

ISSN 0048-3796



PHILIPPINE JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS

VOLUME 48

DECEMBER 2017

PUBLISHED BY THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF THE PHILIPPINES

   paperustrading@gmail.com
0956-665-3859



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLES	PAGE
Domains of Language Use among Gaddang Speakers in Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines <i>Zayda S Asuncion and Marilu Rañosa Madrunio</i>	1
Exploring the Role of L2 in L1 Writing: Clues from English Teachers' Think Aloud Protocols <i>Joel M. Torres and Eden R. Flores</i>	30
Capturing the Language of Flash Fiction: A Stylistic Analysis of a Filipino-Authored "Short" Short Story <i>Veronico N. Tarrayo</i>	51
LSP Annual Report for 2017	75

Torres, J. M. & Flores, E. R.

Exploring the role of L2 in L1 writing: Clues from English teachers' Think Aloud Protocols

Joel M. Torres

De La Salle University, Manila/Central Luzon State University, Science City of Muñoz
joel_torres@dlsu.edu.ph

Eden R. Flores, PhD

De La Salle University, Manila
eden.flores@dlsu.edu.ph

Abstract

In the past, the ESL/EFL field has intensively explored the effects of L1 to L2, yet overlooked the possible effects of L2 to L1. Hence, this study is an attempt to offer an initial answer as regards the considerable interest in how bilinguals make use of their language repertoires when engaged in an L1 composing task. Four Filipino English teachers from four senior high schools were asked to compose essays in their L1 (Tagalog). Think Aloud Method was used to identify the roles of L2 (English) during the L1 composing activities and a semi-structured interview was carried out to determine participants' reasons for language switching. Data from their Think-Aloud Protocols revealed that L2 was adopted as a common strategy during the L1 composing process particularly in text-generating (producing and reviewing the text), idea-generating (planning), idea-organization (planning), task examining, and process-controlling. The amount of L2 use varied with each category of composing activities and among the participants. Participants' exposure to L2 and the lack of equivalent concepts in L1 made the participants resort to their L2 while writing in their L1.

Keywords: *L1 writing, language switching, cross-linguistic influence, composing activities*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Grosjean and Li (2013) posit that language processing is a dynamic process since it involves just one language at one point, and at some other times involves several languages. The prominent stand in the recent years, specifically that of current cognitive and psycholinguistic models, is that bilingual speakers' languages are all active, and thus interfere in domains in which only one is being utilized and even in language specific processing. The concept of dual language, proposed by Kecskes and Papp (2003) and Kecskes and Cuenca (2005) cited in Kecskes (2008) as a substitute to the concept of interlanguage, explains how bilinguals' dual language channels are constantly interacting and mutually influencing each other through their collective underlying conceptual system.

As soon as a speaker becomes bilingual, the new language will very subtly influence the native one even if it is not much used (Ghafarpour & Dabaghi, 2017). Also referred as cross-linguistic influence, language transfer, defined as the effect of a person's knowledge of a language to his knowledge or use of another language (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008 in Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2009). Schmid (2011 in Ghafarpour & Dabaghi, 2017) gives an explanation for how languages influence each other. As soon as an individual is exposed to a new language, his brain cannot re-initialize, thus, the already acquired language or languages will influence the manner the new language is learned and used.

Ulrich (1953 in Cook, 2003) referred to inference as divergence from the standard of either language occurring in bilinguals' speech due to their familiarity with language other than their native language. The term fits with the commonsensical notion that one's L1 affects L2. A number of studies in L2 acquisition have explored the influence of L1 to L2. However only few individuals seemed to discern that interference takes place in either language in such a way that L1 has influence to L2, and the latter has influence to the former. Unlike the effect of L1 to L2, the effect of L2 to L1 is less noticeable in our day to day experience. Effects of L2 to L1 only start to become glaring by the time L1 begins to disappear, when a speaker generates more and more L2 words into their L1. It was also noted that as there is increased L2 use; changes in the operations and processing strategies from those largely dependent in L1 to those normally used with L2 take place. This is consistent with what Marian and Spivey (2003 in Kaushanskaya & Madison, 2011) indicate that the ability to manage information in L1 is influenced by L2.

Language transfer affects all linguistic sub-systems including pragmatics and rhetoric, semantics, syntax, morphology, phonology, phonetics, and orthography. Language transfer is not limited to the study of impact of L1 in L2 production and comprehension since it seems too simplistic to assume that it is only L1 which influences L2. There were instances in the process of L2 or even foreign language learning in which it is L2 that influences L1. Such phenomena gave rise to the studies on bidirectional transfer. Previous authors (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2009) classified bidirectional transfer into three particular directions as forward transfer (from an L1 to an L2), reverse transfer (from an L2 to an L1) and lateral transfer (from an L2 to an L3). Cook (2003) also forwards the notion of language as super-system and multi-competence. Such a concept establishes the fact that since the native as well as other languages are located in the same mind, they must form a language super-system at some level rather than be completely isolated systems. Thus, multi-competence raised inquiry about the possible connection between different languages in use. Cook also presents a continuum separation, interconnection, and integration of the two linguistic systems in the mind. The continuum does not necessarily apply

to the whole language system, such as an individual's lexicon might be integrated, but the phonology can be separate.

While people learn to speak a language without being taught, they have to be taught how to write in a language. This proves that writing, compared to speaking, is not a natural ability since in language learning, writing is the most difficult skill since it requires different sub-skills and background information. Composing written texts is arguably the most cognitively taxing of language production tasks requiring the integration of multiple processing demands across lower order (such as handwriting and spelling) and higher order (ideas generation and organization) skills (Bourdin & Payol 1994 in Gonca, 2016). In the past, the writing process was perceived as a one-step act in which the output was the key concern and limited attention was given to the composing process through which the writer composes the text. According to Murray (2003) the writing process itself can be divided into three stages: prewriting, writing, and rewriting. Everything that a writer does prior to writing falls to prewriting activity, while the act of generating the first draft pertains to writing. Activities such as researching, rethinking, and redesigning are categorized in the last stage, rewriting. Murray's stage process receives criticisms like: it is a linear and gradual process in which writers go from one stage straight ahead to the next. As a response to such criticisms, Murray asserts that in the model, writers are freely allowed to move to and from the stages while composing. Murray emphasizes that the model is "not a rigid lock-step process" (p. 4).

