prior studies (see Allen, 2002; Stepp, 1997; Wolf & Riordan, 1991). The age range was fairly evenly spread from 20-25 through 60, with two notable clusters: one in the 36-40 range (n=5) and another in the 50-55 age range (n=6). Years of experience was equally distributed and ranged from 1 year or less (n=2) to 30 years (n=2). A vast majority (77.8%) reported a Master’s as the highest degree obtained, with several in this group reporting additional credits at the Master’s level beyond the degree. With regard to language specialization, there was an almost equal balance between those reporting teaching only Spanish (n=12) and those reporting teaching French (n=6), French and Spanish (n=7), and another language (n=1, not reported). It is highly likely that those indicating that they taught French and Spanish were formerly French teachers who added Spanish certification as a way of retaining their employment. Consequently, these respondents were grouped within the French cluster in conducting inferential statistical tests that will be reported later. Due to the lack of a definitive statement regarding the major language of specialization, these results should be interpreted with caution. The community context of these teachers was surprisingly rural (n=13), a factor which weighted evenly against urban (n=2) and suburban (n=11) respondents combined. This result may explain the surprisingly high number of teachers reporting teaching all levels of language (n=6) considering that low student enrollment in rural areas might necessitate the full spectrum of level assignments. The dispersion of level grouping clustered additionally around the intermediate and advanced levels (n=7) and the beginning level (n=7), which often, but not always, represents middle school level instruction. Other teaching loads included intermediate level only (n=3), beginning and intermediate (n=2), and beginning and advanced (1).

In spite of the small size of the sample, I used SPSS 12 for Windows to see if subgroupings of the respondents would yield significant differences with regard to their average scores across the teacher talk categories. ANOVA tests of a variety of groupings of the respondents — by experience, age, community context, level of instruction, second language taught — yielded no significant differences in the mean scores on the L1 to L2 scale. The average scores by group were remarkably close, with the exception of two urban teachers (2.34), whose scores were considerably lower. Because of the small group size (only 2 respondents), these low scores did not war-

rant close attention. However, it is worth noting that, in a previous study using the teacher talk survey, urban teachers scored significantly lower in comparison with other teacher categories in several discourse areas (Warford, 2007).

Table 2: Inductive coding of respondents’ open-ended commentary on approaches to L1/L2.

1. Influences (24): prior learning (9), no system (4), being a native speaker favors L2 (3), belief in importance of L2 (3), observing colleagues (2), experience abroad (2), professional development workshops (1).
2. Communication breakdown, student frustration, lack of understanding (20): teacher/student frustration (6), the ‘look’/‘blank stares’ (8), lower level student accommodation (3), when they <i>really</i> don’t understand (3)
3. When it’s important that they understand, say it in L1 (13): L1 explanations ensure comprehension (of complex complexes)
4. Time constraints (12): L1 is a time-saver
5. Teaching/Explaining grammar (11)
6. Depends on Level (8): Less at lower, more at more advanced.
7. Disciplining (4)
8. L1 for nuts and bolts (4): The ‘business part’: routines and explaining assignments.
9. L2 for what students already know (3)
10. L1 for Culture (2)
11. L1 for rapport building (2)
12. Miscellaneous (6): When objectives are focused on; Proficiency testing directions; Feedback on progress; Checking for comprehension; L2 for practice; L1 for explanation:

Respondents reported on preferences for L1 vs. L2 within 40 categories of language teacher discourse rated from 1 (“Almost exclusively in English”) to 4 (“Almost exclusively in L2”). Table 1 presents these results in order of ascending means. It is surprising that out of 40 categories of language teacher talk, the highest rating was 3.67/4, which is just barely tipped in the direction of “Almost exclusively in the target language.” The areas of classroom discourse that rated highest for L2 included, in order: Calling on students (3.44), Repetition drills (3.48), Attention signal (3.50), Courtesy markers (3.63), and Teacher feedback: praise (3.67). Interestingly, these four areas scored on the high end of the L2 spectrum in a previous study using this instrument (Warford, 2007). These results are not impressive, considering that they mainly represent stock phrases that provide very little value for interpreting and negotiating meaning in L2. Teaching vocabulary scored 3.41, which was slightly higher than the average score obtained from a prior administration (Warford, 2007), casting further doubt on a host of prior studies that suggested preference for L1 (Castellotti, 1997; Franklin, 1990; Lin, 1990; Macaro, 1997; Polio & Duff, 1994; Rolin-lanziti & Brownlie, 2002).

