Towards an appraisal of language practices in the FL classroom: A Ghanaian university in focus

Benedicta Adokarley Lomotey

University of Ghana, Ghana
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5337-4626
balomotey@ug.edu.gh

Abstract

Since the 1970s, the monolingual approach to foreign language (FL) teaching has been subject to heated debates among language teachers, applied linguists and other language scholars. The present study seeks to examine the merits of the 100% target language view by investigating the actual use of language in a Ghanaian university context through the use of audio recordings and classroom observations. Questionnaires were also administered to teachers and students with the aim of identifying their perceptions and attitudes towards code-switching in the FL classroom. Finally, the author discusses the factors that influence the language practices of teachers and students and their possible effects on effective FL teaching and learning.

Keywords: language choice; FL classroom interaction; code-switching; FL pedagogy, monolingual approach; bilingual approach

1. Introduction

Language choice in the foreign language (FL) classroom has been a much debated topic in SLA literature for more than a century. By the 1970s, the dominant belief was that the target language (TL) should be the only language used in the FL classroom (Cook, 2016; Ellis, 1984; Krashen, 1981; Macdonald, 1993; Moeller, 2014). Hall and Cook (2012) trace the history of this belief to the Berlitz schools

founded by Maximilian Berlitz in the early part of the 1900s. The Berlitz Method banned any use whatsoever of the student's native language in the classroom. The aim was to "totally immerse the student in the new language" and to "closely simulate the real-life situations in which students would be using the language" (Hall & Cook, 2012, p. 275). Proponents of this approach, which is presently referred to as the monolingual method, further maintain that code-switching[1] (CS) in the FL classroom promotes negative interference from the first language (L1).

Consequently, the use of the L1 in second language (L2) classrooms was frowned upon up until the 1980s when Swan (1985) pioneered a revolution against the long preferred monolingual method. Since then, researchers (e.g., Atkinson, 1987) have tended to criticize the 100% TL use in favor of the bilingual approach, or the use of a language which the students already know alongside the TL (Hall & Cook, 2012, p. 274). Proponents of this approach (e.g., Atkinson, 1987; Butzkamm, 2003; Macaro, 2005) argue that own language use facilitates the learning of the TL and cannot be ostracized from the classroom. Atkinson (1987) criticizes the 100% TL use on three grounds: (1) feasibility: the monolingual approach is impractical as teachers face significant challenges in an attempt to comply with the doctrine; (2) desirability: the bilingual method is the preferred approach in many classrooms around the world; and (3) theoretical rationale: there is no empirical evidence to support the claims of the monolingual approach.

The clarification of the interconnection between theory and practice is of paramount importance for attaining optimum results in FL teaching. The present paper therefore aims at contributing to the debate by examining the language practices of a hitherto unexplored African university context. By so doing, the author hopes to provide novel insights that will shed more light on the merits of both the monolingual and the bilingual methods.

2. Studies on language choice in the FL classroom

In recent years, several studies have been carried out on the merits and demerits of the monolingual and the bilingual methods in language teaching. On the one hand, proponents of the monolingual approach offer a variety of arguments against the use of the L1 in FL classrooms. Cook (2001) sums up these arguments in three categories. The first justification which is based on L1 acquisition argues that the method used by L1 users is the only one that guarantees complete success and, therefore, L2 teaching methods should emulate the characteristics of L1 acquisition. A second argument, dealing with the so-called language compartmentalization,

---

[1] Code-switching, as defined by Cook, "going from one language to the other in mid speech when both speakers know the same two languages" (1991, p. 63).

posits that L2 acquisition can only be successful if the L1 and the L2 are kept rigidly separated. This belief, which originated from transfer theories such as Contrastive Analysis (Lado, 1957), is based on the assumption that the L1 negatively interferes in L2 acquisition and should therefore be avoided. The third argument emphasizes the need for maximal use of the L2 in order to provide quality input that learners can use for acquisition. This communicative view suggests that language in the FL classroom should reflect how the TL is used in real life.

On the other hand, the supporters of the bilingual approach criticize the monolingual method for lack of theoretical rationale, feasibility and empirical evidence. Regarding the argument for the emulation of L1 acquisition, Cook (2001), for example, points to its lack of empirical evidence by noting that the argument relies "partly on a comparison of things that are ultimately incommensurate" because "L2 learning is not L1 acquisition and L2 users are not the same as L1 users". The second argument for language compartmentalization is also criticized on the grounds that it is futile to attempt to eliminate the L1 from the learners' mind (Scott & Fuente, 2008). Several researchers also maintain that the L1 can be a useful tool rather than represent a negative interference and highlight the benefits of own language use in FL teaching (e.g., Atkinson, 1987; Butzkamm, 1998; Cook, 2001; Hall & Cook, 2012). Regarding the argument highlighting the maximal use of the L2, Cook (2001) points out that whereas it is clearly advantageous to maximize access to quality L2 input, it does not imply that the L1 should be avoided. Additionally, Cummins emphasizes the impractical nature of the call against the L1 and proposes the use of bilingual and monolingual strategies in a "balanced and complementary way" (2007, p. 221).