Though Arndt (1987) suggests that L2 writing is very similar to L1 composing, Cohen and Carson (2001) state that the L2 writing process should not be treated like that of L1 writing since L2 writing "may be considerably more complex" than writing in L1 (Silva, 1989 p.132 in Wang, 2003). This is supported by the findings of Williams (2005) that though L1 and L2 writing processes are generally similar, significant differences exist. For instance, L2 writers devote less time planning, are less accurate in language use, process slower and longer than L1 writers, and have more linguistic resources during their composing process. Woodall (2002) argues that one of the most basic differences as regards L1 and L2 composing is that L2 writers have at least two languages at their disposal and that at some point during their writing, L2 writers go back to their L1 in order to compensate for the difficulties in L2 (Cumming, 1989), something which is not observed in monolingual writers.

In the past, the ESL/EFL field intensively explored the effects of L1 to L2, yet overlooked the possible effects of L2 to L1. It was only during the last decade when researchers (Cook, 2000; Kecskes & Papp, 2000; Grosjean, 2001; Toribio, 2001; Van Hell & Dijkstra, 2002) have started testing the hypothesis that L2 influences L1, a situation referred to as the reverse or backward transfer (Noor, 2007). The term refers to instances in which the L1 is found to be affected by elements of an L2 or any additional language. Cook (2003) provides explanations as regards the limited literature and research on the influence of L2 to learners' L1. First, that L2 influence to L1 is less detectable. She also attributes it to the perception that L1, being a mature language system, is always constant and resistant to change. The last reason is based on the perennial idea that the implications of much research on language transfer have been heavily weighted in the perspective of L2 acquisition.

1.2 Related Studies

In their comprehensive literature review of various research conducted to determine the impact of L2 acquisition on the learners and the community in which they belong, Lyseng, Butlin and Nedashkivska (2014) found that L2 affects cognitive development, academic achievement,

native language/L1, citizenship, and economic potential. Based on the studies cited in their review, the authors conclude that it is not tenable to claim that L2 inhibits L1 development.

Several studies (Kecskes & Papp, 2000; Bialystok, 2001; Yelland, Pollard & Mercuri, 1993) have proven that knowing an additional language can be beneficial to L1 due to the classic idea that brain training takes place in language teaching. Kaushanskaya and Madison (2011) find that L2 knowledge can affect bilinguals' performance on L1 vocabulary and reading tasks.

The study of Kecskes (1998 in Noor, 2007) investigating Hungarian students of modern languages found that L2 reinforces the development and use of L1 skills particularly in structural organization. Likewise, Kecskes and Papp (2000) see the presence of more complex sentences in the L1 composition of Hungarian children who were learning English. Bialystok (2001) affirms that compared to their monolingual counterparts, bilingual children possess advanced metalinguistic skills. Agheshteh (2015) in his attempt to investigate the concept of dual language find positive effects of L2 on L1 writing abilities of Iranian bilinguals. In his study, Iranian bilinguals performed better than Iranian monolinguals in an L1 essay writing test.

Language loss or attrition is the usual context that illustrates how L2 use could be harmful to L1. Language loss can be manifested both in the individual or linguistic community (Oxford 1982 in Lu, 2011). Schmid (2011) finds that in the process of L1 attrition, mental lexicon, being an open class system, is the most vulnerable of all areas of linguistic knowledge. This implies that even in predominantly monolingual contexts, it is relatively easy to add new items to the lexicon or change the meaning of existing ones.

1.3 Research Gap

Though there are studies that would establish the positive effects of L2 to L1 writing as well as L2 effects to L1 attrition, there has been no study carried out so far that has identified the roles of L2 during the L1 composing process. Since most Filipinos, if not all, are bilinguals it is important to investigate what roles their L2 plays as they write in their L1. Hence, the bilingual nature of most Filipinos prompted this attempt to explore if L1 writing is also a bilingual event.

1.4 Research Questions

The aim of the present study is to identify the roles of L2 during the bilinguals' L1 composing activities. It has been an established idea that the L2 composing process is a bilingual event. Thus, the present study aimed to determine if L1 composing is also a bilingual event. Specifically, the present study answered the following questions:

1. Do participants think in their L2 when composing in their L1? If yes, how much L2 do they use?
2. What composing behaviors in L1 writing are reported in L2 in the participants' think-aloud protocols?
3. What are the reasons why participants use L2 during L1 composing?

1.5 Theoretical Framework

The study is anchored on the view that in bilinguals, the two languages are integrated and each language acts as a resource for the other. Thus, linguistic experience is spread across two languages. With such, experience is encoded in either of two languages and can be expressed in one or both languages. Information can also be represented by switching between the languages (Malakoy & Hakuta, 1991 in Gort, 2012).

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Participants

Four senior high school English teachers in the provinces of Laguna and Nueva Ecija participated in the study. Due to the complexity involved in data gathering and analysis, the study followed the model of previous case studies which involved few participants (Humes, 1983; Castro, 2003 in Gustilo 2010; Arndt, 1987). The reason for choosing the participants was to explore in what language those who specialize in English verbalize their thoughts as they compose in their L1, which is Tagalog. It is believed that in order to look for influence of an L2 on an L1, starting with those who have the most exposure to the L2 is probably a good choice.

Prior to the conduct of the study, we explained to the participants the nature and methodology of the study. The purpose of the study was only discussed to them after they completed the writing task and Think-Aloud Method to avoid the possibility of influencing the results of the study had the participants known the study's purpose prior to the task completion. A letter, explaining the background and methodology of the study, was sent to them. The letter also informed the participants as regards the phases of the study for them to have an overview on how the study would be carried out as well as the extent of their participation. To indicate the participants' willingness to be part of the study, the participants were asked to sign a consent form.

All the participants completed Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English from a State University in Central Luzon. The first language they learned was Tagalog. All of them learned to speak English between the ages of five to seven. Due to their current line of work (English teachers), English was mostly used. All the four participants considered themselves as better writers in their L2 than in their L1. Based on the linguistic background inventory, the two female participants dream, curse, think, and count in English while the two male participants curse and count in English but used both English and Tagalog when they dream and think.

The first participant was Teacher Scarlet (pseudonym). She was 32 years old and completed Master of Arts in Education major in Teaching English as a Second Language. During the conduct of the study, Teacher Scarlet was already writing her dissertation proposal in completion of the degree, Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Management. After graduating from college, she first worked as a call-center agent for a year prior to teaching. After her stint in the BPO industry, she served as an elementary teacher for two years in a private school. She was a senior high school teacher in a private university in Laguna. Aside from being an English teacher she was also the adviser of their school paper.

