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Abstract

A great percentage of schools in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) are composed of English Language Learners (ELLs) from all over the world. This research paper explores the effects of integration ELLs’ first language (L1) in both ELL classrooms and in mainstream classrooms. This study examines the following research question: What are the effects of integrating ELLs’ L1 in the classroom? The data for this study was collected through interviews with two participants. The two participants are current teachers in the York Region District School Board (YRDSB) who have experience integrating ELLs’ L1 in their classrooms. The findings suggest that educators positively view the integration of ELLs’ L1 and believe that it is most effective when students are at stage 1. However, another finding suggests that educators are faced with a challenge when integrating ELLs’ L1 as they need to seek and apply appropriate tools and resources to best support their students in their L1.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Research Study

English Language Learners (ELL) are students who speak a language other than English in their homes (People for Education, 2008). In the No Child Left Behind Act of 2008 (NCLB), ELLs are defined as those who experience difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding English (Wright, 2010). According to a report from the People for Education, 60% of Ontario’s elementary schools have ELLs (2012). Furthermore, the statistics from the 2005 and 2006 Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO) assessments state that there is approximately 20% of ELLs in English speaking elementary schools in Ontario. These ELLs come from diverse backgrounds including ELLs born in Canada, ELLs with French as their native language, Aboriginal ELLs, and ELLs that are immigrants from other countries. In 2007, the 7th largest non-European ethnic group in Canada was the Korean community, which is continually expanding in Canada (Statcan). Unfortunately, most ELLs are integrated in mainstream classes due to the lack of ELL teachers (People for Education, 2012).

ELLs are also considered to be emergent bilinguals (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010). ELLs can develop additive bilingualism when they learn a new language in addition to their L1 (Wright, 2010). They may not necessarily experience subtractive bilingualism, which is when a new language learned with a cost of the native language (Wright, 2010). As a bilingual, a student must have two of the basic language abilities; listening, speaking, reading and writing (Baker, 2006). Building bilingualism, allows students to communicate in their L1 at home for conversations that are most relevant to the family’s’ native language (Garcia & Wei, 2014).
Previous research has encouraged English-only methods of teaching ELLs English. This method is used to promote the use of English and to discourage the use of ELLs’ native language. However, using ELLs’ native language (L1) for instruction may not always be a disadvantage. Due to this past misconception, in the Greater Toronto Area, teachers experience difficulties when educating ELLs in English-only classroom settings (Bernhard, et al., 2008).

The negligence of ELLs’ L1 may cause an asymmetrical relationship between the teacher and student (Yonesaka, 2005). When teachers prevent the use of ELLs’ native language, students may feel that their identity is threatened and hence, feel uncomfortable and unwelcomed into the new classroom and country (Hopkins, 1988). Consequent to negative relationships and feelings within an English (L2) classroom, ELLs may experience language anxiety (Brown, 2000). Along side, low comprehension of L2 and content areas can cause students to filter out the target language (Meyer, 2008). All these negative factors attribute to the quality of L2 language acquisition. Beginning instruction with ELLs’ native language may build security and self-esteem, thereby facilitating ELLs’ contribution and assisting ELLs’ reach their potential in a new setting.

ELLs’ native language can be used as an effective tool for pedagogy. Native language is the greatest asset student’s hold since the neural connections in their brains use their native language (Khati, 2011). Firstly, students’ native language can be a useful tool for assessment and checking for understanding. It can be used to confirm that the students have understood the material taught by their teacher. Teachers can provide students with a version of a test or assignment in their native language to assess the students’ knowledge of various academic domains. Students’ tests can be later translated and tested
Integrating ELLs’ L1 for content only ignoring grammar or spelling. Doing this may prevent students from guessing what the question is asking and thereby prevent students from performing poorly in academic areas. Therefore, the use of students’ native language facilitates students’ self-esteem in classrooms and generates positive feelings towards the new country. It may also allow students to build their literacy skills and their identity while it diminishes a sense of alienation (Garicia & Wei, 2014). Code-switching and translanguaging are methods in which teachers can implement bilingual education in order to prevent any negative experiences ELLs may encounter.

Code-switching may be used by teachers and ELLs. Code-switching is the process of switching between two languages (Wilkinson, 2010). Often times, it happens within or between sentences (Wilkinson, 2010). Teachers’ use of code switching may encourage students to code switch allowing them to use the language they are most comfortable with (Wilkinson, 2010). Code-switching allows students to increase their vocabulary by drawing connections to their native language. If a teacher shares ELLs’ L1, they are able to point out cognate words in their L1 and L2 (Wilkinson, 2010). Teachers may produce a list of cognate words in order for ELLs to visually see the similarities and differences between their L1 and L2 vocabulary. Moreover, teachers may use the Preview-review strategy. In this strategy, the teachers activates prior knowledge of a topic in ELLs’ L1 and later introduces new material on that topic in English; allowing students’ to deepen their understanding and background knowledge (Garcia & Wei, 2014). This strategy may help students engage in discussion and build an interest in the lesson.

Translanguaging is another approach to bilingualism (Garcia & Wei, 2014). However, teachers that use translanguaging instruction use a combination of English and ELLs’ L1
Integrating ELLs’ L1 rather than using two languages without reference to one another (Celic & Seltzer, 2011). According to Baker (2006), there are four main advantages to translinguaging instruction. First of all, translinguaging by the teacher allows ELLs to obtain a deeper and clear meaning of instructions. With this, students may have a better understanding of expectations. Secondly, translinguaging encourages and facilitates biliteracy in ELLs since practice and support are given in both their L1 and L2. Furthermore, ELLs who maintain their L1 are able to access assistance from home through communication in their L1. Lastly, if translinguaging instruction occurs in mainstream classes, ELLs are able to develop L2 skills simultaneous to knowledge of the content area (Baker, 2006). Therefore, we can see that whether teachers use translinguaging or code switching, there are clear benefits and strategies teachers can use to accommodate ELLs.

