The changing perspectives on learners' L1 in L2 teaching: Recommendations in L2 teacher training handbooks over the last five decades

Aleksandra Wach

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3341-6347
waleks@wa.amu.edu.pl

Abstract

Throughout the history of L2 teaching, various approaches toward the presence and functions of the L1 in L2 instruction have been observed. While L1 use was a cornerstone of some methods, it was totally rejected in others. The article reports the findings of a qualitative content analysis of thirty handbooks for teacher education published in the years 1970-2015, conducted with the aim of investigating what recommendations for teachers' use of the L1 were made, as well as tracing the differences in this respect between materials published in particular decades. The results show that although certain recommendations for L1 use in L2 teaching have always been present in the training materials, a wider and more differentiated range of L1 functions is addressed in more recent sources. Moreover, a greater appreciation of the L1 as a useful resource, and not only as a last resort, can be detected in contemporary L2 teacher education handbooks.

Keywords: L1 use; L1 functions; L2 teaching; L2 teacher education; teacher training handbooks

1. Introduction

The views on the role of learners' native language (L1) in foreign and second language (L2) learning informed by the theoretical positions on second language

acquisition (SLA) have influenced the pedagogical recommendations for the functions and amount of L1 use by learners and teachers in L2 classrooms. These have differed widely, with L2 teaching methods and the didactic procedures they endorsed displaying radical swings in the levels of L1 acceptance. In the earliest approaches, cross-lingual teaching was taken for granted, and the 19th century grammar translation method was based on explicit explanations delivered in the L1 and translation exercises. On the other hand, the entire 20th century was dominated by the monolingual principle which favored L2-exclusivity in L2 instruction. The direct and the audiolingual methods, although stemming from different theoretical rationales, exemplify the L2-only trend in teaching. The direct method followed "naturalistic" procedures aimed at imitating L1 acquisition processes, while the audiolingual one deployed pattern practice as a way of instilling L2 habits in learners. Furthermore, toward the end of the 20th century, the prominent role of meaningful L2 input, interaction and output within the communicative approach made the use of the L1 in the classroom perceived as a factor that can hinder the development of L2 communicative competence in learners (Howatt, 1984; Howatt & Widdowson, 2004; Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Stern, 1992). However, since the beginning of the 21st century, a re-appreciation of the role of the L1 as a useful resource in L2 learning and teaching has been observed in the SLA and L2 teaching literature. Cognitive, affective, and social arguments for L1 use in L2 development have been formulated (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Cummins, 2007; Littlewood & Yu, 2011). The present article presents the findings of a qualitative analysis of thirty handbooks for L2 teacher education published since 1970s, conducted with the aim of exploring the recommendations for L1 use in these materials. The presentation of the results of the analysis is preceded by a literature review of the perspectives on L1 use in different L2 teaching approaches and methods.

2. The position of learners' L1 in L2 teaching across approaches and methods

The unquestioned presence of the L1 in L2 didactics was one of the key features of the grammar translation method (GTM), whose principles paralleled those applied in the teaching of classical Latin. A rigorous analysis of grammar and the use of translation were the most notable teaching procedures. Texts were accompanied with interlinear translations, rules of L2 use were explained in the L1, with the L1 serving as a means of instruction and a reference system for making L2/L1 comparisons (Howatt, 1984; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Howatt and Widdowson (2004) note that translation had been a basic teaching technique even much earlier; they recall that the "double-translation" method which consists in an L2-L1 translation of a chunk of language and then back to the L2 was already known in the 16th century. According to Cieśla (1974), L1 explanations of

L2 rules and intensive use of translation were also present in the 18th century Polish textbooks for teaching foreign languages, mainly French and German. The renowned educator and reformer Kajetan Kamieński already in the 18th century postulated that French-Polish contrasts be displayed in coursebooks with the aim of stimulating interlingual analysis and, consequently, learners' intellectual development. Another notable Polish educator, Stanisław Konarski, was also in favor of introducing translation from L2 French to L1 Polish in lower-proficiency courses, and from Latin to French in more advanced courses as a way of providing intellectual exercise to learners. These examples illustrate the heavy reliance on the L1 in L2 teaching that was a norm until the end of the 19th century. However, despite the considerable popularity of the practices typical of the GTM and their persistence in several settings and classrooms around the world until now (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Stern, 1992), their effectiveness in terms of the L2 communicative command appeared to be far from satisfactory.