Teacher Eduard (pseudonym) was 35 years old. He had been teaching English to senior high school students in a computer training center for more than a decade. He earned units in Master of Arts in Language and Literature. Aside from his teaching post, he was also the Center's Academic Coordinator and the school paper adviser.

Teacher Robert (pseudonym) was 22 years old and had been teaching senior high school students in a Science High School at a state university. Before teaching in senior high school, he taught for a year in an International School in Metro Manila. During the conduct of the study, he was already writing the proposal of his thesis for the completion of the degree, Master of Arts in English major in Language Teaching. He was also the school secretary and adviser of the campus paper.

The fourth participant was Teacher Gaile (pseudonym) who was 24 years old and had been teaching English for three years in a public senior high school. She first taught in a private school for a year before she entered the government service. When the study was conducted,

Teacher Gaile was already writing her thesis for the completion of the degree, Master of Arts in Language and Literature.

The participants did not receive any remuneration in exchange of their participation in the study. Teacher Scarlet and Teacher Eduard were college classmates of one of the researchers, while Teacher Robert and Teacher Gaile were former students, hence they all willingly extended their participation in the study.

2.2 Data Collection

In order to gain insights into what was going on in the participants' mind, the Think-Aloud Method was used. The method has been used as a technique to investigate the cognitive processes that occur in the writer's head while composing and to analyze the actual process of writing from the writer's point of view. Observing what happens in a writer's L1 composing process is a valuable tool to understand the L1 processes and the reasons a writer switches languages during the composing process in their L1.

To familiarize the participants with the method, a two-hour training session and a practice writing prompt was given to them. Although a training session and a practice writing prompt were individually given to the participants, no modeling of the method was provided in order to avoid the possible danger of the participants restricting their thoughts to the type they had seen modeled (Smith, 1994 in Gort, 2012). Further, since it was vital in the present study to let the participants use the language they would feel more comfortable with for their verbalizations, modeling to them the TAP might influence their language choice.

During the actual writing, the participants were asked to verbalize their thoughts in whatever language they were comfortable with while doing the writing task. The participants were asked to write an essay of not less than 300 words on the topic, *Ang positibo at negatibong efekto ng Facebook sa mga kabataan*. The prompt was designed to help participants elicit an argumentative essay for them to express their opinions and defend their stand. According to Castro (2004), an argumentative writing task would prompt writers to include both factual details and personal details in their writing, hence encouraging them to be more productive both in content and expression. Since the purpose of the study was to explore the role of L2 in the L1 composing process and not to measure how knowledgeable they were on a given topic or how they compose a difficult writing task, a familiar topic was given to them. The choice in giving a familiar topic was guided by the knowledge that topic familiarity helps easy selection and generation of ideas from long term memory, which results in less effort being expended by the working memory during the planning and drafting processes (Becker, 2006 in Gustilo, 2010). A minimum number of words (300) was set to guide the participants on how long their compositions should be.

One of the researchers met the participants individually for the completion of the writing prompt. In composing their Tagalog essays, participants used laptop computers. The researcher stayed at the back of the room and was not visible to the participant. As soon as the participant started working on the task and verbalizing thoughts, they were able to work independently and generally became unconscious of the researcher's presence and the fact that they were being video and audio recorded while doing the activity. When the participants would not verbalize their thoughts within five seconds, the researcher would press the buzzer to remind them to keep verbalizing their thoughts. The participants' verbalizations were audio and video recorded. Participants were given one hour to complete the task. Three of the participants finished the task in less than an hour while one participant used the time allotted.

A semi-structured interview was done after four days to determine the participants' reasons for using their L2 during their L1 composing.

2.3 Analysis

Participants' Think-Aloud verbalizations were first transcribed into think aloud protocols. The transcription conventions were based on the work of Wang and Wen (2002). Table 1 shows the transcription conventions and samples that were used in this study.

Table 1

Transcription Convention

Transcription Conventions	Sample Protocols
A series of three consecutive dots denotes a noticeable pause in the writer's verbalization	Because of the influx of information ... they no longer know how to evaluate, to discern which information are reliable, are reliable. I have to present the information...the positive information pala... the positive effects pala... saka negative effects ng facebook sa kabataan, kaya lang I'm still confuse sa age, age limit ng kabataan...kung sinu-sino yung mga considered na kabataan
Underlined words or word sequences mark the verbalization made while the writer is writing the text.	<u>Nagiging kasangkapan din ito para sa mga masasamang loob na madalas mambiktima sa paggawa ng krimen na kadalasan ay para makapanlinlang at makagawa ng krimen at gumawa ng krimen o karahasan na kadalasang bumibiktima sa kabataan.</u>
Words enclosed in quotation marks signal the writing prompt or the previously written text that the writer reads aloud.	<u>nagiging tulay upang mapalapit ang mga kanilang "ang mga kanilang" upang mapalapit sa kanila ang mga mahal sa buhay na nasa malayong lugar "sa malayong lugar" ang facebook rin ang nagiging; nagsisilbing; ang "nagiging tulay rin ito para mapalapit sa kanilang mga mahal; ang kanilang mga mahal sa buhay" na naninirahan sa malayong lugar</u>

The transcripts were divided into t-units, which is an independent clause and all its subordinate elements (Hunt, 1970 in Castro, 2004). After the types of composing behavior were identified, they were coded following the modified taxonomy of Castro (2004) and Wang and Wen (2002). In Castro's modified taxonomy, six main types of composing behavior were identified. Meanwhile, Wang and Wen identified five composing activities including Task-Examining, Idea-Generating, Idea-Organizing, Text-Generating activities, and Process Controlling. For the present study, we looked for similarities between the two taxonomies and were able to suit the identified composing behavior of Castro with that of Wang and Wen. For instance, the meta-comments composing behavior in Castro's taxonomy was classified under task-examining in Wang and Wen's taxonomy. Idea-Generating and Idea Organizing in Wang and Wen were considered the same as Castro's brainstorming and organizational decision,

respectively. Task-Generating activities in Wang and Wen encompassed four composing behaviors (elicited idea, text evaluation, lexical substitution, and idea evaluation) in Castro's taxonomy. Finally, Process Controlling was accounted the same as instruction to self of Castro.

