



## USE OF L1 IN ENHANCING L2 VOCABULARY

**Muthyala Udaya<sup>i</sup>**

Assistant Professor,

Department of ESL Studies,

The English and Foreign Languages University,

India

### **Abstract:**

This present study investigated the role of the first language in enhancing second language vocabulary using bilingual texts. Fourteen students with English as a third language participated in this study. Learners read different versions of the same text (English and Telugu), and a pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test were conducted to measure the incidental vocabulary learning. The findings revealed that (a) the two groups made significant gains in lexical knowledge through completing the treatment; (b) learners who read bilingual text had significantly durable knowledge gain compared to those who read glossed text only. The mean scores in the delayed post-test of the participants who read bilingual text were significantly higher than those who read glossed texts only. Including L1 in language classrooms enables language learners to read beyond their proficiency level and still learn new words while reading. It provides learners the opportunity to learn L2 vocabulary at their own pace. The findings of this study suggest that using L1 in language classrooms contributes to effective learning for L2 vocabulary.

**Keywords:** bilingual texts, vocabulary, incidental, noticing hypothesis, reading

### **1. Introduction**

Research in first-language reading presents a strong relationship between students' vocabulary knowledge and text comprehension (Anderson & Freebody, 1981). As bilingual texts contain L1 and L2, these materials are widely available, and using these materials has increased. The significance of using bilingual texts can be attributed to L2 learners' motivation and interest while reading these texts. There is a positive opinion among the teachers, students, and language researchers on bilingual texts. If the learners face difficulty in L2 learning, they tend to be discouraged, and their confidence may decrease. In this situation, L1-assisted texts can make learners feel comfortable and enjoy

---

<sup>i</sup> Correspondence: email [muthyalaudaya21@gmail.com](mailto:muthyalaudaya21@gmail.com)

reading. It may serve as an enjoyable resource for the learners. The learners can comprehend bilingual text easily compared to English-only text. While reading L2 texts involves not just the students' knowledge of words but also knowledge of the concepts referred to by the words, the depth and fluency of their knowledge of the words, and the extent to which they have been able to acquire words through extensive exposure to written language (Anderson & Freebody, 1981).

Second language acquisition research (Dulay & Burt, 1973; Johnson & Newport, 1991) emphasizes that the difficulties and errors of foreign language learning cannot be completely attributed to interference by the learner's first language. An investigation analyzed the sources of errors among native Spanish-speaking children learning English; Dulay and Burt (1973) found that only 3% of errors came from the L1 interferences, and 85% of errors were developmental. The findings imply that the fear of using L1 in foreign language classrooms should be reduced. In exploring various ways and possibilities of using students' knowledge of L1, it has been observed that there is a great deal of documentation on teachers' use of L1 in the language classroom. Most of the time teacher uses the L1 for translation, explanation, or classroom management. There are many situations where students use their L1, such as student-student discussion of work done, explanation of tasks to one another, collaborative dialogue, particularly in learning.

## 2. Review of Literature

In addition to the research, there is an example, Greggio, and Gil (2007) audio-recorded twelve class sessions of Portuguese-speaking beginner EFL learners. In these sessions, it was observed that the teacher used L1 as an effective strategy for explaining grammar and offering feedback. L1 was used as a viable learning strategy by the learners to clarify their understanding of lesson content and participate in the class discussions. Based on these observations, the researchers suggested that L1 may play an important role in facilitating the interaction between classroom participants and foreign language learning. Another investigation done by Liao (2006) into the role of L1 for Taiwanese college students learning English identified three strategic functions in using L1. First, L1 was used as a memory strategy in improving their ability to memorize words, idioms, grammar, and sentence structures. Second L1 was used as an effective strategy for reducing learning anxiety and increasing their motivation to learn English. Third, L1 was used as a social strategy to assist them in asking questions or cooperating with others, which promoted their learning outcomes.

