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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

“But you don’t speak Somali, how can you teach your students English?” This question has been posed to me many times during my eight years working as an English as a second language (ESL) teacher to high school and adult students in an urban school setting. During my tenure, my students have been primarily from East Africa, the majority being native Somali speakers. My beginning level English learners (ELs) have entered my classroom with little to no formal education, without being literate in their native language, and without much if any knowledge of English. After describing the population of students with whom I work, it is no wonder that I get the above question asked of me. How do I teach these students English when I do not know their first language (L1)?

Per my teacher training, I use many different methods to help my students understand a new word or concept without using students’ L1s: drawings on the board, acting things out, showing images and videos, providing additional examples or explanations, and presenting physical examples for students to see and touch. Although I know these techniques have been used successfully by many ESL teachers to produce students capable of communicating in and comprehending the English language, I cannot help but wonder if our students would benefit from having a teacher with some

---

1 L1 in this capstone refers to the language other than English most commonly spoken or used by a student which may or may not be the first language the student learned.
understanding of their L1 or some knowledge of how to effectively use their L1 as a teaching tool.

Chapter Overview

The first chapter introduces my interest in and reasons for pursuing the topic of this capstone, the use of students’ L1s in the ESL classroom. A description of the researcher’s background is presented followed by a brief explanation of what English-only means and the controversy surrounding the use of students’ L1 within the classroom. The chapter concludes with the purpose for this comprehensive literature review and an overview of the subsequent capstone chapters.

Background of the Researcher

The first time I was presented with a student who was not able to communicate in or understand English, I was like a deer in headlights, frozen in place, not sure of where to begin or how to start. Working with this type of student had been covered in my ESL methodology course, but actually being presented with the situation was another matter entirely. My background in learning another language was not as helpful as I had expected.

Throughout my Spanish courses in high-school and college, my teachers were often native speakers of my L1, English, and were able to make comparisons, offer direct translations, and provide in-depth explanations of difficult Spanish words, concepts and grammar rules in my native language. I was already literate in my L1, so reading translations of Spanish into English and vice versa or using a dictionary to understand unknown words were obvious natural alternatives for me. These methods would not be helpful to my level zero student, who was not literate in her first language and to whom I
could not offer any explanations in her L1 as I did not speak or understand it. How I learned a second language (L2) was in great part due to making connections to and using background information from my L1. Clearly, I would not be able to teach my own students an L2 in the same way.

Through pictures, acting, and some creativity, I was able to teach this student and many who would follow, English. However, at the back of my mind was the thought of how I could use or allow students to use their L1s to enhance understanding. My background learning another language corroborated this idea: utilizing the L1 as a teaching tool may be beneficial in the teaching of an L2.

The various techniques I use in the classroom enable my students to understand what I want them to learn in most cases, but attaining that level of understanding takes time. Things could be easier or more direct in some circumstances if someone were able to translate or explain in students’ L1s, whether this be the teacher, bilingual aide, or other students. The majority of my students are new to the United States and many have never attended school. This unfamiliarity with the country and school system causes many students to be hesitant and shy at the onset of classes. As their teacher, I must establish a relationship of trust and an environment in which each student feels comfortable, as learning a new language requires students to take certain risks and be willing to make mistakes. In order to create this positive atmosphere, I must be able to communicate with the students. A smile goes a long way but a greeting in the student’s L1 could go even further. Are ESL teachers missing out on an untapped resource by reinforcing the idea of English-only, or are we helping students become better English learners by focusing on using only the L2? I believe there is a place for students’ L1
while learning ESL; it is this belief that has motivated me to conduct a systematic literature review to find how students’ L1s can be used in the ESL classroom.

**Introduction to English Only**

The term “English-only” can refer to a movement promoting the declaration of English as the official language of the United States and an educational practice using English as the only medium of communication and instruction within the classroom. There are some ESL learning environments which implement English-only policies in spite of the apparent value of utilizing L1. The language ideology behind English-only practices is discussed in the literature review found in Chapter 2.

U.S. English and English First are the leading groups behind the English-only movement supporting national official English legislation. Daniels (1990) describes U.S. English as in opposition to bilingual education and educational practices that lessen the importance of English and give unfair advantage to immigrants. According to the About section found on its website, English First members believe in the unifying quality of everyone speaking English. Furthermore, English First opposes the use of public funds by the government “to divide Americans on the basis of language or ancestry” (English First, 2011, About section).

In the classroom, adherence to English-only policies would mean all classroom communication, instruction, and learning must be in the English language. The intent behind this language policy is to provide students with high amounts of input in English and many chances to practice it. Proponents of this approach believe maximum English input without interference of L1 will allow students to more quickly and proficiently learn English. Is such submersion in the L2 the best practice for ESL teachers? Should
English only be strictly enforced during the entire class period or only specific parts? These concerns and differences in approach made me question what really was best for students learning English.

When beginning my acquisition of materials for this capstone, I found two specific articles which fueled my interest for more research into this topic. These articles exemplify the strong feelings some educators may possess on both sides of this language issue: using students’ L1s in their ESL classrooms or enforcing English-only. The first article, Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom (Auerbach, 1993), addressed many of my concerns and ideas related to L1 use in the classroom. Auerbach noted that while most ESL educators advocate and support language rights and oppose the English-only movement, in practice many were enforcing the idea that only English could be used in their ESL classrooms.

This article, while published more than twenty years ago, described some of the teaching practices I have noticed in ESL classrooms and occasionally in my own. If ESL teachers feel that they value and support the students’ L1, are we, as ESL teachers, promoting this idea within our classrooms or stifling it?

The second article was a response to the first, Comments on Elsa Roberts Auerbach’s ‘Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom’ (Polio, 1994). This article brought to light the controversy among ESL professionals with this topic. When commenting upon Auerbach’s article, Polio stated that while there may be some situations in which encouraging students to use their L1s could be beneficial, many contexts are not appropriate for the use of students’ L1s. Polio further argued that Auerbach overgeneralizes her stance of not using English only and needs to specify when
use of English or use of L1 would be best in order for her claims to be substantiated. This systematic literature review seeks to discover in which contexts a student’s L1 should be used within the classroom.

Research Purpose

While both of the articles mentioned above cited relevant theory and research to support their arguments, prior to conducting this systematic literature review my thoughts and opinions were based solely on my instincts and personal experience in the classroom. One of the intents of this capstone is to gather the research done pertaining to L1 use in the ESL classroom to generate a more analytical evaluation of teaching practices using L1, based on theory and research.

Another of this capstone’s intentions is to compile information on how students’ L1s can be used in the classroom. In recent years there has been much research conducted on the benefits of bilingual education for ELs. In this type of educational setting, students’ common L1 is used in instruction enabling students to develop literacy in their native language. Bilingual education for ELs differs from traditional bilingual education as the focus is on building content knowledge and literacy in the L1 to support the acquisition of English. Studies regarding the effectiveness of bilingual education in the United States have primarily been conducted in schools teaching Spanish and English. Ramírez, Yuen, and Ramey (1991) and a number of publications from Thomas and Collier (1997, 2004) found a correlation between the amount of time ESL students spent receiving bilingual instruction to an increase in test scores and the quality of performance in school. Students who acquired reading skills in a language that they already knew allowed them to develop better skills in the L2, English, in the long term.
(Ramirez et al., 1991). The results of these studies exemplify how L1 use in the classroom can contribute to greater student success in learning English.

The challenge lies in using students’ L1s in a classroom with a population of ELs who do not share a common language background. Personally, I have had up to five different L1s represented among the students in my classroom; some ESL teachers may have even more linguistically diverse student populations. Can students’ L1s be used to enhance their acquisition of English? If so, how can this be done most effectively? In reviewing many different sources for this systematic literature review, it is hoped that some light will be shed on how students’ L1s can be used specifically in the multilingual environment of the ESL classroom.

Systematic Literature Review

In order to determine the place of L1 within the ESL classroom, I have decided to take the approach of doing a systematic literature review. Using research for the specific purpose of answering a question is how a systematic literature review differs from the standard literature review conducted in Chapter Two of this capstone and capstones containing other kinds of research. The literature review found in Chapter Two of this paper seeks to lay the context for the research that will take place using the systematic literature review. Further details on how this systematic literature review was conducted are explained in Chapter Three.

Capstone Overview

Chapter One explained the motivations for researching this topic and the reasons why further examination of L1 use in the ESL classroom is necessary. Chapter Two defines language ideology, chronicles the history of language ideology in the United
States through a summary of historical events, and presents information regarding monolingual education within ESL instructional contexts. The literature review of Chapter Two concludes with a presentation of theory for and against the use of L1 in learning an L2. Chapter Three outlines the procedure for collecting data for the systematic literature review, search parameters, and justification for document inclusion. The results of the literature review are presented and outlined in Chapter Four and synthesized in Chapter Five. The final chapter includes an analysis of the implications of the findings. The desired outcome of this literature review is for educators and institutions serving ELs to evaluate their current stance on L1 use in the classroom and to entice further research within this topic.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to proceed with the purpose of this capstone, some background information regarding the belief that only English should be used in an ESL classroom must first be discussed. Through the examination of possible motivations or reasons for using or not using L1 in the ESL classroom, the basis for decisions concerning incorporation of L1 into the classroom setting is established. The literature review in this chapter lays the foundation for the in-depth review found in Chapter Four which specifically addresses this capstone’s guiding questions: How are students’ L1s used in the ESL classroom? What benefits are associated with their use?

In the article Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom, Auerbach (1993) argues that using English exclusively in the teaching of ELs has been in many cases simply accepted as the norm whose origins may not be pedagogically founded. According to Auerbach, these origins are based instead upon a politically motivated language ideology that “rests on unexamined assumptions, and serves to reinforce inequities in the broader social order” (p. 9) than on an established methodology supported by research.

Understanding language ideologies that may lie behind the choices of inclusion or exclusion of students’ L1s in the ESL classroom could allow educators to look at their own practices with a more informed and critical eye. This chapter seeks to provide more information on these language ideologies through a definition and description of
language ideology, a discussion of language ideologies throughout the United States’
history as they pertain to the treatment of language minorities, and a presentation of
methodology and ideology that has contributed to the idea of monolingual instruction in
ESL.

Language Ideology

To better understand the complex history of language ideology in the United
States, language ideology must first be defined. Language ideology, according to
Silverstein (1998), embodies the linguistic choices a speaker makes in communicative
interactions based on explicit or implicit beliefs about language use. These beliefs about
language use are formed from the speaker’s prejudice and judgment concerning what is
viewed as appropriate, from social and group contexts and interactions, and from
determinations about the conventional expectations imposed by society (McGroarty,
2010). To put it simply, people exhibit their beliefs and world views as they use
language (Razfar, 2012).

Because language ideologies unconsciously shape how individuals and groups use
language, it is necessary to understand what shapes the ideology rather than considering a
language ideology as natural and neutral. This idea is noted by McGroarty (2010)
“Language ideologies frame and influence most aspects of language use, but their
influence is not always directly observable” (p.3). Fairclough (1989) cautions against the
simple acceptance of practices which have become commonsense as they often have
roots within the dominant class and serve to perpetuate unequal relations of power. He
argues that coercion or consent, acquiring permission consciously or unconsciously, are
two ways in which the powerful exert control. Consent may be obtained unconsciously
through language ideologies as they are shaped many times without the speaker being aware. Therefore, the promotion of certain language ideologies may aid in the inequitable division of power as they influence choices regarding language use.

One example of language ideology contributing to power of one group over another is the idea of Standard English. Both Lippi-Green (1997) and Tollefson (2012) state that the social construct of a standard language is not based upon a neutral ideal which can be accessed equally by all; instead, the standard language supported by the dominant language ideology is based upon the spoken language of the upper middle class. Even though the United States has no official standard language, the accepted use of one variety still inevitably marginalizes those who do not or choose not to speak it (Kroskrity, 2004).

Taking an analytical approach to the language ideology that supports Standard English is of importance to educators who wish to equalize the situation of those who do not speak the standard to those who do (McGroarty, 2010). One way in which teachers may perpetuate this division of speakers and non-speakers of Standard English is through school reward systems where students who speak the standard receive good grades while students who speak a non-standard variety are penalized (Tollefson, 2007). Another are the assumptions that speakers of English with non-standard accents are less than or uneducated compared to speakers of non-accented Standard English (Lippi-Green, 1997).

Another language ideology of interest to educators, especially those working with ELs, is the idea of the English language’s superiority over other languages (Phillipson, 1988). This ideology has perpetuated the linguistic imperialism which English-speaking countries have had over minority-language populations. He argues that if comparisons
between English and other languages are seen as an impossibility because of focus upon English’s superiority rather than similarity to other languages, this would support why some view a bilingual approach as “unthinkable and that the language should be taught monolingually” (Phillipson 1988, p.193).

Tollefson (2007) cites the need for an examination of the hidden language ideologies behind the pedagogical reasoning for certain educational policies and procedures. Such an in-depth examination may provide insights into how alternative instructional policies in English language teaching (ELT) that would better serve minority language groups may threaten the dominant language groups; however maintaining a particular instructional medium may facilitate the continuation of privilege experienced by the dominant majority at the expense of the minority (Tollefson, 2007).

History of Language Ideology in the United States

In order to examine the hidden language ideologies in the United States contributing to the divide of power between the language majority over language minorities as referenced by Tollefson (2007), one must look at the historical context of language ideologies in this country. A brief outline is provided which does not give a comprehensive look at all situations related to education and language throughout the United States’ history but rather seeks to highlight specific events which may have shaped the country’s language ideology and its effects on educational policies. Understanding the history of language ideology as well as the current language policy in the United States is essential to make sense of the argument in Auerbach (1993) that a political language ideology underlies why a teacher would choose to go along with the prevailing practice of using English only within his or her ESL classroom. That the
United States does not have an official language may contribute to the confusion over the place and value of minority languages within this country. While it is clear English is the language of education, business, and government in this country, it is not written in the Constitution or any federal government legislation that English is the official language of the United States. Whether English should be adopted officially and exactly what place other languages have within this country are issues that have been debated throughout U.S. history. Legislation making English the official language of the nation may only impact the language of government; however, opponents of the English Only movement suggest that such a law would deny speakers of minority languages educational opportunities and the ability to advance in socio-economic status (Daniels, 1990; Davis, 1990; Pac, 2012).

Without an official language policy established by the government, the language ideology in the United States has been subject to and shaped by the changing economic, political, and social situations in the country (Crawford, 1992; Ovando, 2003; Wiley, 2000, 2002). As these situations have changed so has the United States’ language ideology which in turn affects ESL education, foreign language education, and the general treatment and value placed on minority languages within this country. To show how language ideology has changed in the corresponding historical context and illustrate its impact on attitudes about students’ L1 and ESL teaching, I will describe the permissive, restrictive, opportunistic, and dismissive periods of U.S. language ideology first identified by Baker and Jones (1998) and used by Ovando (2003).

While looking at the history, two theories will be present in explaining why particular language ideologies were adopted. Davis (1990) argues that how immigrants
are received during a particular time period is based upon two factors: the status of the economy and self-image felt by the nation. Fairclough’s (1988) theory relates to language, power, and inequality. He states that policies concerning language use are a way in which unconscious consent among subordinate groups can be obtained and the dominant group can exert its power. Using the theories of Davis (1990) and Fairclough (1989), the underlying reasons for language ideology can be examined.

The Permissive Period: 1700s-1880s

While this time period covers a wide expanse of years, the prevailing attitudes toward minority languages during this time were ones of acceptance and tolerance (Baker & Jones, 1998; Ovando, 2003). Looking through the lens of Davis’s theory one can see reasons for the more tolerant environment which the immigrants, who came primarily from Northern and Western Europe, entered into during this period. There were ample opportunities and space available as people began to populate the land that would become the United States. These immigrants worked to build a new life in this country, primarily settling in communities of same linguistic and cultural backgrounds; they believed they could preserve their heritage and still be participating members of their new country (Ovando, 2003).