It is also possible for monolingual teachers to incorporate bilingual education in a classroom. If a teacher does not have the knowledge of ELLs’ L1, the teacher may create linguistically homogenous groups and/or partners to assist ELLs in their native language (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Students in these groups are able to communicate and discuss the lesson in a way that is most effective. Teachers may also provide the linguistically heterogeneous class with multilingual spaces within the classes. These spaces may have a high availability of technology, tools, and resources for students such as dictionaries and apps for translation. Teachers may also allow ELLs to research in their native language when working on research projects as well as read in their native language for novels studies.

However, it is important to have knowledge or understand ELLs’ native language and it’s orthography to affectively teach students English. Phonological and morphological
Integrating ELLs’ L1 awareness of both languages (L1 and L2) are also required for academic success. English spelling strongly depends on phonology and morphology (Wilkinson, 2010). However, spelling in English is more challenging for ELLs that have native languages with orthographies different from English (Yeong & Liow, 2011). For these ELLs, they are unable to map out phonemes onto letter-strings when reading and writing. Therefore, encoding print for those ELLs is not as efficient compared to ELLs with native languages with the same orthographies as English (Yeong & Liow, 2011).

The Korean alphabetic system is called, Hangul. Hangul uses phoneme- and syllable-level units (McBride-Chang, et al., 2005). How letter and sounds are associated are different for the English and Korean alphabetic system (Wang, Ko & Choi, 2009). In English, phonemes are not mapped onto letters (Wang, Ko & Choi, 2009). For example, the letter c can be pronounced as \( c, k, ck, ch \), and \( cc \) (Wang, Ko & Choi, 2009). On the other hand, in the Korean language, Hangul, the phonemes are directly mapped onto letters (Wang, Ko & Choi, 2009). The letter \( ㅅ \) can only be pronounced as \( /s/ \). With knowledge to students’ native language alphabetic system, teachers can easily make connections for students to easily remember and apply the English alphabetic system.

Phonological awareness (PA) is the ability to use speech/sound units (phonemes) that include syllables, onsets, rimes, and phonemes (Yeong & Liow, 2011). Phonemes are the individual discrete sounds of language (Wright, 2010). Supra-segmental phonology is the study of intonation and stress patterns (Wright, 2010). Teachers must be aware of ELLs’ native language phonology and also the English phonology in order to help correct ELLs’ pronunciation errors that are common to Korean ELLs. Having a list of phonetic differences between their L1 and L2 may be an asset to a classroom. According to Wright
Integrating ELLs’ L1 (2010), ELLs may have difficulties with the pronunciation of English language because certain phonemes may not exist in their native language. Therefore, the development of PA of English strongly depends on ELLs’ native language (Yeong & Liow, 2011). If teachers understand the difficulties ELLs experience with pronunciation, teachers are able to better support their students in specific phonological areas.

Morphology on the other hand, is the study of language structure (Wright, 2010). Where phonemes are the smallest units of sound of language, morphemes are the smallest units of meaning of language (McBridge-Chang, et al., 2005). Morphological awareness (MA) begins in the earlier stages of reading (McBride-Chang, et al., 2005). For instance, ELLs use MA to understand that the rule for making certain nouns plural is to add s at the end of the nouns (McBride-Chang, et al., 2005). Teachers can use ELLs’ native language morphology to help students’ tenses, plurals, comparatives and contractions (Wright, 2010) by creating a comparison chart of their L1 and L2 morphologies.

Lastly, Korean prosody differs from the English prosody (Guion, 2007). Korean prosody is based on tone patterns that are associated with the accentual phrase (an intonational unit) while English prosody is built with stress patterns that are associated with the lexical items (Guion, 2007). In other words, Korean prosody has a phrasal property while English prosody has a lexical property (Guion, 2007). Korean ELLs must learn the lexical properties of stress patterns in English prosody (Guion, 2007). Therefore, it would be beneficial if teachers have experience with switching Korean and English prosodies as they would be able to share strategies that they may use.
In conclusion, awareness of ELLs’ native language alphabetic system, phonology, morphology, and prosody may help ELL teachers provide clear and precise instruction and strategies for ELLs.

**Purpose of the Study**

The reoccurring concern for ELLs is that teachers have a limited amount of knowledge of students’ native language. Thus, it prevents teachers from teaching ELLs in the most beneficial and productive way possible. Teachers should communicate in a way that their ELL students can understand what they are trying to teach. Having some knowledge of the student’s native language will allow teachers to understand what the student is capable of and understands or perhaps what the student is struggling or confused with. Therefore, using ELLs’ native language to communicate may provide for an effective method for teaching. When ELLs’ native language is used carefully and effectively, performance in all academic domains including English may be enhanced (Yamamoto-Wilson, 1997).

The purpose of this explorative study is to investigate and discover the possible advantages and disadvantages of using ELLs’ native languages when teaching ELLs. I will be examining the benefits of using students’ L1 as a bridge to English and its potential success in teaching Korean ELLs along with its success in other academic domains as well as their social life at school. This study is significant because it will contribute to a better understanding of the role or bilingual education for ELLs in Canada and how it can provide additional opportunities for ELLs. Potential strategies for bilingual instruction that are effective will be included throughout this study. This study will also attempt to provide insight for a change in the potential ELL curriculum in
Ontario. Most importantly, this study will enhance ELL education and raise awareness to the benefits and challenges of bilingual education including translanguaging and code switching.

**Research Questions**

**Main Questions**

The primary question this research paper will ask is; *What are the effects of integrating ELLs’ L1 in the classroom?* In order to answer this overarching question, the research will examine the experiences and perceptions that ELL teachers and students have on bilingual education.

**Sub questions**

The following questions are sub-questions to help answer the main research question of this study.