In light of the criticism, significant changes were brought to L2 education. The reform movement brought a primary interest in the development of oral skills through L2-medium instruction (Cieśla, 1974; Richards & Rodgers, 2014), which instilled a questioning of the role of the L1 in L2 education. As a result, as noted by Littlewood and Yu (2011), "since the grammar-translation approach was first challenged in the late 19th century, the monolingual principle has permeated every language teaching method that has found widespread official support" (p. 66). The rationale behind the L1-only canons was not always purely pedagogical. Auerbach (1993), for example, discusses the ideological and political influences underlying the "Americanization" of ESL didactics as contributing to the rejection of the L1 in L2 teaching approaches at the turn of the 20th century. One of the most prominent naturalistic methods which emerged at that time was the direct method (DM), which aimed at creating conditions imitating child L1 acquisition. Discarding learners' L1 in L2 teaching was among its chief tenets. According to one of the proponents of the reform movement, Wilhelm Viëtor, oral language should be the basis of L2 teaching, grammar should be taught inductively, and translation should be completely removed from teaching practices (as cited in Cieśla, 1974, p. 320). Maximilian Berlitz, one of the most notable propagators of the DM, provided the following justification of the rejection of the translation technique: "(i) translation wastes valuable language learning time which should be devoted entirely to the foreign language; (ii) translation encourages mother tongue interference; and (iii) all languages are different ('every language has its peculiarities, its idiomatic expressions and turns, which cannot possibly be rendered by translation')" (Berlitz, 1898, as cited in Howatt & Widdowson, 2004, p. 224).

The elimination of the L1 continued to be promoted, and in the 1950-1960s it was further intensified by the influences of the behaviorist theory on L2 teaching.

The view of language learning as habit formation and of the L1 as a potential source of interference was the basis for a formulation of new teaching methods, such as the audiolingual method (ALM), which were based on the "monolingual principle" (Cummins, 2007, p. 223). According to the ALM recommendations, the L2 was best learned through pattern practice stimulated by dialogs and drills in the L2, not through conscious analysis (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

The enhancement of communicative and meaningful use of the L2 in the implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) is also largely congruent with the L2-only principle in its instructional procedures (Cummins, 2007). This necessitates a provision of extensive exposure to L2 input and a choice of interactive activities that make learners struggle to convey meaning, often with limited L2 resources and with the strategy of meaning negotiation. It is important to note that although the focus on L2 input, interaction and output naturally calls for L2-mainly use in the classroom, the rejection of the L1 is not explicitly recommended in CLT principles. Instead, "judicious use" of the L1 "where feasible" and the application of translation as a teaching technique "where students need or benefit from it" (Finocchiaro & Brumfit, 1983, p. 92) are allowed. Cook (2001) admits, however, that the role of the L1 has been ignored in CLT, with often repeated vague suggestions that the L1 should be minimized.

A significant change toward the L1 as a resource for L2 learning and instruction has been observed in the SLA and L2 teaching literature since the beginning of the 21st century. A considerable number of theoretical, practical and empirical publications have appeared, discussing the different functions that the L1 can serve in L2 didactics, as well as its benefits for the development of learners' L2 competence (e.g., Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Chavez, 2016; Deller & Rinvolucri, 2002; Kerr, 2016; Scheffler, 2016). There have been various reasons for the contemporary re-evaluation of the L1 role in L2 teaching. One of them comes from the influence of the cognitive learning theory on the field of SLA, and the appreciation of the role of previous knowledge in new knowledge acquisition. Moreover, referring to the L1 as a strategy in the explicit learning of L2 structures has been found to be effective (Källkvist, 2013; Wach, 2019). Furthermore, ways of learning foreign languages are no longer expected to imitate L1 acquisition processes; instead, a developing bilingual or multilingual (rather than an imitator of native speakers), who builds his or her competence on the basis of previously learned languages, has been recognized as the optimal model in L2 learning (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; McMillan & Rivers, 2011). Moreover, an appreciation of learner-centeredness in contemporary education, with a focus on learner self-regulation, autonomy, and identity, is another reason for a growing approval of learners' L1 in current SLA and L2 teaching literature (Inbar-Lourie, 2010).

