

Use of Vietnamese in English Language Teaching in Vietnam: Attitudes of Vietnamese University Teachers

Kieu Hang Kim Anh

College of Finance and Customs

B2/1A 385 Street, Tang Nhon Phu A Ward, District 9, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

E-mail: kieuhangkimanh@yahoo.com.vn

Abstract

Drawing upon the literature on the history of the language teaching methods focusing on the use of L1 in L2 teaching, the debate surrounding the role of L1 in the L2 classroom in general and in the English classroom in particular and recent studies of the issue, this article presents at its core a study that investigated the attitudes of Vietnamese university teachers toward the use of Vietnamese in English Language Teaching (ELT) in the context of Vietnam. A total of 12 teachers from three universities in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam participated in the study. The data was collected via questionnaire and semi-structured interview. The findings support the judicious use of Vietnamese in some situations in ELT. The results also highlight that the use of Vietnamese is not the same in all ELT classrooms. Instead, it should be adapted to suit the context of a specific classroom.

Keywords: Teacher attitudes, L1, L2, Vietnamese (language), English Language Teaching

1. Introduction

At the Sixth National Congress of the Vietnamese Communist Party organized in 1986, Vietnam adopted a socialist-oriented market economy under the State management. Since then, the economic relations between Vietnam and other countries in the region and in the world have ceaselessly expanded. Vietnam joined the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), participated in the ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA), implemented the Vietnam-US Bilateral Trade Agreement, and recently has become the 150th member of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Accordingly, more and more investors, most of whom require English as a means of communication, have poured capital into the country. As a result of this international integration, the demand for a skilled labor force having good command of English has become increased and consequently, English has been the foreign language of first choice in the country. However, the communicative competence in English of Vietnamese workforce has not met the requirements of the employers. A large number of fresh university graduates have not been employed by foreign enterprises because of their poor English listening and speaking skills (Ha, 2007, p. 9).

Several studies conducted with the aim of improving the quality of teaching and learning English in Vietnam show that “traditional pedagogy, emphasizing the acquisition of grammar and vocabulary rather than communicative competence” (Pham, 2005, para. 2) is one of the causes of the problem. Since the early 1990s, therefore, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has quickly become popular in Vietnam (Pham, 2005, para. 2). In accordance with the popularity of CLT in the country, it seems that the only use of English in ELT is widely supported. However, the use of Vietnamese in the process of teaching English is common in Vietnam (Nguyen, 2006, para. 1). These have led to controversial opinions among Vietnamese teachers on the use of Vietnamese in ELT (Nguyen, 2006, para. 1), such as: whether Vietnamese should or should not be used in ELT and whether the use of Vietnamese has positive or negative effects on the learning of English. This paper especially discusses the attitudes of Vietnamese university teachers toward the use of Vietnamese in ELT in the context of Vietnam with a view to disclose future perspectives for studies of this issue in the country.

2. History of language teaching methods focusing on L1 use in L2 teaching

A brief review of the literature related to language teaching methods shows that “the role of L1 in L2 teaching” is “one of the most long-standing controversies in the history of language pedagogy” (Stern, 1992, p. 279). The following glimpse in the historical sequence of the most-recognized language teaching methods will highlight periodic changes in the role of L1 in L2 teaching.

The Grammar Translation Method derived from “the teaching of the classical languages, Latin and Greek” over centuries (Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p. 4) is the first one to be considered here. In the early years of the nineteenth century in Western countries, the Grammar Translation Method dominated the L2 classroom. During this period, L2 was taught through grammar illustration, bilingual vocabulary lists and translation exercises. This method emphasizes on the literary language since its fundamental goal is to help learners be able to read literature

written in L2, not to provide them with the ability to communicate verbally in L2. According to this method, L1 is freely used as “a reference system” in the process of L2 acquisition (Stern, 1983, p. 455).