Accepting views of the diversity of languages present during the Permissive Period can be seen through the number of languages represented in the school system. At the latter part of the 19th century, Czech, Danish, Dutch, French, German, Italian, Norwegian, Polish, Spanish, and Swedish could be found used and spoken in schools in over 17 different states and territories including Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Ohio,
Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin and various states and territories in the southwest (Kloss, 1977). Wisconsin alone had instruction available in five languages other than English (Kloss, 1977). During the early 19th century, literacy for the Cherokee was promoted as writing systems were created and used alongside English (Weinberg, 1977). While offering educational opportunities in languages other than English, the school systems were not actually set up to produce bilingual students but rather encouraged linguistic assimilation without it being forced (Ovando, 2003).

The exceptions to these cases of language impartiality were the languages of African slaves. Within this population, the speaking of their L1 was prohibited and English only was strictly enforced, including separation of people of shared L1 (Weinberg, 1977; Wiley & Lee, 2009). Eventually, literacy in the English language was forbidden through laws preventing African Americans from learning to read and write (Weinberg, 1977). This example of language policy with the African American slave population clearly exhibits Fairclough’s (1988) theory as language was used to exert control over a group by the enforcement of institutional policies concerning language use.

This time period exemplifies a language ideology of general tolerance of languages other than English except the case of African Americans where language policies were put into place to reinforce power and control wielded over the group. The number of languages spoken and used in schools offers a contrast to the Restrictive Period that follows.

The Restrictive Period: 1880s-1960s

The Restrictive Period began during a period of the greatest number of immigrants entering the United States in its history as a percentage of the whole
This new inpouring of immigrants, primarily from southern and eastern Europe, many of whom were Catholic or Jewish, was viewed as a threat to the established way of life among the former immigrants who had come primarily from northern Europe and were Protestants (Daniels, 1990; Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990; Wiley & Lee, 2009). The threatened way of life and diminished self-image of the community at that time in the United States could explain the more negative attitudes these immigrants received according to Davis’s (1990) theory of economics and status influencing the reception of immigrants into the U.S.

As a way to fight the feeling of loss of control among the established U.S. citizens, the Americanization movement was born. This movement promoted the adoption of the American way of life and the use of spoken English instead of the continuation of ancestral customs and languages (Baker & Jones, 1998; Baron, 1990; Ovando, 2003; Simon, 1980; Wiley & Lee, 2009). To protect this way of life, linguistically restrictive immigration laws were put into place including the Naturalization Act of 1906, which called for immigrants to be able to speak English prior to becoming naturalized U.S. citizens (Ovando, 2003). During this period, speaking and using Standard English, free of slang and accent, was a sign that someone was a good patriotic American (Baron, 1990, p.155).

With the United States involvement in WWI, anti-German sentiment abounded (Daniels, 1990; Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990; Wiley & Lee, 2009). German was removed from the curriculum of most schools because its use was deemed un-American (Ovando, 2003). In addition, the promotion of English-only use in classrooms made its way into public education with the passage of a resolution in 1919 encouraging states to require
English as the language of instruction in all schools. The removal of German in the schools and the resolution requiring English as the language of instruction contributed to the discrimination towards immigrant groups and anti-German sentiments (Baker & Jones, 1998; Kloss, 1977). In that same year, laws which forbade teaching German and other foreign languages were passed in 34 different states, creating an environment where public use of languages other than English, especially German, was frowned upon (Wiley & Lee, 2009). These Americanization policies and practices caused a sense of shame among minority language speakers because they spoke a language other than English, instead of the realization they possessed a valuable skill that could benefit them and their country (Simon, 1990). This feeling, according to Simon (1990), caused an “historical cultural barrier to the learning of another language in a land of great ethnic diversity.” (p. 12). The undervaluation of speaking a language or languages in addition to English is a phenomenon that may still exist today as described in the concepts of immigrant bilingualism versus elite bilingualism. Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015) state that while elite bilingualism is seen as valuable because it means speaking two high status languages, immigrant bilingualism is seen as low status as the immigrant language is associated with the lesser educated and poor populations. Thus, people who have immigrant bilingualism do not feel equal value for their two languages. Not until the Opportunistic Period beginning in the 1960’s did a change take place in the promotion of foreign language instruction in the country (Baker & Jones, 1998; Ovando, 2003).

The Opportunistic Period: 1960s-1980s

This period in the United States history of language ideology marked a change in opinions towards the importance of teaching foreign languages and the accessibility of
education to speakers of other languages within this country. During the Opportunistic Period, English-only laws which had been implemented during the Americanization movement were put into question. The launching of Sputnik, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, and the Supreme Court case of *Lau v. Nichols*, 1974, were all pivotal moments within this time period (Baker & Jones, 1998; Ovando, 2003).

A need for improved foreign language instruction in the United States came into the forefront after the beginnings of the Cold War and the Russian launching of Sputnik into outer space which seemed to indicate the U.S. education, particularly in math, sciences, and languages, was not keeping up with that of the Soviet Union (Ovando, 2003). The National Defense Education Act in 1958 addressed this need by making changes to the teaching of foreign languages in our education system, including increased program funding and teacher training (Kloss, 1977).

A change in acceptance of different immigrant groups and minority languages spoken in the United States occurred with the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which worked to establish equal opportunity for all people regardless of race, color, or creed (Baker & Jones, 1998). The government also attempted to address the needs of struggling language-minority students through the enactment of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968. Without defining a clear path of exactly how it should be done, this act forced schools to address the needs of ELs by tying academic success to the receipt of federal dollars. It also allowed bilingual education in the United States school systems, a practice which was loosely in place during the Permissive Period when students’ L1s were present but which had been discouraged during the English-only policies of the
Americanization Period. This Act, however, had the goal of making bilingual education a bridge to English rather than a way to foster students’ L1s (Wiley & Lee, 2009). Still this act was the first time the federal government attempted to promote learning for students coming from a minority language background by using the “students’ home cultures, languages, and prior experiences” (Ovando, 2003, p.8).

Despite the provisions of the Bilingual Education Act, many public schools were still not adequately serving their language minority populations (Wiley & Lee, 2009) as was seen in *Lau v. Nichols* (1974). This Supreme Court case helped pressure schools to address the educational needs of language minority students. The case contended that Chinese language minority students were being discriminated against by the San Francisco school district because they were not receiving a quality education due to their limited proficiency in English preventing them from not fully understanding the content (Ovando, 2003). The court decided in favor of Lau based upon the provision of the 1964 Civil Rights Act that people not be discriminated against based “on the ground of race, color, or national origin” or “be excluded from participation in” or “be denied benefits of any program or activity” (Civil Rights Act 1964, Section 601 of Title VI, 42 USC sec. 2000d). Based upon this decision, schools were then responsible for the education of ELs and were required to put into place programs that addressed this population’s specific needs.

**The Dismissive Period: 1980s-Present**

Many of the initiatives regarding language education and bilingual education instituted during the Opportunistic Period have been stopped in the subsequent years, primarily by the Reagan administration (Baker & Jones, 1998; Ovando, 2003; Wiley &
Lee, 2009). Bilingual education has come under fire and many ideas from the Americanization movement seem to be reemerging such as the importance of maintaining the American way of life, criticism of immigrants, and the pressure to keep the country an English-only nation.

The provisions of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 were subsumed by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) during the Bush administration. NCLB cut out the word bilingual entirely from education discourse on the federal level (Wiley & Lee, 2009). Under this act, to ensure that schools were performing and properly serving their students more emphasis was placed upon results of high stakes standardized tests. Language minority students were included in the expectations of students to perform well on state tests which were in English, regardless if they had time to sufficiently learn the language (Mahoney, Haladyna, & MacSwan, 2009). Pressure to perform on tests made focus on English for test-taking purposes more of a priority. This situation caused schools to once again resort more to the sink or swim method of language teaching; either the students kept up with what was being taught or they failed (Wiley & Lee, 2009).

To what extent native languages should be used at all in the classroom has been heavily debated during the Dismissive Period (Ovando, 2003). Wiley and Lee (2009) note a link between “the ideologies behind Americanization that position English against other languages as an ‘either-or’ choice rather than a ‘both-and’ alternative” and American educational policies that have become apparent as some states have begun implementing English-only policies (p. 8). California has passed a law, Proposition 227, which states that English would be the primary language of instruction for ELs; similar laws have also been passed in Arizona and Massachusetts (Wiley & Lee, 2009).
With the recent passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in December of 2015, NCLB came to an end. This new act does not require the high stakes testing that NCLB required but is still holding states accountable for showing progress of ELs within their education systems through other performance measures. This act does not include provisions for bilingual education or dual language programs.

How the ESSA will impact ESL and bilingual education is still unknown. Whether the United States will continue with what Ovando (2003) and Baker and Jones (1998) state as the policies of the Dismissive Period or if a period of a new language ideology within this country is set to begin has yet to be seen. Even if Americanization remains a goal, Wiley and Lee (2009) state this does not have to mean other cultures and languages within this country should not exist but rather the opportunity to be both an American and multilingual/multicultural is possible

ESL and Monolingual Instruction

The previous section explained a brief history of language ideology in the United States from the time European immigration began, through the Americanization period, to NCLB and ESSA. and highlighted some implemented policies which impacted ESL education. How immigrants were viewed and the corresponding public policies were highlighted to exemplify how economic, social, and political situations in the country influence language ideologies. This section covers some of the specific methodology and practices which promoted the use of English only within the language classroom. Monolingual teaching, teaching practices during the Americanization period in the United States, and the development of English language teaching during the 1950’s and 60’s are described.
Monolingual teaching can trace its origins to the Berlitz Method (Hall & Cook, 2012). Maximilian Berlitz, a U.S. immigrant of German Jewish descent, developed this method after having a French native speaker teach a French class to native English speakers. Unbeknownst to Berlitz, the French speaking teacher could not communicate in English and therefore had to teach French in French. The students under this method seemed to make advancements in learning the language, leading Berlitz to develop his method of exclusive use of and complete immersion in the L2 when learning a new language. By 1914 there were 200 international and national Berlitz school locations using this monolingual approach. The school still is educating language learners today (Berlitz International, 2008).

The monolingual approach of this method was widely accepted in language learning institutions for two main reasons: the formula of a native speaking teacher plus students of varying L1s did not lend itself to bilingual education; therefore, monolingual teaching would be much easier to implement. The promotion of monolingual products, both teachers and materials, could be distributed to worldwide markets benefitting the economies of English-speaking nations (Hall & Cook, 2012; Phillipson, 1992). The adoption of a more monolingual approach can also be seen in the United States after WWI.

During the Americanization movement at the time of WWI, the consensus throughout the country was that “Americanization via English was essential” (Baron, 1990, p. 143). To obtain this goal, English language classes were held for adults in various urban settings. Immigrant children in public schools were not included in this
initiative and were expected to simply assimilate to their English-speaking peers (Baron, 1990).

Since teaching English to non-native speakers was a new field, not many methodologies for teaching it existed other than those methods designed for the teaching of foreign languages. Baron (1990) describes two methods available during the 1920s, indirect and direct. While both methods “focused on acquisition of practical conversational skills through dialogues involving everyday situations” (p.158), they differed in their utilization of L1. The indirect method used students’ L1 to translate and create understanding, whereas the direct method used only English. The direct method was the practice of choice during this period as it allowed for students to be immersed in the English language and was a more economical and convenient choice for schools to implement as any English-speaking teacher could do it without the need for special classes or instructors (Baron, 1990, p. 163). This method of sink or swim, full immersion into the English language without L1 support, allowed educators and policymakers to put the responsibility of language learning and adjusting to the nation’s culture onto the students instead of the schools (Ovando, 2003, p. 6).

One of the developers of ESL curriculum during the 1920’s was Henry Goldberger. While recognizing that teacher knowledge of the students’ L1s could be beneficial, he agreed with and recommended English as the sole language of instruction and even encouraged teachers to not group students of same nationality together, as this could encourage “the formation of ‘national cliques’ which would delay the work of Americanization” (as cited in Baron, 1990, p. 160). Goldberger designed a series of lessons directed towards adult ESL students, emphasizing the English students would
encounter in every-day situations including: talking about personal information, meeting new people, going shopping, banking, visiting the doctor, working, and dealing with things in the home. Many of Goldberger’s suggestions can still be seen operating in adult ESL classes today where English life skills are highlighted.

The ESL teaching professionals during the Americanization movement were required by law in many cases to be native speakers of English and in some cases had to be U.S. citizens (Baron, 1990). These laws kept non-citizen, non-native English speakers out of the teaching profession, and created a teaching corps of ESL educators who were predominately untrained, monolingual English speakers who were “unable to empathize with the non-Anglophone student” (Baron, 1990, p. 162).

The idea of the best teacher of English being a native speaker was a sentiment echoed in the five tenets of English Language Teaching (ELT), announced during a conference at Makere University in Uganda in 1961.

These tenets as listed by Phillipson (1992) are:

- English is best taught monolingually.
- The ideal teacher of English is a native speaker.
- The earlier English is taught, the better the results.
- The more English is taught, the better the results.
- If other languages are used too much, standards of English will drop. (p. 185)

These ideals, while held prior to the Makere conference, gained legitimacy after being written as tenets, and have become the basis for ELT practices worldwide, according to Phillipson (1992). These tenets were focused upon those who primarily taught EFL; however, Auerbach (1993) and Cummins (2007) argue some of these
assumptions about English have also made an impact on the ESL profession, contending
monolingual teaching has now become accepted as “commonsense” and “natural”
(Auerbach, 1993, p.14). This assumption once again falls under an ideology described by
Fairclough (1989) linking the continued control by dominant classes to normalizing
practices which have typically originated with them into everyday commonsense
occurrences.

Summary

In this chapter’s literature review language ideology was explained, the shifting
language ideology of the United States was presented along with the historical events that
shaped it, and information concerning the development of monolingual instruction within
ESL was described. By understanding the historical and political context of language
ideologies, it is hoped that educators can understand why certain decisions pertaining to
language of instruction and language use in the ESL classroom are made.

Given the context of the historical and current language ideologies in the United
States, this systematic literature review seeks to examine the research on L1 use in the
classroom to determine the following: How are students’ L1s used in the ESL classroom
and what benefits are associated with their use? The next chapter will explain the process
through which this systematic literature review was conducted including how searches
were performed, materials obtained, and the criteria for including literature into this
study.
This systematic literature review is designed to survey research that looks at how students’ L1s can be used within the ESL classroom. This particular method of inquiry was chosen in great part to present the answers to the research questions in a way that would be as unbiased as possible and based solely upon the analysis of reliable research. In using this method it is hoped the findings will be of relevance and interest to those working in the field of ESL. Through a comprehensive review of multiple academic sources, this study will attempt to answer the questions: how are students’ L1s used in the ESL classroom and what benefits are associated with their use?

Chapter Overview

This chapter outlines the process through which the systematic literature review was conducted. Items discussed include the tools and keywords used to retrieve articles and other literature pertaining to L1 use, how the data was obtained, as well as the process through which these tools and keywords were chosen. The criteria to validate a source’s inclusion in this study are explained along with a description of the information gathered and recorded for analysis. The process begins with a description of systematic literature reviews.

Systematic Literature Review

Instead of conducting research with human participants to collect data and information to answer a research question or questions, a systematic literature review
uses published studies and articles as the sources for data. This capstone’s systematic literature review uses peer-reviewed publications to gather research concerning L1 use in ESL classrooms. Information from these publications is categorized in a way that highlights trends and common themes and an analysis of what multiple experts and practitioners within the field of ESL have said. Through the detailed review of the studies performed by many researchers, a research-supported view of how L1s can be used in ESL classrooms is presented.

Data Collection

In order to retrieve as much pertinent information as possible for this review, multiple search engines were utilized. The library search engines used included Communication and Mass Media Complete, Education Full Text (EBSCO), Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA), and Modern Language Association (MLA) International Bibliography. Beyond these search engines information was also gathered through Google Scholar.