A number of studies have investigated the quantity of TL use in the FL classroom. Guthrie (1987) analyzed a ten-hour recording on own/new language practices of six university-level French teachers. He found that although there was significant variation in the amount and purposes of own-language use by teachers, most participants used the TL most of the time. Duff and Polio (1990) observed, recorded and transcribed the spoken discourse in 13 foreign language classrooms including many typologically unrelated languages in a university setting. Their investigation also involved the administration of a questionnaire focusing on learner and teacher attitudes and motivations towards own-language use. They found a much wider range of frequency of TL use than that reported by Guthrie (1984), showing that it could range from 10% to 100%. Similarly, Turnbull's (2001) research project involving four Grade 9 core French classrooms in Canada reported high variability in the extent of TL use (from 9% to 89%). A study conducted by Cai (2011), which involved classroom observation and audio-recordings, interviews with the teachers and students, as well as analyses of government documents, teachers' syllabi and teaching plans, revealed a "substantial use of the L1" (up to 80%) despite teachers' self-reports of much lower quantities.

In fact, there are studies that show considerable variation even between lessons. For example, Macaro (2001) carried out a case study of 6 student teachers and their codeswitching habits in a secondary school setting. The study involved 14 foreign language (FL) lessons in which French was the L2 and English was the L1 of the learners. He reported a range of 0% to 15.2% L1 use in different lessons. Additional empirical evidence on variation between lessons is provided by Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002), who investigated teachers' FL practices at the University of Queensland. They observed a 0% own language use by a teacher during a listening exercise. However, during a grammar activity they recorded a 55.51% use of the learners' L1 by the very same teacher.

3. The study

3.1. Aims and research questions

The available literature demonstrates that the issue of language choice in FL classrooms still remains controversial. However, the question of the proportion of new language and old language used has received little attention from researchers on the African continent. As Hall and Cook note, "language learning is an international activity" and it is therefore "important to note that what is in vogue in the literature does not necessarily reflect what is actually happening in all parts of the world" (2012, p. 272). We are thus still far from having a full account of FL teaching practices that will help to connect the dots between theory and practice.

Following the ongoing debate which Hall and Cook (2012) describe as a "division between theory and practice", the present research sought to investigate the actual practices in using the L1 and L2 in Spanish as a foreign language classrooms at a public Ghanaian University. Specifically, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are students' and teachers' attitudes and perceptions about the 100% TL approach in the FL classroom?
2. What is the amount of own language and new language used in the FL classroom?
3. What factors determine the language practices followed in the FL classroom?

3.2. Research context, participants and data

The study was carried out in a Ghanaian public university among students of Spanish as a foreign language. Due to the multilingual situation in Ghana,[2] the learners

---

[2] According to *Ethnologue*, there are 81 languages spoken in Ghana.

had different indigenous Ghanaian languages as their L1. However, as a result of British colonization, and an interplay of historical, linguistic, educational and political factors, they all shared a common language which is the language of education and of mass communication in the country, that is, English. English was therefore the *own language* of the participants, whereas Spanish was the *new language*.[3] Although the university has no official policy on the medium of instruction for FL classes, there is an undocumented preference for the 100% TL use in second, third and final year classes.

The audio recordings and classroom observations were done among continuing students (second to fourth year)[4] of Spanish as a FL during the second semester of the 2018/2019 academic year. First-year students were not included in the study because there is a policy for English to be used as the main medium of instruction for beginner classes. Courses were chosen so as to ensure a coverage of all the areas taught: grammar, literature and civilization. Oral classes, however, were excluded since their general objective is to teach communication skills in the TL and thus the use of own language is often avoided at all costs. All in all, a total of 207 participants and their six SFL teachers took part in the study. Table 1 contains information on the classes recorded and the research participants. Each class consisted of a two-hour lesson.

Table 1 Information about the observed classes

Class	Level	Subject	Native speaker (NS)/ non-native speaker (NNS) lecturer	Classroom activity	Number of students	Core/ elective subject
1)	200	SPAN 201: Grammar and Translation I	NS	Verbs *ser* and *estar*	85	Core
2)	200	SPAN 205: Spanish History and Civilization	NNS	The "Renacimiento", "Barroco" and "Picaresque" movements	85	Core
3)	300	SPAN 313: Latin American Studies I	NNS	Independence of Latin America and the formation of New Republics	34	Elective
4)	300	SPAN 301: Intermediate Spanish Usage	NNS	Direct objects/the imperfect/irregular verbs	72	Core
5)	400	SPAN 411-Latin American Literature: Prose	NNS	Presentations on various literary movements of Latin American literature	3	Elective
6)	400	SPAN 401: Advanced Spanish Proficiency	NS	Text book question-and-answer activities	40	Core

---

[3] *Own language* is "the language which the students already know and through which (if allowed), they can approach the new language" (Cook, 2010, p. xxii) and *new language* is "the language being learned" (Hall & Cook, 2012, p. 274).