1. *What are effective strategies for integrating ELLs’ L1?*

2. *What experiences have ELL teachers had with the integration of ELLs’ L1?*

3. *What are the views of ELL teachers on bilingual education including translanguaging and code switching?*

4. *How often should ELLs’ L1 be integrated for students with little to no English background?*

5. *What challenges do ELL teachers face with the integration of ELLs’ L1?*
Background of the Researcher

I chose to explore the topic of bilingual education for this paper mainly because of my own personal experiences growing up and its relevance to my current teaching career. My interest for language acquisition began at an early age. With English being my second language, I am bilingual in Korean and English. Growing up, translanguaging and code switching were commonly practiced in my home. I used Korean with my parents most of the time, except for rare terms I was unfamiliar with. With my younger sibling, I code-switched between English and Korean frequently. Finally, I solely used English with my friends that visited my home. For this paper, I am interested in looking at the advantages for teachers who practice bilingual education when teaching ELLs with Korean as their L1. I believe that ELL teachers should have knowledge about ELLs’ native language (sound and structure) along with the student’s culture in order to effectively teach the students.

During the process of my mother attending adult ELL classes, I learned that it was difficult for my mother to connect with her English-only teachers. Listening to her opinions about ELL teachers, I realized that it would be easier for her to learn English from someone that knows the background of her native language. I believe that this would be most effective because a teacher that is bilingual in English and Korean will be able to correct her grammar or pronunciation that specifically compares with her native language sound and structure. I am now curious to discover whether there is a clear advantage for bilingual teachers teaching ELLs.

Interactions between teachers and ELLs are difficult. This notion was strengthened via my first two practicum experiences. The population at my first practicum school was
mostly Chinese and Indian. There were clear difficulties in oral communication along with cultural differences that made it hard for teachers to understand why the student behaved in a certain way. Likewise, the language and cultural barrier made it challenging for the students to understand why their teacher behaved and treated them in a certain way as well. During parent-teacher interviews at the school, I noticed that many ELL parents have a difficult time communicating with their child’s teacher. For example, parents struggled to ask questions about their child and their child’s work, to understand what the teacher had to say about their child, and to express their concern or gratitude towards the teacher. Thus, I sensed importance of educators who knew ELLs L1.

Additionally, I had the opportunity to observe and assist in ELL classes in my second practicum placement. At this school, there is a large population of Korean ELLs. There was one observation that made me rethink about ELLs and their potential to succeed academically. There was a Korean ELL student that never participated in class discussions nor completed assigned work. After necessary discussion with the ELL teacher about approaching the student in her native language, I quickly learned that the student had the capacity and potential to do well. She had the desire to complete her assignments and do well in school however, did not understand any of the oral and written instructions given by the teacher. Once I translated a few key terms in her math review package, she was able to not only complete the questions, but also complete it without minimal errors in her calculations. Through this experience, I realized how important it is for teachers to have a background knowledge of student’s native language, especially in their early levels of English proficiency or beginning months of their arrival.
to a foreign country. The various interactions and experience working with ELLs has provided me with rich insight regarding language acquisition for ELLs.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter of my paper, I provide a literature review of various studies that will contribute to my study including its research questions, research design, and possible participants. The following literature review examines phonological awareness, systematic phonics instruction, morphological awareness, Korean-English dual language programs, the use of L1 in L2 classroom settings, and previous research conducted on multilingual literacy.

Phonological Awareness (PA)

Kang and Guion (2012) examined the relationship between English Phonological Awareness and Korean Phonological Awareness (PA) in the development of literacy in both languages. Kang studied the relationship between languages with different orthographies in order to assess whether PA transfers across languages. The first difference is that Hangul uses syllabic units to form words. Letters are organized into syllable blocks whereas the English alphabetic system uses strings of letters into words (linear form). For example, the word hand is written 손. The syllabic unit is ㅅ, ㅗ, ㄴ which is in the pattern consonant-vowel-consonant. Each letter is organized into a unit by stacking each of the letters in order from top to bottom. Additionally, Korean orthography is very transparent in that there is a consistent mapping of sound to letter unlike English orthography, which is opaque. The result show that, “(1) the Korean EFL learners found body units to be the more accessible than rime units; (2) there were significant relationships between PA and reading skills within and across languages; (3) their overall Korean PA had a significant effect on their English reading skills, but their
English PA did not affect their Korean reading, after controlling for their vocabulary, letter name knowledge and their PA in the language of reading task; and finally (4) their syllable and phoneme awareness in Korean contributed to English reading skills beyond the effects of their emergent literacy skills and PA in English.” These results were consistent with predictions made by Kang and Guion. Kang and Guion, both hold doctorate degrees. Their research was funded by the National Institute of Health. The finding that is important for my study is that PA in one native language can affect ELLs’ development of reading in another language that is not consistent in orthography. Korean ELLs use Korean PA to read English. Knowing these findings, I believe that ELLs can benefit from maintaining their Korean proficiency as the Korean PA helps with reading English and thus, foster bilingualism. Additionally, the differences between English and Korean PA can be applied to my research, as I will be able to use the knowledge to formulate strategies for potential teachers to use in their instruction.

**Systematic Phonics Instruction**

In the study researched by Ehri, Nunes, Stahl, and Willows (2007), systematic phonics instruction benefits students’ reading skills. This approach teaches students to decode grapheme-phoneme units as well as whole units (Ehri, et al., 2007). More specifically, according to the researchers, systematics phonics instructions is effective in helping students decode words, facilitate text comprehension, and aid students’ spelling (Ehri, et al., 2007). The meta-analysis of studies that were identified and coded were limited to peer reviewed journals (Ehri, et al., 2007). Further questions that can be posed upon reading this study, is whether Ontario educators have the knowledge and education
required to teach systematic phonics effectively. Additionally, as this study did not include systematic phonics instruction for ELLs, it is important to know whether this affects transfers to ELLs’ reading skills.