Considering the goal of SLA, teachers can utilize the L1 as a tool or necessary scaffolding which is gradually removed over time, a time-efficient strategy and effective with the students whose L2 proficiency is low, and as a bridge between the L1 and L2, providing a more comprehensible and comfortable learning environment. In addition, Cook (1997) referred to two languages where the L2 meanings do not exist separately from the L1 meanings in the learner's mind.

In support of L1 use, Finocchiaro and Boumfit (1983) believed that sensible use of L1 is acceptable where possible. Following Krashen (1981), language learners develop

their competence if teachers expose them to varieties of comprehensible input. If the input is not comprehensible enough, the acquisition will be incomplete; the mother tongue use can be a helpful tool. For instance, if the text is too difficult for the students to comprehend or if its comprehension depends on background knowledge, the teacher can build this background using students' mother tongue.

Similarly, Atkinson (1987) recommends using the L1 equivalents for eliciting language and comprehension checking by both teacher and student in the form of "*How do you say in English?*" Thus, first language use can facilitate communication in the target language. Some scholars reject the monolingual approach to language instruction on many other grounds. Hopkins (1988) believed that if another language learner is inspired to omit his own language from the L2 learning process and completely ignores it, they might feel identity-threatened. In addition, Skinner (1985) rejected the exclusive use of the target language on practical grounds by expressing the difficulties in connection with using the L2 exclusively in the classroom. To support this idea, Stern (1992) questioned the traditional belief of L2-only classrooms by arguing that learners' L1 could have a reasonable place in an FL classroom.

Moreover, Auerbach (1993) believed that using students' L1 arouses a sense of security in them since, without their mother tongue, they cannot express themselves and their experiences in their mother tongue, especially at the beginning stages of language development. Along the same line, Schweers (1999) emphasized the importance of judicious and selective use of L1 in L2 classrooms to help facilitate the learning process. Eldridge (1996) believed there is no empirical evidence to support the notion that restricting mother tongue use would necessarily improve learner efficiency. Interestingly, Atkinson (1987) also added that "*total prohibition of the students' L1 is now unfashionable*" (p. 241). Far from being an obstacle, learners' first language is a precious resource for some scholars. For instance, Stern (1992) considered the judicious use of L1 as a resource that turns input to intake.

Similarly, based on his experience, Cook (2001) believed that optimal first language use is conducive to having more authentic L2 users. He further believed that finding cognates and similarities between the languages develops an "*interlinked L1 and L2 knowledge in the students' minds*". By the same token, Cook (2001) and Tang (2002) believed that the occasional use of L1 by both students and teachers increases both comprehension and L2 learning since L1 plays a supportive role in the classroom.

Several studies demonstrated the benefit of using L1 to learn a target language. For example, Villamil and de Guerrero (1996) analyzed the discourse of Spanish-speaking university students while they engaged in peer revision of their target language writing. Their data demonstrated that "*the L1 was an essential tool for making meaning of the text, retrieving language from memory, exploring and expanding content, guiding their action through a task, and maintaining dialogue*". Similarly, Swain and Lapkin (2000), in their examination of the L1 use by 22 pairs of Grade 8 French immersion students as they completed dictogloss and jigsaw tasks, found that if the students had not used L1 as a means of negotiation and communication, the tasks might not have been accomplished as effectively, or perhaps they might not have been accomplished at all.