[4] The Spanish course at the research setting is a four-year bachelor's programme in Spanish philology. The program therefore comprises subjects in all the areas of language learning (listening, speaking, writing and reading) as well as literature and civilization.

The survey was conducted in the second semester of the 2017/2018 academic year. This was secondary data which were originally collected for a different project on language choice in the FL classroom. 147 UG students in their second, third and final years of the Spanish program participated in the study. Table 2 provides detailed demographic information about the 147 student participants, while Table 3 does the same for the six teacher participants.

Table 2 Demographic information on student participants (N = 147)

Question	Response options	Number	%
Age:	15- 20	58	40.3%
	21- 25	85	59%
	26- 30	1	0.7%
	31+	0	0%
Gender:	Female	117	81.8%
	Male	26	18.2%
Nationality:	Ghanaian	136	96.5%
	Non Ghanaian	5	3.5%
Level:	200	55	39%
	300	24	17%
	400	62	44%
Number of years learning Spanish:	2 Years	58	40.3%
	3 Years	24	16.7%
	4 Years	45	31.3%
	> 4 Years	17	11.8%
Proficiency in Spanish:	Beginner	8	5.5%
	Low intermediate	77	53.1%
	High intermediate	54	37.2%
	Advanced	6	4.1%
Choice of Spanish upon admission:	Yes	103	71.5%
	No	41	28.5%
Exposure to Spanish:	At home or elsewhere in the local community	17	11.9%
	In a different institution	11	7.7%
	In a country where the language is spoken	16	11.2%
	No other experience other than previous courses before this academic year	105	73.4%

Some qualitative data which were obtained from the transcriptions of the classroom interactions were also analyzed in order to examine the functional allocations of the new language and the own language as well as the reasons that motivated their choice. Whereas the quantitative data provided an overall picture of the language practices for all the classroom participants, that is, both students and teachers, the qualitative data allowed closer analysis of the language used during teacher-student and student-student interactions.

Table 3 Demographic information on teacher participants (*N* = 6)

Question	Response	Number
Age:	25-30	0
	31-40	3
	41-50	1
	51-60	1
	61+	1
Gender:	Female	4
	Male	2
Nationality:	Ghanaian	2
	Spanish	3
	Senegalese	1
Qualification:	Master of Philosophy	2
	Doctor of Philosophy	3
	Other (please specify)	BA translation and interpretation English-Spanish
Experience in teaching Spanish:	1-5 years	1
	6-10 years	2
	11-15 years	1
	16-20 years	1
	21-25 years	0
	26 years plus	1
Specialization:	Language (Orals)[5]	2
	Language (Linguistics)	3
	Literature	2

3.3. Procedures

The present research draws on the study conducted by Duff and Polio (1990). As mentioned above, six lessons were observed and audio-recorded. For each class, an observation form was completed as well which included the following details: the number of students, the classroom arrangement, extra-linguistic gestures which were of interest to the objectives of the study and technical problems which occurred.

The participants completed questionnaires concerning demographic information, their perceived language proficiency, the year-abroad experience, and their attitudes towards the choice of language in the classroom. The instructors also filled out questionnaires about their background and training, attitudes towards code-switching in the classroom, as well as their perceptions about the monolingual approach. It is worth pointing out that the questionnaires administered to the students were fully anonymous. However, in the case of the

---

[5] These are oral classes in which the instructor focuses on language skills such as reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

teachers, identification was necessary in order to allow the researcher to make comparisons between instructors' self-reported behavior in the questionnaire responses and their actual practices, as revealed through classroom observations.

Quantitative data on the language choice of the participants[6] of the classroom interactions were obtained by listening to the classroom recordings. The language that was used in the class was noted at 15-second intervals. This was done by listening to the tape and making a pause after every 15 seconds and coding the language in use for that period as follows:

1. LE: The utterance is completely in English.
2. LEC: The utterance is in English with few words or phrases in the target language.
3. Mix: The utterance is, approximately, an equal mixture of English and the target language.
4. LSC: The utterance is in the target language with few words or phrases in English.
5. LS: The utterance is completely in the target language
6. P: No speech.
7. ?: The utterance was not clear enough to be coded.

This procedure was applied for the entire lesson period of each class. The figures obtained were then converted into percentages by dividing the time each language was used in a given class by the total period of the class and then multiplying the result by 100.

The classroom discourse was also transcribed for cross-verification purposes using the Jefferson Transcription System. The transcriptions and observation notes were useful in the interpretation of the data as they afforded extra information, especially with respect to the extra-linguistic details of classroom interactions.