Presented in Table 2 is the coding scheme used in this study. In the present coding scheme of the composing activities, we separated the sub-categories of Idea-Generating, Idea-Organizing, and Text-Generating. One of the researchers and his two colleagues coded the α protocols. Prior to the coding of the protocols, the raters met and discussed the coding scheme used and identified possible examples for each composing activity. As regards the difference between Idea Generating (Planning and Evaluation) and Text Generating Activities (Producing and Reviewing) conscientious examination of the protocols led the researcher and the two raters to infer that Idea-Generating included all those segments that indicated operations including the retrieval and/or development of ideas and aims. Meanwhile, Text Generation was taken to include both the verbalization of the written material and those other utterances that due to their strict linear structure (lexical units, syntactic structure) could be seen clearly in the text.

Table 2

Coding Scheme for L1 Composing Activities

Composing Activities	Sample Protocols
Task Examining: analyzing the writing prompt or commenting on the tasks	So I need to write an essay entitled <u>Ang Positibo at Negatibong Efekto ng Facebook sa kabataan.</u> (Line 1, Scarlet)
Idea-Generating (Planning)	Another would be ahm, communication skills, greater social awareness, self expression. (Line 14, Scarlet)
Idea-Generating (Evaluating)	That would fall under laziness kapag naging dependent sila sa FB (Line 29, Scarlet)
Idea-Organizing (Planning)	Sa introduction, growing popularity of FB. (Line 39, Scarlet) second paragraph positive effects (Line 70, Eduard) Paano i-e-end? (Line 59, Robert)
Idea-Organizing (Evaluating)	Ayos ba na ganito ang umpisa ko? (Line 4, Eduard)
Text-Generating (Producing)	<u>Madaming aspeto ng kanilang buhay na nagsasanhi ng katamaran dahil sa nakamulang mabilis na paraan ng paggawa ng mga bagay-bagay.</u> (Line 202, Scarlet) <u>Sa pagiging mapusok nila nagagamit narin ang internet, partikular na ang facebook upang makapanood ng malisyosong panoorin na marahil ay hindi angkop sa kanilang edad,</u> (Line 150, Robert)
Text-Generating (Reviewing)	“Sa katunayan nagagamit ng mga kabataan ang malaking porsyento ng mga oras nila sa pag gamit lamang ng facebook bagamat dito mo mababasa ang kanilang ginagawa ang kanilang nararamdaman ay hindi maikakaila na ang facebook ay” (Line 57, Eduard)
Process-controlling:	So I need to translate all these to Filipino. (Line 37, Scarlet)

controlling the writing procedures, word and time limit.	<p>Check natin kung consistent ang ating claims when it comes to positive and negative effects (<i>Line 104, Robert</i>)</p> <p>So, gawin ko narin para, para may masabi. (<i>Line 31, Gaile</i>)</p>
--	---

To check the inter-coder reliability of the protocols, Cohen’s Kappa was used. Cross tabulation results show the α values: between Rater 1 and Rater 2 is ($\alpha=.947$), between Rater 2 and Rater 3 ($=.927$), and between Rater 1 and 3 ($\alpha=.968$). After the analysis and coding of all the protocols, the three coders convened and checked for discrepancies in coding the protocols. After they agreed on how to code those protocols that were different from each other, a frequency count of verbalizations in English, Tagalog and English and Tagalog was done.

The transcribed semi-structured interviews were analyzed qualitatively to identify the participants’ reasons for using L2 in L1 composing.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 L2 use in L1 composing

Table 3 presents the overall verbalizations produced by the four participants while composing in their L1. As shown in Table 3, a total of 856 t-units were obtained from the participants’ Think-Aloud Protocols. The verbalizations were done in their L1 (Tagalog), L2 (English), and a combination of L1 and L2. Of the 856 t-units, 111 (12.97%) were verbalizations done in the participants’ L2, 272 (31.78%) were done in combined L1 and L2, and more than half (473 or 55.28%) were verbalizations done in their L1. Of the four participants, Teacher Scarlet produced the most number of verbalizations with a total of 254 t-units, followed by Teacher Gaile (234 t-units), Teacher Robert (199 t-units), and Teacher Eduard (169 t-units).

Table 3 also reveals that nearly half (44.03%) of the total verbalizations were devoted in Text Generating (Reviewing), more than one-fourth (32.79%) were used in Text-Generating (Producing), and a little more than 10% was used in Process-Controlling. Meanwhile, the remaining percentage of the total verbalizations in participants L2, L1 and combined L2 and L1 were devoted for Idea-Generating (Planning and Evaluating), Idea-Organizing (Planning and Evaluating), and Task Examining.

Based on the foregoing findings, it can be deduced that though the participants were asked to compose in their L1, still at some point of their composing activity, their L2 is still active. The presence of L2 verbalizations in the participants’ L1 composing activity conforms to what researchers (Cenoz & Cortez, 2011 in Wang, 2003) found that bilinguals tend to use their complete language repertoire when writing. This pattern of findings concurs with the interactive view of the bilingual cognitive system and suggests that L1 processing and L2 processing are mutually dependent processes (Kaushanskaya & Madison, 2011). It also supports the statement that bilinguals have linguistic resources in more than one language from which they can draw when engaged in various macro-writing process (Manchon 2013). Meanwhile, the presence of L2 verbalizations in the participants’ protocols contradicts what Woodall (2002) affirms that one of the most basic differences when it comes to L1 and L2 writing is that L2 writers have at least two languages at their disposal. The fact that the participants produced L2 verbalizations while composing in their L1 disputes Woodall’s premise that it is only L2 writers who have at least

two language repertoires. This means that like L2 writers, bilinguals writing in L1, at some point of their composing process, resort to their L2 to offset for the difficulties in their L1 writing.

Moreover, the results show that the tendency of L2 occurrences during L1 writing differs with the composing activities of individuals. Of the 111 verbalizations done in English, Teacher Scarlet produced 72 verbalizations, Teacher Robert had 14 verbalizations, Teacher Eduard had 13 verbalizations, and Teacher Gaile generated 12 English verbalizations. The results also show that L2 verbalizations in the L1 composing process is more likely to occur in Text Generating (Planning and Reviewing) and Process Controlling than in Idea Generating (Planning), Idea Organizing (Planning) and Task Examining. Further, no L2 verbalization was recorded in

Composing Activities		LANGUAGES USED IN VERBALIZATION						TOTAL	
		L1 only (Tagalog)		L2 only (English)		Combination of Tagalog and English			
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Task Examining		6	0.70	5	0.58	5	0.58	16	1.87
Idea Generating	Planning	13	1.52	15	1.75	16	1.87	44	5.15
	Evaluating	3	0.35	0	0	4	0.47	7	0.82
Idea Organizing	Planning	5	0.58	12	1.40	19	2.22	36	4.22
	Evaluating	0	0	0	0	1	0.12	1	0.12
Text Generating	Producing	166	19.39	26	3.04	88	10.28	280	32.79

evaluating sub-categories of Idea Generating and Idea Organizing.