In the late of the nineteenth century, the Western world experienced a big change in the need of learning L2 as commercial contact and travel between European nations increased more and more. People tended to learn L2 with the aim of communicating, not reading literature written in L2 as before. This led to the emergence of the Direct Method, which pays its whole attention to the spoken language. The Direct Method is based on the belief that L2 learning should be an imitation of L1 learning. In this light, learners should be immersed in L2 through the use of L2 “as a means of instruction and communication in the language classroom”, and through “the avoidance of the use of L1 and of translation as a technique” (Stern, 1983, p. 456). After its highest popularity during the period from the late nineteenth century to the first quarter of the twentieth century, the Direct Method began to decline because, as Brown (1994, p. 56) points out, “(it) did not take well in public education where the constraints of budget, classroom size, time, and teacher background made such a method difficult to use.” However, the method has laid foundation upon which many of the later methods and approaches expanded and developed. Among them are the Audiolingual Method and Communicative Approach.

The Audiolingual Method, the origin of which is found in the Army Method developed in response to the need for Americans to learn the languages of their allies and enemies alike during World War II, aims at helping learners “to be able to use the target language communicatively” (Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p. 43). Like the Direct Method, the Audiolingual Method focuses on the spoken language and forbids translation at early level and the use of the students’ native language in the classroom (Finocchiaro & Brumfit, 1983, cited in Ellis, 2003, p. 84). Meanwhile in the Communicative Approach, which has attracted most attention from the language teaching profession during the past five decades, the restricted use of native language is allowed where feasible and translation may be used when learners find it essential or helpful (Finocchiaro & Brumfit, 1983, cited in Ellis, 2003, pp. 84-85).

Recently, there has been an increasing attention to the merits of the L1 use in the language classroom among the language teaching profession. Several studies related to the role of L1 in the teaching of L2 have been carried out around the world in order to develop post-communicative methods which consider L1 as a classroom resource. The Functional-Translation Method by Robert Weschler, which combines “the best of traditional “grammar translation” with the best of modern “direct, communicative” methods”, can be taken as an example (Weschler, 1997, para. 3).

3. Debate surrounding the role of L1 in the L2 classroom

3.1 Support for the monolingual approach

The support for the monolingual approach in the literature is organized around three fundamental principles.

The first principle is based on the rationale that from childhood, human beings are exposed to the surrounding sound environment. We listen, imitate and respond to what we hear around us and then we succeed in mastering our L1. As a result, the proponents of the monolingual approach, who believe that L2 learning follows a process similar to L1 learning, claim that exposure is vital in the learning of L2 (Cook, 2001, p. 406). In other words, learners of L2 should be exposed to an L2 environment as much as possible. Krashen, a pivotal advocate of the only-L2 use in the classroom and also an expert in the field of linguistics, continues this idea, stating that “comprehensible input is the only causative variable in second language acquisition” (1986, cited in Brown, 2000, p. 280). He means that “success in a foreign language can be attributed to input alone” (Brown, 2000, p. 280).

Regarding the second principle, the supporters of the monolingual approach indicate that the main impediment to L2 learning is the interference from L1 knowledge (Cook, 2001, p. 407). Krashen, (1981, p. 64) in his influential “Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning”, suggests that L1 is a source of errors in learners’ L2 performance. Based on research findings, he reports that “a high amount of first language influence” is found in “situations ... where translation exercises are frequent” (Krashen, 1981, p. 66).

As for the third principle, it is believed that the use of only L2 for all interactions in the L2 classroom can proclaim the significance of L2 in satisfying learners’ communicative needs (Littlewood, 1981, cited in Cook, 2001, p. 409) and depict the usage of the target language (Pachler & Field, 2001, cited in Miles, 2004, p. 8).

In addition to the above fundamental principles, the monolingual approach believes that “the teacher who is a native speaker is the best embodiment of the target and norm for learners” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 194). This belief is based on the assumption that native L2 speakers possess “greater facility in demonstrating fluent, idiomatically appropriate language, in appreciating the cultural connotations of the language, and in being the

final arbiter of the acceptability of any given samples of the language”, which seem to make them “intrinsically better qualified than the non-native” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 194). This native speaker principle is quite popular in several countries including Vietnam. One can easily realize the strong preference of Vietnamese learners of English for native speakers of English through the advertisements put by foreign language centers in Tuoi Tre Newspaper- one of the most popular and prestigious newspapers in Vietnam. For example, Europe-USA International English School (EUIES) – an English language school in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam - advertised in Tuoi Tre Newspaper dated January 11, 2010 that “in EUIES, you will learn English speaking and listening skills with 100% native teachers of English”.