Despite its facilitating roles, the mother tongue in the EFL classroom has been a skeleton in the cupboard. Teachers do not have a positive feeling towards using it. They mostly feel ashamed and consider English-only classrooms as more efficient. However, in response, Gabrielatos (2001) believed that L1 had been more "*a bone of connection*" than "*a skeleton in the cupboard*". He stated that "*the skeleton has been there all the time; we just have not wanted to talk about it, because perhaps we have not had the psycholinguistic or pedagogic framework in which to do so*" (p. 8). He thought that a bilingual teacher could amend L2 learning by the use of the mother tongue: "*if the L1 facilitates learning, then we use it*" (p. 8). Taking the facilitating function of L1 in teaching L2, in a clean and brief categorization Wharton (2007) explains three major ways in which the students' L1 can be used in the language classroom: (1) providing L1 equivalents of English words and expressions; (2) using L1 to focus on language in use; and (3) using L1 for classroom interaction. Reiterating these functions, Nation (2003) added another useful function of L1 by considering it as a productive instrument for communicating meaning. In addition to these functions, optimal L1 use in teaching a foreign or second language can be justified since:

- 1) Initiating with the learners' mother tongue grants the learners a sense of security and accredits students' lived experience (Auerbach, 1993);
- 2) L1 use grants students "*cognitive support*" that enables them to explore language and produce work of higher standard by playing the role of a bridge for students to analyze the language and try more than the time they use foreign language only (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003).

In spite of the pedagogical functions of L1, some practitioners dogmatically reject L1 in language teaching. A situation of this kind was reported by Nunan (1999), describing a situation where an EFL teacher in China imposed fines on his students in situations they spoke Cantonese in the classroom. The result was not appealing, and the learners became silent. Neither did they use the mother tongue, nor did they use English. The teacher got his wish of no Cantonese, but ironically, he did not get any English from his students either (p. 158). Putting their prejudices aside, practitioners should let the L1 fulfill its facilitating functions in language classes because:

- 1) When learners are allowed to use their mother tongue, they can express themselves more effectively (Wharton, 2007);
- 2) From a humanistic perspective, it is highly unlikely that a teacher would refuse to answer a question like "*How can I say?*" (Harbord, 1992); it is the "*preferred learning strategies*" of most language learners in language classrooms around the world (Atkinson, 1987, p. 242); it is a time-saving device (Wharton, 2007; Atkinson, 1987).

The role of the noticing hypothesis in this study is essential; it says that input taken by the learner does not become intake for language learning unless it is noticed, which means consciously registered (Schmidt, 2000). Following this principle, the study presented learners two versions of the same text, the target language, L1 (Telugu) and L2 (English). At the time of treatment, participants were to find the meanings of the target words. In this process, the concept of noticing plays an important role. If the students notice the words, they can write the target words' meaning unless they are noticed.

## 2. Methodology

The purpose of this research is to find out how does L1 influences L2 vocabulary learning. If it has any influence, we can use it in real class teaching and learning.

- 1) Does reading bilingual materials contribute to vocabulary learning?
- 2) Do L1 glossed texts contribute to L2 vocabulary learning?

Fourteen students aged 15 - 17 years, studying in tenth grade with English as a Second language, were selected for this study. These students had the least exposure to the target language, L2 (English), and learned the English language for a minimum of six years. Their proficiency levels are at the pre-intermediate level. These students are taught English as a subject, not as a language. They were divided into two groups; each group consisted of 7 participants. Participants were informed about the reading and test but were not informed that the study focuses on vocabulary learning. The test format was not revealed until they finished the reading session. A pre-test, immediate post-test, and a delayed post-test experimental design was adopted. Participants were given instructions on how to complete the given task in their mother tongue, i.e., Telugu.

The two treatment groups: Plain Text Group (PTG) and Glossed Text Group (GTG), were formed. Each group read a modified text. The PTG read the text in L2 and L1, in which the target words were not glossed. They had to read the text both in L2 (English) and L1 (Telugu) to find the meaning of the target words by comparing the text. The GTG reads the text in L2, in which the target words were glossed in their L1 immediately after the word. Before the treatment, a pre-test was conducted with the selected fourteen target words. Clear instructions were given to write the meanings of the given target words and check if the participants knew the meanings. The participants were given two vocabulary post-tests: immediate post-test and delayed post-test. The immediate post-test was similar to the pre-test where the participants had to write the target words' meaning. The delayed-post test is a word recognition test with 14 target words with four multiple-choice answers for each item. The participants were awarded one mark for each correct answer, which amounted to 14 maximum scores in total for the test. The participants select the most appropriate meaning from the four L2 (English) options.