Table 3

L1 Composing Behavior Items Verbalized in Participants' L2

	Reviewing	254	29.67	29	3.39	93	10.86	376	44.03
Process Controlling		26	3.04	24	2.80	46	5.37	96	11.24
TOTAL		473	55.28	111	12.97	272	31.78	856	100

Participants' composing behavior reported in their L2 during their L1 writing is presented in Table 4. Of the 111 verbalizations done in L2, more than half belong to Text Generating (Reviewing = 26.13%; Producing = 23.42%) and nearly one-fourth (21.62%) was accounted to Process Controlling. Other types of composing behavior reported in L2 were Idea Generating-Planning (13.51%), Idea Organizing-Planning (10.81%), and Task-Examining (4.51%). No L2 verbalizations were reported in the evaluating sub-categories of Idea-Generating and Idea-Organizing.

Text-Generating (Reviewing). Text-Generating covers activities that include producing and reviewing the text. The latter sub-category of Text-Generating was the most frequently verbalized composing behavior in English (26.13%). The use of L2 in Text-Generating revealed that bilingual L1 writers, like the participants, may resort to their L2 to address any particular concern they encounter during L1 composing. Reviewing is a component of the writing process similar to what Manchon (2013) referred to as revision, which involves the answer of various types of incongruences between the writers' intentions and their linguistic expressions ranging from whether the text in effect conveys the intended message and whether the ideas in the text have been successfully structured to whether there is accuracy in the linguistic choices made and appropriateness in consideration of the function of the text or its intended audience.

Table 4.

L1 Composing Behaviors Reported in Participants' L2

Composing Activities		<i>f</i>	%
	Sub-categories		
Task Examining		5	4.51
Idea Generating	Planning	15	13.51
	Evaluating	0	0
Idea Organizing	Planning	12	10.81
	Evaluating	0	0
Text Generating	Producing	26	23.42
	Reviewing	29	26.13
Process Controlling		24	21.62
Total		111	100

Alamargot and Chanquoy (2001 in Beare & Bourdages, 2007) explained reviewing as a strategy used to generate content by reworking the text to create new ideas. As seen in the sample protocols of the participants in Excerpt (1) below, L2 was used to revise the text as

regards the language use (Lines 62, 63, 82, and 247 from Teacher Scarlet; Lines 39, 51, and 52 from Teacher Gaile) and content (Lines 42, 60, 63, 72, 91, 130, 193, 209, 237, and 242 from Teacher Scarlet; Lines 92 and 93 from Teacher Eduard; and Lines 68, 112, 122, 140, 151, and 152 from Teacher Robert).

It can also be seen that participants usually reverted to their L2 by purposely back translating the already written text in order to get the exact concepts, phrases, or even sentences.

(1) *Teacher Scarlet*

- 42. I have to delete that
- 60. I think about this
- 62. Okay let me change that.
- 63. Delete that second sentence.
- 72. I'll just change it.
- 82. What is another word?
- 91. It all started with cellphones.
- 130. It should be this
- 193. What's sound judgment?
- 209. Would that explain that?
- 237. Okay introduction, growing population, body laziness positive, guidance.
- 242. It could mean the same.
- 247. It's redundant.

Teacher Eduard

- 92. it's not a place eh
- 93. its a site

Teacher Robert

- 68. what else?
- 112. Okay for leisure time, for spending there, leisure time, six
- 122. okay so grades, scam, grade what else?
- 140. okay four points
- 151. Perfect!
- 152. so we have five positive points and five negative points

Teacher Gaile

- 39. wrong spelling; "komunikasyon"
- 51. redundancy
- 52. wrong

The foregoing findings suggest that though instances of reviewing the text in L1 writing would be more likely to be verbalized in L1, still there were recorded L2 verbalizations from the participants' protocols.

Text-Generating (Producing). During this composing stage, writers put the content of their intended message into language. According to Manchon (2013), producing the text involves the construction of sentences through the selection of appropriate forms or items from the writer's

mental lexicon. Excerpt (2) lists examples of Text-Generating (Producing) composing behavior verbalized in L2: Lines 53, 58, 98, 152, 197, 198, 199, and 207 from Teacher Scarlet's protocol; Lines 16, 46, 48, 80, and 89 from Teacher Eduard's protocol; and Lines 145 and 35 from Teacher Robert and Teacher Gaile's protocols, respectively.

(2) *Teacher Scarlet*

- 53. In what ways?
- 58. Changes in people's lives are really dependent on the technological changes
- 98. It makes their lives a lot easier.
- 152. It also serves as an outlet of expression.
- 197. Since information is easy, it can readily be available we can be too dependent on social media.
- 198. It's very evident.
- 199. because everything is made easy through social media.
- 207. They get information easily.

Teacher Eduard

- 16. Spend a lot of time
- 46. the feelings that reflects the personality
- 48. anything that reflects their personality
- 80. its very alarming; very alarming, very alarming
- 89. one of its positive effects is; first form of socialization

Teacher Robert

- 145. uhm exposure to pornography and other related malicious acts

Teacher Gaile

- 35. it makes; it allows people

The use of L2 in L1 composing, particularly in Text-Generating (Producing), is related to what Pavlenko (2000) suggested that the lexicon is the first and the main area where L2 influence becomes visible, which claim is substantiated by the findings of Boyd (1993), Lomaa (1998), Otheguy and Garcia (1993) and Pavlenko and Jarvis (2002). Further, Pavlenko and Jarvis (2002) found that semantic transfer was involved in 71% of the instances of L2 influence on L1 in the identified data. Semantic extension, lexical borrowing, and loan translation were included in these instances. Likewise, more studies cited in Pavlenko (2000) establish L2 influence of L1 lexical processing. The use of L2 in Text-Generating (Producing) also conforms with what Schmid (2011) found that of all areas of linguistic knowledge, which were investigated in the process of L1 attrition, mental lexicon is the most vulnerable since it is an open-class system implying that it is relatively easy to add new items to the lexicon or change the meaning of existing ones even in predominantly monolingual contexts.