3.2 Support for the bilingual approach

The proponents of the bilingual approach have focused their efforts on three points to discredit the monolingual approach.

According to Phillipson (1992, p. 191), the biggest problem of the monolingual approach is that “it is impractical”. There is the fact that non-native speakers account for the vast majority of teachers of English across the world (Hawks, 2001, cited in Miles, 2004, p. 9). These teachers’ English is usually not good enough to carry out the English-only teaching in the classroom; thus, the insistence on the monolingual approach may result in their reduced ability to communicate and consequently their reduced teaching performance (Miles, 2004, p. 9). Another reason for the monolingual approach’s impracticality is that the exclusion of L1 in lower-level monolingual classes is practically impossible (Nunan & Lamb, 1996, cited in Vaezi & Mirzaei, 2007, para. 7). As a result, the English-only teaching in the classroom may create “the alienation of learners from the learning process” (Pachler & Field, 2001, cited in Miles, 2004, p. 14).

The monolingual approach also receives criticism regarding its claim that maximum exposure to L2 leads to the success of L2 learning. According to Phillipson (1992, p. 211) this is not the case as “...there is no correlation between quantity of L2 input, in an environment where the learners are exposed to L2 in the community, and the academic success”. He cites Cummins (1984), as stating that “a maximum exposure assumption is fallacy” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 211). He further points out that although maximizing L2 input is important, other factors such as the quality of teaching materials, teachers and methods of teaching are of more significance (Phillipson, 1992, p. 210).

Concerning the belief that native teachers are the best teachers, Cook (1999, p. 186) stated that the characteristics which native speakers are usually said to possess are “not a necessary part of the definition of native speaker”. Phillipson (1992, p. 194) shares the same idea, saying that all of these characteristics such as fluency and appropriate use of language can be achieved in the process of training. He goes further in arguing that non-native teachers seem to be better than native ones as they themselves have experienced the process of learning L2, acquiring insight into the need of their learners, which is a valuable resource for their teaching (Phillipson, 1992, p. 195).

In this light, Phillipson (1992, p. 195) suggests that the ideal teacher is the person who “has near-native speaker proficiency in the foreign language, and comes from the same linguistic and cultural background as the learners”.

Apart from discrediting the monolingual approach, the advocates of the bilingual approach indicate the benefits of using L1 in L2 teaching.

Based on the belief that L1 is part of adult learners’ experience which they bring into the classroom, Corder (1992, cited in Ellis, 2003, p. 94) states that:

Second language learners not only already possess a language system which is potentially available as a factor in the acquisition of the second language, but equally importantly they already know something of what a language is for, what its communicative functions and potentials are.

He proposes that L1 can help learners “in the process of discovery and creation”; thus “the effect of the mother tongue on learning L2” is “facilitatory” (Corder, 1992, cited in Ellis, 2003, p. 94).

Atkinson (1987, p. 242), in his discussion about general advantages of L1 use, claims that to let learners use their L1 is “a humanistic approach” which allows them to “say what they really want to say sometimes”. He also indicates that the use of L1 can be very effective in terms of the amount of time spent explaining (Atkinson, 1987, p. 242).

4. Studies exploring L1 use in L2 teaching

Several studies have been carried out across the world during the past three decades with the aim of

demonstrating the positive role of L1 in L2 teaching, finding out teachers and learners' attitudes toward this issue and identifying specific situations in which L1 should be used in the L2 classroom.

4.1 Studies aiming at demonstrating the positive role of L1 in L2 teaching

Miles (2004, p. 15) carried out two experiments at the University of Kent, England in the attempt to substantiate that the use of L1 in the classroom not only does not hinder the learning of L2 but also can facilitate the development of L2. In the first experiment, three low-level classes were compared. One class did not use L1, another did use it (in this class, the teacher could not speak Japanese; however, Japanese used by the students was allowed to an extent) and the third did utilize it (in this class, the teacher could speak Japanese and use it periodically). In the second experiment, the attention was paid to one class. Four lessons were taught to this class, two using L1 and two not using L1. All the participants who were male of the age between 18 and 19 enrolled at a university in Tokyo, Japan, but spent their first year studying English in England, regardless of their majors (English or a different subject). Japanese was their L1, and most of them had learnt English for 6 years at high-school. Generally, the findings from the two experiments were supportive of the use of L1 in the classroom (Miles, 2004, pp. 36-37).