**Morphological awareness (MA)**

Wang, Ko, and Choi (2009) examined the relationships between morphological awareness (MA) in Korean-English bi-literacy acquisition and reading ability. The authors examined whether cross language transfer occurs between two languages with different orthographies. As mentioned before, English is an opaque orthography system, meaning letter and sound are not directly mapped whereas Hangul is a transparent orthography system, meaning letter and sound are directly mapped. The findings of this suggest that MA is important in both transparent and opaque orthographies since it predicts reading ability. Moreover, cross language transfer of MA occurs in bilingual reading acquisition although the two languages may be different in orthography. Wang completed her post doctorate at the Learning Research and Development Centre and received a National Institute of Health grant to preform the study. In future studies, it may be worth examining how syntax transfers across languages as syntactic awareness is related to MA of languages. Therefore, I believe that because MA transfers across languages (Korean MA may be used to develop English reading skills) it is important to maintain Korean proficiency and foster additive language development. These findings can be applied to my research as it can assist in the explanation of the importance of native language proficiency. Moreover, how MA transfers is important for teachers, as it will equip teachers of strategies to best utilize students’ native language.
**Korean-English dual language immersion (DLI) program**

Lee and Jeong (2012), used a qualitative data to examine the experiences and perceptions of teachers, students, and parents of Korean-English Dual Language Immersion (DLI) programs. The Korean-DLI program provides instruction in both English and Korean language. The three criteria for DLI programs have been outlined by Lee and Jeong (2012). DLI programs must be incorporated by both students who are native Korean speakers and students who are native English speakers. Incorporating both the native language and the language intended to learn has shown both benefits and challenges. The DLI program has resulted in higher academic performance and language skills. Maintaining a classroom with a population of native Korean and native English speakers provide motivation for both language speakers and models each language for either language learners. DLI programs not only support language learning but also foster positive attitudes towards different cultures. DLI programs also require for content to be delivered in context. This requirement facilitates language development while maintaining grade level content instruction. I appreciate this study because it not only investigates the benefits of DLI programs but also the challenges that are experienced by students, parents, and teachers. First of all, children and parents are concerned that English language develops slower in DLI programs than English-only programs. Because of this, teachers experience a drop out of Korean families. In addition, Korean families and non-Korean families experience unequal opportunities for parental involvement due to linguistic and cultural barriers. Furthermore, teachers expressed concerns regarding developing Korean language teaching resources and maintaining their Korean proficiency. Lee completed a doctorate degree in Language Learning and Policy Program at Stanford
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University and received funding from the Foundation of Child Development for the study. Using the information gathered from this study, I would like to explore the ratio of Korean-English instruction in different ELL levels and possible teaching resources to support bilingual teachers in both their L1 and L2.

The difference between a dual language program and a heritage language program is that a dual language program consists of L1 language majority and minority students whereas the heritage language program consists of mainly L1 minority students (Baker, 2006). Heritage language education is mainly targeted for recent immigrant families with an L1 other than English (Wilkinson, 2006).

**Using native language, L1, in a L2 classroom**

Schweers (1999), investigated the effects of using L1 (Spanish) in L2 classes at the University of Puerto Rico. The researcher found that a high percentage of Spanish ELL students prefer their native language to be used in their L2 classes when explaining difficult concepts. Following, a considerable amount of students felt that the use of their native language would foster an environment that is comfortable and that allows them to be confident. However, both students and teachers did not feel that native language should be used for testing. In this study, Schweer used Spanish to produce a good rapport with his students as it allowed him to connect with the students and show respect to their native language. As a result, Schweers found that the ELLs were more eager to be in class as it showed on their attendance. Additionally, Schweers discovered that the use of Spanish helped students feel more confident and willing to attempt challenges of learning English. At the time of investigation, Schweers was a teacher at the University of Puerto
Rico. The gap in this study is that the author focused on the views on the use of L1 in L2 classes rather than the quality of instruction. The results of the investigation of the use of L1 (Spanish) in L2 classes will give me insight to possible views of the use of L1 (Korean) in L2 classes. The gap I have mentioned will ensure me to include aspects of quality of instruction. This study has also brought my attention to how I will control my independent variables (quality of instruction).

In a study done by Carson and Kashihara (2012), the use of ELLs’ native language (Japanese) in a L2 classroom was examined. The questionnaire used in this study were adapted from Schweers’ set of questions. The questionnaires from surveys completed by Japanese University student ELLs indicated that ELLs prefer the use of their native language in their L2 classrooms. However, their preference for the use declined as their English abilities increased. Throughout each proficiency level, all students preferred the use of L1 to introduce new content. Lastly, a U-shaped pattern was identified because ELL students with the highest level of proficiency requiring more L1 support when taking challenges and learning difficult content they are not familiar or confident with. Kashihara is a professional translator and also lectures at the Hiroshima City University in Japan. In this study, TOEIC scores were used to differentiate different proficiency levels of English. I believe that the use of only TOEIC scores to differentiate proficiency levels may not suffice for accurate differentiation. It would be beneficial to look at the different proficiency level assessments currently available. Another limitation to this study is the unequal amount of participants in each proficiency level experimental group. In my study, I hope to use similar number of participants in each group for validity.
Another study examined the amount of L1 (Napali) used in L2 classrooms, the reason for the use of L1 in L2 classrooms, and strategies to avoid the overuse of L1 in L2 classrooms (Khati, 2011). It is stated that the only L2 (English) exposure Napali students have are during 5 or 6 hours of classes per week. The results identify several reasons for teachers to use L1 in L2 classrooms. Occasions for teachers to use Napali are as follows; to give instructions, to make difficult concepts clear, to explain new words, to make fun, to explain grammar points, to make students’ feel confident, and to confirm students’ responses. The common reason for the use of L1 in L2 classrooms is due to the challenges surrounding pronunciation and their lack of confidence. The two main suggestions identified in this paper for teachers is to use familiar and interesting topics in L2 classrooms to increase students’ confidence and to use appropriate positive feedback by encouraging both high and low achievers. Khati is a central committee member as well as an advisor of Nepal English Language Teachers’ Association (NELTA). It is important to note the limited exposure of L2 in L2 classes in L1 countries. For my study, I will be examining the use of L1 in L2 classrooms located in L2 countries rather than L1 countries. Hence, an assumption for the amount of L1 used in classes cannot be made for my study.