This study involved reading different folk tale versions selected from the grade X TS SCERT English textbook. First, students are given the English version of the story, followed by the Telugu version of the same story, which has the target words. This enabled the participants to compare the two texts and find the meaning of the target words without the L2 glosses. The research also indicates that L1 glosses are more effective than L2 glosses for vocabulary learning (Scherfer, 1993). The following paragraph is an example from the story presented in English and Telugu, and the target words are highlighted.

Ex. (For BTG.)

An old tiger ran through the rain, looking for shelter. He was wet and cold and his cave was far away. While **hurrying** to his shelter, he saw an old hut. With a sigh of relief, the

tiger **crawled** under the thatched roof and **lay down** by the door. Except for the sound of the rain all was quiet. Before he could **nod off**, however, he heard something heavy being dragged inside the hut. This was followed by the voice of a woman.

ఒక ముసలి పులి ఆశ్రయం కోసం వర్షం గుండా పరిగెత్తింది. అది తడిగా మరియు చల్లగా ఉంది మరియు దాని గుహ చాలా దూరంలో ఉంది. తన ఆశ్రయానికి పరుగెడుతున్నప్పుడు అది ఒక పాత గుడిసెను చూసింది. ఒక నిట్టూర్పుతో, పులి త్రాటి పై కప్పు కలిగిన గుడిసెలోకి పాకి, తలుపు దగ్గర పడుకుంది. వర్షం శబ్దం తప్ప మిగతావన్నీ నిశ్శబ్దంగా ఉన్నాయి. అది నిద్రలోకి జారుకోక ముందే, గుడిసె లోపలికి ఎదో బరువైన దాన్ని ఎవరో లాగడం దానికి వినబడింది. దీని తరువాత ఒక మహిళ గొంతు వినిపించింది.

Reading the same story in different versions makes the learners understand the text and learn vocabulary quickly. Learners are motivated to read when given L1 assistance.

Ex: (For GTG)

The tiger was **terrified** (భయపడడం) and he ran through the dark forest.

Fourteen target words were selected from a range of word frequency levels. Providing the unknown word meaning immediately after the target word helps learners identify the target word. In incidental vocabulary learning, only low-frequency words are chosen as target words; however, choosing words at different frequency levels reflects vocabulary learning, as high-frequency words are often assumed to be known to readers; it is likely that some higher frequency words are unknown or partially known (Webb & Chang, 2015). The target words are listed in the following table.

**Table 1:** List of Target Words

blinding light	dangerous	terrified
hurrying	frightened	miserable
crawled	laydown	capture
nod off	screamed	thatched
	runaway	mysterious

A pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test were created to measure the incidental learning of unknown vocabulary. All tests were in a paper and pencil format, and the participants completed the tests without any external support from dictionaries and electronic devices.

In the pre-test, students were instructed in Telugu to write the meanings of the 14 target words, scored in the analysis. The immediate post-test was carried out after the treatment. Participants were given a sheet of paper with the L2 target words in English and asked to write the meanings of the words in L1. In the delayed post-test, the participants were informed to write the meanings of the target words in their L1. Every correct meaning was assigned one mark, thus the maximum scoring was 14.

Because of the nature of the Telugu language, there are different ways of expressing the same meaning. Thus, the meaning of the words was scored carefully. Synonyms or definitions of words were marked as correct answers as long as they expressed the meaning of the target words in the context. For example, correct responses for the target word *run away*, (*flee*), (*run off*).