3. Findings

3.1. Teachers' attitudes and perceptions regarding TL use

When asked if they were aware of the "target language only theory", the majority of the teacher participants (5) answered in the affirmative, while one (1) lecturer answered in the negative. Additionally, 4 participants confirmed that the language they used in teaching was mainly Spanish, whereas 2 respondents said they used both English and Spanish in their teaching. In relation to their perceptions of the monolingual approach, the majority of the participants expressed disagreement (4), while the minority (2) supported this view. Table 4 illustrates

---

[6] Unlike Duff and Polio (1990), this study examined the total language used by both teachers and students.

the summary of the teacher participants' responses to the questions regarding language choice in the FL classroom.

Table 4 Teachers' perceptions of the 100% TL use (*N* = 6)

Question	Response	Number
Awareness of "the target language only theory":	Yes	5
	No	1
Acceptance of "the target language only theory":	I agree	2
	I totally agree	0
	I don't agree	4
	I totally disagree	0
Language mainly used as medium of instruction:	Target language (Spanish)	4
	English	0
	A combination of both	2

As regards their perceptions about CS in the FL classroom, 2 participants believed its use was unnecessary, 3 felt it was necessary, whereas 1 teacher expressed indifference. Additionally, when asked if they engaged in code-switching in class, 2 teacher participants answered in the negative, another 2 acknowledged that they used it rarely while 2 respondents admitted that they used CS somewhat frequently. Moreover, the majority of participants (4) believed that students should not be allowed to engage in language alternation in class, while 2 participants thought otherwise (see Table 5).

Table 5 Teachers' perceptions of code-switching in the FL classroom (*N* = 6)

QUESTION	RESPONSE	No
Opinions about CS:	Unnecessary	2
	Necessary	3
	Very necessary	0
	I am indifferent	1
Use of CS:	No, not at all	2
	Yes, but rarely	2
	Yes, somewhat frequently	2
	Yes, very frequently	0
Allowing students to use CS:	Yes	2
	No	4

3.2. Students' attitudes and perceptions regarding their teachers' language practices

A significant percentage (70.6%) of the students confirmed they liked the use of CS during their Spanish lessons, whereas a very low percentage of 3.5% said they disliked it. 25.9% were indifferent to reliance on CS. Regarding the use of FL in class, a small percentage of the students (1.4 %) confirmed that they would

prefer less frequent use of the TL, whereas 46.4 % said they would prefer more. However, the greater number of participants (52.1 %) expressed satisfaction with the amount of the TL used by their lecturers. 55.6% said that they understood almost everything their teachers said in the TL, 41.7% stated that they understood some of it and 2.8% admitted that they understood very little. The results on students' perceptions are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6 Students' attitudes towards code-switching in the FL classroom (N = 147)

Question	Response	Number	%
	I dislike it	5	3.5%
Attitudes towards CS:	I like it	101	70.6%
	I am indifferent	37	25.9%
	More of the foreign language than now	65	46.4%
Preferred amount of TL use:	About the same as now	73	52.1%
	Less than now	2	1.4%
	Almost all of it	80	55.6%
Amount of TL speech understood:	Some of it	60	41.7%
	Very little	4	2.8%

3.3. The amount of own language and new language used in the classroom

The analysis showed varying degrees in the amount of own language and new language used in the different classes that were observed for the purposes of the present study. The final calculation of the amount of Spanish used was done by adding the figures for LS and LSC (see section 3.3. above for an explanation) which were interpreted as new language use. The highest observed use of the new language was 96.61%, whereas the lowest was 36.10%. On the other hand, the percentages recorded for the use of own language ranged from 60.39% to 0%. These figures were also obtained by combining the results for LE, Mix and LEC which were all considered as own language use. Table 7 presents a breakdown of the distribution of own language and new language use into different categories.

Table 7 Distribution of own language use and new language use

Course	Own language				New language			
	LE	LEC	LE+LEC	MIX	LS	LSC	LS+LSC	P/?
History & civilization (200)	46.33%+	11.82%	= 58.15%	2.24%	26.84%+	9.27%	= 36.10%	2.24%/ 1.28%
Grammar and translation (200)	5.84%+	8.03%	= 13.87%	0.73%	54.26%+	13.87%	= 68.13%	0.00%/17.27%
Latin American studies (300)	6.06%+	0.25%	= 6.31%	3.28%	71.97%+	3.54%	= 75.51%	14.90%/ 0.00%
Intermediate Spanish usage (300)	11.0%+	0.7%	= 11.7%	8.1%	62.1%	4.2%	= 66.3%	1.8%/ 11.20%
Advanced Spanish proficiency (400)	1.2%+	0.00%	= 1.2%	2.8%	82.4%	0.6%	= 83.0%	5.6%/7.40%
Latin American literature (400)	0.00%+	0.00%	= 0.00%	0.00%	94.57%+	2.04%	= 96.61%	2.04%/ 1.36%