In looking at the scores between 2.5, which represents the midpoint between “Mainly in English” and “Mainly in the target language” and 3.5, which denotes the entry point into “Almost exclusively in the target language” there are roughly 31

Table 1: Average scores across categories of teacher discourse (ascending means).

FL Teacher Talk Category	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Grammar explanation	26	2.00	0.85
Incidental cultural notes	24	2.25	0.85
Disciplining / Reprimanding	25	2.32	0.90
Culture explanation	26	2.35	0.85
Quick translation check/answer to student question	26	2.50	0.86
Reminder of rules	27	2.52	0.80
Overview	26	2.62	0.94
Facilitating class discussions	24	2.63	0.97
General announcements	26	2.65	0.89
Individual feedback on performance, progress	27	2.67	0.78
Closure	25	2.68	0.95
Whole class feedback on performance, progress	26	2.73	0.83
Transitions	24	2.75	0.90
Spontaneous conversation with students beyond simple Q&A exchange	24	2.75	0.90
Check for comprehension	26	2.77	0.91
Encouraging on-task behavior	27	2.78	0.93
Giving homework assignments	26	2.81	0.80
Teacher feedback- explicit correction	24	2.83	0.82
Anticipatory set	27	2.89	0.89
Teacher feedback, reinforcement, paraphrasing	24	2.92	0.78
Class routines	27	2.96	0.85
Extension scenarios	24	3.04	0.81
Warm-ups	27	3.07	0.87
Preparation check	23	3.09	0.90
Book exercises	26	3.12	0.77
Calling roll	24	3.13	1.12
Teacher feedback — IRF/Elicit more student talk	24	3.13	0.74
Teacher feedback — prompted correction	26	3.15	0.73
Time check	25	3.20	0.87
Modeling	26	3.23	0.91
Guided practice	27	3.26	0.76

Continued on next page

Table 1: Average scores across categories of teacher discourse (ascending means). *Continued*

FL Teacher Talk Category	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Giving directions, p. #s, etc.	27	3.30	0.67
Q & A personalization	25	3.32	0.75
Praise / Reinforcement	27	3.37	0.69
Introducing, practicing vocabulary	27	3.41	0.64
Calling on students	27	3.44	0.64
Repetition drills	27	3.48	0.58
Attention signal	26	3.50	0.65
Courtesy markers (i.e., merci)	27	3.63	0.56
Teacher feedback- praise	27	3.67	0.48

areas of classroom discourse, suggesting a high degree of ambivalence about L1 vs. L2 within this group. Ellis (1990), Hall (1995), and Hinton (2002) have underscored the importance of extended, everyday classroom interactions as an important tool for developing proficiency. In this mid-range between L1 and L2, there is a surprisingly high concentration of areas that are associated with opportunities for extended interpretation and negotiation of meaning: Overview (2.62), Facilitating class discussions (2.63), General announcements (2.65), Individual and whole-class feedback on performance, progress (2.67 and 2.73 respectively), Closure (2.68), Transitions (2.75), and Spontaneous conversation (2.75) each represent areas of classroom discourse rich in opportunities to nurture both linguistic and sociolinguistic competence. Anticipatory sets (2.89), Extension scenarios (3.04), Modeling (3.23), Guided practice (3.26), Giving directions (3.30), and Q&A personalization show movement toward L2, but given the halo effect associated with exaggerating one’s use of L2, these scores are not as high as they could be.

Within the categories of teacher talk that leaned toward L1, it is worth noting that not a single category leaned in the direction of “Almost exclusively in English.” Disciplining, as well as grammar and culture teaching, represent significant challenges to foreign language teachers in terms of their teachability in L2. The preponderance of evidence for language teachers’ preference for L1 in disciplining students (Franklin, 1990; Macaro, 1997, 2001; Mitchell, 1988; Turnbull, 2001; Turnbull & Lamoureux, 2001; Warford, 2007) finds further confirmation in this study. Grammar teaching rated the lowest on the scale of L1 vs. L2 (2.00), which lends support to a variety of studies pointing toward a preference for L1 in grammar teaching (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 1994; Antón, 1999; Franklin, 1990; Macaro, 2001; Mitchell, 1988; Lin, 1990; Turnbull, 2001; Warford, 2007). With regard to culture teaching, in spite of Bragger and Rice’s (1999) and Henning’s (1993) call for gradually integrating target cultural content materials from the first days of language teaching, culture clearly continues to be a topic that teachers prefer to take on in English (Culture explanation: 2.35; Incidental