As part of the pre-test, the participants were given a list of target words and asked to write the meaning of the given words. In the next step, they were given an English version of the story in which target words were glossed in L2 and asked to guess the meaning of the target words. Later they all were given the Telugu version of the story and asked to compare both the texts to find out the meaning of the target words. This was done as a part of the immediate post-test. After a week, a delayed post-test was conducted with the target words, and students were asked to write the meanings of the target words either in English or Telugu.

### 3. Data Analysis

The variables of interest in this study were pre-test scores, immediate post-test scores, and delayed post-test scores for the different treatments. Data was collected in terms of scores and analysed using descriptive statistics to show the group's performance. In the descriptive statistics, the mean and standard deviation is calculated; while calculating the mean, all participants are included, whereas, in median and mode, all the participants are not included. This tool is used to trace the learner's behaviour. Standard deviation is used to find out the range of variation between the central and mean scores. If the group has less standard deviation, it implies lesser variation between other group members' central scores. In this case, the participants have performed homogeneously. If the group has a high standard deviation, it implies a greater deviation between the central score and a more heterogeneous group. However, descriptive statistics do not link group performances or variables. The descriptive statistics, including the number of participants, means, and standard deviations, are reported in Table 2.

**Table 2:** Mean and Standard deviation of learning conditions on the dependent variable

Group		Pre-test	Immediate post-test	Delayed post-test
BTG (n = 7)	Mean	3.6	4.9	7.1
	SD	2.0	4.3	3.3
GTG (n = 7)	Mean	8.0	13.1	6.7
	SD	2.3	1.1	0.5
<b>Note:</b> The maximum score of all tests is 14; BGT = Bilingual text group; GTG = Glossed text group				

The independent variable in this study is the version of reading material the participants received. To answer research question one and determine whether words can be remembered for an extended period, mean difference is found between pre-test and immediate post-test scores and delayed post-test and pre-test scores within each group. Table 3 shows significant differences between pre-test and immediate post-tests and pre-test and delayed post-test scores within each group. The value of p indicates the

significant difference between the tests. In table 3, we can observe that the p values between all tests are less than 0.05 ( $p < 0.05$ ), indicating that each learning condition had contributed to significant gains in vocabulary knowledge except for the Glossed Text Group (GTG) group between delayed post-test and pre-test,  $p = 0.299$ , which means the difference is not significant between these tests.

**Table 3:** Mean, probability value (p), and effect size (Cohen's d) on the dependent variable

	Group	Mean Difference	p	Cohen's d
Immediate post-test to pre-test	BTG	1.3	.00*	0.38
	GTG	3.6	.00*	2.82
Delayed post-test to pre-test	BTG	5.1	.03*	1.28
	GTG	-1.3	.29	0.78

**Note:**  $p < .05^*$ ; BTG = Read Bilingual Text Group only; GTG = Read English with Telugu glossing.

After the treatment, the bilingual text group had the highest mean increase (5.1). The effect size was large (1.28). The bilingual text condition led to a statistically significant increase between immediate post-test and pre-test. The glossed text group had a mean decrease of 1.3 between pre-test and delayed post-test, and the effect size was (0.78); there was no significant gain in vocabulary knowledge found for this group in delayed post-test.

To answer the second research question if the L1 glossed text has any effect on vocabulary learning, when the pre-test and delayed post-test scores are considered, we can observe from the findings that GTG had mean decrease of 1.3 in delayed post-test, and there is no significant mean difference ( $p = 0.29$ ). This implies that the GTG has not shown any significant vocabulary gain compared to BTG.

In summary, the analysis showed: (a) The two groups made significant gains in lexical knowledge through completing the treatment. (b) Learners who read bilingual text had significantly durable knowledge gain compared to those who read glossed text only. The mean scores in the delayed post-test of the participants who read bilingual text were significantly higher than those of participants who read only glossed texts.