Table 8 Data on code-switching

Course	LEC	MIX	LSC	TOTAL
History & civilization (200)	11.82%	2.24 %	9.27%	23.33%
Grammar and translation (200)	8.03%	0.73%	13.87%	22.63%
Latin American studies (300)	0.25%	3.28%	3.54%	7.07%
Intermediate Spanish usage (300)	0.7%	8.1%	4.2%	13%
Advanced Spanish proficiency (400)	0.00%	2.8 %	0.6 %	3.4%
Latin American literature (400)	0.00%	0.00%	2.04%	2.04%

Although the numbers calculated for LSC were added to those of the LS and considered as samples of new language use, technically speaking, the figures reflecting LSC are examples of code-switching. Subsequently, by adding the data on LEC, Mix and LSC, figures were obtained that illustrated the extent of CS used during the lessons under investigation (see Table 8). The data show that some amount of code-switching was used in all the lessons. In the following section, we will examine.

3.4. Factors shaping language practices in the FL classroom

The language choices of the teacher and student participants were influenced by factors such as students' (perceived) language competence and their previous exposure to the new language. Additional factors were teachers' perceptions concerning the 100% TL use policy, the subject matter and the dominant teaching strategy used by the teacher.

In the first place, some instructors varied the amount of new language use depending on the instructional level and subject matter of the class. For example, one instructor who used 96.61% of the TL in a final year literature class, used a lower amount of new language (66.3%) in a third-year grammar class. Variation in language choice according to lesson contents could also be attributed to the peculiar demands of each subject. Consequently, in a literature class CS could be useful for facilitating discussions of topics for which the students might not have adequate vocabulary. In a grammar class, on the other hand, CS could be employed for explaining new linguistic features. For example, the extract below shows how one grammar instructor used cross-linguistic comparison to explain the use of possessives in Spanish.[7]

---

[7] The original extracts are followed by translations.

Extract 1: SPAN201

1	P:[8]	En inglés, sois muy egoístas, '*mine, mine, mine, mine, mine*' pero en español no usamos posesivos, no usamos posesivos. *Because whose is the leg, if it's not yours?*
2	C:	[laughter]
3	P:	¿O no? ¿Sí o no? ¿Yo digo 'me me', yo 'me he roto la pierna', sí? *I have a headache ...*
4	E:	Tengo dolor de cabeza.
5	P:	Tengo dolor de cabeza, muy bien. Más natural, me duele...
6	C:	La cabeza
7	P:	La cabeza. *Because it's mine, it's not yours, it's mine so I don't need to say it,* ¿entendéis? ¿Sí? Entonces estoy 'hasta las narices', sí, no 'hasta mis narices', *because it's obviously yours*, sí. [inaudible] pero cuando es tuya, es obvio, es obvio, sí, ¿sí?

1	P:	In English, you are very selfish, 'mine, mine, mine, mine, mine' but in Spanish We do not use possessives, we do not use possessives. Because whose is the leg, if it's not yours?
2	C:	[laughter]
3	P:	Or not? Yes or no? I say 'me me', I 'have broken my leg', yes? I have a headache...
4	E:	I have a headache.
5	P:	I have a headache, very good. More natural, it hurts...
6	C:	The head
7	P:	The head. Because it's mine, it's not yours, it's mine so I do not need to say it, do you understand? Yes? Then I am 'up to the nose', yes, not 'up to my nose', because it's obviously yours, yes... [inaudible] but when it's yours, it's obvious, it's obvious, yes, yes?

Classroom observations also revealed that one instructor who answered negatively when asked whether she used the students' L1 while teaching, actually did use it 13.87% of the time. There was therefore some amount of discrepancy in the participant's questionnaire response and her behavior. On the one hand, this discrepancy could be interpreted as a desire on this teacher's part to comply with what she believed to be an ideal (i.e., monolingual) approach to L2 teaching although classroom realities (e.g., students' proficiency levels) made it difficult or even impossible. On the other hand, it could simply have been that the participant responded inaccurately. As Bernard and Ryan note, accuracy is a "real issue" in interviews because "people are inaccurate reporters of their own behavior for many reasons" (Bernard & Ryan, 2010, p. 37). For example, respondents might "overreport socially desirable behavior (...) and underreport socially undesirable behavior"; or they might simply be reporting "what they think they usually do" (p. 37). In sum, code-switching was observed in all the lessons observed including those of the two teacher participants who reported that they supported the 100% TL dogma.

---

[8] P (Profesor[a] = Teacher; E (Estudiante) = Student; C (Clase)= class.

The analysis also showed that the amount of code-switching used had little to do with the native speaker versus non-native speaker status of the teachers concerned. Of the two native speaker instructors who participated in the study, one used as much as 13.87% of own language and 68.13% of new language while teaching a second year grammar class. Ironically, this teacher was strongly in favor of the 100% TL view. The other native-speaker instructor who, however, opposed the 100% TL view, used as little as 1.2% of own language and 83.0% of new language. This data shows that the language choice of the teachers depends much more on existing circumstances, such as the proficiency levels of the class, than the teachers' opinions about the monolingual approach.