Finally, it is noteworthy that the Council of Europe (2001, 2018) underscores the skill of both cross-lingual (L1 ↔ L2) and intralingual (L2 → L2) mediation as

an important part of an L2 user's competence. This calls for an implementation of translation and interpretation activities in L2 education. The document (Council of Europe, 2001) also recommends justified L1 use in giving explanations, in comprehension tasks, as well as in grammar and vocabulary practice activities. Concerning the Polish national curriculum, there is a general recommendation that teachers conduct L2 lessons in the L2 and create ample opportunities for learners to use the L2 in classroom interactions, while at the same time the role of the L1 is acknowledged in reducing learning burden and facilitating L2 comprehension (Ministerstwo Edukacji Narodowej, 2017). However, there is no specific guidance about how much L1 (Polish) can be used and for what reasons.

Given the changing perspectives on the presence and functions of learners' L1 throughout different L2 teaching approaches and methods, an analysis of L2 teacher education handbooks published by British, American, and Polish publishing houses was conducted. The analysis addressed the following research questions:

1. What recommendations concerning the use of the L1 and its functions are formulated in the materials?
2. How do these recommendations differ in the materials published across the span of five decades?

3. Recommendations for L1 use in L2 teacher training handbooks

This section is devoted to the presentation of the analysis of the L2 teacher training materials.

3.1. The selection of the material

The books selected for the analysis were recommended by their authors as handbooks for teacher education, most of them at both pre-service and in-service levels. The information about the purposes and intended audience of the books was provided either on their back covers or in the introductory sections. The materials were accessed by the researcher in the university library in the "L2 teaching methodology" compartment, as well as found in her own home library. In order to address the aim of the investigation and track the changing recommendations over the last decades, books published between the years 1970 and 2015 were selected for the analysis. A total of thirty books were chosen: three published in the 1970s, five – in the 1980s, ten – in the 1990s, and 12 – after the year 2000. All of the materials were published by renowned publishing houses, 27 by British or American ones (the majority of them by Longman), and three – by Polish ones. The list of the analyzed sources is provided in the Appendix.

3.2. The analytical procedures

A qualitative content analysis was performed in order to elicit the data. The materials were first carefully investigated in relation to the information about L1 use they contained. This was done in two ways: by using the subject index at the end of the book and looking up entries such as *L1*, *L1 use*, *native language*, *mother tongue*, *language use*, *code choice*, and *translation*, and, if none of these entries was present in the index, by reading sections devoted to language use, management issues, classroom interaction, teaching grammar, vocabulary, and skills development. All parts referring to L1 use were then rewritten under the headings created separately for four periods: the 1970s, the 1980s, the 1990s, and the 2000s. Over multiple readings of the gathered material, the content was hand-coded and categorized into the following seven thematic groups: translation of vocabulary, explanation of grammar, L1/L2 contrasts, checking reading comprehension, instructions, classroom management, and respect of learners' identity.

3.3. The findings

The categories identified through the content analysis served as a basis for presenting information about the presence of recommendations in particular handbooks in a tabulated form. Hence, Tables 1-4 illustrate the frequencies of recommendations for L1 use found in the books in relation to its specific functions. Descriptive examples of some of the most representative recommendations are provided under each table.

Table 1 The functions of the L1 addressed in the handbooks published in the 1970s

source	translation of vocabulary	explanation of grammar	L1/L2 contrasts	checking reading comprehension	instructions	classroom management	respect of learners' identity
Krzeszowski (1970)	yes	yes	yes	-	-	-	-
Haycraft (1978)	yes	-	yes	-	-	-	-
Rivers and Temperley (1978)	yes	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 1 contains a summary of the functions of the L1 identified in the three handbooks published in the 1970s. As can be seen, the recommendations were formulated in relation to three categories. All three sources saw L1 translation as a possible technique of teaching new vocabulary, however, making a reservation that giving vocabulary equivalents is acceptable only if no other means are possible. Rivers and Temperley (1978) stressed that translation helps learners understand clearly, but it must not be overused. Two of the sources found

a justification for presenting cross-lingual contrasts to learners. Krzeszowski (1970), who admitted that the use of the L1 was "a matter of argument" (p. 128), also conceded that "[f]ormulation of certain grammatical rules, previously induced by the learners themselves can and, in fact, should be done in Polish". Haycraft (1978) agreed that a brief L1 explanation is a useful shortcut to conveying the meaning behind a structure. Interestingly, Rivers and Temperley (1978) suggested using the so-called "guided conversation" technique, in which hints about what learners are to say in the L2 are given, preferably by the teacher, in the L1 (e.g., "Ask B where she's going" – in the L1). All authors agreed that the L1 can be potentially harmful, as it hinders exposure opportunities and the development of thinking in the L2. Krzeszowski (1970) added that translations of whole texts or speaking L1 during lessons were unjustified and unacceptable.