As it can be seen from Excerpt (2) above, the participants were able to produce L1 text using their L2 via translating such as in Lines 53, 58, 98, 152, 197, 198, 199, and 207 from Teacher Scarlet; Lines 16, 46, 48, 80, and 89 from Teacher Eduard; and Lines 145 and 35 of Teachers Robert and Gaile, respectively. Participants' temporary use of their L2 in lieu of the hard to find Tagalog lexicon enabled them to move forward and to continue generating the text.

This is similar to what happens in L2 writing as what Murphy and Roca de Larios (2010) assert that there are instances when L2 writers prefer to use their L1 during the L2 writing process to avoid possible overloading of their working memory capacity and to what Cumming (1989) affirms that L2 writers use their L1 for them to compensate L2 writing difficulties, something that monolingual writers do not observe.

Process-Controlling. Participants also switched to their L2 to control the process of writing, that is, the need to use their L2 to organize and plan what they wanted to write in their compositions. According to Flower (1989 in Gustilo, 2010), writers constantly instruct themselves how to write and what to do, and then track how well their current undertaking is going. Of the 111 L2 verbalizations, Process Controlling accounted for 21.62%. Sample L2 verbalizations categorized in this composing behavior are presented in Excerpt (3).

(3) *Teacher Scarlet*

- 30. I'll go back to that.
- 37. So I need to translate all these to Filipino
- 83. O let it be.
- 87. If I can't think of a better term I'll start with simpler term
- 88. then I'll use it
- 89. then when I'm doing final editing that's when I change words.
- 106. let me write the word
- 108. I will just italicize the word
- 118. Okay, I'll go back to cellphone
- 119. I need to spell out this first.
- 125. I'll change it to P.
- 126. I'll go back to the first paragraph
- 141. Okay let me verify that
- 211. I don't think I have to expound
- 227. Wrap up, wrap up

Teacher Eduard

- 136. okay next

Teacher Robert

- 195. Let your readers decide
- 198. I think I'm done
- 199. I think I'm good.

Lines 30, 37, 83, 87, 88, 89, 106, 108, 118, 119, 125, 126, 141, 211, and 227 from Teacher Scarlet's protocol, Line 136 of Teacher Eduard's protocol, and Lines 195, 198, and 199 from Teacher Robert's protocol are sample L2 verbalizations for Process-Controlling. In those lines, it can be noticed that the participants were literally talking to themselves while thinking aloud by mainly giving instructions and directions or announcing the next course of action. Example verbalizations include imperative and declarative statements.

Sample types of composing behavior under Process Controlling show how the participants control the writing procedures, word choice, and time limit.

Idea-Generating (Planning). Idea-Generating (Planning) is a type of composing behavior that is similar to what Castro (2004) referred to as brainstorming. Like brainstorming, Idea-Generating (Planning) is a type of retrieval that entails self-questioning in order to generate ideas or move the composing process. Of the 111 verbalizations made in L2, this type of composing behavior accounted for 13.51%. Verbalizations of the writer's thoughts categorized under this type do not necessarily become part of the text they produced since the elicited thoughts and verbalizations made were not generated to be part of the essay but for the purpose of the writer's thought expression to appear as an end in themselves instead of serving as means towards accomplishing the writing task. Excerpt (4) presents sample L2 verbalizations for this type of composing behavior. Lines 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 20, 22, 23, 33, and 36 from Teacher Scarlet's protocol and Line 4 from Teacher Robert's protocol show sample verbalizations that belong to this category.

(4) *Teacher Scarlet*

2. So before I start writing the essay let me prepare an outline.
3. Of course I need to have an introduction.
4. Introduction how would I introduce the topic?
11. What else?
12. Facebook improves their communication skills.
14. Another would be ahm, communication skills, greater social awareness, self expression.
20. Okay. what else?
22. Because of the influx of information, they no longer know how to evaluate, to discern which information are reliable, are reliable.
23. So in English that would be lack of sound judgment.
33. Ahmm, alright, too much of some things is bad.
36. And I need to point out that FB should be used to share, just like technology, should be used to their advantage.

Teacher Robert

4. I have to present the information.

Idea-Organizing (Planning). Excerpt (5) below shows sample L2 verbalizations under Idea-Organizing (Planning) composing behavior. Lines 5, 6, 7, 8, 16, 31, 35, and 36 from Teacher Scarlet's protocol, and lines 70, 13, and 5 in the protocols of Teacher Eduard, Teacher Robert, and Teacher Gaile, respectively were verbalizations that announce that some structures or arrangements are being imposed on the ideas or paragraphs presented in the essay. This type of composing behavior accounts for 10.81% of the total verbalizations done in L2.

In Excerpt (5) below, Teacher Scarlet pertained to the three-part move in developing the essay. For instance, Line 5 refers to what she intended to include in the introduction, Line 7 in the body, and Line 31 had to do with the conclusion. Meanwhile, Lines 36, 13, and 5 present the questions participants asked themselves on how they would start their compositions.

(5) *Teacher Scarlet*

5. Ah, maybe, I'll start with the growing popularity of Facebook...
6. The growing popularity of Facebook.

7. Body, I'll discuss of course I'll start with the positive.
8. Part I positive.
16. Now let's have negative.
31. For my conclusion, I need to wrap up the positive and negative effects.
35. So I'll wrap-up the positives and negatives and then the word moderation and then guidance and supervision from those parents and teachers
36. How would I start?

Teacher Eduard

70. Second paragraph positive effects

Teacher Robert

13. How shall I start?

Teacher Gaile

5. Ah so, how can I start this?

Task-Examining. In the participants' TAP, there were five instances of Task Examining verbalized in English (Excerpt 6). Based on the findings, participants used their L2 to examine the task given to them at the beginning of their composing process. When the participants were reading the prompt, they used their L2 to ensure that they understood what the prompt asked. Sample protocols below from Teachers Scarlet, Eduard, and Robert belong to Task-Examining composing behavior.

Line 1 in Teacher Scarlet and Teacher Robert's protocols above show how the two made use of their L2 to understand the task given. Instead of instructing themselves on what had to be done using their L1, it can be seen that their L2 was used in lieu of L1. Meanwhile, lines 101 and 102 from Teacher Scarlet's protocol showed her feelings or opinions about the task. As she looked at the task given, she commented that the activity would have been faster if it would be done in her L2. Teacher Eduard's verbalization in Line 140 also presents how he looked at the task hence there was the utterance of "need help".