The search began using the terms “English Only” and “ESL.” I first wanted to see if there were articles specific to my question or that dealt specifically with the idea of enforcing the use of only English within the ESL classroom. This search yielded some results but not enough to provide a comprehensive look at this topic. I then differentiated my search by using the terms “L1 use” with “ESL classroom”; variations of these terms were also used including “first language,” “mother tongue,” and “native language” for “L1” and the spelling-out of “English as a Second Language” substituting for “ESL.” The word “classroom” was also omitted to see if this would garner more or different results.
Because of the ideas addressed by Auerbach’s (1993) article concerning a re-evaluation of English only language policies in the teaching of ESL, I used her article as a search within Google Scholar. The same search terms mentioned above were used to look specifically among articles that had cited Auerbach (1993).

These initial searches produced usable sources; however, I wanted to be certain that I had exhausted all search possibilities. I met with a research librarian who recommended using the search terms “teacher practices” and “outcomes” in tandem with “L1 use” to get a good representation of articles from varying angles.

After incorporating these terms and reaching a point of saturation, the same titles appearing multiple times, the research librarian was satisfied with the multiple approaches I took to find articles and considered I had most likely obtained all pertinent resources. Once these search options were exhausted, the next step was to determine which items would qualify for inclusion into this study.

Justifying Document Inclusion

In order to determine which sources answered this review’s guiding questions, how are students’ L1s used in the ESL classroom and what benefits are associated with their use?, criteria to justify a document’s inclusion into or exclusion from this study needed to be established. The articles required a focused use of L1 or a mentioned use of L1 in the teaching of ESL students. Other criteria decided upon were the educational setting of the study, participant information, and peer-reviewed status.

Use of L1

To determine the place of an L1 in the ESL classroom, studies included in this review had to contain a clear description of L1 use in the teaching of ELs. Data, both
qualitative and quantitative, could be obtained via observations, surveys, interviews, or collected by any number of methods.

Articles which analyzed a number of studies or offered suggestions pertaining to L1 use within an ESL classroom were also included into the review. Many of these studies included data obtained from studies conducted with L1 use and L2 classroom that could also include foreign languages. As long as there was a clear link to L1 use specifically in the ESL classroom, these works were also admitted for review.

Educational Setting

Because the guiding questions of this systematic literature review focus upon the use of L1 in the ESL classroom, studies needed to include analysis of L1 use within an educational setting with multiple students and a teacher. Situations in which there were no direct personal contact between teacher and student were not subject to inclusion in this review. Research concerning bilingual education was included into this study only if the bilingual classroom setting was specifically designed to meet the needs of ELs.

Only research conducted in English-speaking countries was used in this study: the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand. Students learning English in these countries may share similar classroom populations, opportunities for English input, and motivations for learning the language unlike those of students learning English as a foreign language (EFL). EFL classrooms tend to contain students who all share the same L1 which is typically not the case in ESL settings. EFL students tend to be more limited in the amount of English input they receive with most coming from within the EFL classroom. Students in ESL programs have the opportunity of greater English exposure as it is the language of the society as a whole. ELs in the countries
mentioned above also have similar pressures to learn English, as proficiency in the language is more closely linked to success in school and economic advancement in the job market.

Participants

In order to include as much research as possible, this study includes research from classrooms of varied ages. The only disqualifications of studies reviewed for this capstone based on age of participants are those studies pertaining to university undergraduate students and beyond. The English levels of these students are advanced to near fluent; therefore, they do not match the needs of students who would qualify for specific ESL services. Community colleges do offer ESL classes to those students who are not yet proficient, so studies from this type of location are included in the study.

Peer-reviewed Status

The decision was made to include only work which has been peer-reviewed so that a wide range of studies based upon experts within the field are represented. In order to ensure peer-reviewed status, the searches conducted in the various databases were refined to only include these types of articles. While gathering documents from Google Scholar, a search of the journals from which the articles came verified whether they were peer-reviewed.

Data Organization for Analysis

Next, the manner used to record data for analysis is described. Using Excel software spreadsheets, information from each source was recorded: author, type of source, year of publication, country of study, educational setting, participant information, L1 of teacher and students, method for gathering data, research question, instance of L1
use, and study results. After all data were compiled, the information was ready for analysis to determine the answer to this capstone’s question: how are students’ L1s used in the ESL classroom? and what benefits are associated with their use?

Summary

This chapter detailed the methods used for finding, including, and documenting the data for this systematic literature review. The search for information to be included for review into this capstone was conducted with the research questions as a guide: how are students’ L1s used in the ESL classroom? and what benefits are associated with their use? The next chapter will present the data collected and analyze the results of what was found.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The purpose of this systematic analysis of literature is to determine the uses of L1 in the ESL classroom after examining the underlying language ideologies which may be influencing the choices of which language to use during instruction and learning. In some language classrooms instruction in and use of only the English language within second language learning contexts has been considered the best way for a student to learn a new language, which when applied to the ESL classroom means “English-only.”

Much research has been done within the last twenty-five years challenging this assumption and analyzing the place of students’ L1s in acquiring an additional language. Examining some of this research specifically pertaining to L1 use in English learning classrooms within English-speaking countries, I sought to discover the answer to the following question: how are students’ L1s used in the ESL classroom? and what benefits are associated with their use?

Chapter Two laid the contextual foundation for the extensive review of literature found in this chapter about how students’ L1s are used in the ESL classroom. Knowing how language ideologies are formed by both implicit and explicit influences and how these ideologies shape language use allows for a critical examination of why certain choices are made and how attitudes develop towards the use of L1 to teach ELs. This chapter begins with a discussion of the diverse materials consulted to answer the research question. Studies containing qualitative and quantitative data are used, as well as papers
that analyze and interpret the results of previous studies which varied in size, scope, and presentation of data.

While conducting this research several themes emerged: how students’ L1s were used in the classroom, attitudes toward the incorporation of L1 into the school environment, and claims advocating for the use of L1. The findings are explained and analyzed according to these themes. How L1 was used in the classroom and/or school environment in general is presented in terms of source of the L1: whether it is from a bilingual teacher or aide, monolingual teacher or a teacher with limited knowledge of student’s L1, or the students within the classroom. Attitudes toward using L1 in learning English are examined through the eyes of both teachers and students. Finally, advocacy is explored through a discussion of the arguments presented to support the use of students’ L1s and oppose monolingual (“English-only”) instruction and ideas suggested as to how students’ L1s can be incorporated into educational practices.

Materials Consulted

This systematic review was conducted using studies which had a research question or questions related to L1 use in the classroom, research examining practices in ESL learning that mentioned L1 use, attitudes toward the inclusion or exclusion of students’ L1s into teaching practices, or articles which drew conclusions about and presented recommendations and reasons for L1 use in the ESL classroom by examining multiple studies within the field. Appendix B provides the research question(s) for all of the studies incorporated into this review. In total, thirty-two studies were included in this review; twenty-one from the United States, two from Australia, one from Canada, one from the United Kingdom, and seven reviews of published literature. Table 1 illustrates
the number of articles utilized in this review categorized under the following: descriptions of L1 use, discussion of attitudes, and literature reviews. Some of the studies appear in more than one category as they had multiple foci; however, all literature reviews remain in their own category. Appendix A provides a more detailed presentation of which article can be found within each of the categories.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Focus</th>
<th>Number of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of L1 Use</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of Attitudes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the divergent approaches to the discussion of L1 use, the articles also differed in the methods used for collecting data, the participants involved, and the educational settings in which investigations and information gathering occurred. Data collection methods and details pertaining to the educational settings in which the studies occurred are expanded upon in the following two sections. Information regarding the research participants is included in the explanation of the education settings in which the investigations took place with a more concise view displayed in Appendix C including number, L1, language proficiency, and educational setting.

Methods of Data Collection

Various methods were used throughout the studies consulted for this review. The majority could be classified as case studies varying in length of time but averaging one year. Specific ways in which data were gathered included interviews with participating
educational professionals, field notes from classroom observations, and surveys; these and other ways in which data were obtained are recorded in Table 2. The information is organized according to which method was used most frequently among the documents consulted for this review. Many of the studies utilized multiple methods in order to acquire significant data for analysis, therefore the number of occurrences exceeds the number of documents analyzed for this review.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic Methods/Case Studies</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Published Research</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Recordings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document and Material Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Recordings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress Data</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Visits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diversity of Educational Settings

Whereas all studies contained ELs in English-speaking countries, studies varied regarding the educational space in which the students were learning English. Table 3 highlights the educational settings in which research was conducted and analyzed for this review. Each setting is then expanded upon in the discussion that follows.
A number of the studies consulted for this capstone involved classrooms and students within adult educational settings: Huerta-Macias and Kephart (2009), Lukes (2011), Ma (2009), Mori (2014), Storch and Wigglesworth (2003), and Yeh (2014). The majority of these studies observed a place of instruction but only focused upon the teacher and a small number of students within the classroom. Ma (2009) selected two adult students each from the low, medium, and high English proficiency levels who were attending a bilingual class taught by a tri-lingual Cantonese, Mandarin, and English teacher. Also gathering information from students in a bilingual class was Lukes (2011); the focus of this class was concurrent native literacy instruction with ESL classes for adults. Mori (2014) focused upon five students, three Spanish-speaking and two Urdu-speaking, within the context of a high beginner ESL class. Six adult ESL speakers who had either intermediate or advanced English proficiency levels were the sources of data for Yeh (2014).

Huerta-Macias and Kephart (2009) examined multiple classrooms varying from family literacy to credit bearing college-level ESL classes serving adult students in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Setting</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School and Middle School</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Classroom Settings</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

_Diversity of Educational Settings_
borderland region of the United States and Mexico. In total, eleven classroom sessions were observed, recorded, and sampled for occasions of L1 use. In addition to these samplings, Huerta-Macias and Kephart distributed surveys to eighty-four teachers of adult ESL throughout the nation, gathering specific data directly from teachers concerning purposes for and policies governing L1 use in adult educational settings nationwide.

The 2003 study performed by Storch and Wigglesworth did not contain observations of classroom instructional practices; instead, it utilized activities constructed exclusively for the study. These activities were then observed in a lab setting allowing for the analysis of cooperative learning among six pairs of adult students with shared L1s.

High School and Middle School Settings

Three articles referenced in this review utilized data obtained from high school and middle school settings. The only study consulted that dealt with a middle school setting was the study by Faltis (1996). Two Spanish-English bilingual middle school teachers were the center of this study which examined their teaching methods and language ideologies prior to and after a series of workshops and focused discussions about bilingual instruction.

The sources for Razfar and Rumennapp (2012) and Henze and Lucas (1993) were high school students and teachers. Razfar and Rumennapp researched both the attitudes toward and classroom practices concerning L1 use in high school sheltered ESL and advanced ESL classes. Analyzing the classroom practices of teachers who successfully meet the needs of minority language students, Henze and Lucas (1993) observed four different classes within a high school setting.
Elementary School Settings

Four studies included into this review were conducted in the lower elementary grades, Kindergarten - third grade. The studies by Kolano, Lewis, and Kissau (2011) and de Oliveira, Gilmetdinova, and Pelaez-Morales (2016) were both conducted in mainstream kindergarten classrooms whose ELs were native Spanish speakers. First grade Hmong-speaking ESL students were the focus of Duke and Mabbott’s (2000) year-long study. The sources for the data in Stritukus’s (2006) study were observations of and interviews with two third grade ESL teachers.

Studies in the upper elementary school grades included Bourne (2001), Horst, White, and Bell (2010), Welch (2015), and Worthy, Rodríguez-Galindo, Assaf, Martínez, and Cuero (2003). A mainstream classroom in London containing a variety of L1 speakers including twelve Bengali, seven Cantonese, seven native English, one Pushtu, and one Farsi were observed and analyzed for Bourne’s (2001) study, while Horst, et al. (2010) analyzed forty-eight French speakers within an English immersion program in Montreal. Welch (2015) centered her study on observations of a pull-out ESL class with a native Spanish-speaking teacher and six Mexican immigrant students who were in the United States for less than two years and were performing below grade level. Worthy et al. (2003) interviewed and observed fifteen fifth grade students who were part of a bilingual education program in Texas. Also interviewed as part of this study were eleven of the students’ parents.

Multiple Classroom Settings

A number of studies included analysis of L1 use in classes covering many different ages and settings. Karathanos (2009), Karathanos (2010), and Motha (2006)
gathered information through input from teachers representing various grades in K-12 settings. While Motha used interviews conducted with four female teachers, Karathanos’ studies gathered data from surveys distributed to 327 pre-service and practicing teachers who were in the process of taking ESL teaching courses at a Midwest university.

Also covering L1 use in K-12 settings were de Jong, Gort, and Cobb (2005) and Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, and Asato (2000), both examining how school districts were responding to restrictive language laws. De Jong et al. (2005) analyzed three school districts in Massachusetts, primarily through interviews with personnel who were responsible for making decisions pertaining to ESL education within the district and who had been advocates for ELs prior to the passage of Question 2 which mandated English be the language of instruction. A similar law, Proposition 227, was passed in California, the location for Gutierrez et al.’s (2000) study. Also examining three school districts, Gutierrez et al. interviewed teachers, parents, bilingual coordinators, and administrators, and analyzed field notes from classrooms and school meetings prior to and after the passage of the law to determine how the districts were interpreting the new law and implementing it.

Similar to the studies mentioned above, the purpose of the research conducted by Lucas and Katz (1994) was to determine how programs utilized students’ L1s despite prohibitive language policies. Their data was obtained through the examination of nine different programs serving ELs in K-12 classrooms throughout the United States which were all English-based.

Khmer-speaking ELs from Cambodia were the focus group for both Skilton-Sylvester (2003) and Wright (2004). The subjects of Wright’s (2004) research were ten
adults who had already passed through the K-12 system in California, but whose school experiences provided the data evaluating how their school addressed their specific learning needs and the consequences experienced due to the manner of schooling they received. Skilton-Sylvester (2003) examined how students were currently being served in both adult and K-12 ESL programs in the city of Philadelphia and how these students’ language and culture were being valued within the educational system.

Presentation of Findings

The findings for this literature review are not a comprehensive overview of every detail from every article consulted for this research but rather a summary of all pertinent information which support the arguments presented in this chapter and the next regarding L1 use in the ESL classroom. Findings are presented according to three main categories: instances of L1 use, attitudes, and advocacy. Instances of L1 use are explained depending upon the source of the L1 whether it be from a bilingual teacher, monolingual teacher, or from the students. The investigations into L1 use within school districts under restrictive language laws are also presented at the end of this category. Attitudes are examined in depth from the perspectives of both the students and the teachers. One particular study will be highlighted, that of Razfar and Rumenapp (2012), due to teacher and student attitudes being the focus of their research. The category of advocacy presents the data compiled from the literature reviews read and arranges the information into the following subcategories: reasons for opposition to monolingual teaching practices, support given for the incorporation of L1 into the language classroom, and suggestions for how L1 can effectively be used within the classroom.
Instances of L1 Use

Throughout the review of data, multiple uses of students’ L1s were found. The terminology to describe how the L1 was used varied widely among the research consulted for this study. The specificity about how the L1 was used also differed between the studies, especially those discussing bilingual instruction. To simplify the results and use a common language to present findings, see Appendix D: Instances of L1 Use, which is modeled after the table presented by Lucas and Katz (1994) to record their observations of native language use.