#### 4. Discussion

In response to the first research question, the results of this study indicated that reading bilingual text contributed to the acquisition of vocabulary knowledge. The results showed that vocabulary test scores increased by 25.7% through reading bilingual text. The study done by Hu et al. (2012) indicates that reading bilingual books may contribute to vocabulary learning; the results of this study support the findings. In their study, native Chinese participants were involved in an eight-week treatment where they read English-Chinese bilingual books for one and a half hours every week. Statistics obtained from pre-test and post-test assessments to report on their participants' language development were compared. It was found that the number of words participants could identify had an increase of 28% and 27.2% for two groups of target words. The current



study found slightly smaller vocabulary knowledge gains. The lower scores in this study may be because the participants were tested on their knowledge of form-meaning connection rather than spelling. Research suggests that knowledge of written form is gained more easily than knowledge of form-meaning connection. The participants are exposed to the text-only once at the time of treatment, and research on incidental vocabulary learning suggests that gains are more extensive when learners read multiple texts rather than single text (Horts, 2005; Webb & Chang, 2015). Reading multiple texts increases the chances of repeatedly encountering the same words and thus increases the potential for learning the words.

In answer to the second research question, the results indicated that reading L1 glossed text had no significant influence on vocabulary learning. This result does not provide any explicit support for the theories of SLA discussed earlier. From the standpoint of the noticing hypothesis, the unknown words are noticed when the L1 words are provided immediately after the target word. Lee and VanPatten (1995) suggested that from noticing and attention, glossed target words should have a greater chance to be learned by participants because the glossing helps focus readers' attention on the target words in the text. Thus, it is reasonable to believe that bilingual reading would be less effective in vocabulary learning than glossed text reading. However, the results of this study did not support the assumption.

The bilingual text group had more knowledge gains compared to the glossed text group, this may be due to the relatively short length of the reading text-enabled participants to notice and attend to unfamiliar words in the bilingual reading condition. Also, in the bilingual text, the L1 translation might have enabled participants to make less effort in understanding the material. Participants were able to get more time to focus on learning the unknown words because there is a low burden on text comprehension.

#### **4.1 Pedagogical Implications**

The findings indicate that bilingual text may make valuable contributions to L2 vocabulary learning in ESL/EFL classrooms. In the bilingual text, the translation of the L2 text may be helpful not only for reading comprehension but also for incidental vocabulary learning. There is much value in including bilingual texts in reading programs because a) language teachers and learners would have a broader range of appropriate reading materials because bilingual books may reduce the potential for learners to misunderstand the content. b) learners can read bilingual materials beyond their proficiency level and may still learn new words through the reading process. Learning and teaching are flexible when bilingual materials are used in the classrooms. Each learner in the classroom is unique; they may have different background knowledge of the text even if they are from the same class. Thus, selecting the glossed words is unlikely to meet each reader's individual learning needs in glossed reading materials. In contrast, reading bilingual books allows readers to learn every unknown word at their own pace. This may help to facilitate vocabulary learning both inside of the classroom and out of the classroom.

L1 and L2 overlap are one of the most important things to be noted in using bilingual texts in the classroom; some sentences have a word-for-word overlap, sometimes sentences may vary in terms of overlap because most of the sentence structures of L1 differ with sentence structures of L2. This might affect how words can be learned through bilingual text.

Modifications should be done with several elements of this study in future studies to investigate further the effect of L1 in learning L2 vocabulary. First, in this study, one group read the bilingual text, and another group read glossed text, the amount of time allotted to the two groups is the same, but the bilingual text group may require more time than the bilingual text group. It would be helpful to examine the influence of time on reading L1 translated text. However, research indicates that time on task can influence vocabulary gains through different learning conditions (Webb, 2005). When the participants read two versions of the same text, they may take a different amount of time than those who read only glossed text. Thus, it would be helpful to check if the given time benefited the one type of text more efficiently for vocabulary learning.