Table 2 The functions of the L1 addressed in the handbooks published in the 1980s

source	translation of vocabulary	explanation of grammar	L1/L2 contrasts	checking reading comprehension	instructions	classroom management	respect of learners' identity
Willis (1981)	-	yes	-	yes	yes	-	-
Gower and Walters (1983)	yes	yes	-	-	yes	-	-
Harmer (1983)	yes	yes	-	-	yes	-	-
Hubbard, Jones, Thornton and Wheeler (1983)	-	-	yes	yes	yes	-	-
Doff (1988)	yes	yes	yes	-	-	-	-

Table 2 gives information about the functions of the L1 found in the handbooks from the 1980s. Altogether the recommendations regulating L1 use were found in connection with five categories. Harmer (1983), agreeing that translation can save time and hence be a useful technique, warned that "it should be used with caution" (p. 86). Hubbard et al. (1983) also acknowledged the usefulness of L2/L1 comparisons in teaching vocabulary, for example in exploiting semantic grids (e.g., making collocations between *shell, peel, skin* and *oranges, fish, nuts* can be followed by comparisons with possible collocations in learners' L1). Doff (1988) stated that lexical translations could be helpful with potentially confusing items, such as *liver* and *government*. Gower and Walters (1983), admitting that translation might be a useful shortcut, at the same time cautioned that it can be a "dangerous habit", and learners "need to be encouraged out of it" (p. 67).

Willis (1981), while stressing that making the L2 the primary code of classroom communication should be every teacher's priority, acknowledged the usefulness of the L1 in certain situations, such as giving explanations and instructions, and checking learners' comprehension. The reasons for this were time efficiency and

increasing learners' confidence and openness to learning. Hubbard et al. (1983) also admitted the usefulness of the L1 for giving instructions and checking the comprehension of texts, adding, however, that such procedures are appropriate only with weaker students. Similarly, Doff (1988) noted that although the L2 should be the language of classroom communication, the amount and functions of the L1 depended on learners' L2 proficiency level and teachers' L1 knowledge.

Gower and Walters (1983) and Harmer (1983) pointed out that learners' inhibitions about speaking and thinking in the L2 might develop as a result of over-using the L1, particularly in groupwork activities. Consequently, they listed a number of practical solutions for limiting the possibility of learners' L1 use in group-work. On the other hand, they stressed that, despite these dangers, teachers still should not be afraid of learners' using their L1, as long as it is not overused.

All authors agreed that it is important to establish the L2 as a means of conveying meaning. This can be aptly illustrated by the following quotation made by Willis (1981, p. xv): "Learning English through English (…) in a classroom with an English atmosphere is, for your students, the next best thing to going to Britain or an English speaking country and learning English there". All authors made a reservation that occasional L1 use can be more economical, often more convenient, and it may help avoid confusion or misunderstanding.

Table 3 The functions of the L1 addressed in the handbooks published in the 1990s

source	translation of vocabulary	explanation of grammar	L1/L2 contrasts	checking reading comprehension	instructions	classroom management	respect of learners' identity
Richards (1990)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harmer (1991)	yes	-	-	yes	-	-	-
Nunan (1991)	yes	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cross (1992)	yes	yes	yes	-	yes	-	-
Halliwell (1992)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parrot (1993)	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	-	-
Bowen and Marks (1994)	yes	yes	yes	-	-	-	-
Gower, Phillips and Walters (1995)	yes	-	-	-	yes	-	-
Ur (1996)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tanner and Green (1998)	yes	-	yes	-	yes	-	-