While the table presented by Lucas and Katz was helpful, some modifications were made to better display the findings of this review. The categories used by Lucas and Katz which are also included in some form in Appendix D to classify teacher L1 use include: to check comprehension, to translate a lesson, to explain an activity, to provide instruction, and to interact socially. To make findings more relevant to this study, “to provide instruction” is changed to “explain complex concepts” because much of the research read for this review highlights the importance of explaining the complex aspects of content in the L1 to provide a background for students to more effectively learn the content in English. “To translate a lesson” is shortened to “translate” as some teachers translate only words and phrases, not entire lessons. In terms of student use of L1, the categories used by Lucas and Katz (1994) and in Appendix D include: to assist one another, to ask/answer questions, to write in L1, and to interact socially. The category, bilingually taught class, is added to account for studies which noted this type of L1 use but may or may not have detailed exactly how the L1 was utilized.
A list of the number of occurrences for each instance of L1 use is summarized in Table 4 for teachers and later in Table 5 for students in order of most common to least common. Studies may detail more than one instance of L1, especially Lucas and Katz (1994) who presented findings from nine different sites, therefore the number of instances does not match the number of documents consulted for this review.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instances of Teacher L1 Use</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interact socially with students</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain an activity</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain complex concepts</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translate</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check comprehension</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use mentioned but was unspecified</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section, the instances of students’ L1 use are described. How L1 has been used within the classroom may vary depending upon the teacher’s abilities in speaking and using an additional language. For this reason, the instances of L1 use discovered through the literature review are categorized in terms of who is the source of the L1: bilingual teachers, monolingual or limited proficient teachers, and students. The Instances of L1 Use section of this chapter also includes the sub-heading teacher self-reported L1 use which provides an account of the results of surveys conducted by Kolano (2010) and Huerta-Macias and Kephart (2009). The use of multilingual materials was considered but was not a large enough focus in any of the studies to be included into this
presentation of findings. A precise representation of the sources of L1 found in the research can be found in Appendix E.

**Bilingual Teacher L1 Use**

Bilingual teachers or bilingual aides were the most common source of the L1 found in the research. Being bilingual in the L1 of students offers varying opportunities for its use as the teacher has a clear understanding of vocabulary and grammar, the ability to communicate with students efficiently in their L1, and knowledge of similarities and differences between the L1 and English. The studies described below illustrate how bilingual educators who were fluent in the students’ L1 used the students’ L1 used the language within their respective classrooms.

In their study, Duke and Mabbott (2000) describe the use of a Hmong bilingual educational assistant within a first grade classroom to increase students’ understanding of content. The aide would explain concepts and ideas before they were taught instead of simply translating. The pre-teaching of specific skills and abstract concepts allowed students to have an established background in important subject areas like math and reading in their native language before being taught in English. Research showed developing background knowledge facilitated a better understanding of content for the students within the study.

Also providing explanation of concepts in students’ L1s were the Spanish bilingual teachers in one of the highlighted programs in Lucas and Katz’s (1994) study. This study examined multiple sites across the United States to find how students’ L1 was incorporated into English-based programs serving ELs. In addition to pre-teaching key
concepts, another way in which the bilingual teachers used the students’ L1 was to give and explain directions.

The tri-lingual teacher cited in Ma’s (2009) study of adult ELs used Chinese to illustrate how a word would be pronounced in English and recognized the importance of using the L1 to explain abstract ideas, especially to students with lower English proficiency. While clearly supporting L1 use through his bilingual class, the teacher also felt apprehension concerning the diminished opportunities to practice the target language due to the bilingual instructional setting. Lukes’ (2011) study, also in an adult bilingual class, focused on native language literacy classes which were conducted in tandem with ESL classes. The students involved in this study had low level proficiency in English and had limited or interrupted formal educational backgrounds. The L1 here was used to get students the skills they needed in order to make learning English more accessible. The students felt that learning English would be impossible if they did not know how to read and write in their L1 first.

An additional concern of the teacher interviewed by Ma (2009) was students’ overreliance on the L1 to facilitate their understanding. This dependence upon translation of words and concepts into the L1 is a subject addressed by Faltis (1996). According to Faltis, when translation is used as the primary method of ensuring student comprehension, students will ignore the teacher when he or she is speaking in their second language as they are quickly programed to expect the teacher’s translation into their first language to make sure they understand. In addition to not taking advantage of input in the L2, the other problem is translation ensures students understand the meanings of words but not necessarily the concepts. Faltis sought to correct this habit of translation
with the two teachers in his study through workshops and discussions surrounding effective bilingual instructional practices. After the teachers’ participation, they no longer relied on simple one-to-one translation as a teaching tool; instead they focused upon using language to teach concepts as well as aid English acquisition creating more dynamic classrooms where students’ participation increased.

The teacher in Mori’s (2014) study, although described as only semi-proficient, used Spanish to communicate important information, to give directions or explain them after failed attempts in English, to clarify vocabulary, and for other classroom-directed activities. However, unlike the studies conducted by Duke and Mabbott (2000), Faltis (1996), Lukes (2011), and Ma (2009) where students had the same L1, the classroom in Mori’s (2014) study was linguistically diverse. Frustration among the minority students over the use of Spanish was exemplified when an Urdu-speaking student, one of two in the class, requested the English-only policy be enforced. The researcher interpreted from the observations that the students who did not speak English nor the majority L1 within the classroom most likely felt isolated and did not experience the same camaraderie as the Spanish-speaking students in the class (Mori, 2014).

Huerta-Macias and Kephart (2009) did not specify the proficiency of the teachers in their study; however, some fluency in Spanish would have been necessary in order to perform the uses of L1 mentioned in their study. Of the classes observed, the only significant use of students’ L1 was during the family literacy class, which focused on non-academic literacy development. Huerta-Macias and Kephart surmised another reason for increased L1 use in this class was the upcoming elections being the topic of learning and the need for students to understand the election process. During interviews
with the other teachers whose classes had been examined for the study, the prevailing opinion stated was the use of students’ L1 would negatively impact students’ development in the L2 (Huerta-Macias & Kephart, 2009). Researchers found this contrasted with the amount of use expressed in their nationwide survey of ESL teachers (see section on Teacher Self-Reported L1 Use). They attribute the difference in reported L1 use in the classroom to the students in the classrooms observed living near the Mexico border where their L1 was dominant within the community.

In summary, bilingual teachers and aides are able to provide support to their students in a number of different ways, such as giving and explaining directions (Lukes, 2011; Mori, 2014), developing L1 literacy skills (Lukes, 2011), clarifying vocabulary (Mori, 2014), and providing pronunciation examples as in Ma (2009). The most common utilization of students’ L1s was to develop background for complex concepts first in students’ L1s (Duke & Mabbott, 2000; Faltis, 1996; Huerta-Macias & Kephart (2009); Lucas & Katz, 1994; Lukes, 2011; Ma, 2009; Mori, 2014). Precautions suggested regarding L1 use include not using simple one-to-one translation but instead utilize the L1 to facilitate learning of the L2 through providing background information or pre-teaching content (Faltis, 1996) and avoidance of relying too heavily upon the L1 which may result in less exposure to and practice with English (Huerta-Macias & Kephart, 2009; Ma, 2009).

**Monolingual or Limited Proficient Teacher L1 Use**

This category focuses on L1 use in situations where the teacher using the L1 may have minimal proficiency in the language(s) spoken by students. None of the studies
examined provided data concerning a teacher who was a monolingual speaker of English; all teachers had some knowledge of a language other than English.

One teacher who had limited knowledge of the students’ L1s was the focus of the study by de Oliveira et al. (2016). In this particular situation de Oliveira et al. examined how a mainstream kindergarten teacher with emerging skills in Spanish used this language in her classroom of 23 students, eight of whom were native Spanish speakers with varying English proficiency levels. De Oliveira et al. (2016) found that, despite her limited proficiency level, the teacher frequently used Spanish as an instructional tool within her classroom. Specific uses included giving instructions, reinforcing concepts or words, checking comprehension and managing classroom behavior. Socially, the teacher also used language as a means to establish a connection with her students and relate to them effectively.

Kolano et al.’s (2011) study examined teachers’ attitudes and classroom practices toward their kindergarten students’ use of L1, in this case Spanish. Although the teachers, mainstream and specialist teachers who all taught the observed class of twenty-three kindergartners including seven native Spanish-speakers, reported having positive attitudes towards the students using L1, Kolano et al. found their instructional methods did not support their stated language ideology. Through the course of the study, the researchers became cognizant of the extreme measures teachers took to actually prevent the use of L1 or, in some cases, any form of verbal communication at all. To the researchers, these actions seemed to promote a culture of silence within the kindergarten classrooms. Procedures preventing language use for all students were established through a system of punishment and rewards for those who were silent during classroom
instruction and transition periods. A practice targeting the ELs more specifically included assigned seating and groupings which intentionally separated the Spanish-speakers from one another. Two instances in which teachers did use the L1 included an incident where a teacher asked a student for the Spanish word for “grandma” and occasional requests for students with a higher command of English to translate for a student of lower proficiency (Kolano et al., 2011).

Although the teachers in studies by de Oliveira et al. (2016) and Kolano et al. (2011) had limited proficiency in Spanish, the ways in which they utilized the language contrasted significantly. The teacher in de Oliveira et al. incorporated Spanish into the classroom despite not being a fluent speaker to give instructions, check comprehension, explain concepts, and establish connections with her students. On the other hand, only one instance was recorded of a teacher using the L1 to make a connection with the student, when the Spanish word for grandma was asked, but overwhelmingly students were expected to stay quiet in the study by Kolano et al.

Teacher Self-Reported Use of L1

Both Karathanos (2010) and Huerta-Macias and Kephart (2009) utilized surveys to gather data about L1 use. The participants in Karathanos’ (2010) study included 227 mainstream teachers who were part of an ESL endorsement program at a university in Kansas, while the participants in Huerta-Macias and Kephart (2009) were 84 ESL teachers teaching adult students nationwide. The ways in which teachers reported using their students’ L1s and reasons given for not using students’ L1s are described in this subsection.
An overwhelming number of teachers, 84% of participants, in the survey conducted by Huerta and Kephart (2009) stated they incorporated their students’ L1s into their classrooms. Of those reported L1 uses, 73% translated a few words, 45% communicated informally with students prior to and after class, 16% gave directions, and 11% taught content in students’ L1s. Teachers also mentioned utilizing students’ L1s to make comparisons during grammar instruction, to do an oral history project, to advise students, and to help create welcoming classroom environments.

In Karathanos’s (2010) study, 41% of those surveyed indicated using students’ L1s at least some of the time. Through the use of open-ended questions, Karathanos discovered five overarching themes for teachers’ use of students’ L1s: “translation, peer-grouping, materials, learning activities, and status/value” (Karathanos, 2010, p. 14). Translation included communications with family, words, phrases, classroom directions, and assignments. Teachers explained how they used peer groupings to put higher proficiency students with lower proficiency students to assist in understanding instructions and content and provide English translations for the students who knew what they wanted to say in their L1 but had difficulty expressing themselves in English. Materials such as word walls and flashcards enabled students to see the English with the equivalent word in their native languages. A notable learning activity mentioned was allowing minority language students to teach their language to the native English-speakers in their class promoting students feelings of elevated status and value regarding their language and culture.

Huerta-Macias and Kephart (2009) and Karathanos (2010) also enquired about teachers’ opinions as to why they did not utilize students’ L1s. The top reason cited in
Huerta-Macias and Kephart’s (2009) study, at 43%, was due to the multilingual composition of the classes followed by 27% stating the belief that L1 use would inhibit students’ acquisition of English, and 25% citing their lack of proficiency in students’ first languages. Teachers, according to Karathanos (2010), also attributed their difficulties in incorporating students’ L1s into the classroom to students’ having multiple L1s and teachers’ own deficient proficiencies. Two reasons unique to Karathanos’ study were limited time and resources to support the use of L1 and issues with involving the native English speakers into activities.

**Students’ Use of L1**

Throughout the research reviewed, students used their L1 in a variety of ways within the classroom, at times with the encouragement of the teacher and at other times despite disapproval. Student use of L1 can easily be facilitated by a teacher who understands it, yet a teacher who is not proficient in the students’ L1s must trust that students are using it for academic reasons and not social purposes (Mori, 2014). Table 5 provides a summary of the number of articles which noted particular instances of students using their L1s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instance of Student L1</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist one another</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask or answer questions</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact socially</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write in L1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focusing specifically on how students utilized L1 amongst each other to complete tasks in cooperative groups, Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) conducted their research in a controlled setting instead of in the classroom. They found that students used L1 to manage the task and to navigate the writing assignment. Managing the task included L1 use to explain directions, clarify meaning of the prompt, and discuss how it should be completed. In order to navigate the writing assignment, L1 was used to talk about vocabulary, structure, and grammar. The largest amount of time any of the groups used L1 was 50% and the least amount was only an occasional word or phrase.

L1 use in cooperative groups was also evident in a sheltered ESL classroom despite the teacher’s rule against it (Razfar & Rumenapp, 2012). The researchers were looking for instances in which the teacher invoked the English-only rule within his classroom. The three occasions noted by the researchers all took place while students were doing group work. One episode occurred when two girls, who had been heard talking and laughing in Spanish, were told by the teacher to use English because they were in English class. The sentiment expressed by the teacher was echoed by a Polish-speaking student who responded in agreement to the teacher’s admonition to use English. Another instance took place when a small group of four Latino boys were instructed to use English, to which the students responded with silence. After the teacher was out of hearing distance, the boys continued the completion of their assignment in Spanish. The third occasion of English-only being enforced happened during a peer-editing activity throughout which students used their L1s to ask questions of each other and create meaning during the task. The teacher commented about the excessive talking he was hearing as students were working, which a student justified by explaining they were
talking about the assignment. He instructed them to simply perform the steps of the assignment without complaints (talking). Reflecting on these instances, the researchers noted that students were using their L1s to make meaning of and engage in the literacy activities of the classroom (Razfar & Rumenapp, 2012).

The ESL teacher in Mori’s (2014) study also had an English-only policy. However, in this study the policy was not consistently enforced, with Mori observing occasions in which the teacher would speak one of the students’ L1s, Spanish, and would permit the students to use their L1. One situation where the teacher encouraged a student to say something in Spanish occurred when the student was unable to express herself in English while communicating with the teacher. Permission to use L1 was granted on a number of occasions to the two non-Spanish speaking students, one of whom was new to the country and had very limited English skills. One particular instance involving these two particular students using L1 was noted by the researcher when they were talking in the L1 in the computer lab and were reprimanded by the teacher to speak English as a result. The more proficient student argued that the lower level student did not understand and needed help. This explanation prompted the teacher to allow the L1 to be used. The Spanish-speaking students in this classroom frequently used L1 to communicate with one another, sometimes socially and other times to offer assistance, despite teacher scolding and demanding they speak English.

In the classroom observed by Yeh (2014) and one of the classrooms observed by Henze and Lucas (1993), understanding the content was valued above which language was used for communication; thus, students were encouraged to confer with one another in their L1 about content. Students at two of the sites detailed in Lucas and Katz (1994)
were also encouraged to use their L1 to create understanding of content. In both locations, students used their L1 during academic tasks and peer interactions. The strategic grouping of students with like L1s enabling a lower English proficiency student to benefit from the assistance of a higher proficiency student was observed at one of the sites. Teachers requested students to use their L1s additionally in translating difficult concepts for less proficient students (Lucas & Katz, 1994).

For literacy development, Lucas and Katz (1994) witnessed an activity where students shared stories from their countries of origin. Students first read the stories in their L1 and then translated them into English to be shared with others in the class. Another way in which literacy in both English and students’ L1s was encouraged as noted by Lucas and Katz was through writing activities in which students could use their L1 and English to communicate their ideas.

In order for students to utilize their L1s within the classroom, teacher fluency or knowledge of that language is not a necessity. Using L1 in peer communication empowers students to use each other and their background knowledge to make meaning of tasks and content (Henze & Lucas, 1993; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Razfar & Rumenapp, 2012; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Yeh, 2014) and to assist those students with lower English proficiency (Lucas & Katz, 1994; Mori, 2014). As seen in the example from Lucas and Katz (1994), writing is a method in which students can employ their L1. Accordingly organizing thoughts and ideas first in the L1 may facilitate writing in English.
L1 Use despite Restrictive Laws

Even when laws are put into place to restrict L1 use in instruction, ways have been found to circumvent this as seen in the studies by de Jong et al. (2005), Gutierrez et al. (2000), and Stritikus (2006). These studies analyze teacher and district responses to California’s Proposition 227, English for the Children Initiative, which virtually eliminated bilingual classrooms within the state, requiring ELs to be taught primarily in English (Gutierrez et al., 2000; Stritikus, 2006), and Question 2 in Massachusetts, which also mandated English be the sole language of instruction to ELs and limits bilingual programs (de Jong et al., 2005). A similar measure to those of Massachusetts and California also passed in Arizona, Proposition 203. At the time of the writing of this capstone, these laws are being challenged and legislation is being proposed to revise them.