The second element that could be examined is the extent to which vocabulary may be learned when the L2 versions of reading texts are beyond a reader's current proficiency level. The text used in the present study was selected to fit the proficiency level of the participants. Thus, it would be helpful to examine the extent to which bilingual texts that are clearly beyond readers' proficiency level contribute to learning. The learners who are yet to master the most frequent 2000 words of the target language can learn vocabulary through reading a bilingual text in which knowledge of the most frequent 3000 words is required to reach 95% lexical coverage. The final limitation is related to the assessment of participants' vocabulary learning. This study measured only receptive knowledge of the target words in meaning recall tests. It would be better to include different vocabulary tests to assess vocabulary knowledge. For example, the extent to which participants could recall the L2 vocabulary and link it to the L1 meaning. The target words are glossed with L1 meanings in the treatment, but the options are given in the delayed test in the target language. Therefore, learners might have felt difficulty in answering the questions.

## **5. Conclusion**

The present study's findings indicate that L1 has great potential in learning L2 vocabulary. The vocabulary gains through reading bilingual text are more significant than reading glossed text. These findings indicate the potential value of including L1 in language learning. The findings revealed that participants who read bilingual and glossed texts gained significant vocabulary knowledge through reading material. Adding bilingual text enabled participants to get significantly higher scores in the delayed post-test than the pre-test. The present study provided valuable implications for language learning. First, a more comprehensive range of appropriate reading materials should be available for language teachers and learners. Bilingual materials can reduce the potential of misunderstanding content as they enable readers to get the correct meaning of the content from text written in their L1. Secondly, when learners are provided input in their

L1, they can read the text with flexibility—in EFL/ESL classroom, using glossed text as reading material is unlikely to meet every learner's needs because the target vocabulary may be known to one learner. Including L1 in language classrooms enables language learners to read beyond their proficiency level and still learn new words while reading. It also allows learners to learn L2 vocabulary at their own pace. Thus, using L1 in a language classroom contributes to learning L2 vocabulary.

### **Conflict of Interest Statement**

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

### **About the Author**

Muthyala Udaya, Assistant Professor, Department of ESL Studies, The English and Foreign Languages University, India. Her research interests are second language acquisition, bi/multilingualism, corpus, and language teaching.

### **References**

- Anderson, R. C., & Freebody, P. (1981). Vocabulary knowledge. In J. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and Teaching: Research Reviews* (pp. 77-117). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). *The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource?* *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241-247.
- Auerbach, E. (1993). *Re-examining English Only in the ESL Classroom*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27/1: 9-32.
- Cook, V. (2001). *Using the first language in the classroom*. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 402-423.
- Cook, V. J. (1997). *The consequences of bilingualism for cognitive processing*. In A. de Groot & J. F. Kroll (eds.), *Tutorials in Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Perspectives* (pp.279-299) Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum
- Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1973). *Should we teach children syntax?* *Language Learning*, 23, 245-258.
- Eldridge, J. (1996). *Code-Switching in a Turkish Secondary School*. *ELT Journal* 50 (4) 303-311.
- Finnochiaro, M., & Brumfit, C. J. (1983). *The functional-notional approach: From theory to practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gabrielatos, C. (2001). *L1 use in ELT: Not a skeleton, but a bone of contention*. *Bridges*. 6. 33-35.
- Gardner, R. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). A student's contribution to Second Language Learning: Part II, Affective Factors. *Language Teaching*, 26, 1-11.
- Greggio, S. & Gil, G. (2007). *Teacher's and Learners' Use of Code-Switching in the English as a Foreign Language Classroom: A Qualitative Study*.
- Harbord, J. (1992). *The use of the mother tongue in the classroom*. *ELT Journal*, 46/4, 350-355.