In Table 3, the summary of the L1 recommendations found in the handbooks published in the following decade, the 1990s, is presented. Five categories of L1 functions are present in the sources published in the 1990s. It is interesting to note that, in the collection of ten sources, three did not make any references to the L1 at all, and another one, Nunan (1991), while devoting considerable space to teacher talk and teacher language use in an L2 classroom, did

not even mention the code choice. Nunan (1991) made no comment about possible L1 use, remarking only once in the whole book that using a bilingual dictionary by learners might be accepted as a last resort in the presentation of vocabulary. No hints about the possible functions of the L1 can be found in Richards (1990), either. In relation to the L1, Richards (1990) only made one covert suggestion that the L1 should be limited as much as possible, illustrating this with a positive example of a teacher who managed to decrease his or her L1 use. Similarly, the use of the L1 by learners was only mentioned by Ur (1996) as a problem with groupwork speaking activities. Consequently, ideas were provided for teachers about how this problem can be solved. Halliwell (1992) did not refer to the L1 at all, focusing exclusively on the advantages of L2-only instruction and giving advice on how to achieve it.

On the contrary, Gower et al. (1995) presented a number of possible L1 applications in L2 teaching. In their opinion, in a monolingual class, "translating a word or two" (p. 63) constitutes a useful shortcut in teaching vocabulary. Moreover, using a bilingual dictionary can serve as an activity to practice study skills. It is also possible to use the L1 to give instructions, and to help learners talk about tasks and lessons. The translation of texts can enhance advanced learners' awareness of "subtle nuances of English" (p. 63). At the same time, however, Gower et al. (1995) also underscored the necessity of conducting lessons primarily in the L2, and gave hints on how to limit learners' use of the L1 when they should be practicing the L2. Cross (1992) stressed the relevance of pointing out cognates to students, stating that "it would be illogical to ignore this rich and readily available language resource" (p. 7). In his opinion, lexical translation is recommended when there are no alternative ways of conveying a word's meaning, and a bilingual dictionary can be used by learners, although using a monolingual dictionary is more advantageous. Crosslinguistic comparisons as a way of making new L2 vocabulary items more memorable to learners were discussed by Bowen and Marks (1994), and Harmer (1991) mentioned lexical translation as a straightforward and time-saving technique. Interestingly, Harmer (1991) also acknowledged the role of the L1 in checking learners' understanding of written L2 texts. Bowen and Marks (1994) and Cross (1992) saw a role of the L1 and L1/L2 contrasts in giving grammar explanations. Moreover, Cross (1992) also suggested using translation, or even literal translation, to explore the linguistic complexity of songs as L2 input. Finally, although he admitted that L1 instructions, for example for introducing pair-work activities, were a good way of making students understand what is required of them, he strongly opposed using the L1 for classroom management, stating that "to resort to the mother tongue at such moments gives the impression that the foreign language is for practice alone" (p. 237).

Table 4 The functions of the L1 addressed in the handbooks published after the year 2000

source	translation of vocabulary	explanation of grammar	L1/L2 contrasts	checking reading comprehension	instructions	classroom management	respect of learners' identity
Hedge (2000)	yes	yes	yes	-	-	-	-
Harmer (2001)	-	yes	-	yes	yes	yes	-
Komorowska (2001)	yes	yes	yes	-	yes	-	-
Dakowska (2005)	yes	yes	yes	-	-	-	-
Thornbury and Watkins (2007)	yes	-	yes	-	-	-	-
Johnson (2008)	-	yes	-	-	-	-	-
Hall (2011)	-	yes	yes	-	-	-	yes
Scrivener (2011)	-	-	yes	-	yes	-	-
Harmer (2012)	yes	yes	yes	-	-	yes	yes
Nunan (2015)	yes	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harmer (2015)	yes	yes	-	-	-	yes	yes
Richards (2015)	yes	-	-	-	-	-	-

The analysis of the recommendations for L1 use in the final group of handbooks, those published in the 21st century, is summed up in Table 4. As can be seen all seven categories of L1 use are referred to in the sources published after the year 2000. Most of the handbooks (eight out of twelve), like in the earlier decades, recommend translation as a vocabulary presentation technique. Nunan (2015) and Richards (2015) point out that translation is a natural vocabulary learning strategy employed by learners, "the most obvious reference in studying vocabulary", which can be reinforced by such teaching techniques as bilingual glosses in texts and flashcards (Richards, 2015, p. 318). However, a reservation is often made in the materials that lexical translation should be justified by, for example, an insufficiency of other techniques, by the specificity of the item (e.g., abstract or very specific, according to Komorowska, 2001), or by learners' low proficiency. On the other hand, Harmer (2012) sees a justification for translation activities at any level and for various purposes, such as an exploration of linguistic and cultural differences through finding L1 equivalents of idiomatic expressions, or linguistic awareness-raising through a discussion of the inaccuracies of the translations provided by online translation tools. Choosing the best translation as an awareness-raising technique is also suggested by Scrivener (2011) regardless of the proficiency level. Learners' low proficiency level is the most frequent justification for L1 explanations of L2 grammar. For example, Hedge (2000) and Johnson (2008) state that the L1 provides meta-language for the understanding of the form and meaning of structures, but primarily at early stages of learning.