Wright (2004) warns against the lasting negative effects due to the English immersion model promoted by these restrictive laws. He uses the stories of ten Cambodian-American students to illustrate the disadvantages of an English-only education with little to no L1 support.

Massachusetts’ Question 2

In addition to requiring English as the language of instruction, Massachusetts’ Question 2 also encourages schools to group their ELs together in multilingual, similar English proficiency classes, and stipulates that ELs should only be in structured English immersion (SEI) classes for one year. Previous to this law, many school districts in Massachusetts had transitional bilingual education (TBE) programs in place to address the needs of their ESL populations. De Jong, et al. (2005) interviewed three individuals
who were all involved in some capacity in deciding how their respective medium-sized districts in Massachusetts would implement the provisions of Question 2. All of the study’s participants were regarded as experienced advocates for bilingual education in the state.

The study (de Jong, et al., 2005) found the districts had different ways of dealing with the new law including concealing the use of L1, continuing to use it to support vocabulary acquisition and explain academic content, and exploiting the waiver system to continue transitional bilingual programming. As one district lead from the Winterport district was quoted as saying, “I could not fathom running an English-only program for beginners. I just think that that is educational malpractice.” (de Jong, et al. 2005, p. 612).

District leads interviewed made decisions that would be of the most benefit to their populations of ELs within the provisions of the law. These decisions included the allotment of minimal use of students’ L1s when necessary and focus upon ELs’ readiness to be successful participants in mainstream classes prior to exiting, despite the law stipulating ELs should be in SEI programs for only one year.

**California’s Proposition 227**

As was the case in Massachusetts, preceding the passage of Proposition 227, California had bilingual programs in place to serve the needs of its EL population. Gutierrez et al. (2000) investigated how three school districts interpreted Proposition 227 and considered how the law impacted their EL populations. On a micro-level, Stritikus (2006) evaluated how two third grade teachers responded to the law.

Through case studies conducted in three separate classrooms, extensive interviews with administrators, former bilingual coordinators, teachers, and some parents, and field
notes from school meetings, Gutierrez et al. (2000) found language ideologies to be an underlying force in how districts chose to shape their policies regarding Proposition 227. Upon the law’s passage, one school immediately replaced “Bilingual Department” signs with ones reading “Multicultural Department,” and henceforth offered no bilingual programs (Gutierrez et al., 2000, p. 7). Anti-bilingual education sentiments were also echoed in interviews with teachers as demonstrated in a comment made by an elementary school teacher, “You know, you’re in this country, learn the language” (Gutierrez et al., 2000, p. 9). Despite research providing support for L1 literacy and the benefits of bilingual education to ELs, Gutierrez et al. noted the deterioration of quality education for language minority students with the passage of Proposition 227 as it encouraged the use of English immersion, creating an educational system which advantaged native English speakers and disadvantaged ELs.

Teachers who supported bilingual education felt limited and trapped by the new laws, as they were not able to implement what they felt to be best teaching practices such as using the L1 to provide clarification or assistance due to the prohibition of teachers using the students’ L1s in any form (Gutierrez et al., 2000). Students, too, felt the ramifications of the new law, fearing they or their teachers could get in trouble for using Spanish. If a classroom were out of compliance with the policies mandated through the law, a provision within Proposition 227 allowed parents to sue the teacher. Gutierrez et al. (2000) concluded these types of interpretations of and provisions in the law lead to restrictive practices which caused further decline in students’ L1s being utilized within the classroom.
Stritikus (2006) observed two third grade teachers’ practices subsequent to the passage of Proposition 227: Elisa, who viewed students’ L1s as a beneficial teaching tool, and Connie, who viewed students’ L1s as a hindrance to their learning. In Elisa’s class, where a bilingual program was maintained through the utilization of waivers, Stritikus observed students’ L1 being valued and employed as a scaffolding tool. Students were engaged and actively looking for ways in which they could use English and words they already knew and could use in English writing. In Connie’s class, where a prescribed literacy series was used, students identified long vowel sounds in the reading. Stritikus noted one student using self-talk to make sense of the content in the reading but determined understanding the context “didn’t matter” and continued with the correct termination of the assignment, illustrating how form over meaning was valued within the class (Stritikus, 2006, p. 225). Similar to the conclusion drawn by Gutierrez et al. (2000), some students in Stritikus’s study may be at a disadvantage in the educational system created by Proposition 227.

Wright (2004) cautioned against the negative implications of restrictive laws such as Proposition 227 and Question 2 for ELs as a result of his investigation into the education provided to a group of ten Cambodian-American former students. The students completed their schooling in the same California school district prior to the passage of Proposition 227; however, their experiences mirror those which many minority language students are now facing. Due to the scarcity of qualified Khmer bilingual teaching candidates, the students in Wright’s study did not participate in bilingual programs nor did they have access to primary language materials in Khmer. Khmer-speaking aides were employed by the district but only three of the seven former
students interviewed had access to one. The ESL instruction the students received in some cases began too late into their educational experiences, was too short in length, with students entering into the mainstream before being adequately prepared, or was too long in duration, preventing students from receiving the same quality education as their native English-speaking peers. Consequences of the education received through the district included the students not being ready for college, as some needed to take ESL enrichment courses prior to entering credit-bearing classes, difficulty in reading and writing, and weakened skills within their L1s without accomplishing complete mastery of the English language. The English immersion model designed to serve these former students and the one which students experience after the passage of the restrictive language laws does not adequately meet the needs of ELs (Wright, 2004).

Attitudes

Throughout the investigation to find how students’ L1s have been used in the ESL classroom, a common theme emerged: teacher and student attitudes toward using the L1. As a result of the discussion of language ideology in Chapter Two and its influences upon language use, considering the attitudes surrounding L1 use was deemed important for review. In this section, attitudes held by teachers and students about the incorporation of L1 in the ESL classroom are presented. In addition to the subcategories of teacher and student attitudes, the study by Razar and Rumenapp (2012), whose research specifically focused upon attitudes held by teachers and students obtained through interviews and surveys, is described.
Teacher Attitudes

Attitudes about the use of students’ L1s in K-12 classrooms were obtained through an extensive survey of 327 pre-service and practicing mainstream teachers (Karathanos, 2009), which found correlation between, on the one hand, teacher ESL training and experience and, on the other hand, teacher’s support for including L1 in classroom instruction. These findings concerning L1 use were held only in the elementary level; L1 use did not receive the same support at the secondary level.

A positive attitude toward students’ use of L1 was noted in Welch (2015) and Worthy et al. (2003). The native Spanish-speaking bilingual teachers interviewed and observed in both studies placed value upon their students as bilingual members of the community. They cited the importance of maintaining their Spanish abilities and recognizing the dual role students had not only as students learning English but also as translators and bilingual agents who could assist less proficient family members. The teacher in Worthy et al. (2003) felt conflicted, however, in how to best enable students to develop their native language skills while adequately preparing them for their futures which would involve education without the support of bilingual instruction.

The native Khmer bilingual teacher in Skilton-Sylvester (2003) had an opposite view of valuing the L1 within his classroom. He believed use of the L1 would hinder the acquisition of English, citing his own experience while learning English of feeling handicapped and slowed down by having a translator. Although he allows students to use their L1 with each other or translate a word if absolutely necessary, this teacher feels providing maximum English input is his responsibility. Based upon the research from Karathanos (2009), this teacher’s attitudes toward L1 use in the classroom may be
attributed to his lack of ESL training as he is not a formally trained teacher but a businessman who was teaching adult ESL in the evening.

Language ideologies can create confusion in the language learning environment if what is stated and what is practiced conflict, as seen with the classroom in Mori’s (2014) study. The teacher had an English-only policy which was not universally followed nor enforced. The teacher used the students’ L1 she knew, Spanish, occasionally in lessons and sporadically encouraged students to use their L1s to aid in the negotiation of meaning. Adding to the confusion were times students would be reminded to use only English. Clarifying what the ideology was and creating expectations and parameters for use were needed in this classroom (Mori, 2014).

How language ideology and practice conflict was also observed by Kolano et al. (2011). Despite expressing concerns about not understanding the language themselves, teachers interviewed in this study all recognized the importance of students using their L1 to assist in understanding. What Kolano et al. discovered through classroom observations was that these same teachers did not do much, except on rare occasions, to actually encourage or support students using their L1.

Also expressing concerns about not being able to use L1 was a teacher at the second site highlighted by Lucas and Katz (1994). This teacher felt L1 had a place within the classroom but considered herself to be limited because she did not have an extensive knowledge of Spanish, the students’ L1, and could only use it to translate the occasional word. Other teachers at the same site viewed it their responsibility to “bombard” students with as much English as possible during the school day because the
students, in these teachers’ opinions, received enough input from the L1 outside of class. Teachers within the same school may have differing views of L1 use.

Teacher attitudes varied greatly from placing value upon the students’ L1s (Welch, 2015; Worthy et al., 2003) to sentiments of “English-only” being the correct course of action (Skilton-Sylvester, 2003), and could even vary within the same school environment (Lucas & Katz, 1994). The amount of formal ESL training may impact attitudes toward the use of L1 (Karathanos, 2009) with more training contributing to positive attitudes and less contributing to negative attitudes (Skilton-Sylvester, 2003). The implicit nature of language ideology was demonstrated through the conflicting stated ideologies in Kolano et al. (2011) and Mori (2014). The teachers in Kolano et al.’s study may be unaware of ideologies they may hold placing higher value upon English as evidenced through their classroom practices. The teacher in Mori (2014) may be unaware of pressure not to use students’ L1s which may have contributed to her inconsistent use, she may value students’ L1s as a teaching tool but feel unable to make specific policies within the classroom to allow it.

**Student Attitudes**

Expanding upon the work done in 2009, Karathanos (2010) noted a theme which emerged from teacher survey responses. Teachers commented that their use of students’ L1s contributed to the students’ feeling elevated status and that their language and culture were valued. Henze and Lucas (1993) observed a similar phenomenon in the Biology 1 class for Spanish speakers where the teacher taught completely in Spanish other than emphasizing key science vocabulary in English. This teacher had learned Spanish as a second language, which demonstrated to students his value for the language; allowing
students to correct him on his pronunciation and grammar increased the confidence felt by students in their own proficiencies in Spanish.

Unlike the feelings of worth expressed by students in studies by Karathanos (2010) and Henze and Lucas (1993), Motha (2006) found the feelings of the ELs within her interview subjects’ classrooms were generally negative. As a result of her interviews with four ESL teachers, Motha discovered the students within their classes largely felt marginalized from the mainstream and inferior to their monolingual, monocultural classmates. Reasons for these negative attitudes discovered through the interviews included isolation of the physical ESL classroom and the students themselves from the mainstream classrooms within the building. In order for these students to feel valued, the worth and importance of multilingualism must be shown and highlighted, according to Motha (2006).

In observations of ELs within an urban school setting in London, Bourne (2001) discovered students’ relative indifference to the terms mother tongue and L2; the two languages are integrated into their communication practices without much thought. For these students, switching between their mother tongue and English is similar to switching between different registers, depending upon the audience or the situation. Multilingualism was heavily valued in the classrooms in Welch’s (2015) and Worthy et al.’s (2003) studies. Welch noted the students preferred their ESL class because they were able to use both of their languages; being bilingual was seen as an asset. In the third site discussed in their study, Lucas and Katz (1994) observed a general sense of respect for students’ L1s, which researchers saw realized in the comfortable manner in which students used their L1s across the different classroom settings.
Ma (2009) also sought to understand students’ attitudes toward L1 use by asking if ELs preferred bilingual classes and finding out the reasons for such preferences. Students in this study cited both pedagogical and cognitive reasons for their partiality towards bilingually taught English classes. Reasons given included being able to better learn the English basics, being able to communicate more effectively with the instructor, and being more encouraged to attend class because students did not feel the amount of confusion and frustration they had felt in monolingual English classes.

Attendance for English classes among the adults in Lukes’ (2011) study also increased because of the use of students’ L1 in instruction. Prior to the native language literacy classes offered in addition to the ESL classes, students in this study were not able to keep up with the pace of the traditional ESL classrooms. Frustration in not understanding the class and shame in being illiterate contributed to students’ not attending their ESL classes; they noted feeling useless, stuck, stupid, blind, ashamed, and caged prior to attending the native literacy classes. Through participation in the native literacy program, the students became motivated to develop their literacy skills in both English and Spanish; they viewed this dual literacy as essential for success in the future.

Adult ELs were initially hesitant to use their L1s in the constructed group activities of Storch and Wigglesworth’s (2003) study. The second group within their study was explicitly given permission to use the L1 and as a result reverted to their L1 more frequently than the first group. When asked about their hesitation to use the L1, participants stated they wanted to use as much English as possible in their ESL classes in order to improve their skills. Even with this reluctance, eight of the twelve students
revealed that using their L1 would have aided in the efficient completion of the tasks, admitting the value that using their L1 could have had.

Making connections between the language students were learning, English, and their L1, French, through intentionally planned lessons was the focus of Horst et al. (2010) in Montreal, Canada. These researchers found that allowing students to give examples and to explain grammar by making comparisons to French was very valuable. The English teacher in this study commented "being able to explain things about French to their English teacher gave the students confidence and a sense of empowerment." (Horst et al., 2010, p. 344) Similar to these feelings, a teacher in Lucas and Katz (1994) stated that the students would correct her grammar or word usage when she used their L1, Spanish. This, in her opinion, allowed her and her students to establish camaraderie. Most likely for the reasons stated in Horst et al. (2010), students may feel empowered by being able to teach their teacher.

Language use is closely tied to feelings of identity which was part of the focus in the study performed by Yeh (2014) which examined language ideology in terms of teacher’s coercive power and students’ abilities to balance that power. All of the participants in the study, adult ELs with L1s in French, Turkish, Chinese, Spanish, Korean, were observed utilizing their L1s in a confident manner within the ESL classroom to establish their identity as multilinguals and as knowledgeable experts in a language other than English through connections made between their L1 and English. Occasionally, this use of L1 was seen as negative because it was perceived as threatening to peers of speakers from different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. In these cases, the other students requested English be used in the classroom (Yeh, 2014).
As exhibited through the above examples, students tend to have positive attitudes towards their use of L1 when they feel their L1 and their status as competent users of the L1 are being valued (Horst et al., 2010; Karathanos, 2010; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Lukes, 2011; Ma, 2009; Welch, 2015; Worthy et al., 2003). Conversely, negative attitudes are felt when students’ L1s are viewed as a hindrance to participation in school as opposed to an asset as seen among the students in Motha (2006). The subjects of Storch and Wiggleworth’s (2003) study exemplified the assumption English is best learned if it is used exclusively without interference from the L1. Participants initially were reluctant to revert to their L1 stating they wanted to maximize their use of English; however, after receiving permission and utilizing their L1 as a learning tool, students admitted its value. Whereas students felt confident using their L1s in Yeh (2014), when students communicated for extended time periods in their L1 other students, who did not share that L1, would request “English-only.” This practice also occurred in earlier discussions from Mori (2014) and Razfar and Rumenapp (2012) when the L1 minority students felt threatened by the L1 majority’s use of L1, thus showing how while L1 use is valuable it should also be used judiciously.