- Hatch, E., & Brown, C. (1995). *Vocabulary, semantics, and language education*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopkins, S. (1988). *Use of mother tongue in teaching of English as a second language to adults. Language Issues*, 2(2), 18-24.
- Horst, M. (2005). Learning L2 vocabulary through extensive reading: A measurement study. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61, 355-382.
- Johnson, J. S., and E. L. Newport. 1991. Critical period effects in second language learning: The influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second language. *Cognitive Psychology* 21: 60-99.
- Krashen, S. (1989). 'We Acquire Vocabulary and Spelling by Reading: Additional Evidence for the Input Hypothesis', *Modern Language Journal* 73: 440-62.
- Krashen, Stephen, D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Laufer, B. and I. S. P. Nation (1999). 'A Vocabulary Size Test of Controlled Productive Ability,' *Language Testing* 16.1: 36-55.
- Lee, J. G., & VanPatten, B. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Liao, Posen (2006). *EFL Learners' Beliefs about and Strategy Use of Translation in English Learning*. *Relc Journal*.
- Maximo, R. (2000). Effects of rote, context, keyword, and context/ keyword method on retention of vocabulary in EFL classroom, *Language Learning*, 50, 2, 385-412.
- McDonald, C. (1993). *Using the target language*. Cheltenham: Mary Glasgow Publications
- Meara, P. (1980). *Vocabulary acquisition: A neglected aspect of language learning*. *Language Teaching and Linguistics Abstracts*, 13, 221-246
- Nation, I. S. P. (1978). *Translation and the teaching of meaning: some techniques*. *ELT Journal* 32, 3: 171-175.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2011). *Research into practice: Vocabulary*. *Language Teaching* 44.4, 529-539
- Nation, P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Nation, P. (2003). *The role of the first language in foreign language learning*. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 1-18.
- Neuman, S. B., & Dwyer, J. (2009). *Missing in Action: Vocabulary Instruction in Pre-k. The Reading Teacher*, 62, 384-392.
- Nunan, D. (1987). *Communicative language teaching: making it work* *ELT Journal*, 41(2), 136-145.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Nunan, David (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology. A Textbook for Teachers*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Oxford, R. (1999). *Anxiety and the Language Learner: New Insights*. In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in Language Learning* (pp. 58-67). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies. What Every Teacher should know*.
- Richards, J. C. (1980). *The role of vocabulary teaching*. In K. Croft (Ed.), *Readings in English as a second language: For teachers and teacher trainers* (2nd ed., pp. (424-438).

- Scherfer, P. (1993). *Indirect L2-vocabulary learning*. *Linguistics*, 31, 1141-1153.
- Schmitt, N. (1999). *The relation between TOEFL vocabulary items and meaning, association, 325 collocation, and word-class knowledge*. *Language Testing* 16, 189-216.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Schmitt, N., D. Schmitt and C. Clapham (2001). '*Developing and Exploring the Behaviour of Two New Versions of the Vocabulary Levels Test*', *Language Testing* 18: 55-88.
- Schweers, C. (1999). *Using L1 in the L2 Classroom*. *English Teaching Forum*, 37, 6-13.
- Skinner, D. (1985). *Access to meaning: The anatomy of the language/learning connection*. *J Multiling Multicult Dev*, 6, 369-389.
- Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching* (edited posthumously by Patrick Allen & Birgit Harley). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). *Is there a role for the use of L1 in an L2 setting?* *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 760-770
- Tang, J. (2002). *Using L1 in the English Classroom*. *English Teaching Forum*, 40, 36-43.
- Ur, Penny (1998). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Villamil, O. and de Guerrero, M. (1996). "*Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Social-cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behaviour*", in *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5:51-75.
- Webb, S. (2005). *Receptive and Productive Vocabulary Learning: The Effects of Reading and Writing on Word Knowledge*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 27: 33-52.
- Webb, S.A. & Chang, A, C-S. (2015). *Second language vocabulary learning through extensive reading: How does frequency and distribution of occurrence affect learning?* *Language Teaching Research*, 19(6), 667-686.
- Wharton, C. (2007). *Informed use of the mother tongue in the English language classroom*.
- Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions, and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of English Language Teaching shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).