culture notes: 2.25). Duff and Polio (1990), Rolin-lanziti and Brownlie (2002) uncovered this tendency at the post-secondary level, while Lin (1990) noted the preference for English in teaching culture at the secondary level. Warford (2007) found evidence for this tendency across all levels.

At the end of the survey, respondents were asked to comment on their approach to selecting between L1 and L2 in classroom discourse. Table 2 reports on the results of coding and tallying these responses. In addition to underscoring particular discourse categories that respondents felt warranted L1 (disciplining, procedures, teaching culture and grammar, rapport-building, feedback, checking for comprehension), the open-ended commentary also suggests that L1 functions as a kind of life-preserver, bailing them out of a variety of potential pitfalls such as losing students (particularly lower-level students), losing time, or avoiding misunderstandings on key matters. Overall, the open-ended comments buttress attitudes expressed in an earlier administration of the survey (Warford, 2007), particularly with regard to concerns about using too much L2 with lower level/ability students and the emphasis on L1 for clarification purposes or in response to potential communication breakdown and time constraints.

Conclusions and suggestions for further research

The K-12 teachers who responded to the Foreign Language Teacher Talk Survey (Rose and Warford, 2003), representing a diversity of level, language, social, and experiential backgrounds, speak to an overall preference for teaching “Mainly” in L2; however, as we move in the direction of “Almost exclusively in the target language,” opportunities for meaningful, extended communication in L2 are reserved for mainly stock phrases. In contrast, areas of classroom communication that lend themselves to sustained conversation lean toward equal teacher use of L1 and L2 to “Mainly in English.” Considering that language teachers tend to exaggerate the extent to which they teach in the target language and weighing the findings presented in this study with the supporting evidence from prior research, the overall picture suggests a formidable discrepancy between professional ideals and actual teacher beliefs where code-switching is concerned. Teaching culture and grammar, disciplining, and the ‘nuts and bolts’ of running a class are areas teachers appear to approach in L1, a decision that may be rooted in issues of practicality and time-efficiency.

In response to the aforementioned trends, we are presented with two choices: (a) accept that there will always be a measure of L1 in even the most proficiency-oriented classrooms or (b) challenge teacher training programs to focus more attention on specific skills and strategies that enhance teaching in the target language in spite of the kinds of constraints this study has brought to light. It is surprising that, in none of the three major studies of the FL methods course published in the past twenty years (Warford, 2003; Schrier, 1989; Grosse, 1993) has teaching in L2 emerged as a syllabus topic. Methods instructors and supervisors may profit from the classroom observation-reflection tool my col-

“...culture clearly continues to be a topic that teachers prefer to take on in English.”

“...the overall picture suggests a formidable discrepancy between professional ideals and actual teacher beliefs...”

league, M. Rose, and I developed. Appendix A contains The Foreign Language Teacher Talk Inventory (2003, 2006), which offers a tool for analyzing the same discourse categories contained in the survey in terms of how often they are executed in L1 vs. L2. Because teachers tend to exaggerate the extent to which they teach in L2, critical reflection that compares what teachers believe they do with what they actually do may provide a profound reality check to focus professional development in the direction of teaching more in the target language.

Future administrations of the survey to larger samples of language teachers will point the way to where we stand as a profession and aid in determining whether or not there is quantifiable evidence of a concern regarding the extent to which teachers are committed to using L2 in the classroom. At this exploratory stage, the findings point to instrument testing that needs to be addressed in advance of a more conclusive, nation-wide sampling study of K-Postsecondary teachers. Combining the current results with those obtained from prior administrations of the survey will provide the opportunity to generate reliability coefficients (Cronbach's Alpha), which in turn, will assist in future investigations by revealing which items in the survey are most germane to the measure of teachers' beliefs about L1 vs. L2. Based on the minimal variation noted in the first two administrations of The FL Teacher Talk Survey, the scale has been recalibrated on a scale from 0-10 (“0” representing *Never in L2* to “10” meaning *Always in L2*) in order to allow for more subtlety in measuring teachers' prefer for L1 vs. L2. Also, categories have been re-organized in light of recent reliability tests of the instrument. The reader will find the latest version of the instrument in Appendix A.