Razfar and Rumenapp

Razfar and Rumenapp’s (2012) study explored the language ideologies of both teachers and students through interviews with the teachers and a survey distributed to students. The classroom practices of the teachers were then observed in order to examine how ideologies affect discourses which were previously described under the topic of student use of the L1. The teachers were one who taught a sheltered ESL class, and a
multilingual teacher of the advanced ESL class. These teachers demonstrated differing language ideologies in their interviews and through their classroom observations.

When asked about “English-only” rules, the sheltered ESL teacher emphasized the importance of an English class being conducted in English and being focused upon the acquisition of English skills. He stated students’ L1s play a minor role in his class and he limits the amount of time and opportunities the students have to use them. The teacher of the advanced class, on the other hand, stated the importance of L1 within her class to understand how her students learn. She discussed the relationship between formal L1 literacy and ease of L2 (English) acquisition and how knowledge of students’ L1s enables her to better understand the source of some student errors. She cited one specific example about how knowing a Spanish speaker may have trouble with the prepositions in and on in English, which fall under the same word in Spanish *en*, enables her to create additional visual support and opportunities to practice the English prepositions.

In addition to investigating the language ideology of teachers, students’ language ideologies were also studied by Razfar and Rumenapp (2012). One example where a student demonstrated a particular language ideology occurred in the advanced ESL class. Researchers observed an interaction beginning with the student being asked which class was his favorite. The student replied Mandarin, his L1, was his favorite because it was easy and he would like to teach it one day. When asked a follow-up question about which classes are important for the student’s future, he responded saying English and math. This interaction shows the student was cognizant of the importance of English over his own native language.
More specific information from the high school students in the advanced ESL and sheltered ESL classrooms observed for the study concerning language ideologies were obtained via interviews. Students were asked the questions described below about the use of their L1s at home and at school.

When asked, “Did your parents or other relatives have strong feelings about which language should be used at home?”, 95% of students in the sheltered class responded their relatives felt speaking both languages would be good while 75% of the students in the advanced ESL class stated their relatives had negative feelings when the students spoke English at home. The background of the students is important to note here as the students in the sheltered class, a transitional class before entering the mainstream, had either immigrated before the age of 5 or were born in the United States, many growing up in bilingual households, whereas the students in the advanced ESL class were newer arrivals to the United States whose family members were proficient only in the L1 and not English.

Concerning attitudes of how and when their L1s can be used within the school setting, students were asked, “Do you remember any rules about using Spanish (or another language) in school?” Again, answers to this question varied greatly between the students in the sheltered ESL class, with the majority saying there were no explicit rules except an occasional comment about not speaking it in class or mixing the two languages, and those in the advanced ESL class with more than half stating that yes, there were rules.

Comments made by the members of the advanced ESL class included an anecdote about a teacher in middle school telling the student to not speak Spanish in class because
the more he speaks English the more he will learn English. Other students mentioned the inappropriateness of using their L1 if other people in the classroom were not able to speak or understand it.

A positive attitude towards the students’ own L1s was noted through their responses to the question, “How do you feel about your primary language?” Positive feelings and pride were expressed among students of both classes concerning the different languages students spoke as well as a noted connection between those languages and their identities in terms of where they come from, family roles, and ethnic backgrounds (Razfar & Rumenapp, 2012).

Razfar and Rumenapp’s (2012) study illustrated how students’ attitudes towards L1 use may be associated with their level of English proficiency, time spent in the country, and family’s abilities in English. As students advance in their English learning and time in the country, it would be interesting to see whether these attitudes change.

Advocacy

In searching for materials that address how students’ L1s have been used in the ESL classroom, multiple studies were found which relied on the work of others to make arguments pertaining to why students’ L1s should be incorporated into classroom practices. While this systematic literature review only offers information found from studies which addressed ESL students in English-speaking countries, some of the literature reviews described within this topic include studies in foreign language and EFL classrooms. The arguments presented, which advocated for L1 use in the language classroom in general as opposed to specifically the ESL classroom, especially Cummins (2007), Cook (2001), and Cook and Hall (2012), were deemed important for
consideration into this capstone and are described within this category of advocacy. The information obtained from the seven literature reviews consulted for this capstone is divided among the categories reasons for avoiding L1 and suggestions for how the L1 can be incorporated into the classroom.

Reasons for Avoiding the L1

Both Cummins (2007) and Cook (2001) frame their arguments about why students’ L1s should be part of the language learning classroom by exposing the reasons which are made to avoid its use. This section will model its structure upon the categories used by Cummins (2007) and Cook (2001) to illustrate what they consider to be the erroneous motives for denying students’ L1s a place in the language learning environment. Cummins (2007) describes three assumptions promoting the use of monolingual instruction in the language classroom, while Cook (2001) presents three arguments. Drawing upon these notions, the reasons for avoiding the L1 in the classroom will be explained through the following sub-headings: L2 input maximization, L1 and L2 separation, and translation avoidance.

L2 Input Maximization

The maximization of L2 input is an argument presented in Cummins (2007) termed “the direct method assumption” (p. 222) and categorized by Cook (2001) as “argument for second language use in the classroom” (p. 408). The belief is that the target language (TL) or L2 should be employed at all times within the classroom while entirely abstaining from the L1 in order to provide students with as many meaningful examples of and practice with the L2 as possible. Cook (2001), Cummins (2007) and Turnbull (as cited in Cummins, 2007, p. 227) acknowledge the maximization of L2 input
does not equate to L1 avoidance. Genesee et al. (2005) also contend there is little research to support that taking time away from L2 instruction to focus upon L1 literacy development has negative effects on the learning of the L2. Reasons given to support these claims include observed practices of L1 use in language classrooms which were deemed successful in meeting the needs of L2 learners, described benefits of L1 use in learning vocabulary, scaffolded teaching to promote understanding, and increased status given to language minority students in using their L1.

In making his case for the benefits of students’ L1s within the language classroom, Cummins (2007) highlighted the study conducted by Lucas and Katz (1994), who examined effective practices in ESL classrooms where English was the principal language of instruction but had proven to be successful in teaching ELs. They found students’ L1s to be used in a number of ways that proved to be beneficial to students. A quote from their study which was also used in Cook (2001) and Hall and Cook (2012) describes what Lucas and Katz found to be the case in their observations, “the use of the native language is so compelling that it emerges even when policies and assumptions mitigate against it” (p. 558).

Studies from a number of sources, including Luppescu and Day; Prince; Laufer and Kimmel; and Laufer and Shmueli (as cited in Cummins, 2007, p. 226) and Prince; Nation; Bruton; Laufer and Girsai; and Celik (as cited in Hall & Cook, 2012, p. 290) provide support for the use of bilingual dictionaries in learning L2 vocabulary. Nation (as cited in Hall & Cook, 2012, p. 290) deems translating into the L1 the best way in which to learn L2 vocabulary.
The research by Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (as cited in Cummins, 2007, p. 231) determined “optimal learning” takes place when students’ prior knowledge is activated and built upon. Using students’ background knowledge in this way is a method of scaffolding, allowing students to gradually build up to what they need to learn. The exclusion of students’ L1s from the language classroom prohibits students from fully utilizing this background knowledge as they are limited to sharing or drawing upon only what they can express or understand in the L2 (Cook, 2001; Cummins, 2007) thus preventing “optimal learning”. Hall and Cook (2012) cite scaffolding as a key use of the L1 in L2 learning, as teachers will need to employ students’ L1s in order to fully “activate learners’ prior knowledge” (p. 291).

Students’ L1s are linked to their identity, culture, and sense of self. Cook (2001) states “when using the L1, the teacher is treating the students as their real selves rather than dealing with assumed L2 personas” (p. 416). Specifically examining adult populations of ELs with limited to no literacy in their L1, monolingual instruction prevents these students from accessing information, limits full participation in the classroom, and contributes to dropping out of school as seen in the studies by Strei and Gillespie and Balering (as cited in Auerbach, 1993, p. 17). Denying the use of L1 within the ESL learning context, Auerbach argues, may inhibit the acquisition of English as it promotes “disempowering relations” (1993, p. 16). Not utilizing students’ L1s in the classroom demonstrates to students that neither their L1 nor their experiences or knowledge relating to it are valued, causing feelings of lowered self-esteem and status as students are subject to the powers of the language majority in the classroom (Auerbach, 1993).
Maximizing L2 input is not an excuse for L1 avoidance. Researchers throughout the literature reviews agreed upon the importance of optimal input in teaching; they argued the benefits of incorporating students’ L1s judiciously are undeniable. Utilizing L1 in the learning of vocabulary, scaffolding learning through the activation of prior knowledge in the L1, and validating the importance and status of the L1 may enable students to more efficiently and effectively experience success in learning the L2.

**L1 and L2 Separation**

The separation of the L1 and L2 called the “two solitudes assumption” by Cummins (2007, p. 223) and the “argument from language compartmentalization” by Cook (2001, p. 407) refers to the isolation of the two languages, the L1 and L2, from one another in teaching and learning. Both languages are used within instruction but each fill a certain need or function isolated from the other (Cummins, 2007). While the students’ L1s are being used in this situation, not making a connection between the L1 and the L2 does not take advantage of what Cook (2001), also referenced in Hall and Cook (2012), termed as compound bilingualism, which is the interweaving of both languages within the learner’s mind. In order to negate the reasons for keeping L1 and L2 separate, researchers described the benefits of making connections between the two languages and developing literacy skills in the L1 which in turn promote literacy skills in the L2.

There are key differences between those acquiring an additional language and how people learn their L1, learners of an L2 already know ‘how to mean’ according to Halliday (as cited in Cook, 2001, p. 406). When learning an additional language, Stern (as cited in Hall & Cook, 2012, p. 280) states making connections between students’ L1s and the L2 within the minds of learners is an ‘indisputable fact of life’, students will
inevitably reference their L1 when learning the L2 regardless of whether teachers explicitly draw connections to it, a phenomena which cannot occur when learning an L1 as there is no other point of reference. Similar to Stern’s argument, Cummins (2007) points out the practice of making connections between the L1 and L2 is already occurring within students’ minds. If teachers make explicit references to or offer strategies specifically employing the L1, they may be able to further exploit what Butzkamm and Caldwell (as cited in Hall & Cook, 2012, p. 282) call ‘the greatest pedagogical resource’ students have in the learning of an L2, their L1.

The skills learned in the L1 can also be transferred to the learning of the L2, further opposing the need to keep students’ L1s and L2 separate. Thomas and Collier (as cited in Cummins, 2007, p. 233) found students’ proficiency in their L1s at the time of entry into the United States to be the major indicator of future academic development in English. In the review of research conducted in the United States concerning the educational outcomes of ELs, Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, and Christian (2005), encountered similar findings of levels of L1 literacy relating to successful acquisition of English. Specific skills in the L1 which assisted in the development of the L2, included having phonological awareness, recognizing the representation of sounds through letters, and possessing a more extensive vocabulary in the L1, which helped in the recognition of cognates in the L2 (Genesee et al., 2005).

Negative ramifications of isolating the L1 and L2 from one another were found in Genesee et al. (2005). Genesee et al. discovered a correlation between ELs who viewed their L1 as a cause for confusion and kept both languages separate while learning the L2 and a tendency to experience more difficulties in learning English. Jimenez et al. (as
cited in Genesee et al., 2005, p. 372) proposed making explicit connections between the languages may be beneficial to students who are struggling. In the reviews of studies consulted for this section, separation of L1 and L2 was not found to benefit language students.

Translation Avoidance

Two educational approaches related to translation in the language classroom are the grammar/translation method, which was the primary method used up until the late nineteenth century focusing upon the translation of written texts and memorization of grammar rules, and the concurrent translation method, which provides students with a translation of classroom instruction immediately into their L1 (Cummins, 2007). The grammar/translation method did not provide students with the opportunity to use language for verbal communication and is not well supported today (Cook, 2001). Immediate translation of the L2 into a student’s L1 could cause problems as students may rely on the translation rather than attempting to understand what is being said in the L2 (Cummins, 2007; Faltis, 1996; Ma, 2009). Research has emerged, however, which draws attention to the beneficial aspects of translation in language learning.

To make the argument for the benefits of translation, Cummins (2007) highlights the work from Manyak (2004) who studied first and second graders in a California English immersion classroom. In various activities observed, translation was determined to be helpful in promoting English acquisition to all students as low and high proficient students had access to content, developing literacy in both English and the L1 of students (Spanish), and increasing confidence and pride in students’ abilities as Spanish and
English speakers (Manyak, 2004). A sense of pride in being bilingual was also noticed by Malakoff & Hakuta (as cited in Cook, 2001, p. 417).

Translation is also a practical life skill needed outside of the classroom setting. Cook (2001) and Cummins (2007) recognize language minority students often are called to serve as translators for their parents or older generations. Hall and Cook (2012) advocate for the use of translation because it is an important skill for language learners utilizing the skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

Cummins (2007) surmises “L1 is not the enemy in promoting high levels of L2 proficiency” (p. 238). Students’ L1s can be used as a resource in the learning of the L2 by aiding in the acquisition of L2 vocabulary, scaffolding information being learned in the L2, promoting feelings of elevated status and pride in the L1 even as the L2 is learned, connecting skills and knowledge to the L2, and using it as a communication tool through translation. According to the literature reviews described in this section, when used judiciously, the students’ L1 can assist in the successful acquisition of the L2.

Suggestions for Incorporating L1 into the Classroom

Not only do the literature reviews consulted for this study present a case for the inclusion of L1 into the language classroom, they also suggest ways in which it can be utilized as an instructional and learning tool within the classroom. Ideas offered for the incorporation of the students’ L1s include areas of classroom management, classroom instruction, and promoting positive classroom environments.

The management of day to day operations in the classroom has a language of its own. Cook (2001) offers the use of L1 to more easily and efficiently give directions and explanations. Auerbach (1993) proposes the use of students’ L1s in establishing
classroom procedures and even suggests discussions concerning topics of interest to be covered in class and determining situations in which the L1 would be appropriate or needed in the classroom take place in the students’ L1s.

Suggestions involving using the L1 in classroom instruction are the most numerous. Providing links between what is already known in the L1 to the L2 including identifying similarities and differences and using the L1 to activate students’ background knowledge is recommended by Auerbach (1993), Cook (2001), Cummins (2007) and Hall and Cook (2012). Developing ways in which students can practice code-switching and translation, skills students will encounter outside of school, is proposed by Cook (2001). Other methods in which the L1 can be utilized to assist in L2 instruction and learning proposed by Auerbach (1993) include initial literacy development in the L1 prior to or in conjunction with ESL classes; writing activities including pre-writing in the L1 and explicitly discussing differences and similarities between writing in the L1 and the L2 developing metacognitive processes; and in the teaching of grammar and vocabulary.

Cook (2001) and Cummins (2007) mention the use of L1 when students work collaboratively in groups. Liang, Mohan, and Early (1997) specifically studied the use of cooperative learning groups with ELs. Their research indicated that cooperative learning was potentially beneficial due to the creation of opportunities for both input and output of the L2 and providing the opportunity to draw upon the L1 while developing L2 skills. According to Liang et al. (1997) more research is needed to analyze what types of L1 and L2 discourse is taking place within groups and whether the use of some students’ L1s in the ESL classroom negatively impacts inter-ethnic relationships within the classroom environment among students who speak other L1s. While the use of cooperative groups
seems an ideal way to incorporate students’ L1s into the classroom, especially in situations where the teacher does not have knowledge of the students’ L1s, research needs to be conducted to determine how ELs perceive the use of this method of learning as some ELs uphold the traditional view of all education needing to be obtained from the figure of authority within the classroom, the teacher.

Use of the L1 also contributes to positive classroom environments and can aid in reducing student anxiety (Auerbach, 1993; Hall & Cook, 2012). Building rapport between students and teachers is another outcome of L1 incorporation (Hall & Cook, 2012). Auerbach (1993) further suggests facilitating conversations that allow students to teach each other about their cultures and create understanding across cultures through the use of students’ L1s.