More recently, Vaezi and Mirzaei (2007, para. 22) conducted a study in order to answer the following question:

“Does the use of translation from L1 to L2 have any effect on the improvement of Iranian EFL learners' linguistic accuracy—focus on form?”

To achieve the aim of this study, 155 participants (70 male and 85 female) Iranian pre-intermediate learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) between the age of 13 to 24 studying in several language centers in Iran were given a pre-test, aiming at identifying the participants who were not familiar with the four chosen structures of the study namely “Passive voice, Indirect reported speech, Conditional type 2, and Wish+ simple past” (Vaezi & Mirzaei, 2007, para. 27). Based on the results of the pre-test, 72 participants were selected and were divided into two groups: the experimental and comparison groups. The experimental group was asked to translate Persian sentences into English using the structures that they have been taught meanwhile the other group was requested to do grammar exercises in the course book. Then both groups were given a post-test. The results of the post-test showed that “the experimental group outperformed the comparison group in terms of accuracy” (Vaezi & Mirzaei, 2007, para. 3); this supported Atkinson's (1987, p. 244) statements:

An exercise involving translation into the target language of a paragraph or set of sentences which highlight the recently taught language item can provide useful reinforcement of structural, conceptual and sociolinguistic differences between the native and target languages. This activity is not, of course, communicative, but its aim is to improve accuracy.

The study also concluded that “mother tongue, if used purposefully and systematically, can have a constructive role in teaching other languages” (Vaezi & Mirzaei, 2007, para. 42).

4.2 Studies focusing on teachers and learners' attitudes toward L1 use in L2 teaching and specific situations in which L1 should be used in the L2 classroom:

In several other studies conducted by the supporters of the bilingual approach, the focus tends to be on teachers and learners' attitudes toward the use of L1 in L2 teaching and specific situations in which L1 should be used in the L2 classroom. Teachers and learners' favorable views of the place of L1 in the English classroom can be found in a research on the use of Spanish in English classes at the University of Puerto Rico, Bayamon Campus, Puerto Rico. Participants including teachers (n =19) and students (the number of the student participants was not mentioned in the study) were asked to fill out a questionnaire about their attitudes toward the use of Spanish in the English classroom. Schweers (1999, para. 5), the author of the research, also recorded a 35-minute sample from three classes at the beginning, middle, and end of the first semester of the 1997–1998 academic year in order to see how frequently and in what situations these teachers used Spanish in their classes. According to the study, the majority of the respondents supported the use of L1 in ELT and would like L1 to be used in English classes “sometimes”. Regarding the reasons for their preference for the use of Spanish in the classroom, the respondents answered that it could aid comprehension and make students feel more comfortable, less tense and less lost. The research also listed possible applications of L1 in the classroom such as explaining difficult concepts, checking comprehension, defining new vocabulary items, joking around with students and testing. Based on the study's findings, Schweers (1999, paras. 25-26) argued that

... a second language can be learned through raising awareness to the similarities and differences between the L1 and the L2.

Additionally, bringing Spanish into the English classes has made learning English appear to be less of a threat to

their vernacular. They learn first hand that the two languages can coexist. Finally, ... using Spanish has led to positive attitudes toward the process of learning English and better yet, encourage students to learn more English.

Inspired by Schweers's research, Tang (2002, para. 9) carried out a similar study in the Chinese context. Results obtained from the questionnaires filled out by the participants of the study (100 first-year English-majored university students and 20 teachers), interviews and classroom observations shared many similarities with Schweers's study in the context of Puerto Rico. There existed certain differences in the occasions when L1 should be used and the reasons for the use of L1 in the classroom. Tang's study suggested two more reasons for the use of Chinese in the English classroom, namely "it is more effective" and "it is less time-consuming". The study concluded that

The research seems to show that limited and judicious use of the mother tongue in the English classroom does not reduce students' exposure to English, but rather can assist in the teaching and learning processes. This is not to overstate the role of the L1 or advocate greater use of L1 in the EFL classroom, but rather to clarify some misconceptions that have troubled foreign language teachers for years, such as whether they should use the mother tongue when there is a need for it and whether the often-mentioned principle of no native language in the classroom is justifiable.