**Multilingual Literacy**

South Eastern Asia:

Researchers Bernhard et al. (2008), documented a case study at Markham Gateway Public School in the York Region District School Board (YRDSB). A dual language book project was developed in order to increase levels of self-identity (2008).
These books were written in students’ L1 and L2 with assistance from teachers and parents (2008). This instilled a sense of belonging and security for ELLs by acknowledging and valuing their first languages in class (2008). Through a questionnaire developed and distributed to parents, a set of themes were identified. The findings suggested that English was not the primary language used in their homes (2008). This study suggest that the integration of ELLs’ L1 creates a right multicultural environment that increases social interactions and builds relationships with other students (2008). As I will be looking for teachers in the YRDSB as my participants, the results of this study will be valuable and perhaps transferable as the dual book project was held in a school in the YRDSB.

Middle East:

Thornwood Public School in the Peel District of Mississauga consists of a great population of ELLs. A group of primary grade teachers along with ELL teachers promote literacy development in ELLs’ native language using dual-language book bags (Thornwood Public School, 2001). These book bags consist of reading material and audio tapes in multiple languages (2001). Students share their book bags with their family at home (2001). The integration of ELL instruction in mainstream classrooms reaches ELLs as it is inclusive and provides opportunities to demonstrate their skills without feeling alienated (2001). Through a strategic literary method called fractured fairytales, students personalize pre-existing fairytales with components of their own lives. They wrote initial drafts of their stories in the language they were stronger in. Students learned about each others’ cultures through fractured fairytales. This literacy project illustrates the potential
Integrating ELLs’ L1 for the integration of ELL instruction; welcoming the method of transferring L1 into L2 in mainstream classrooms. Unfortunately, a challenge for both the dual language projects is that it may not be feasible for teachers to integrate these projects in their mainstream classrooms.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Procedure

The purpose of this study was to explore the effects of integrating ELLs’ L1 in the classroom. An extensive qualitative research was conducted to identify important information for enhancing language acquisition for ELLs. The methodology section of this paper will outline the research design including a description about the participants, data collection and analysis.

Teachers were interviewed in person in order to investigate the current and past views and experiences of integrating ELLs’ L1 in their classrooms. Following the data collection, the data was transcribed, coded, and noted for similar and different themes. The final section of this chapter will address possible limitations of this study.

Instruments of Data Collection

Interviews were conducted to teachers who have experience with ELLs in their classroom in order to collect data on various experiences and perceptions of bilingual instruction. The interview questions were provided ahead of time so that the participants had enough time to think about the questions. The interviews for the first part of my study were adapted from questionnaires developed by Schweers (1999) (Appendix B and C).
Ethical Review Procedures

Prior to interviewing the teachers, all participants were required to read and sign a consent form (Appendix A). The consent form informed the participants about the purpose and procedure of the study, and about the use of the data gathered via interviews. Participants were aware that they can refuse to participate and withdraw from the study during any point of the research. All copies of the consent form as well as any other documents used for research purposes will be stored in a password-protected device up to two years following publication for research purposes only. All the documents will be safely destroyed after the completion of the study.

Participants

The context for this research were teachers in the York Region District School Board (YRDSB). These participants are teachers currently living in Canada. Teachers that were recruited for this study are those teaching as Junior/Intermediate teachers. I focused on teachers who have had at least two years of experience teaching ELLs. Teachers with a background of teaching Korean ELLs were preferred.

Data Collection and Analysis

All data required for this study were gathered by interviews with teachers in the YRDSB. The interviews were scheduled and organized according to participants’ availability. Each interview was 20-40 minutes in length. During the interviews, I noted all information that could not be captured by an audio-recording device (e.g. body language, student work, ELL resources, etc). The face-to-face interviews were audio-
recorded, transcribed, and coded for in-depth data analysis. During the analysis, data was organized into similarities and differences. Key themes and sub-themes that are relevant to the purpose of this study were highlighted and noted.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

This chapter will outline the main findings discovered from the two interviews conducted. Pseudonyms have been assigned to the two participants of this study. Participant 1 will be referred to as Joy while participant 2 will be referred to as Elena. Joy has fifteen years of teaching experience including two years of teaching the ELL class at her current school. Joy currently holds part 1 of the ELL Additional Qualifications (AQ). Moreover, Elena is a homeroom teacher with eight years of teaching experience. She has taught in foreign countries where English is not their first language. During her time as a teacher, she has had experience teaching ELLs that were integrated in her classroom. Whereas Joy has training to prepare her to teach ELLs, Elena has not taken any ELL AQs. Both Joy and Elena have had experience teaching all four stages of ELLs.

The audio recordings of the interviews with Joy and Elena were transcribed, coded according to common themes and sub-themes, and subsequently analyzed. The common themes from the interviews correspond with the information from the literature review. The four major themes presented in this paper are further organized into sub-themes. The data collected from the two interviews presented the following four themes along with its sub-themes; (1) the integration of ELLs’ L1 [a. teachers’ use of ELLs’ L1 and b. ELLs’ use of their L1], (2) response from the class [a. response from ELLs and b. response from the rest of the school], (3) effects of the integration of ELLs’ L1 [a. challenges experienced by teachers and b. positive and negative effects experienced by ELLs] and (4) effective strategies for integrating ELLs’ L1. The data collected revealed rich information on the common benefits and challenges educators experience when
integrating ELLs’ L1. The stated major themes and sub-themes are identified and discussed in this chapter.

**Theme 1: The Integration of ELLs’ L1**

*Teachers’ use of ELLs’ L1*

Both participants, Joy and Elena expressed acceptance for the use of ELLs’ L1 to support the ELLs. Joy stated, “Yes, if I spoke Mandarin or Cantonese, I would definitely be using it with my stage 1’s [ELLs], who don’t understand what I am saying, and I have to rely on student translation and/ or Google translate.” Joy expressed that if she could speak another language she would use it to support ELLs in stage 1. Joy used Mandarin and Cantonese as example languages because the greater percentage of ELLs at her current school are those who speak Mandarin and Cantonese as their L1. Likewise, although Elena does not speak any other languages, she stated that if she could speak the ELLs’ L1, she would “absolutely speak their languages” would in order to support the ELLs integrated into her class.