(6) *Teacher Scarlet*

1. So I need to write an essay entitled Ang Positibo at Negatibong Efekto ng Facebook sa kabataan.
101. This is going to be faster
102. This seems to be faster in English

Teacher Eduard

140. need help

Teacher Robert

1. So, I'll be writing an essay on the topic positibo at negatibong epekto ng facebook sa kabataan

The foregoing finding shows that within the brains of bilingual tasked to write in their L1, there are possible instances when they would instruct themselves on what to do with the task

(such as Line 1 in Teachers Scarlet and Robert's protocols), express difficulty about the activity (such as in Line 140 of Teacher Eduard), and express discomfort (such as in Lines 101 and 102 of Teacher Scarlet's protocol). Further, it can be deduced that whatever ideas a writer has in mind prior to actual writing can be verbalized in various ways and not limited to a particular language.

3.2 Reasons for language switch in L1 composing activity.

Based on the transcripts of the semi-structured interview, different reasons that the participants had for verbalizing in their L2 while composing in their L1 can be deduced. Presented below are the participants' responses to the question: What are the reasons for verbalizing your thoughts in L2 (English) while composing in your L1 (Tagalog)?

(7) Teacher Scarlet: I think one reason has to do with the number of years I have been using English in most of my day-to-day activities. In school, for instance, I use English in teaching and talking with my students even beyond class hour. At home, I even use English often especially when I talk to my nine-year-old son.

Teacher Eduard: There were instances that I think in my L2, which is English, during the composing in my L1 since I use English more often in chatting and texting. In school, I use English more often. It is only after office hours that I used Filipino.

Teacher Robert: Thinking in English at times while composing in Filipino helps in making the task easier. I believe that thinking in English help me generate ideas and therefore complete the task since most of the time I use English in doing paper works or office works, technical reports and research[es].

Teacher Gaile: I construct in English. I think in English because I'm already used to it. After I graduated in College and have learned about the structure of the English language, I become used to organizing my ideas in English.

In the interview excerpt above, it can be noted that the common reason for participants' language switching has to do with their exposure to English. Knowing that they had early exposure to English and had specialized on it during their tertiary years support the fact that the English language has already become part of their system. Further, the nature of their work requires them to use English more often during their active hours.

Participants' responses in Interview Excerpt 2 present another reason why they verbalized their thoughts in their L2. According to them, the lack of equivalent concepts in their L1 made them think in their L2, which has more available terminologies in relation to the prompt they were working on. Participants' responses in Interview Excerpt 2 relate to what Jaspert and Kroom (1992) and Othequy and Garcia (1993), both in Pavlenko (2000), argue that the most important psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic factor affecting L2 influence on L1 lexicon and semantics seems to be the need for readily adoptable words and expressions to refer to new objects and concepts specific to the L2 environment and culture. Further, Pavlenko (2000) asserts that conceptual change in adult L2 learning may result in internalization or borrowing of L2-based concepts as manifested in lexical borrowing, loan translation, and code switching, shift

from an L1 to L2 conceptual domain, convergence of two concepts into one, restructuring in which new elements are incorporated into a previously existing concept, and attrition of previously available concepts.

(8) Teacher Scarlet: Most of the time, I expressed myself in English because I was trying to look for the Filipino equivalent term of those English concepts I had in mind.

Teacher Eduard: Though the task was to write in Filipino, I still can't set aside the use of English language since English helped me search for the Filipino counterparts of the concepts which I originally had in English.

Teacher Robert: The fact that there were no equivalent Filipino words for some of the words I had in mind while composing in Filipino, provided me with no other option than to think in English despite the fact that I was asked to write in Filipino.

Teacher Gaile: While writing essay in Filipino, there were moments in which I could not recall of the exact term in Filipino which made me think in English

Likewise, the participants language-switched because their L1 contained impoverished technical and scientific vocabulary, which relied heavily on foreign borrowings and, often, constructions (Yap, 2010).

4. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

4.1 Summary

The results provide a comprehensive view of bilinguals' languages and how they make use of their available languages in their L1 composing. The findings of this study confirm that like L2 writing process, the L1 writing process is also a bilingual event. Similar to writing in L2, L1 writers also have two languages (i.e. L1 and L2) at their disposal when they are composing in L1. For the four teacher-participants, their use of L2 in their L1 composing activities accounted for 12.97% (111 out of 856) of their overall Think-Aloud Protocols. Generating L1 text (Producing and Reviewing) was the most recurring purpose for using L2 (55 of 111 L2 verbalization or 49.55%), followed by Process-Controlling (21.62%), Idea-Generating (Planning = 13.5%), Idea-Organizing (Planning = 10.81%), and Task-Examining (4.51%). No L2 verbalizations were done in the evaluating sub-categories of both the Idea-Generating and Idea-Organizing. Exposure to L2 and the lack of equivalent concepts in the L1 lexicon were two of the cited reasons for language-switching.

4.2 Conclusion

Overall, observing L2 use during the L1 composing process implies bi-directionality of connections between L1 and L2 as well as the permeability of L1 abilities to influences associated with the acquisition of a new linguistic system (Kaushanskaya & Madison 2011).

L2 performs a variety of functions especially in L1 composing. Participants' language switches from their L1 to L2 for reflective, evaluative, generative, and regulatory purposes were done to perform the different composing activities. This is in line with what Reyes and Moll

(2008 in Gort 2012) stated that the availability of more than one language is part of a bilingual's total communicative and literacy resources.

Switching from L1 to L2 to discuss the forms and meanings of words assisted the participants when it comes to connecting their L2 linguistic and conceptual information to their L1 and it also brought attention to morpho-syntactic, semantic, and orthographic differences between the languages and supported the unfolding of meaning.

Based on the findings, it is conceivable that whatever thoughts a writer generates before writing can be expressed in a variety of ways not tied to a particular language.

By critically looking at the matter, it is concluded that the word for word translation from L2 to L1 has led to semantic transfer, syntactic transfer, and lexical transfer. Further, a closer examination of the occurrence of semantic transfer revealed that all of these occurred due to word for word translation and not paying attention to systematic differences between languages.

Although all the participants specialized in English and used the language in almost all the domains of their lives, there were still differences in the amount of the L2 verbalizations they produced while composing in their L1. Such differences could be explained by what Pavlenko (2000) refers to as possible constraints on L2 influences. These constraints included individual factors, sociolinguistic factors, and linguistic and psycholinguistic factors. The first type of constraints included learner's age and onset of L2 learning, learner's goals and language attitudes, language proficiency and individual differences. Thus, what makes Teacher Scarlet different from among the other participants was that she used English even beyond the work place since; as she indicated, she still uses the language at home when dealing with her son. Further, the fact that among all of the participants, only Teacher Scarlet has been teaching in a private institution for more than a decade, which has enabled her to be more immersed in English than the rest of the participants. It is a given notion that private institutions in the Philippines put premium on the intensive and comprehensive teaching of English to their students. From this it can be concluded that Scarlet's deeper immersion in L2 and her being employed in private institutions for more than a decade could be the reason why she showed more L2 verbalizations than the other participants. Such illustrated the inverse relationship between L2 exposure and L1 vocabulary skills.