Most authors stress the importance of using the L2 for classroom management as a way of ensuring more meaningful input. Harmer (2001, 2012, 2015), however, argues that the L1 makes classroom management easier and is justified at lower

levels. Moreover, management matters which require more sensitivity from the teacher can be addressed through the L1. Harmer (2015) also links classroom L1 use with a better, more relaxed atmosphere and teacher-student rapport, and advocates introducing "stress-free-own-language breaks" during lessons (p. 51).

All of the authors point out that in a communicative classroom, the L2 should be used as much as possible, and therefore it is the teacher's task to promote the use of the L2. Whether and to what extent the L1 is justified and beneficial to learners depends on the task. This point of view is summarized by Dakowska (2005) in the following way: "the learners' native language is a resource which can be tapped under specific didactic circumstances, but, like salt, should be used with moderation" (p. 32). Therefore, as stated by Harmer (2012), a code of conduct regulating the use of the L1 for its purposeful, optimal exploitation is needed.

Finally, it should be emphasized that Hall (2011) and Harmer (2012, 2015) recognize classroom use of learners' L1 as a manifestation of valuing their identities and diversity. References to the L1 for various didactic reasons can be a sign of appreciation of who the learners are. As stated by Harmer (2012), "[p]art of a student's identity comes from the language(s) they speak. We should encourage our students to celebrate their multilingual identities" (p. 170).

4. Discussion

As was seen in the findings of the analysis, most of the handbooks, with the exception of only three (out of thirty), contain explicit recommendations concerning the use of the L1 in an L2 classroom. Since these are materials to be used in teacher training, these recommendations usually concern L1 use by the teacher, with L1 use by the students being sometimes discussed within topics such as classroom management issues or student interaction formats. Overall, a range of specific functions of the L1 are addressed in the materials, both didactic (i.e., connected with the actual teaching of L2 subsystems and skills development), and pedagogical (i.e., related to management and affective functions). The most frequently quoted function is lexical translation as a vocabulary presentation technique. Twenty-one out of the thirty sources at least mentioned it. In most of them, however, a reservation was made that translation is just one of many different vocabulary teaching techniques, appropriate in the teaching of certain, not all, lexical items. Giving explanations of grammar and referring to L1/L2 contrasts with the aim of clarifying vocabulary and grammar were next most frequently mentioned L1 functions; each of them was referred to fifteen times. Pedagogical functions, such as giving instructions and managing classrooms, were addressed less frequently with regard to L1 use. A general conclusion arising from the analysis is that according to the recommendations, L2

lessons should be conducted in the L2, but, with the exception of the three sources that did not mention it, hence probably assuming that instruction should be entirely L2-based, L1 use is also allowed. However, the handbooks differ in their recommendations concerning the extent and specific functions of L1 use. These differences can be noticed among the handbooks published within similar periods, as well as across the five decades.