Many suggestions were given for the incorporation of students’ L1s into the classroom of which these are just a few of the examples. A summary of the most common methods found and discussed is presented in Chapter 5.

Summary

Through the process of this research, multiple ways in which students’ L1s have been used within the ESL classroom were discovered; regardless of the teacher’s own language abilities or understanding of the students’ L1s, this resource can be drawn upon to enable students to have meaningful access to content and instruction. Research to support the absence of students’ L1s from the ESL classroom and the use of monolingual instructional strategies was not found. While advocating for the utilization of students’ L1s as a teaching tool and means by which to scaffold learning, many researchers caution
against unbridled use and encourage the thoughtful and judicious incorporation of students’ L1s.

Attitudes towards L1 use and the practice of incorporating it into the classroom are intrinsically linked. Understanding the implicit forces influencing our language ideologies and how those ideologies empower or disenfranchise ELs is essential in challenging societal assumptions that may negatively impact language minority students. The role of ESL teacher may not only entail developing English skills in the areas of reading, writing, speaking, and listening but may also include making students explicitly aware of language ideologies.

The results of my collection of data from the analysis of thirty-two studies pertaining to the use of students’ L1s in ESL classrooms were presented in this chapter. Materials consulted were explained through a description of the studies’ foci, manners in which data was collected, and educational settings in which research occurred. Major findings from the articles utilized within this systematic literature review were summarized under the categories: instances of L1 use, L1 use despite restrictive laws, attitudes, and advocacy. In Chapter Five, a discussion of the major findings, their implications, and limitations of the study are found. This capstone concludes with how I intend to share the information and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

In this systematic literature review, I have sought to answer the question of how students’ L1s are used in the ESL classroom and what benefits are associated with their use. While these research questions appear simple, through the reading of the research complexities underlying the motivations for using or not using students’ L1s as a part of the English-learning process emerged. As noted previously in Chapter 2, language ideologies may influence what choices an individual makes or the policies a school, district, or state implements in terms of language use. As a result of the complex relationship between language ideologies and language use, the conclusions presented in this chapter not only discuss specific ways in which students’ L1s are used by teachers and/or students, but also themes regarding attitudes towards and motivations for the use or non-use of students’ L1s within the ESL classroom.

This final chapter will present the major findings of the data discussed in Chapter Four. Major findings are categorized into the following themes: motivations, methods, and benefits. Implications of what these findings may mean for educators and administrators, limitations of the research reviewed, and options for further research close the chapter.

Major Findings

Throughout the data gathering process for this review there were many articles which pertained to L1 use in foreign language or EFL classrooms. Articles focusing
upon L1 use specifically within an ESL classroom setting of ELs in English-speaking
countries were much more difficult to discover; however, thirty-two articles were found
which addressed L1 use in ESL classrooms and helped answer this capstone’s research
question of how students’ L1s are used in the ESL classroom. Through an analysis of the
research results, the major findings of this systematic literature review can be categorized
into three central themes: motivations, methods, and benefits.

Motivations

Through the analysis of classroom practices, attitudes, and reviews of literature,
many justifications were discovered for invoking “English-only” or not implementing
students’ L1s within the classroom. These reasons included assumptions about L2
learning, the underlying political ideologies, and the need to manage classroom behavior.

While the intention of this paper was to determine how L1 has been used in the
ESL classroom, why it has or hasn’t been used emerged as an important theme
throughout the research. Initially in the search, the aim was to analyze studies showing
the use of students’ L1s specifically in ESL classrooms as well as any research promoting
the prohibition of use of L1 by students and teachers through the enforcement of English
only policies. All of the studies consulted for this literature review supported some use of
the L1 within the ESL classroom, many times described as “judicial” use. The lack of
studies presenting arguments for the complete immersion of students into the target
language (TL) caught me by surprise. This void of research backing the use of “English
only” within the ESL classroom is considered a major finding in itself.

In the rebuttal to Auerbach’s (1993) assertion of language ideologies playing a
role in teachers’ decisions to use “English-only” within their classrooms, Polio (1994)
cites methodology as the motivation for this policy. Discovering a lack of studies supporting “English-only” provides evidence to back the argument presented by Auerbach (1993): language ideologies, overt or underlying, affect language choice within classrooms more than a research-backed suggestion of best practice. These language ideologies may be political in nature or rest upon assumptions about how second languages should be learned and have been taken for granted as accepted practices. Chapter 4 highlighted the arguments presented in various literature reviews which argued for the use of L1 in the L2 classroom. Many of the assumptions about how to best learn a language were denounced. Optimal use of the L2 in the classroom is beneficial; however, this does not justify the avoidance of the L1 altogether. The L1 can actually enhance L2 learning through scaffolding what students already know, making connections to literacy skills already developed in the L1, translating vocabulary and content, developing rapport between teachers and students, creating positive classroom environments, and easing anxiety by placing value upon the L1 (Horst et al., 2010; Karathanos, 2010; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Lukes, 2011; Ma, 2009; Welch, 2015; Worthy et al., 2003).

A motivation which also emerged for not using the students’ L1s within the classroom was to manage student behavior. In a number of the examples of teacher/student interactions presented in the studies contained in this review, students were encouraged to speak “English-only” instead of their L1 to prevent them from talking too much in class. The teacher in Mori (2014) was observed telling students to use only English when there was chatter among students in their L1 during class time. The exchanges between the teacher and students observed by Razfar and Rumenapp (2012)
could also be considered a means of classroom management as every instance of telling students to speak only in English came when there were excessive amounts of talking among students. This is an area in which more research is needed as through my discussions with other ESL professionals during the writing of this capstone, the topic of restricting L1 use to control student behavior was presented on a number of occasions.

**Methods**

The main purpose of this literature review was to find the techniques teachers have implemented or allowed for the use of students’ L1s within their classroom. Looking at the methods by which many teachers have successfully incorporated students’ L1s into the classroom offers helpful examples of how others have utilized students’ L1s as a valuable teaching tool. Even if a teacher is not fluent or has no training in another language there are ways to integrate it into the classroom.

There are a number of strategies that students can employ to use their L1s to promote comprehension of content within the classroom. Students were seen using their L1 in the classroom to provide assistance to one another, ask and answer questions of each other or the teacher if the language was mutually understood, and provide the teacher with translations of words or concepts. Allowing students to use their L1s can prove beneficial in the classroom and does not rely upon the teacher understanding the students’ L1s; however, as Mori (2014) observes this method of incorporating students’ L1s into the classroom requires a level of trust in students using the L1 appropriately and correctly.

Ways in which teachers utilized the students’ L1s in the classrooms included explaining activities, translating words and concepts, checking students for
comprehension of what was said or taught in English, and even at times interacting socially with students. An emphasis was placed on the importance of not providing simple direct translation from English into the students’ L1s but rather an explanation of complex concepts in the L1, which would then provide a foundation of understanding for students to draw upon when learning in English.

Bilingually taught classes enabled students to develop literacy in the L1 which in turn assisted in their learning of English. This method of L1 use is not available in all ESL program models and depends upon the program structure and availability of qualified teaching professionals proficient in English and the L1 being used. The studies consulted that employed this method were primarily Spanish/English bilingual settings but also included a Chinese/English bilingual classroom, and a bilingual Hmong aide who assisted Hmong children learning English. The use of the bilingual educational method in a multilingual classroom setting was not explored.

Benefits

Many studies within this review spoke of ways in which the L1 was used within the classroom but did not elaborate upon the benefits to students as a result of its use; however, those that did provided anecdotal evidence experienced by students and teachers and some quantitative evidence. Benefits described in the research included promoting understanding of content and English acquisition, modeling language acquisition, developing rapport between teachers and students, and promoting increased student self-esteem and positive classroom environments.

Using students’ L1s in the ESL classroom has many benefits to students’ abilities to understand and make meaning of content. Tedick and Cammarata (2012) found use of
students’ L1 could be beneficial in promoting academic achievement while promoting L1 literacy but call for more research as to what judicious use of the L1 within language learning contexts means. Horst, et al. (2010) found that connections made cross-linguistically assisted in learners in to link new information in the L2 to knowledge they already had. While Horst, et al. (2010) states this is just good teaching, the idea of using students’ L1s to make these types of connections has been viewed as not acceptable practice in L2 learning contexts.

Duke and Mabott (2000) present quantitative findings to support the effectiveness of the inclusion program implemented with first grade students. Those participating in the inclusion model exited the ESL program at an increased rate and out-performed their peers on district assessments. Teachers noted that inclusion program participants took more risks when they knew there was L1 support available and seemed to utilize English more in classroom interactions. An additional benefit to the use of students’ L1 (Hmong) was students who were not Hmong-speakers learned a few words in the language and gained an appreciation for the language as they heard it being used with teaching staff and students.

A teacher with limited proficiency in the students’ L1, noted in de Oliveira, et al. (2016), asked for student feedback when she attempted to use Spanish in her classroom. By asking students for validation of her language use and trying despite not being perfect, this teacher was modeling how language is acquired. De Oliveira, et al. (2016) noted the benefits of modeling in this way, especially to lower level students who may be more encouraged to learn English while still using their Spanish to negotiate meaning. If
students see a teacher attempting to use their L1 despite struggling, they may be more at ease and tempted to take risks in communicating in English.

A teacher in Lucas and Katz (1994) also reported using Spanish and having students correct her vocabulary or grammar usage because she felt this helped her to form camaraderie with the students. The teacher in Horst, et al. (2010) also reported students responding positively when they were seen as the experts in their L1 who could teach the teacher. Auerbach (1993) states with the incorporation of the L1, students’ self-esteem is elevated and with this more confidence in their skills to become successful in learning English and anxiety and culture shock can be diminished.

The study conducted by Henze and Lucas (1993) found features which specifically promoted the use of students’ L1 as good teaching practices. These features were allowing students to use their L1s for social and academic purposes, emphasizing the importance of learning content instead of learning English, and showing the value the teacher held for the students’ L1s. The teacher of Biology 1 for Spanish-speakers observed by Henze and Lucas exemplified these features as he used students’ L1 to promote the learning of science concepts and felt free to make mistakes in the L1 which students then corrected.

A teacher trying to use the students’ L1 and being open to making mistakes and allowing students to be the experts in their own language also helps build confidence in the students’ own language abilities even if those abilities are in a language other than English as seen in the examples listed above. Using Fairclough’s (1988) theory related to language, power, and inequality, the correlation between students’ L1s being used and students feeling elevated status shows how teachers can challenge the traditional ideology
of undervaluation of minority languages and perpetuation of the dominance of English. The inequality ELs experience as a result of the pressures to assimilate into American culture and the ideology of “English only” can be confronted in the classroom through teachers demonstrating that their language also has value (Karathanos, 2010).

Rivera states monolingual teaching in ESL should be denounced not solely because it does not benefit ELs and restricts them from using their L1s as a resource, but it also relies on the language accessible to students in English which for beginners is simple and childlike regardless of age and devoid of higher level thinking skills and engagement (as cited in Auerbach, 1993, p. 22). Monolingual teaching ultimately contributes to the power relationship of benefiting some while marginalizing others “reproducing a stratum of people who can only do the least skilled and least language/literacy-dependent jobs” by forcing students to only be able to communicate up to a certain level as their proficiency permits as they are unable to utilize their L1s.

Implications

This research has many implications for the classroom practices of teachers serving ELs and the main implication is to use students’ L1s in the classroom. As summarized in the findings above, there are multiple ways in which teachers, second language ability notwithstanding, can incorporate parts of the students’ L1s into the classroom. While using students’ L1s can be beneficial, it should not be used without intention or purpose. Of the literature reviews examined for this investigation, all state students’ L1s should be used in the classroom “judiciously.” The exact definition of what “judicious” use of students’ L1s means is an area in which more research needs to be done.
Another technique teachers can use to support their ELs is talking about language ideologies in the classroom. As ESL teachers, recognizing the power relationships that undermine the value of the students’ L1s and bringing this to students’ attention is imperative in fighting against them. Students need to know that although learning English is important to their success in this country and the opportunities available to them, maintaining their L1 and being fluent and knowledgeable users of another language is a valuable asset.

Limitations

Due the nature of systematic literature reviews, which rely on the work of other professionals, and the size and scope of the study, this review was limited in a number of ways. The primary limitations of this study include the parameters used to search for and include documents into this review and the gray area between programs designed to promote acquisition of English language and programs which promote bilingualism.

The first limitation of this study was how information was gathered and included into the review. In a systematic literature review, the data used for analysis are obtained through research conducted and articles written by others; hence, finding all research available is one issue specific to this type of review. Multiple efforts were made in order to obtain as many available sources as possible to answer this capstone’s research question, including various keyword searches conducted in a number of different databases and consultation with a reference librarian. Despite these efforts, some sources may have been missed which could have offered more data on how students’ L1s are used in the ESL classroom. Other keywords were discovered through the investigation of
articles. Keywords such as “subtractive schooling” and “monolingual instruction” could have been utilized during the initial search and may have yielded more results.

Because the ultimate goal was to find ways in which the L1 was used in ESL classrooms, the choice was made to focus upon this particular learning environment in the English-speaking countries of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. These parameters excluded research conducted in countries such as Malaysia and South Africa as well as studies focusing upon L1 use in the EFL and foreign language classrooms. Sources were further evaluated for inclusion based upon peer-reviewed status which excluded dissertations and masters’ theses. These types of documents could have provided more information specific to L1 use in the ESL classroom.

The second limitation of this review concerns ESL and bilingual education, two separate but overlapping educational approaches. This study was intended to look specifically at L1 use in an ESL classroom with particular interest in how students’ L1s were used when a class represented students with diverse L1s. Studies relating to the unique situation of ELs with different L1s within the same classroom were few in numbers. Bilingual classrooms designed specifically to address the needs of ELs were thus included into this study, but were limited to only those that appeared under the search terms used (see Chapter Three). Other studies that addressed L1 use in bilingual education may have been missed due to using “ESL” or “English as a Second Language” as search terms.
Further Research

As I conducted the research for this review, many possibilities for further inquiry into the topic of L1 became evident or were presented in the articles. While the research conducted answered the guiding question of how students’ L1s have been used in the ESL classroom, this entire process has left a need to know more. The questions and research suggestions focus upon the areas of classroom setting, “judicious” use of L1, and student outcomes.

Much of the research consulted for this review dealt with classrooms of students who either all or the majority shared a common L1 (de Oliveira et al., 2016; Duke & Mabbottt, 2000; Faltis, 1996; Horst et al., 2010; Huerta-Macias & Kephart, 2009; Kolano et al., 2011; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Lukes, 2011; Ma, 2009; Skilton-Sylvester, 2003; Welch, 2015). More research into L1 use in ESL classrooms with students from diverse L1 backgrounds is needed. This situation is different from a classroom with students from the same language background and presents a unique set of questions needing to be answered: what happens when the teacher knows one of the students’ languages but not the others? and how does a teacher allow students to use L1 among themselves when there may be a student who does not share an L1 with anyone in the class?

Specific populations of ELs may respond differently to the incorporation of their L1 into the ESL classroom, particularly older students with limited formal education who may not have literacy in their respective L1s. Lukes (2011) found adult Spanish-speakers who were not literate in their L1 found their Spanish literacy classes to be very valuable and integral to their success in learning English. Further exploration into the native literacy model for older ELs of languages other than Spanish is needed. Genesee et al.
(2005) also mention a need for more research with similar students in middle and high school.

Many of the articles used in this review, while supporting L1 use, mention the need for it to be used “judiciously” in the classroom. The articles, however, do not elaborate upon what exactly “judicial” means or how it would manifest itself in the classroom. Are there circumstances in which the students’ L1s could be used excessively or inhibit the learning of English? Further study is needed to address when L1 use aides in English acquisition and when focusing on the target language, in this case English, is best in order to provide clear parameters for what “judicious” use of L1 may entail.