References

- Adair-Hauck, B., & Donato, R. (1994). FL explanations within the zone of proximal development. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50, 532-557.
- Allen, L. Q. (2002). Teachers' pedagogical beliefs and the standards for FL learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, 518-529.
- Antón, M. (1999). The discourse of a learner-centered classroom: Sociocultural perspectives on teacher-learner interaction in the second-language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, 303-318.
- Antón, M., & DiCamilla, F. (1999). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, 314-342.
- Auerbach, E. (1993). Putting the P back into participatory. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 543-545.
- Bragger, J. D., & Rice, D. (1999). The message is the medium: A new paradigm for content-oriented instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 32, 373-391.
- Calman, R., & Daniel, I. (1998). A board's eye view of core French: The North York Board of Education. In S. Lapkin (Ed.), *French second language education in Canada: Empirical studies* (pp. 283-325). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Castellotti, V. (1997). Langue étrangère et français en milieu scolaire: Didactiser l'alternance. *Études de Linguistique Appliquée*, 108, 401-410.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 402-423.
- Duff, P., & Polio, C. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *Modern Language Journal*, 74, 154-166.
- Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language instruction: Learning in the classroom*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Franklin, C. E. M. (1990). Teaching in the TL. *Language Learning Journal*, 2, 20-24.
- Grosse, C. U. (1993). The foreign language methods course. *Modern Language Journal*, 77, 303-312.
- Hall, J. K. (1995). Aw, man where you goin'? *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 37-62.
- Henning, S. D. (1993). The integration of language, literature, and culture: Goals and curricular design. *ADFL Bulletin*, 24(2), 51-55.
- Hinton, L. (2002). *How to keep your language alive*. Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books.
- INTASC FL Standards Committee (2002). *Model standards for licensing beginning FL teachers*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Kalivoda, T.V. (1983). The priority of conducting foreign language classes in the target language. *Hispania*, 66, 573-81.
- Lin, A. M.Y. (1990). *Teaching in two tongues: Language alternation in FL classrooms*. Research Report No. 3. Hong Kong City Polytechnic. Dept. of English.
- Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' code switching in FL classrooms: Theories and decision-making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 531-548.
- McShane, K. (1997). Do as I say and do. *Babel: Australia*, 32, 4-9.
- Mitchell, R. (1988). *Communicative language teaching in practice*. London: CILTR.
- Mollica, A. (1985). Student exchanges: Getting to know one another. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 41, 697-722.
- NCATE Foreign Language Teacher Standards Writing Team. (2002). *Program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers*. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL.
- Polio, C., & Duff, P. (1994). Teachers' language use in university FL classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 313-326.
- Pufahl, I., Rhodes, N., & Christian, D. (2001). *What we can learn from foreign language teaching in other countries*. ERIC Digest. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 456 671).
- Rolin-lanziti, J., & Brownlie, S. (2002). Teacher use of the learners' L1 in the FL classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58, 402-426.
- Rose, M., & Warford, M. K. (2003). The Foreign Language Teacher Talk Inventory. Unpublished manuscript, Iowa State University.
- _____. (2007). The Foreign Language Teacher Talk Inventory (Rev. Ed.). Unpublished manuscript, Buffalo State College.
- Schrier, L. (1989). A survey of foreign language teacher preparation patterns and procedures in small, private colleges and universities in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus
- Schweers, C., Jr. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *Forum*, 37(2), 6-14.