The vast majority of students (73.4%) had no other exposure to the new language than in courses taught in the previous academic year. This was indicative of the students' limited exposure to and competence in the TL. Moreover, although no statistical data were collected on students' classroom performance, their self-ratings were indicative of their proficiency levels. As noted by some researchers, perceptions of personal competence can also be a good predictor of actual proficiency (see Shi, 2011). In relation to the students' perceived level of proficiency, the majority (53.1%) rated themselves as low intermediate learners, whereas only 4.1% considered themselves to be advanced students. Indeed, the transcribed data provided clear evidence of communication breakdowns in some cases due to students' insufficient communicative competence, as illustrated in Extract 2:

Extract 2: SPAN 313

1	E1:	Por ejemplo, la medida de Galtón es eliminación que es algo como *harsh*...
2	P:	Wow I understand. Muy bien eh
3	E1:	Ahaaa. Pero la medida de Vasconcelos es muy↓
4	P:	Pacífica.
5	E1:	Pacífica.
6	P:	Sí
7	E2:	Pero dije que erh...tiene...tengo...tengo una problema ...
8	P:	Un problema
9	E2:	Un problema con la meta. Es para desaparecer los negros y los indígenas.
10	E1:	Pues es ( )
11	E2:	[Sí no tengo un problema con...
12	E1:	¿Puedo explicar en inglés? →
13	P:	Sí, sí, sí puedes.
14	E1:	> < *That's the system that they have in the Latin American countries. There are inferior people and there are superior people.*

1	E1:	For example, Galton's measure is elimination that is something like 'harsh'...
2	P:	Wow I understand. Very good eh
3	E1:	Ahaaa. But the measure of Vasconcelos is very ↓

4	P:	Peaceful.
5	E1:	Peaceful.
6	P:	Yes
7	E2:	But I said that erh... has... I have... I have a problem (fem)...
8	P:	A problem (masc)
9	E2:	A problem with the goal. It is to make the blacks and indigenes disappear
10	E1:	Well it is ()
11	E2:	[Yes, I do not have a problem with...
12	E1:	Can I explain in English? →
13	Q:	Yes, yes, yes you can.
14	E1:	> <That's the system that they have in the Latin American countries. There are inferior people and there are superior people.

Evidently, some instructors were unwilling to allow CS (see Table 5) because of the negative associations with CS and their preference for the 100% TL view. As mentioned above, the use of CS in literature classes allows learners who might not have high competence in the new language to contribute more to the lesson and engage more critically with the curriculum. Indeed, Arthur (1996) suggests that code-switching creates a "safe-space" in which learners can participate in class discussions. A comparison of the two literature classes that were observed in the present study showed varying amounts of CS use. However, it remains clear that the sequence of interaction was also different. In the class in which the instructor allowed CS, the students expressed their opinions in a way that was interactive and this even included some classroom debates. In the other class in which CS was not permitted, the interaction between the instructor and the students appeared to proceed mainly on a question-and-answer basis. This can be observed in the following extract:

Extract 3: SPAN 411

1	P:	el amo no tiene manera de defenderse en la historia de Periquillo. ¿Me entendéis? Y como críticos tenemos que considerar todos estos elementos. Él nos dice. Ya. Él nos dice todo lo que dice una persona o lo que dice otra persona. Y entonces en el cuento de su historia, ¿cómo sale él de su historia? ¿Cómo sale él, cómo sale Periquillo en su propia historia?
2	E:	una héroe [sic]
3	P:	¿cómo?
4	E:	una héroe [sic]
5	P:	Como héroe. [risa] ya. Como héroe ¿no? ¿Podréis identificar con él? ¿Podréis digamos esperar a que tenga éxito en lo que está haciendo? ¿o no? Creo que sí porque si te toca curar a alguien que está muriendo, ¿vas a querer que la persona muera? No. ¿Entendéis?

1	P:	the master has no way to defend himself in the history of Periquillo. You understand me? And as critics we have to consider all these elements. He tells us. Ok. He tells us everything a person says or what another person says. And then in the story, how does he appear in his story? How does he come out, how does Periquillo come out in his own story?
2	E:	A hero [sic]
3	P:	How?
4	E:	A hero [sic]
5	P:	As a hero. [laugh] Ok. As a hero, right? Can you identify with him? Can you hope for him to succeed in what he is doing? Or not? I think so, because if you have to cure someone who is dying, are you going to want the person to die? No. Do you understand?