*ELLs’ use of their L1*

Both teachers, Joy and Elena allow ELLs to use their L1 in various ways in the classroom. Joy allows her students to use their L1 to demonstrate that they know or need help with concepts. For example, she stated that she uses, “bilingual books through print or online” in order to teach ELLs story structure as the structure of different stories is concrete. She allows ELLs in stage 1 to listen to a universal fairytale story in their first language. This helps ELLs understand the content of the story. The ELLs then write their
response in their first language. This indicates to the teacher that the student has understood the learning target, which is to understand the components and structure of a story. Similar to Joy, Elena identified various ways in which she already integrates ELLs’ L1 in her class as she shared that, “I use their first language if I think it will help them”. Elena allows ELLs to bring their own personal electronic dictionaries and/or translators to class. These help her students read and answer questions presented for assessment purposes. Students may use their personal devices to look up any terminologies they need clarifications with. She also provides a vocabulary list with definitions in their first language and English as well. A list with definitions in both L1 and L2 allow students to compare the terminologies and expand their L2 vocabulary. Furthermore, Elena creates and provides different versions of tests and assignments with incorporations of terminology in each of the ELL’s first language. This helps students better understand the questions and possible relieve language anxiety they may feel. During the interview, Elena shared her experience pairing ELLs with language partners who speak the ELLs’ L1. Elena stated that these language partners must be proficient in English and ELLs’ L1 in order translate or clarify any terminologies or instructions for ELLs. However, Elena is aware that language partners may not always be available in a class and thus the strategies she indicated above is most effective in class.

**Theme 2: Response from the class**

*Response from ELLs*

Neither Joy nor Elena provided any negative information as responses from the ELLs. Joy stated that ELLs enjoy being integrated with their classmates and feel that they
are valued for who they are and their potential is known. According to Joy, ELLs prefer being integrated rather than being withdrawn and reviewing “intensive support” and working on phonics/vocabulary/grammar worksheets in isolation from other students in their class. Joy believes consistently withdrawing students draw attention to the students and limits their opportunities for collaboration with students in English. Likewise, Elena has not received any negative feedback from her students for integrating them and their L1 into the class. Both participants agreed that only positive effects result from integrating ELLs’ L1 from the ELLs themselves.

Response from the rest of the class including parents and the school

Joy and Elena acknowledged the views and opinions of other important members surrounding ELLs including the parents of ELLs as well as other students in the class. Joy has had positive feedback from ELLs’ parents. Joy stated, “[P]arents are usually happy with my program because the students are happy to come to class. The parents also see the reading progress, in terms of movement of their reading levels.” Joy indicated that due to the improvement in reading as shown through specific reading levels, parents of ELLs are appreciative of the program Joy is running for ELLs.

Although from Elena’s experience the ELLs in her class felt appreciative towards their classmates and towards their language partners, Elena has identified that this feeling is not always mutual with the rest of the class, especially those who are more invested and involved in helping to support ELLs. Elena shared that these students may feel burdened and pressured to always help ELLs who may be struggling. She further supported her statement by adding that some students may not feel that it is fair and feel
as though they have no choice but to help although they do not want to. However, she also stated that this may not always be the case, and that there are still students who enjoy assisting ELLs and who enjoy being friends with ELLs. With this being said, Elena also shared, “I have not heard anything negative about my way of integrating ELLs’ L1 in the classroom”. The interviews with Joy and Elena revealed different perspectives for the integration of ELLs’ L1 and its influence on other members of the school as well as parents and guardians.

### Theme 3: Effects of the integration of ELLs’ L1

**Challenges experienced by the participants**

When discussing the obstacles and challenges of integrating ELLs’ L1, similar responses were produced by both Joy and Elena. Joy explained that the biggest challenge when teaching ELLs with beginner’s level proficiency is that most educators do not have the first language fluency of their students.

In my opinion, the biggest challenge is that most of the educators do not have the first language fluency of their students. Therefore, educators need to resort to other tools, translations, and other resources to help their students.

Joy continued by stating that educators thus, need to use other resources and support in order to integrate ELLs’ L1. However, Joy identified that it is a challenge for accessing those resources and support to help ELLs. Additionally, she added that there are educators who do not have a “growth mindset” that allows them to seek additional help in order to integrate ELLs’ L1 in the classroom. Therefore, she believes that those educators feel that the first language of ELLs should not be encouraged or permitted in the classroom.
Elena also expressed her concerns for integrating ELLs’ L1. She presented several likely challenges educators may face when integrating ELLs’ L1. The main challenge she shared was the amount of additional work that needs to go into when integrating their L1. She provided examples of situations such as when educators need to go out of their way to look for additional definitions and definitions in students’ first language. Elena stated,

Last year, I had a boy who spoke Spanish, I took his work to another teacher in the school who could speak and read Spanish. This teacher would translate it for me and I could find out what he was saying. Or, I would ask the ELLs to type in their work into Google translate and then translate it themselves. Again, it is time consuming to either find someone or to have the ELLs translate it themselves. But I think when they are stage 1 ELLs, there are no other options because the just don’t have the vocabulary.

Elena believes that although answers can be translated, it could become time consuming to find the right person someone to translate their work. Although it is a challenge to integrate ELLs’ L1 in the classroom, she believes that at times it is the best teaching method. Elena also stated that it is important for educators to make sure that the definitions in L1 are accurate since resources such as Google translate may not always be accurate. Elena stated,

If it’s like Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, or Japanese, there are several languages where the script is very different so there is no way of really knowing if you are using the best word so this can be a real challenge unless you have someone else in the school that can check these for you.

Elena believes that if you are providing incorrect or inaccurate definitions and inappropriate support, there is no point in providing this type of support and assistance to the ELLs. Another challenge Elena shared was that if teachers consistently do everything in ELLs’ L1, ELLs may not pick up English as quickly as they may become dependent on the language that they are most comfortable with; their L1. Furthermore, Elena
believes that if teachers allow students’ answers and responses for assessment questions to be in their L1, then it becomes difficult to accurately assess students’ knowledge. It was clearly indicated through the interviews that there are many obstacles and challenges that come with integrating ELLs’ L1 in the classroom.