Therefore, it can be stated that according to the findings of the analysis, a certain evolution in the attitudes toward L1 use over a span of time can be traced. The most notable differences concern the range of the functions that the L1 has been recommended to serve. In the earlier sources, published in the 1970s, the range of possible L1 functions is severely constrained, as they contain some recommendations with respect to purely didactic use of the L1 only, such as presenting vocabulary and grammar. The recommended L1 use is, naturally, strictly limited, and reservations are always made about the limitations of translation as a teaching technique. One of such limitations is that translation does not give information about the multiple meanings or the connotations of a word (Krzeszowski, 1970). Similar suggestions and reservations concerning the limitations of translation are also present in later publications. In the 1980s, apart from recommendations for a limited use of the L1 for lexical and grammatical explanations, voices for facilitating the understanding of instructions by employing some L1 gradually started to appear. This use of the L1 might seem somewhat surprising given the variety of other techniques, such as nonverbal ones, for clarifying the meaning of instructions in a communicative classroom. Nevertheless, a few of the authors in the 1980s and 1990s acknowledged the functionality of the L1 as a time- and effort-saving tool (e.g., Cross, 1992; Gower et al., 1995; Hubbard et al., 1983; Willis, 1981). Generally, the handbooks published in the 1980s and 1990s seem to be similar in terms of the recommended L1 use, as the range of functions addressed is the same. On the other hand, the three handbooks which do not make any references to potential L1 use, thus rejecting its usefulness, were all published in the 1990s (Halliwell, 1992; Richards, 1990; Ur, 1996), which might suggest that the L2-only policy was the strongest in this decade. Discussing the range of L1 functions addressed in the materials, it is evident that the most recent sources contain references to their broadest range, as all of the seven functions appear in the handbooks published after the year 2000. A novelty in comparison with the previous publications is that Harmer (2001, 2012, 2015) sees the usefulness of the L1 for many aspects of classroom management, for example, for issuing announcements, especially at lower levels. Moreover, L1 use as a recognition of learners' identities started to be discussed in the most recent publications (Hall, 2011; Harmer, 2012, 2015). The broader perspective on L1 use can be thus interpreted as a sign of a

multidimensional approach toward L1 functions, and an extension of the boundaries of traditional didactic applications of the L1.

Apart from the range of L1 functions addressed in the materials published across the time span, certain differences also pertain to the attitudes toward L1 use conveyed by the authors. While it is stressed in most of the handbooks, regardless of the time of publication, that the L2 should be the predominant language in L2 lessons, more disadvantages of L1 use and warnings against its overuse can be found in the earlier publications. Moreover, the warnings are formulated in a more decisive tone in the earlier sources. Furthermore, in more recent handbooks, the disadvantages or possible pitfalls connected with L1 use are outnumbered by its advantages. Although suggestions that teachers should not be overly worried with learners' use of the L1 are also found in earlier publications (e.g., Gower & Walters, 1983; Gower et al., 1995), the attitude toward L1 use by the teacher and by the learners seems to be more relaxed and flexible in more recent sources. In a similar vein, while in older handbooks L1 use is definitely treated as "a last resort", something that makes teaching easier, but is generally to be avoided, in more recent publications it is portrayed as a valuable addition to L2-based teaching, useful in its own right.

5. Conclusions, limitations and implications

The findings of the qualitative analysis of teacher education handbooks have highlighted the changing position of the L1 in L2 teaching over the last decades. The analyzed handbooks were published in the years 1970-2015, and it can be assumed that the views represented in them, with the exception of Krzeszowski (1970), which is closer to the audiolingual paradigm, are congruent with the communicative approach in L2 teaching. This is evident in the recommendations concerning L1 use: the role of conducting lessons in the L2 is stressed, as well as promoting learner interaction in the L2 through pair- and groupwork. The analysis showed, however, that suggestions about the functions that the L1 may perform in L2 lessons are present in the handbooks published over all five decades, which indicates that the role of the L1 has never been completely discarded by L2 methodologists. Instead, its "judicious use" has been advocated, which is in line with the principles of CLT. The analyses also revealed a less strict attitude toward the L1 in L2 teaching in contemporary handbooks, together with a more extensive range of functions it is recommended for. This may signal a step toward a broader perspective on language code choice in current L2 teaching, whose aims include preparing learners for the demands of interactions in multilingual settings.

It needs to be acknowledged that the analysis has several limitations. First, the selection of the handbooks was restricted to what was available to the researcher through the university and her own home library. Therefore, the

selection was not random, but was based on convenience. Secondly, the total number of the materials was limited to thirty, and there was an uneven distribution of the numbers of books in the particular decades. This might have biased the findings of the analysis.

Despite these limitations, however, the analysis leads to certain practical implications. One of them is that recommendations for the amount and functions of L1 use in an L2 classroom are needed and expected by trainees and inexperienced teachers, which has been generally appreciated by handbook writers. The code choice by the teacher is a relevant issue, underlying the implementation of specific teaching procedures, therefore, teachers need guidance in developing their sensitivity to it. A related implication is that in order to fully benefit from working with a given handbook, a trainee needs to be aware of the context in which it was published, that is, the method that it endorses, and the second versus foreign language setting that it pertains to. The date of publication thus seems to be a relevant issue that should be taken into account in the selection of handbooks for teacher training. Many of the handbooks published earlier still contain valuable content that can be exploited in contemporary teacher education; at the same time, certain differences that result from the changing methodologies in L2 teaching can lead to insightful discussions in teacher training courses.