(Tang, 2002, para. 33)

Other researchers, Nguyen (1999, p. 40) and Zacharias (2003, p. 74) reported their studies on the use of L1 in L2 teaching and concluded that most of the respondents held supportive views on the role of L1 in the English classroom. Zacharias (2003, p. 74) further pointed out the possible uses of L1 in the process of teaching L2 including explaining the meaning of new words and grammatical points, giving instructions, checking learners' understanding and giving feedback to individual learners.

5. The study

5.1 Participants

A total of twelve Vietnamese teachers of English (10 females and 2 males) from three universities in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam responded to the questionnaire designed for the study. The percentage of the teachers with a bachelor degree was little higher than that of those with a master's degree. The teachers differed considerably with respect to the age and the year(s) of teaching experience. They aged between 26 and 47 while their teaching experience ranged from 3 to 22 years. Of the twelve respondents to the questionnaires, only 4 teachers allowed interview. The interviewed teachers were given pseudonyms – Vinh (the only male), Nhung, Dao and Lan.

5.2 Instruments

The current study made use of two data collection instruments, including:

- a questionnaire (Appendix 1) developed to elicit the teacher respondents' attitudes toward the use of Vietnamese in ELT in Vietnam;
- a semi-structured interview (Appendix 2) employed to cross-check the questionnaire data as well as to collect detailed explanations for the teacher respondents' attitudes related to the topic of the present study

5.2.1 Questionnaire

As part of the preparation for the questionnaire, take-noted interviews related to the topic of the study with 3 university teachers of English were conducted. The pilot questionnaire developed from the questionnaires designed by Schweers (1999), sources reviewed in Sections 4 and the information drawn from the preliminary interviews as well was tested with 3 other university teachers of English. Some minor changes in both wording and format resulted in the official questionnaire which was framed in Vietnamese to ensure that the data to be collected would be valid. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first is about the participants' own background and the second deals with the respondents' attitudes toward the use of Vietnamese in ELT in the context of Vietnam.

5.2.2 Interview

A semi-structured interview was conducted in Vietnamese with each of the four teachers. Each interview lasted between 10 minutes and 15 minutes. They were based on the following key questions:

- 1). Should teachers use Vietnamese in ELT in Vietnam?
- 2). If not, why should not teachers use Vietnamese in ELT?

3). If yes, in what situations teachers should use Vietnamese in ELT?

4). Why should teachers use Vietnamese in these situations?

5). How often should teachers use Vietnamese in ELT?

Besides the above questions, examples or follow-up questions were included in the interview schedule to encourage interviewees to give more detailed information.

5.2.3 Procedures

The data collection procedures involved the following steps:

-A total of 15 copies of the questionnaire were distributed to teachers from the three universities and 12 copies were returned.

-After the questionnaires were returned, four interviews were conducted separately with the permission of the four teachers. During these interviews, written notes were allowed by the teacher participants.

The results highlight the following points

Vietnamese is useful in some situations

All of the participants advocated the use of Vietnamese in ELT. According to them, Vietnamese was a part of the teaching method and could play a positive role in the classroom. This is similar to the standpoint of Atkinson (1987), who believes in the great potential of L1 “as a classroom resource” (Atkinson, 1987, p. 241).

The findings suggest a lot of situations in which Vietnamese should be used in ELT. Among them, ‘explaining grammatical points’ (75%), ‘explaining new words’ (67%) and ‘checking for understanding (67%)’ were the three most popular situations. However, these situations should not be fixed. Instead, they could be changed according to ‘the context of a specific class’ as the following comment made by Lan:

Based on the context of a specific class, the teacher can decide which situations Vietnamese should be used in. For example, in the elementary English class, I may explain grammar and new words in Vietnamese; however, in the class with a higher English level, I may first do these things in English. If the students look puzzled, I will use Vietnamese to reinterpret my English explanations. If the students understand with my explanations in English, I will continue the lesson without using Vietnamese.