Positive and negative effects experienced by ELLs

Further findings indicate that there are both positive and negative effects of integrating ELLs’ L1 experienced by ELLs. Educator Joy delivers an integrated ELL program where ELLs are only withdrawn to a small group outside of class for an intensive support session, which is held for approximately 200 minutes per week. Therefore, ELLs get a minimum of 40 minutes of support each day from their 100-minute literacy period. The rest of the time, the ELLs are integrated with their classmates. Joy stated, “This immersion helps them pick up the oral language much faster”. This immersion method provides time for ELLs to spend with their classmates for rich opportunities to socialize and communicate in English. As stated previously, ELLs appreciate this quality to time with the rest of the class. Furthermore, Joy stated, “When the student’s first language is used and supported, they are able to truly show you if they understand the concept”. Permitting ELLs to use their L1 to demonstrate their knowledge about a concept can be effective in improving their attitude and confidence towards their overall school experience.

Elena stated that ELLs pick up spoken language immediately, “If they are working with another student who is speaking to them partially in their L1 or translating into L1, they tend to pick up spoken English very quickly.” However, Elena also stated
that technical and mathematical language does not seem to significantly impact ELLs to pick up these terminologies because often times as students do not have the educational language from before.

**Theme 4: Effective strategies**

Joy and Elena indicated various strategies that have been affective in their practices. Joy believes that ELLs’ L1 needs to be used whenever it is appropriate and necessary to ensure students’ success and support within the classroom. In other words, Joy stated, “[W]e need to accommodate so that the student feels and experiences success.” Therefore, she claims that teachers need to take cues from ELLs and sense their emotions such as frustration and implement their L1 where required.

Elena integrated ELLs’ L1 when students are in stage 1. However, beyond stage 1, she believes that it is necessary to utilize English rather than relying on their L1 in order to build their grammatical skills. She stated that once these students have good conversational skills in English then teachers can slowly begin to reduce the amount of L1 exposure. Since students at stage 2 and 3 may still not know a lot of words, Elena recommends that the ELLs use dictionaries, translators as well as implement language partners within the class. Elena shared that,

> Last year, I had a girl who was Hebrew speaking and I paired her with another girl that could also speak Hebrew but also proficient in English so she could help translate things for the Hebrew-speaking ELL.

In Elena’s experiences, the use of language partners was affective in the classroom. Both Joy and Elena expressed that educators should not be hesitant when
integrating ELLs’ L1 into the classroom. The following chapter will connect the analysis from this chapter to the literature reviewed in Chapter 2.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to identify possible benefits and challenges of integrating ELLs’ L1 when teaching stage 1 ELLs. This chapter first explores the connections between the main findings from Chapter 4 and the literature presented in Chapter 2. It then explores the limitations of this study and concludes by pointing to opportunities for future research.

Connecting the Findings and the Literature

As the central research question was: *What are the effects of integrating ELLs’ L1 in the classroom?*, the purpose of this was to explore how the two educators interviewed support ELL education in their classrooms. Some of the commonalities and differences are indicated as follows. One of the most important results of this research was that both teachers, Joy and Elena, responded positively to the idea of being able to communicate and to use ELLs’ L1 when teaching ELLs in their classrooms. Personal experiences within the classroom and positive feedback from ELLs may be what strengthened the participants’ desire to use ELLs’ L1 and to support their language development. The data collected by Schweers (1999) also suggests that many ELLs feel that the inclusion of their first language creates a safe and comfortable environment. This may be the reason why the two participants have received positive feedback from ELLs in their class.

Some of the strategies suggested by Joy and Elena are similar to those identified in the literature review. Joy’s use of stories and books in ELLs’ first language had similar positive effects to the dual language book project at Markham Gateway Public School (2008) and to the dual-language book bags that were used at Thornwood Public School.
Integrating ELLs’ L1 (2001). Not only were the methods alike but also the effects produced were positive from ELLs.

According to Joy and Elena, the greatest challenges these teachers feel are that teachers generally do not have language proficiency of ELLs’ L1 and thus, have a difficult time finding appropriate resources and support to effectively integrate ELLs’ L1. For teachers who do not speak their ELLs’ L1 are never completely sure and are uncomfortable incorporating their L1. Similarly, in the research conducted by Lee and Jeong (2012), teachers expressed concerns for developing their own ELL teaching resources in the ELLs’ L1. Additionally, Elena pointed out that although ELLs and parents have responded positively to the use of ELLs’ L1, other students in the classroom, especially those who are committed to helping ELLs at a deeper level may not be as supportive of the language integration approach.

Both educators, Joy and Elena shared that positive outcomes are evident when ELLs are integrated into mainstream classes working amongst their peers and/ or with language partners rather than when they are segregated into a labeled ELL class. Positive effects were seen socially and linguistically. Integrating ELLs in the mainstream classes allows students to socialize and practice their English with their classmates as this helps students experience a positive and welcoming experience in a new environment. As stated in Lee and Jeong’s research (2012), incorporating ELLs in mainstream classes allows ELLs to be motivated to speak English, which in turn creates positive attitudes towards the immersion approach. When ELLs learn English along side the grade level content, educating ELLs becomes that more affective (Lee & Jeong, 2012).
It was suggested by Elena that integrating ELLs’ L1 may not be as beneficial for students who are in the higher stages of their ELL education. She stated that there is a need for teachers to slowly reduce the amount of exposure of their L1 since they may become reliant on their first language. The research by Carson and Kashihara (2012) suggests that it may be relatively easy for teachers to reduce the exposure since ELLs’ preference for their L1 will eventually decrease as their English language develops. Furthermore, the findings from Lee and Jeong’s (2012) supports this notion as it further indicates that many ELLs and their parents are concerned about the rate of English language development. Both the literature review and the data collected from the interviews reveal that the integration of ELLs’ L1 should be decreased as they become more familiar with the English language. Unlike the study performed by Khati (2011), the interviews did not include any information on the possible overuse effects of L1. In order for students to practice English and to feel comfortable, both Joy and Elena believe that it is crucial for students to eventually be integrated into the mainstream classes with minimal use of their L1.