References

Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 9-32.

Butzkamm, W., & Caldwell, J. (2009). *The bilingual reform: A paradigm shift in foreign language teaching.* Tübingen: Narr.

Chavez, M. (2016). The first language in the foreign language classroom: Teacher model and student language use – an exploratory study. *Classroom Discourse, 7*(2), 131-163.

Cieśla, M. (1974). *Dzieje nauki języków obcych w zarysie.* Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 57,* 402-423.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment: Companion volume with new descriptors.* https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(2), 221-240.

Deller, S., & Rinvolucri, M. (2002). *Using the mother tongue: Making the most of the learner's language.* London: Delta Publishing.

Finocchiaro, M., & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The functional-notional approach.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howatt, A. (1984). *A history of English language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howatt, A., & Widdowson, H. (2004). *A history of English language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Inbar-Lourie, O. (2010). English only? The linguistic choices of teachers of young EFL learners. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 14*(3), 351-367.

Källkvist, M. (2013). Languaging in translation tasks used in a university setting: Particular potential for student agency? *Modern Language Journal, 97*(1), 217-238.

Kerr, P. (2016). Questioning 'English-only' classrooms: Own-language use in ELT. In G. Hall (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 513-526). Abingdon: Routledge.

Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching, 44*(1), 64-77.

McMillan, B., & Rivers, D. (2011). The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes toward "English only". *System, 39,* 251-263.

Ministerstwo Edukacji Narodowej. (2017). *Podstawa programowa: Język obcy: Wstęp*. Retrieved from https://men.gov.pl/wp-content/uploads/.../podstawa-programowa-–-jezyk-obcy.pdf

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scheffler, P. (2016). Implementing bilingual pattern practice. *RELC Journal, 47*(2), 253-261.

Stern, H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wach, A. (2019). *The L1 as a consciousness-raising tool in learning L2 grammar*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Appendix

The list of the analyzed teacher training handbooks

Bowen, T., & Marks, J. (1994). *Inside teaching: Options for English language teachers*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Cross, D. (1992). *A practical handbook of language teaching*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Dakowska, M. (2005). *Teaching English as a foreign language: A guide for professionals*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Doff, A. (1988). *Teach English: A training course for teachers: Trainer's handbook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gower, R., & Walters, S. (1983). *Teaching practice handbook: A reference book for EFL teachers in training*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Gower, R., Phillips, D., & Walters, S. (1995). *Teaching practice handbook* (New Ed.). Oxford: Heinemann.

Hall, G. (2011). *Exploring English language teaching: Language in action*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Halliwell, S. (1992). *Teaching English in the primary classroom*. Harlow: Longman.

Harmer, J. (1983). *The practice of English language teaching.* Harlow: Longman.

Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching* (New Ed.). Harlow: Longman.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd Ed.). Harlow: Longman.

Harmer, J. (2012). *Essential teacher knowledge: Core concepts in English language teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching* (5th Ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education.

Haycraft, J. (1978). *An Introduction to English language teaching*. Harlow: Longman.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hubbard, P., Jones, H., Thornton, B., & Wheeler, R. (1983). *A training course for TEFL*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnson. K. (2008). *An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching* (2nd Ed.). Harlow: Pearson.

Komorowska, H. (2001). *Metodyka nauczania języków obcych*. Warszawa: Fraszka Edukacyjna.

Krzeszowski, T. (1970). *Teaching English to Polish learners.* Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. (2015). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages: An introduction*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Parrott, M. (1993). *Tasks for language teachers: A resource book for training and development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. (1990). *The language teaching matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. (2015). *Key issues in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, W., & Temperley, M. (1978). A practical guide to the teaching of English as a second or foreign language. New York: Oxford University Press.

Scrivener, J. (2011). *Learning teaching: The essential guide to English language teaching*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Tanner, R., & Green, C. (1998). *Tasks for teacher education: A reflective approach*. Harlow: Longman.

Thornbury, S., & Watkins, P. (2007). *The CELTA course: Trainer's manual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willis, J. (1981). *Teaching English through English*. Harlow: Longman.