4.3 Recommendations and Implications

In future studies, it is worth examining the relationships between factors such as task variability (ranging from descriptive, narrative, and argumentative writing), language proficiency, language learning context, and writers' age and gender to the effects of L2 in L1 composing process. With such, a more comprehensive view as regards reverse language transfer will be accounted for. To further account for the roles of L2 in L1 composing, longitudinal studies which include bigger samples from different fields such as practitioners in the advertising, business, sciences, and law should be conducted.

The findings in the present study can be worth the reference of language teachers, material developers and translation trainers who can consider different kinds of language transfer in each step of language instruction, assessment, and material development.

References

Agheshteh, H. (2015). On the effects of L2 on Iranian bilinguals' L1 writing ability. *Advances in Language and Literacy Studies*, 6(4), 48-52.

- Arndt, V. (1987). Six writers in search of a text: A protocol-based study of L1 and L2 writing. *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 257-267.
- Beare, S. & Bourdages, J. (2007). Skilled writer's generating strategies in L1 and L2: An exploratory study. In Torrance, M., Waes, L.V., and Galbraith, D. (Eds.). *Writing and Cognition: Research and Applications* (pp. 282-286). UK: Emerald.
- Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castro, C. D. (2004). The role of Tagalog in ESL writing: Clues from students' think-aloud protocols. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 35(2), 23-39.
- Cohen, A.D., & Brooks-Carson, A. (2001). Research on direct versus translated writing: Students' strategies and their results. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 169-188.
- Cook, V. (2000). *Is transfer the right word?* [Presentation]. Paper presented at the 7th International Pragmatics Conference, Budapest.
- Cook, V. (2003). The changing L1 in the L2 user's mind. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Effects of the second language on the first* (pp. 1-18). GB: Cromwell Press Ltd.
- Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second-language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 39, 81-141.
- Ghafarpour, H., & Dabaghi, A. (2017). Cross linguistic influence of the second language on the first: Written production of Iranian immigrants to Australia. *Lingua*, 189-190, 66-74.
- Gonca, A. (2016). Do L2 writing courses affect the improvement of L1 writing skills via skills transfer from L2 to L1. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(10), 987-997.
- Gort, M. (2012). Code-switching patterns in the writing-related talk of young emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Literary Research*, 44(1), 45-75.
- Grosjean, F. (2001) The bilingual's language modes. In J. Nicol (Ed.), *One mind, two languages* (pp. 1-22). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Grosjean, F., & Li, P. (2013). *The psycholinguistics of bilingualism*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gustilo, L. E. (2010). What you think, feel, and experience shape your writing: Cognitive, affective and contextual process in ESL writing. *The Asia Pacific Education Researcher* 19 (2), 271-285.
- Jarvis S. & Pavlenko, A. (2009). *Cross-linguistic influence in language and cognition*. New York and London: Routledge Press.
- Kaushanskaya, M., & Madison, V. (2011). The effect of second-language experience on native-language processing. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8, 55-77.
- Kecskes, I. (2008). Synergic concepts in the bilingual mind. In Kecskes, I. & L. Albertazzi (Eds.), *Cognitive aspects of bilingualism* (pp. 26-63). Heidelberg/London: Springer.
- Kecskes, I. & Papp, T. (2000). *Foreign language and mother tongue*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Latomaa, S. (1998). English in contact with the "most difficult language in the world": The linguistic situation of Americans living in Finland. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 133, 51-71.
- Lu, A. H. (2011). Effects of L2 vocabulary acquisition on L1 performance: Evidence from form-meaning mapping between Chinese and Japanese (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh.
- Lyseng, B., Butlin, M. & Nedashkivska, A. (2014). Impact of second language education on intellectual development, socialization and economic potential of student and province. In Wachowicz, S. (Ed.), *Impact of second language on first language learning by BOF*

- trustees. Retrieved from www.district18.nbed.nb.ca.
- Manchon, R. (2013). Writing. In Grosjean, F. & Li, P. (Eds.), *The psycholinguistics of bilingualism* (pp. 100-115). UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Murphy, L., & Roca de Larios, J. (2010). Searching for words: One strategic use of the mother tongue by advanced Spanish EFL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*(2), 61-81.
- Murray, D. (2003). Teach writing as process not product. In V. Villanueva (Ed.), *Cross talk in comp theory* (pp. 3-6). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Noor, H. (2007). The influence of L2 on the syntactic processing of L1 by Arab EFL learners. *Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics, 1*(1), 2-18.
- Otheguy, R., & Garcia, O. (1993). Convergent conceptualizations as predictors of degree of contact in U.S. Spanish. In A. Roca & J. Lipski (Eds.), *Spanish in the U.S.: Linguistic contact and diversity* (pp. 135-154). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pavlenko, A. (2000). New approaches to concepts in bilingual memory. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 2*, 209-230.
- Pavlenko, A., & Jarvis, S. (2002). Bidirectional transfer. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(2), 190-214. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/aplin/23.2.190>.
- Schmid, M.S., (2011). *Language attrition: Key topics in sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toribio, A.J. (2001). On the emergence of bilingual code-switching competence. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 4*(3), 203-232.
- Van Hell, J.G. & Dijkstra, T. (2002). Foreign language knowledge can influence native language performance in exclusively native contexts. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, 9*(4), 780-789.
- Wang, L. (2003). Switching to first language among writers with differing second-language proficiency. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 347-375.
- Wang, W., & Wen, Q. (2002). L1 use in the L2 composing process: an exploratory study of 16 Chinese EFL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*, 225-246.
- Williams, J. (2005). *Teaching writing in second and foreign language classrooms*: New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Woodall, B.R. (2002). Language switching: Using the first language while writing in a second language. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*, 7-28.
- Yap, F. A. (2010, January). *A look @ global Filipino orthography: Towards modernization and standardization*. Paper presented in 2nd International Conference on Filipino as a Global Language, San Diego, California, USA.
- Yelland, G.W., Pollard, J., & Mercuri, A. (1993). The metalinguistic benefits of limited contact with a second language. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 14*, 423-444.