Regarding to the reasons for using Vietnamese, the findings indicate that ‘helping students understand complex grammatical points better’ (75%), ‘helping students understand difficult new words more clearly’ (67%) and ‘making sure that students understand the lessons’ (50%) were the three reasons which the teacher participants chose with the highest frequency. The interviewed teachers continued their ideas stated in the questionnaire, giving more detailed information about their choices:

Explaining the meanings of terminologies and difficult words in English only is a time-consuming but ineffective work. In this case, giving a Vietnamese equivalent can help students understand more clearly. My students are also asked to do Vietnamese-English-Vietnamese translation exercises and tests because I think this can improve the students’ translation skills that they will need for their future jobs. (Vinh)

Using Vietnamese in explaining terminologies and abstract words and complex grammatical points is extremely effective. Students will understand better and more clearly what they are being taught. Moreover, students’ understanding of the lessons is very important; therefore I frequently use Vietnamese to check for my students’ understanding. I like joking with my students and I think students may enjoy a joke told in Vietnamese more. This will create a less-stressed learning environment and so help them learn better. (Nhung)

Vietnamese is really useful in explaining technical terms and complex grammar structures because in these cases, if we use only English, it is very easy to make the students feel confused or misunderstand. Sometimes we should use Vietnamese in checking for comprehension and giving feedback to make sure that the students understand the lesson and help them see their strong and weak points clearly. I also discuss classroom methods in Vietnamese because this will help us and our students better cooperate in the future. (Dao)

In the elementary English class, Vietnamese can make new words and grammatical points easier to understand. In the class with a higher English level, I only use Vietnamese in case my students are confused with my English explanations in order to help them understand more clearly. In addition, the teacher should use Vietnamese to give instructions about the activities that are performed for the first time. I do not want the activities to be stopped because the students do not know what to do next. It is very important to me that the students understand what they have been taught and see clearly their errors, so Vietnamese should also be used in checking for understanding and giving feedback. (Lan)

Vietnamese should not be overused

The majority of the teachers (67%) agreed that teachers just should use Vietnamese ‘sometimes’. In other words, most of the respondents supported the limited use of L1, not the overuse of L1. This was consistent with the view made by Ellis (1984, cited in Mattioli, 2004), claiming that too much L1 use should be avoided because it could “deprive the learners of valuable input in the L2” (para.15).

The present study goes further in providing the following suggestions for the judicious use of Vietnamese in ELT:

We can adjust the amount of Vietnamese to students’ levels of English, types of lessons and types of English we are teaching. (Vinh)

The higher students’ level of English is, the less Vietnamese should be used. (Nhung)

The frequency of teachers’ use of Vietnamese depends on a lot of things such as students’ levels of English, aims of the lesson and duration of the class. In Vietnam, the English levels of the students in the same class are not the same; therefore using some Vietnamese in ELT is useful for the weaker students. If there is plenty of work that has to be finished in a short-time class, I may use Vietnamese more than usual. (Lan)

The amount of Vietnamese used by teachers should vary by students’ levels of English. (Dao)

These comments implies that according to the teacher participants, the judicious use of L1 by teachers could not be the same universally because it was influenced by specific factors in specific English classrooms as they listed above. This was in line with the claim made by Edstrom (2006) that “judicious L1 use will likely look different in different classrooms” (p. 289).

6. Conclusions and implications

Joining the debate surrounding the use of L1 in L2 teaching in general and in ELT in particular, this article highlights that once Vietnamese (L1) is not overused and its use is adapted to the context of each class, it (L1) could be seen as an efficient tool in the ELT classroom. The outcome of the present study also presents the possible useful role of Vietnamese in several situations such as explaining new words, especially terminologies and abstract words, in ELT in Vietnam. As a result, there is a need to conduct experimental studies in order to evaluate the actual role of Vietnamese in these situations, which is likely to make an important contribution to the development of a systematic way of using Vietnamese to the end of effective English language teaching and learning.