As Seedhouse (2009) notes, the language teacher balances "multiple and sometimes conflicting demands" (p. 7) because he is tasked with managing different but interrelated concerns simultaneously. These include allowing the students to share their ideas while practicing the new language, responding to the ideas shared by the learners, responding to learners' linguistic incorrectness, ensuring that the other learners are following the class discussions and maintaining a concurrent dual focus on both form and meaning. Instructors need to realize these different roles and try to use the bilingual and monolingual strategies in a "balanced and complementary way" (Cummins, 2007, p. 221) that will enable the attainment of these goals. Indeed, in the words of Hall and Cook (2012), code choice and code-switching are "central and creative elements of multilingual discourse" which have become "increasingly de-stigmatized beyond the classroom and, consequently, are also starting to be seen as a 'normal behavior' (Levine, 2009) within language classrooms" (pp. 278-279).

Furthermore, different frequencies on own and new language use were recorded for classes at the same instructional level. For example, the use of the bilingual method was most extensive in the second year civilization class, where 60.39% of own language use was recorded. However, in the grammar class for the same group of students[9] (L200), 14.6% of own language was observed. It is worth pointing out that the second year civilization class had the highest amount (60.39%) of own language use in the study. The instructor often resorted to the use of CS in order to invite students to contribute to ongoing discussions. The following extract illustrates how the instructor's language choice was influenced by the need to elicit student participation.

---

[9] But different teachers.

Extract 4: SPAN205

1	P:	Ahora, errrm la semana pasada, o sea, el jueves pasado, ¿qué habéis hecho con vuestro profesor? ¿Qué habéis hecho? ¿Alguien recuerda? (.) ¿Lo que habéis hecho? (0.4) ¿Quién recuerda? Algo, lo que sea. → *En español o en inglés. En inglés, podéis decirlo en inglés.* Sí, adelante. En inglés. Voluntario (.) Qué habéis visto, habéis aprendido. (0.7) ¿Nadie recuerda? ¿Sí, te llamas cómo?
2	E:	Me llamo XXX
3	P:	Sí XXX. Ahah. ¿Qué recuerdas?
4	E:	We looked at the literature of Spain, ( ) the Catalan language and then also the other languages that follow ( ).

1	P:	Now, errrm last week, that is, last Thursday, what did you learn with your teacher? What did you do? Does anyone remember? (.)What did you do? (0.4)? Who remembers? Something, whatever. → In Spanish or English. In English, you can say it in English. Yes, go ahead. In English. Volunteer (.) What did you learn? (0.7) Does anyone remember? Yes, what's your name?
2	E:	My name is XXX
3	P:	Yes XXX. Ahah. What do you remember?
4	E:	We looked at the literature of Spain, () the Catalan language and then also the other languages that follow ()

Finally, CS appeared to be a "natural occurrence" which cropped up spontaneously during student-student interactions. This could be attributed to the multilingual background of the participants. Multiple use of several languages at the same time, which is characteristic of most Ghanaian polyglots, can be observed in the following extract. Here, the students can be seen instinctively mixing English, Spanish, Akan and Pidgin English in a group discussion.

Extract 5: SPAN 201

1	P:	Escribimos la escena err, escribimos. Vale, un minuto para terminar el texto, un minuto para terminar el texto. Un minuto.

G1: [group discussion]

2	E1:	*So let's start. No no no, let's start.* Oye, ¿qué tal?
3	E2:	Estamos bien.
4	E1:	A dónde compra, ¿a dónde compraste tu camiseta? Parece viejo…
5	E3:	*You can do your face some way bi[10] like this.*
6	E1:	*Yeah.*

G2: [group discussion]

7	E1:	*Are you guys going to bring something up?*
8	E2:	*You too you should also bring something.*

---

[10] Kind of (Of pidgin English origin).

9	E1*:*	*Abi[11] I'm thinking, or are you guys in your thinking mode?*
10	E2*:*	*We are also thinking, yes.*
11	E3:	*Kwai bebre wor etchre, misi kwai bebre wor book wei etchre.*
12	E2:	*Wu dier wu, ooo no*!

| 1 | P: | Describe the scene. Let's write Ok, one minute to finish the text, one minute to finish the text. One minute. |

G1: [group discussion]

2	E1:	So let's start. No no no, let's start. Hey what's up?
3	E2:	We're fine.
4	E1:	Where do you buy, where did you buy your shirt? It seems old ...
5	E3:	You can do your face some way like this.
6	E1:	Yeah.

G2: [group discussion]

7	E1:	Are you guys going to bring something up?
8	E2:	You too you should also bring something.
9	E1:	Abi I'm thinking, or are you guys in your thinking mode?
10	E2:	We are also thinking, yes.
11	E3:	There is lots of space at the back. I say there is lots of space behind this book (Akan)
12	E2:	As for you, oh no (Akan)

5. Conclusion

The aim of the present study was to analyze students' and teachers' attitudes to and perceptions about the 100% TL approach, provide quantitative data on the amount of own language and new language used in the classroom and to discuss the factors related to the language practices observed in the FL classroom. The findings suggest that the majority of the teacher participants were aware of the TL only theory in foreign language teaching. Although most of them were in disagreement with the tenets of the theory, they still expressed the opinion that students should not be allowed to switch languages in the FL classroom. This implies that, although the instructors themselves code-switch quite often, they were reluctant to allow their students to engage in similar practices. This finding is an indication of the instructors' negative attitudes towards CS and shows that the teachers had somewhat conflicting perceptions concerning the monolingual theory. Nonetheless, classroom observation and quantification of the extent of own language use also showed that code-switching was used in all the lessons observed although there was much variation across the classes. Qualitative analysis of extracts from the transcribed classroom interactions revealed that CS

---

[11] But (Of pidgin English origin).

was used for various purposes, such as facilitating communication, making cross-linguistic comparisons, encouraging participation and as a "spontaneous" means of communication in student-student interactions.