- Shapson, S., Kaufman, D., & Durward, L. (1978). *B.C. French study: An evaluation of elementary French programs in British Columbia*. Burnaby: Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University.
- Stepp, J. E. (1997). A demographic profile of U.S. middle school foreign language. *Education*, 118(2), 221-225.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). *L1 and L2 use in French second language teaching: Pre-service students' views and classroom practice*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Association of Applied Linguistics, St. Louis, MO.
- Turnbull, M., & Arnett. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and FL classrooms. *ARAL*, 22, 204-218.
- Turnbull, M., & Lamoureux, S. (2001, May). *L1 and L2 use in core French: A focus on pre-service students' views and classroom practice*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics, Québec.
- Warford, M. K. (2007). *The Foreign Language Teacher Talk Survey/Inventory: A tool for discourse analysis and reflective inquiry in the foreign language classroom*. Unpublished manuscript, Buffalo State College.
- Warford, M. K., & Rose, M. (2003). *The Foreign Language Teacher Talk Survey*. Unpublished manuscript, Iowa State University.
- _____. (2007). *The Foreign Language Teacher Talk Survey (Rev. Ed.)*. Unpublished manuscript, Buffalo State College.
- Wells, G. (1999). Using L1 to master L2: A response to Anton and DiCamilla's socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, 248-54.
- Wing, B. H. (1980). *The languages of the foreign language classroom: A study of teacher use of the native and L2s for linguistic and communicative functions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Wolf, W. C., Jr.; & Riordan, K. M. (1991). Foreign language teachers' demographic characteristics, in-service training needs, and attitudes toward teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 471-78.
- Wong, W. (2005). *Input enhancement: From theory and research to the classroom*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wong-Fillmore, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? In S. M. Gass, & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 17-50). Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Appendix I

The Revised Foreign Language Teacher Talk Survey/Inventory (Warford and Rose, 2007 [based on Warford and Rose, 2003])

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHER TALK SURVEY (Warford and Rose, 2003, 2007): This survey assesses your overall approach to using English (L1) vs. the target language (L2) in teaching. It should take about 10 minutes to complete.

Category of foreign language teacher talk	0% of time in L2 (always in L1)	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100% of time in L2 (never in L1)
Procedural:											
1. Calling roll											
2. General announcements											
3. Attention signal ("Listen up!" / 3 2 1 countdown)											
4. Preparation check ("Everyone ready?")											
5. Giving directions, p. numbers, etc.											
6. Specialized class routines											
7. Time check ("You have three more minutes.")											
8. Giving homework assignment											
9. Calling on students											
10. Courtesy marker (i.e. gracias)											
Instructional:											
11. Warm-ups (i.e. date, weather, time, review questions)											
12. Anticipatory set (generating prior knowledge of lesson topic)											
13. Overview of lesson (agenda for lesson, goals for the day)											
14. Transitions ("Now that we've read the story, let's go to p....")											

Continued on next page

Category of foreign language teacher talk	0% of time in L2 (always in L1)	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100% of time in L2 (never in L1)
15. Introducing vocabulary											
16. Reviewing vocabulary											
17. Modeling (miming/acting out use of a grammar feature, vocabulary)											
18. Extension scenarios/ Providing examples											
19. Grammar Explanation											
20. Culture explanation											
21. Book exercises/ worksheets/											
22. Choral repetition											
23. Form-focused oral practice (substitution drills, Q&A)											
24. Interpretive activities (listening, reading, viewing)											
25. Check for student comprehension ("Any questions?")											
26. Closure: ("What did you learn today?")											
Feedback:											
27. Praise (IRE: Input, Response, Evaluation)											
28. Praising and repeating correct answer (IRE)											
29. Explicit correction (IRE: "It's not ... it's ...")											
30. Prompting student self-correction (IRE: i.e., "you bringed it...?")											
31. Eliciting more student talk (IRF: "You like to ski? Where?")											
32. Answer to student question											

Continued on next page

Category of foreign language teacher talk	0% of time in L2 (always in L1)	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100% of time in L2 (never in L1)
33. Individual feedback on performance, progress											
34. Paired/Small group feedback on performance, progress											
35. Whole class feedback on performance, progress											
Secondary acquisition											
36. Facilitating class discussions											
37. Incidental anecdote											
38. Incidental cultural note(s).											
Rapport-building											
39. Spontaneous conversation (beyond form-focused practice)											
40. Expressing sympathy/concern											
41. Expressing humor											
Management / Discipline											
42. Disciplining / Reprimanding											
43. Encouraging on-task behavior											
44. Reminder of rules											

45. Below, please provide any information that might clarify your approach to using the first vs. the second language with your students.