References

- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected source? *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241-247.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Longman.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Edstrom, A. (2006). L1 use in the L2 classroom: One teacher’s self-evaluation. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes*, 63(2), 275-292.
- Ellis, E.M. (2003). *Bilingualism among Teachers of English as a Second Language: A study of second language learning experience as a contributor to the professional knowledge and beliefs of teachers of ESL to adults* (Doctoral thesis, Griffith University, 2003). Retrieved from <http://www4.gu.edu.au:8080/adt-root/public/adt-QGU20040618.172404/index.html>.
- Ha Thi, T.D. (2007). Nang cao hieu qua giang day tieng Anh o bac dai hoc nhin tu goc do giao vien chu nhiem. In P.A.Vu Thi, et al. (Eds.), *Giang day tieng Anh bac dai hoc tai Viet Nam: Van de va giai phap* (pp. 9-17). Ho Chi Minh City: Nha xuất bản Đại học Quốc gia TP Ho Chi Minh.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mattioli, G. (2004). On native language intrusions and making do with words: Linguistically homogeneous classrooms and native language use. *English Teaching Forum*, 42(4). Retrieved November 6, 2007 from <http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol42/no4/p20.htm>.

- Miles, R. (2004). *Evaluating the use of L1 in the English language classroom* (Master thesis, University of Birmingham, 2004). Retrieved from www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Milesdiss.pdf.
- Nguyen Thi, N.Q. (2006). Using Vietnamese: The assistance or interference in the teaching-learning process in English language classes. *University of Danang Journal of Science and Technology*, 22. Retrieved January 22, 2008, from www.kh-sdh.udn.vn/zipfiles/so22/26.quynh_da%20sua.doc.
- Nguyen, X.Q. (1999). *The role of the Vietnamese language in the English teaching and learning in Vietnam*. Unpublished master thesis, Hanoi University of Foreign Studies & Ho Chi Minh City University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.
- Pham, H.H. (2005). "Imported" Communicative Language Teaching: Implications for local teachers. *English Teaching Forum*, 43(4). Retrieved February 3, 2008, from <http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol43/no4/p2.htm>.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schweers, W. Jr. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 37(2). Retrieved November 22, 2007 from <http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol37/no2/p6.htm>.
- Stern, H.H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stern, H.H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tang, J. (2002). Using L1 in the English classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 40(1). Retrieved November 22, 2007 from <http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol40/no1/p36.htm>.
- Vaezi, S., & Mirzaei, M. (2007, September). The effect of using translation from L1 to L2 as a teaching technique on the improvement of EFL learners' linguistic accuracy – focus on form. *Humanising Language Teaching*, 9(5). Retrieved February 20, 2008 from <http://www.hltmag.co.uk/Sep07/mart03.htm>.
- Weschler, R. (1997). Uses of Japanese (L1) in the English Classroom: Introducing the Functional-Translation Method. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 3(11). Retrieved December 20, 2007 from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Weschler-UsingL1.html>.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2003). *A survey of tertiary teachers' beliefs about English Language Teaching in Indonesia with regard to the role of English as a global language* (Master thesis, Assumption University, 2003). Retrieved from <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/thesis.php>.

APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE

Section A:

1. University where you are teaching:
2. Sex:
 - Male
 - Female
3. Age:
 - years old
4. Number of years of teaching English:
 -year(s)
5. Highest academic degree:

Bachelor's degree	Doctorate degree
Master's degree	Other; please specify

Section B:

1. Should teachers **use Vietnamese** in teaching English?

a. Yes b. No

2. If "No", give the reasons:

.....

Thank you.

APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interviewee:

Intended duration:mins

University:

Interview began:

Date:

Interview finished:

Location:

Actual duration:mins

1. Should teachers use Vietnamese in ELT in Vietnam?
2. If not, why should not teachers use Vietnamese in ELT?
3. If yes, in what situations teachers should use Vietnamese in ELT?

(Prompts: explaining new words/explaining grammatical points/giving instructions...)

(Prompts: in what situations it is especially advisable for teachers to use Vietnamese?)

4. Why should teachers use Vietnamese in these situations?

(Prompts: help students understand better/save time...)

5. How often should teachers use Vietnamese in ELT?

(Prompts: rarely/sometimes/frequently...)