The merits of the 100% TL can be considered by examining the results of the present study in the light of Atkinson's (1987) seminal arguments regarding the monolingual approach. Some instructors resorted to the use of own language for the resolution of communication difficulties. Ultimately, this also ensured the achievement of teaching goals and highlights the lack of feasibility of the monolingual approach. Additionally, although the majority of instructors believed that students should not be allowed to code-switch, the survey responses showed that the majority of students expressed positive attitudes towards code-switching on the part of their instructors. Qualitative data also revealed instances when students asked for permission to be allowed to code-switch or when the instructors were compelled to do so themselves in order to elicit classroom participation. This finding confirms that the bilingual approach is preferred by the student participants. In relation to theoretical rationale, the data revealed that CS facilitated lesson progression and enabled students to engage more critically in the subject matter. When used strategically, own language facilitated the teaching of both content and form and, indeed, seemed to confirm Lucas and Katz's (1994) claim that the use of the own language is "so compelling that it emerges even when policies and assumptions mitigate against it" (p. 537). Such considerations highlight the need to rethink the links between theory and practice in the debate on language choice in the FL classroom. This is necessary in order to avoid the practical inefficiencies that could result from such theoretical misperceptions.

With an awareness of the restricted dataset which does not easily allow generalizations, the results of this study suggest that despite the backlash against the monolingual method, some instructors still have negative attitudes towards the bilingual approach. However, as Hall and Cook affirm, the long silence regarding the bilingual teaching method "has been broken" and "the way is open for a major 'paradigm shift' in language teaching and learning" (2012, p. 299). The time has come for language teachers to acknowledge the positive role played by CS in the classroom. Whereas its overuse could be detrimental to the language learning process, the available data on the benefits of its strategic usage show that it is a key route to achieving the ultimate goal of effective foreign language teaching and learning.

Acknowledgement

References

Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal, 41*(4), 241-247.

Bernard, H. R., & Ryan, G. W. (2010). *Analyzing qualitative data: Systematic approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Butzkamm, W. (1998). Code-switching in a bilingual history lesson: The mother tongue as a conversational lubricant. *International Journal of Bilingual Education, 1*(2), 81-99.

Butzkamm, W. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: Death of a dogma. *Language Learning Journal, 28*(1), 29-39.

Cai, G. (2011). *The tertiary English language curriculum in China and its delivery: A critical study,* Unpublished PhD thesis, Open University.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(3), 402-423.

Cook, V. (2016). *Second language learning and language teaching*: London: Routledge.

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

Duff, P. A., & Polio, C. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *Modern Language Journal, 74*(2), 154-166.

Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Guthrie, E. (1987). Six cases in classroom communication: A study of teacher discourse in the foreign language classroom. In J. P. Lantolf & A Labarca (Eds.), *Research in second language learning: Focus on the classroom* (pp. 173-193). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching, 45*(3), 271-308.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* Oxford Pergamon Press.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lucas, T, & Katz, A. (1994). Reframing the debates: The roles of native languages in "English-only" programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*, 537-561.

Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *Modern Language Journal, 85*(4), 531-548.

Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In N. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers* (pp. 63-84). Boston: Springer.

Macdonald, C. (1993). *Using the target language*. Cheltenham: Mary Glasgow Publications.

Moeller, A. J. (2014) Creating a learning environment where target language Is "standard". *University of Nebraska Lincoln NCLRC Language Resource Newsletter, 17.* http://nclrc.org/about_teaching/topics/PDFs/Feature-M oeller-target languageEnvironmentIsStandard-abridged.pdf

Rolin-Ianziti, J., & Brownlie, S. (2002). Teacher use of learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 58*(3), 402-426.

Scott, V. M., & Fuente, M. J. (2008). What's the problem? L2 learners' use of the L1 during consciousness-raising, form-focused tasks. *Modern Language Journal, 92*(1), 100-113.

Seedhouse, P. (2009). The interactional architecture of the language classroom. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature, 1*(1), 1-13.

Shi, L.-F. (2011). How "proficient" is proficient? Subjective proficiency as a predictor of bilingual listeners' recognition of English words. *American Journal of Audiology, 20*(1), 19-32. http://doi.org/10.1044/1059-0889

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but.... *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(4), 531-540.