Very few studies in this review included student outcomes specifically related to L1 use within the classroom. Most evaluations as to the effectiveness of L1 use were made determined upon anecdotal evidence acquired from students and teachers. Clearly defined research questions aimed to specifically obtain student and teacher feedback about L1 use in the classroom are needed to produce more substantial results that can be critically analyzed to show the benefits of and attitudes toward L1 use. In addition to this qualitative form of outcome evaluations, quantitative measures such as performance on standardized tests, classroom performance, and ESL program exit data are also needed. Duke and Mabbott (2000) present quantitative data based on test scores and exit data which are encouraging; however, the performance measures were a result of multiple changes to the ESL program which included incorporating the use of L1 into instruction. This did not provide a one-to-one connection between L1 use and improved EL performance. Direct links between L1 use and quantitative measures may be useful to prove the advantages of incorporating students’ L1s into the classroom.
Communicating the Results

This study’s research will be available electronically via Hamline University’s website and may be of interest to educators who want more information concerning the use of students’ L1s as a teaching tool in the classroom. I hope to use the foundation gained through the analysis of others’ use of L1 within the ESL classroom to conduct studies of my own with students. I would like to determine my students’ attitudes about the use of their L1s during classroom instruction and possibly perform a study with adult newcomers with limited formal education to see if developing their literacy skills in Somali will assist in their acquisition of English. In the future I would like to present a summary of my research to other educators at Minnesota’s Adult Basic Education Summer Institute and possibly publish findings in a relevant journal.

Conclusion

Prior to conducting this research, I was an advocate for L1 use within the classroom but did not have the knowledge of facts and figures supporting my opinions. As a result of performing this systematic literature review, I am better equipped to back my stance and reason with those who do not see a place for the students’ L1s in the ESL classroom.

A revelation through the course of this research was that as teachers we have the responsibility to talk to our students about language ideologies. We have the power to ensure students feel value in the languages they speak and the experiences and knowledge they bring with them to the classroom. Speaking another language and being bilingual should be a source of pride; teachers can make sure the students are aware of this.
In researching the history of language ideologies in the United States and how policies toward language have changed throughout time in this country, I was overwhelmed by the feeling that we were returning to some of the restrictive language policies and ideologies of the past. By becoming aware of the influence of power which underlie language ideologies, understanding the historical and political context for educational policies and practices, and considering the overwhelming benefits of the L1 in the learning of English, it is hoped this knowledge may allow a more subjective critical look into how using a student’s L1 within the classroom could be beneficial from a purely pedagogical lens instead of simply continuing with the status quo.
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Appendix B – Research Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research Question/Study Purpose</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auerbach</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>&quot;Although the exclusive use of English in teaching ESL has come to be seen as a natural and commonsense practice which can be justified on pedagogical grounds, this article argues that it is rooted in a particular ideological perspective, rests on unexamined assumptions, and serves to reinforce inequities in the broader social order. Evidence from research and practice is presented which suggests that the rationale used to justify English only in the classroom is neither conclusive nor pedagogically sound.&quot;</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourne</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>&quot;Bilingualism is part of school life and part of school learning, whether that is officially accepted or not. In what ways 'multilingualism' was lived out in the classroom, what categories of pupil were constructed there, what sorts of positions teacher and pupils seemed to make up in that context?&quot;</td>
<td>U.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>&quot;This paper argues for the re-examination of the time-honored view that the first language should be avoided in the classroom by teachers and students.&quot;</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummins</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>This paper &quot;argues for reconceptualization of the empirical and theoretical rationales underlying much contemporary second/foreign language teaching and bilingual/immersion programs. The author argues that when we free ourselves from exclusive reliance on monolingual instructional approaches, a wide variety of opportunities arise for teaching languages by means of bilingual instructional strategies that acknowledge the reality of, and strongly promote, two-way cross-language transfer.&quot;</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Research Question/Study Purpose</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Jong, Gort, &amp; Cobb</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1. “What programmatic changes occurred in each district as a result of Question 2?</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. How did the administrators translate those sections of Question 2 that aimed at the erosion of the use of languages other than English in school into policies?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Oliveira, Gilmetdinova, &amp; Pelaez-Morales</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>&quot;When, how and why does Ruby (the teacher) use Spanish in the classroom?”</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke &amp; Mabbott</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>&quot;Would a more inclusive method work better for students than the traditional self-contained language development model (ESL teacher pull-out)?&quot;</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faltis</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1. &quot;How were teachers’ views about bilingual teaching and how students learn demonstrated in their instruction? Did these views change after participating in workshops, discussions, and practices?</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. What reasons did teachers give for switching from one language to another during content instruction? Did the reasons change after participating in workshops, discussions and practice?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. What kinds of bilingual teaching strategies did teachers rely on during instruction? Did these strategies change after participating in workshops, discussions, and practice?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, &amp; Christian</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>&quot;This article reviews findings from scientific research that has been conducted in the United States since 1980 on the educational outcomes of English language learners (ELLs).&quot;</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, &amp; Asato</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>&quot;The primary goal of this research was to document stakeholders' understanding of the proposition (California's Proposition 227), its effects, its implementation, and its immediate and long-term consequences on the teaching and learning of literacy and, thus, student learning.&quot;</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Research Question/Study Purpose</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall &amp; Cook</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>&quot;This article surveys the developing English language literature on the role of students' own language(s) in the language classroom.&quot;</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henze &amp; Lucas</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>&quot;Key Objectives for effective teaching in classes for language minority students:  A good class shows evidence of high expectations of students.  A good class promotes language development (in English or the students' native languages).  A good class promotes the development of content knowledge.  A good class promotes active student involvement and engagement.  A good class promotes student self-esteem.  How do these four teachers, all of whom are considered &quot;successful,&quot; accomplish these objectives?  In other words, how does their everyday practice reflect these rather abstract ideals?  And how do the ideals, which are general enough to apply to any students, relate in particular to language minority students?&quot;</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Horst, White, & Bell | 2010 | 1. "To what extent were the two teachers already making connections to the other language in their teaching?  
2. How did analysis of the teaching context (observational data, curriculum materials, teacher attitudes) inform the development of the experimental CLA teaching materials?  
3. Was it feasible to implement CLA activities for a variety of language features: How did the learners and teacher respond to the activities?"                                      | Canada      |
| Huerta-Macias & Kephart | 2009 | "First part of the study: to determine to what extent and for what purposes the students' L1 was used in the Adult classes observed.  Second part of the study: Using a survey of adult educators throughout the United States to answer these questions:  
1. For what purposes do adult ESL instructors use L1 in the classroom?  
2. Do ESL programs have policies regarding native language use in ESL classrooms?  
3. If instructors do not use L1, why don't they?"                                                                 | U.S.A.       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research Question/Study Purpose</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Karathanos         | 2009 | 1. "What are mainstream teachers' perspectives concerning the theory and practice of incorporating ELL students' native languages into instruction?  
2. Do three groups of teachers with varying degrees of teaching experience and ELL-related university preparation differ in their theoretical and practical perspectives on use of the L1 in instruction? Are these perspectives moderated by instructional grade-level?"                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | U.S.A.      |
| Karathanos         | 2010 | 1. To what extent do two groups of mainstream teachers with differing degrees of ELL-specific teacher preparation reportedly promote use of ELL students' native languages in instruction.  
2. In what specific ways do mainstream teachers report promoting use of ELL students' native languages in instruction?  
3. What do mainstream teachers report as most challenging about this practice?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | U.S.A.      |
<p>| Kolano, Lewis, &amp; Kissau | 2011 | &quot;What are the classroom practices of teachers with self-reported positive attitudes toward the use of Spanish by their students in the school?&quot;                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | U.S.A.      |
| Liang, Mohan, &amp; Early | 1997 | &quot;This article reviews the research literature on cooperative learning in the second language (L2) classroom in relation to L2 acquisition, maintenance of first language (L1), the integration of language and content learning, and L2 learners' perceptions, and discusses some issues and problems of this educational innovation in an English as a second language (ESL) context.&quot;                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Literature Review |
| Lucas &amp; Katz       | 1994 | The purpose of this paper is &quot;to examine the data to determine in what contexts, to what extent, for what purposes, and in what ways students' native languages were used in these English-based programs' SAIPIs, Special Alternative Instructional Programs.&quot;                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | U.S.A.      |
| Lukes              | 2011 | &quot;The study purpose is to explore the potential of native language instruction in the context of ESL education for immigrant-emergent bilingual adults.&quot;                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | U.S.A.      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research Question/Study Purpose</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ma               | 2009 | 1. "Do learners prefer to study in a bilingual class? What reasons do the learners give for their preferences?  
2. How important is studying in a bilingual class for the learners?  
3. What attitudes does a bilingual teacher adopt towards the use of learners' L1 in teaching English?" | Australia |
| Mori             | 2014 | "How does the instructor use and enforce her English-only policy in the classroom and how do students respond to such efforts? What are the socialization processes that occur regarding regulation of language use in the classroom?" | U.S.A    |
| Motha            | 2006 | "This study examines each of three interconnected colonialist manifestations within the schools of study:  
1. an embracing of the supremacy of English over other languages, related to the dominance within school walls of a monolingual model of identity;  
2. an investment in keeping Self and Other dichotomous, reflected in a construction of the school category of ESOL as Other and deficit; and  
3. the promotion of a White, NES, American norm and the consequent marginalization of ethnic minority, NNES, and immigrant status." | U.S.A.   |
<p>| Razfar &amp; Rumenapp | 2012 | &quot;As part of a larger interest in how language ideologies mediate classroom discourse practices, this paper analyses the role of awareness in language ideological (L1) inquiry, its methodological implications, as well as pedagogy in second language learning.&quot; | U.S.A.   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research Question/Study Purpose</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Skilton-Sylvester | 2003 | "The paper looks especially at teacher policies concerning the use of English and Khmer in the multilingual classroom and shows how these issues surface in ESL classrooms for both adults and children.  
1. Policies about Khmer use in the classroom (as a way of understanding the value placed on the language in these contexts).  
2. Policies about the use of ‘minority’ content in the classroom and other ways of creating curriculum that is culturally relevant to Cambodians". | U.S.A.  |
| Storch & Wigglesworth | 2003 | "The study purpose was to investigate whether learners in an ESL context would use their L1 as a mediating tool in performing complex tasks and, if so, what cognitive functions would the L1 serve?  
1. How much L1 was used?  
2. What functions did the L1 serve?  
3. What were the students' attitudes toward the use of their L1 in completing tasks in the L2 setting?" | Australia |
<p>| Stritkus          | 2006 | &quot;Through the case study of two teachers in one district's implementation of Proposition 227, the implications of additive and subtractive conceptions for the education of English language learner (ELL) students, the competing theories regarding the education of ELL students materialize into action, and the connections between teachers' theories about their students and the role in the policy to practice connection are examined.&quot; | U.S.A.  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research Question/Study Purpose</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tedick &amp; Cammarata</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>&quot;This literature review, which examines the research on integrating teaching of content and language at the pre-K - 12 level, provides a synthesis of research conducted over the past 10 years in a wide array of educational contexts, ranging from content-driven, high time-intensive to language-driven, low time-intensive program models. This review examines research on student, outcomes, on classroom interaction studies that emphasize teacher practice, and on stakeholder perspectives in contexts where approaches aiming at integrating content and language in instruction are being implemented.&quot;</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>&quot;How does a teacher create in her class an interactional space to support her students’ developing bilingual identities and to build their linguistic repertoires?&quot;</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthy, Rodriguez-Galindo, Assaf, Martinez, &amp; Cuero</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>This study &quot;examined, through observations and interviews, how they (fifth-grade students who are either immigrants of the children of immigrants from Latin American countries, predominantly Mexico) use their two languages at home, in the community, and at school. Also examined were students’ perspectives and those of their parents and teacher about continuing to maintain and develop their bilingualism, and their awareness of barriers they may face in the future.&quot;</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>&quot;The research on second language acquisition and the education of language minority students shows that the type of educational programs schools provide to students plays a crucial role in lack of students’ success. The focus of this study is to make this connection and look at the consequences of English-only education once students leave school for Cambodian-American students in an urban school district in Southern California.&quot;</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Research Question/Study Purpose</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Yeh        | 2014 | 1. "Was any code-switching discursive practice being used as a mechanism, with its ratified hierarchical meanings, in reframing participants' operation of ESL classes?"  
2. Did participants reject the use of coercive power on the part of teachers when it came to such issues as classroom procedures, the pace of the class, and participants' construction of their own meaning?  
3. Did the participants use strategies to help maintain the balance of teacher-student power in problem solving and other ESL class acquisition activities?  
4. How did the participants form their social identity in ESL classes?" | U.S.A. |
Appendix C – Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students Number</th>
<th>Students Language</th>
<th>Teacher ESL/Bilingual</th>
<th>Mainstream</th>
<th>Other Subjects</th>
<th>Student Proficiency</th>
<th>Classroom Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bourne</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bengali, Cantonese, Pushtu, Farsi, Vietnamese, Finnish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Jong, Gort, &amp; Cobb</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>district personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Oliveira, Gilmetdinova, &amp; Pelaez-Morales</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke &amp; Mabbott</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Beginners</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faltis</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, &amp; Asato</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>primarily Spanish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>district personnel</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Other Subjects</td>
<td>Student Proficiency</td>
<td>Classroom Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henze &amp; Lucas</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Primarily Spanish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horst, White, &amp; Bell</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huerta-Macias &amp; Kephart, observed classes</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 different adult classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huerta-Macias &amp; Kephart, survey</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karathanos</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karathanos</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolano, Lewis, &amp; Kissau</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas &amp; Katz</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>varies, primarily Spanish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>multiple, K-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukes</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LEP, low or no literacy in L1</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low, Medium, High</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish, Urdu</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Other Subjects</td>
<td>Student Proficiency</td>
<td>Classroom Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motha</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razfar &amp; Rumenapp</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and other languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilton-Sylvester</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>K-12, Adult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storch &amp; Wigglesworth</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Intermediae</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stritikuks</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Primarily Spanish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthy, Rodriguez-Galindo, Assaf, Martinez, &amp; Cuero</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12 of the students' parents</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low at time of entry into the school system</td>
<td>K-12, College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>French, Turkish, Chinese, Spanish, Korean</td>
<td>Intermediate and advanced</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D – Instances of L1 Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teacher or Aide</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Bilingually taught class</th>
<th>L1 use mentioned but unspecified</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>English only for classroom management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bourne</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Jong, Gort, &amp; Cobb</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Oliveira, Gilmedinova, &amp; Pelaez-Morales</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke &amp; Mabbott</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faltis</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, &amp; Asato</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henze &amp; Lucas</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horst, White, &amp; Bell</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huerta-Macias &amp; Kephart (observed classes)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Teacher or Aide</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huerta-Macias &amp; Kephart</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(survey results)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karathanos</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karathanos</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolano, Lewis, &amp; Kissau</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas &amp; Katz</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukes</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motha</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razfar &amp; Rumenapp</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilton-Sylvester</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storch &amp; Wigglesworth</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stritikus</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthy, Rodriguez-Galindo, Assaf, Martinez, &amp; Cuero</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E – Sources of L1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Monolingual</th>
<th>Some proficiency in student L1</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>Bilingual Native Speaker of L1</th>
<th>Bilingual Aide</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bourne</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Jong, Gort, &amp; Cobb</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Oliveira, Gilmetdinova, &amp; Pelaez-Morales</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke &amp; Mabbott</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faltis</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, &amp; Asato</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henze &amp; Lucas</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horst, White, &amp; Bell</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huerta-Macias &amp; Kephart</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kan &amp; Kohnert</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karathanos</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolano, Lewis, &amp; Kissau</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>Some proficiency in student LI</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>Bilingual Native Speaker of LI</td>
<td>Bilingual Aide</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas &amp; Katz</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukes</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razfar &amp; Rumenapp</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilton-Sylvester</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storch &amp; Wigglesworth</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stritikus</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthy, Rodriguez-Galindo, Assaf, Martinez, &amp; Cuero</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>