The participants interviewed in this study provided a wealth of information on the benefits and challenges of integrating ELLs’ L1 in the classroom. Many correlations between the literature review and the interview data were identified. With the analysis of the four themes and sub-themes from Chapter 4, commonalities and differences between the data from the literature review and from the interviews were clear.
Limitations

Although this research has provided strong insight to the benefits and challenges of integrating ELLs’ L1, there are a number of limitations to this study. One limitation of this study is that the number of participants was limited as only two educators were interviewed. Increasing the sample size of participants would have provided further in-depth insights for this research. It would have been beneficial if a larger sample of ELL teachers as well as mainstream educators who integration ELLs’ L1 were interviewed. The two participant groups could have been compared and contrasted to one another to see if there are differences in their responses exist.

Unfortunately, participants with a Korean language background were not found for this study. This limited the ability to connect to the literature review regarding phonology and morphology of the Korean and English language. The lack of research surrounding the Korean language makes it very difficult to draw any clear connections with Korean-English language acquisition for ELLs with L1 in Korean.

Another limitation is that ELLs were not active participants for this study as they were not interviewed. ELLs’ opinions on the integration of their L1 would have been informative to this study. Furthermore, field experiences were not used as a part of this research. Observing and communicating with ELLs may have provided further suggestions for effective strategies that may be used in the classroom.

The findings clearly suggest a need for further investigation in order to identify effective teaching strategies for integrating ELLs’ L1.
Directions for Future Research

As a next step in this research, I believe that it would be beneficial to study whether ELLs’ reading skills in their L1 is transferable to their English reading skills. To do so, it is necessary to interview teachers who speak ELLs’ L1. Interviewing teachers who use ELLs’ L1 (verbally) would help discover whether there are benefits in teaching phonology and morphology of the language. Recognizing the limitations of the study allows future researchers to conduct studies where there are gaps in the current research that already exist.

This study clearly identified some common concerns educators feel surrounding the use of ELLs’ L1 in the classroom. This study explored these issues by examining the current literature and data collected from interviews, specifically looking at the challenges and advantages of integrating ELLs’ L1.

The study includes the analysis of the results of interviews with two very experienced teachers organized in four themes. The information gathered and organized into the four themes was used to answer the main research question of this study. It is clear from the findings that there are areas within ELL education that need to be further researched and improved in order to better assist the individual needs of ELLs in classrooms. Fortunately, the research revealed many important benefits and challenges for the integration of ELLs’ L1, which I hope will give rich insight for mainstream teachers, ELL teachers, as well as future teachers.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Letter of Consent for Interview

Date: ___________________

Dear ___________________,

My name is Jenifer Kim and I am a graduate student at OISE, University of Toronto, and I am currently enrolled as a Master of Teaching candidate. I am studying ELL education for the purposes of investigating the advantages and disadvantages of L1 in a L2 classroom setting. I think that your knowledge and experience will provide insights into this topic.

I am writing a report on this study as a requirement of the Master of Teaching Program. My course instructor who is providing support for the process this year is Dr. Arlo Kempf. My research supervisor is Dr. Katherine Rehner. The purpose of this requirement is to allow us to become familiar with a variety of ways to do research. My data collection consists of an interview between 20-40 minutes that will be audio-recorded. I would be grateful if you would allow me to interview you at a place and time convenient to you. I can conduct the interview at your office or workplace, in a public place, or anywhere else that you might prefer.

The contents of this interview will be used for my assignment, which will include a final paper, as well as informal presentations to my classmates and/or potentially at a conference or publication. I will not use your name or anything else that might identify you in my written work, oral presentations, or publications. This information remains confidential. The only people who will have access to my assignment work will be my research supervisor and my course instructor. You are free to change your mind at any time, and to withdraw even after you have consented to participate. You may decline to answer any specific questions. I will destroy the audio recording after the paper has been presented and/or published which may take up to five years after the data has been collected. There are no known risks or benefits to you for assisting in the project, and I will share with you a copy of my notes to ensure accuracy.

Please sign the attached form, if you agree to be interviewed. The second copy is for your records. Thank you very much for your help.
Yours sincerely,

Jenifer Kim
Researcher
647-938-309
jenifer.kim@mail.utoronto.ca

Dr. Arlo Kempf
Instructor
Arlo.kempf@utoronto.ca

Dr. Katherine Rehnder
Research Supervisor
905-828-3748
katherine.rehner@utoronto.ca

---

**Consent Form**

I acknowledge that the topic of this interview has been explained to me and that any questions that I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I can withdraw at any time without penalty.

I have read the letter provided to me by Jenifer Kim and agree to participate in an interview for the purposes described.

Signature: ________________________________
Name (printed): ________________________________

Date: ________________________________
Appendix B: Teacher Interview Questions

Participant Background:
1. How many years of teaching experience do you have?
2. How many years of experience do you have teaching ELLs?
3. What level of ELLs have you taught?
4. If any, what other languages are you proficient in?
5. What is the demographic of the student population at your school?
6. How many ELLs do you teach?

Practices and experience:
1. What experiences have you had with bilingual, translanguaging, and/or code switching instruction?
2. What kind of feedback have you had from students, parents, colleagues, and/or administrators regarding your practice?
3. What improvements and/or differences have you noticed with the use bilingual, translanguaging, and/or code switching instruction?
4. What are effective strategies for bilingual, translanguaging, and/or code switching instruction?
5. What were your experiences with these strategies?
6. How do you motivate ELLs who feel alienated in school?

Perceptions and beliefs:
1. Should bilingual, translanguaging, and/or code-switching instruction be used to teach ELLs?
2. What are your views on bilingual instruction?
3. When do you think it is important and beneficial to use bilingual, translanguaging, and/or code-switching instruction?
4. How often do you think bilingual, translanguaging, and/or code-switching instruction should be used in class?
5. What are the benefits and challenges of using bilingual instruction when teaching ELL students with beginner’s level proficiency level?
6. Why do you think some educators may be hesitant in using bilingual, translanguaging, and/or code switching instruction?
7. Are there any additional comments that will allow me to further understand bilingual, translanguaging, and/or code switching education in a classroom?