Continued on next page

46. Is there a category this survey has overlooked? If so, please indicate below:

Elaboration on Particular Teacher Talk Categories

Instructional:

Secondary acquisition opportunities:

Conversation that does not relate to the lesson but that spontaneously occurs between teacher and student(s). These episodes have the potential to provide students with additional opportunities to acquire L2 expressions, forms.

Teacher feedback:

IRE / IRF: The distinction between types of teacher feedback: IRE (Initiates, responds, evaluates) feedback is a quick evaluative type of feedback that tends to stop a conversation. IRF (Initiates, responds, feeds back) is a statement or a question that assists the student in coming up with more to say so that the conversation keeps going.

#30. Prompting student for correction: Teacher leads student to correct answer by pausing at a certain point in the sentence or by raising voice intonation around error.

#31. Teacher feedback / to elicit more student talk: *IRF / teacher asks a follow-up question or makes a comment that provides increased opportunity to hear the language and that encourages student to continue.

IRE:

T: Paul, ¿cuántos años tiene Juan?
[Paul, how old is Juan?]

S: Juan tiene 5 años.
[Juan is 5 years old.]

T: Sí, Juan tiene 5 años. Bueno.
[Yes, Juan is 5 years old. Good.]

IRF:

T: Lucía, ¿juegas al fútbol?
[Lucia, do you play soccer?]

S: Sí.
[Yes.]

T: ¿Dónde?
[Where?]

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHER TALK INVENTORY (Warford and Rose, 2003, Revised, 2007)

This form may be used in conjunction with a scripted/videotaped lesson. It is designed to complement the teacher talk survey as a tool for reflection on use of L1 vs. L2; it is not designed for supervision purposes. (see Teacher Talk categories for reference).

Name of teacher _____ Date _____

School _____ Language and level _____

Category of foreign language teacher talk	Check here each time observed in L1	Check here each time observed in L2	Comments (May include specific wording, if L1 is combined with L2, etc.)
Procedural:			
1. Calling roll			
2. General announcements			
3. Attention signal ("Listen up!" / 3 2 1 countdown)			
4. Preparation check ("Everyone ready?")			
5. Giving directions, p. numbers, etc.			
6. Specialized class routines			
7. Time check ("You have three more minutes.")			
8. Giving homework assignment			
9. Calling on students			
10. Courtesy marker (i.e. gracias)			
Instructional:			
11. Warm-ups (i.e. date, weather, time, review questions)			
12. Anticipatory set (generating prior knowledge of lesson topic)			
13. Overview of lesson (agenda for lesson, goals for the day)			
14. Transitions ("Now that we've read the story, I have a worksheet...")			
15. Introducing vocabulary			
16. Reviewing vocabulary			
17. Modeling (miming/acting out use of a grammar feature, vocabulary)			
18. Extension scenarios/Providing examples			

Continued on next page

Category of foreign language teacher talk	Check here each time observed in L1	Check here each time observed in L2	Comments (May include specific wording, if L1 is combined with L2, etc.)
19. Grammar Explanation			
20. Culture explanation			
21. Book exercises/worksheets/			
22. Choral repetition			
23. Form-focused oral practice (substitution drills, Q&A)			
24. Interpretive activities (listening, reading, viewing)			
25. Check for student comprehension ("Any questions?")			
26. Closure: ("What did you learn today?")			
Feedback			
27. Praise (IRE: Input, Response, Evaluation)			
28. Praising and repeating correct answer (IRE)			
29. Explicit correction (IRE: "It's not . . . it's . . .")			
30. Prompting student self-correction (IRE: i.e. "you bringed it...?")			
31. Eliciting more student talk (IRF: "You like to ski? Where?")			
32. Answer to student question			
33. Individual feedback on performance, progress			
34. Paired/Small group feedback on performance, progress			
35. Whole class feedback on performance, progress			
Secondary acquisition			
36. Facilitating class discussions			
37. Incidental anecdote			
38. Incidental cultural note(s).			

Continued on next page

Category of foreign language teacher talk	Check here each time observed in L1	Check here each time observed in L2	Comments (May include specific wording, if L1 is combined with L2, etc.)
Rapport-building			
39. Spontaneous conversation (beyond simple Q&A personalization)			
40. Expressing sympathy/concern			
41. Expressing humor			
Management / Discipline			
42. Disciplining / Reprimanding			
43. Encouraging on-task behavior			
44. Reminder of rules			