REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

INVESTIGATING THE TEACHERS' USE OF L1 in EFL CLASSES

THESIS BY
Ufuk TANRISEVEN

Supervisor : **Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ (Çukurova University)**
Member of Jury : **Dr. Zehra KÖROĞLU**
Member of Jury : **Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülden TÜM (Çukurova University)**

MASTER OF ARTS

MERSİN / MAY 2020

APPROVAL

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY
DIRECTORSHIP OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

We **certify** that this thesis under the title of "**INVESTIGATING THE TEACHERS' USE OF L1 in EFL CLASSES"** which was prepared by our student Ufuk TANRISEVEN with number 20188010is satisfactory **consensus** for the award of the degree of **Master of Arts** in the Department of **English Language Teaching**.

(Enstitüde Kalan Asıl Sureti İmzalıdır.)
Univ. Outside- Supervisor**:** Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ (Çukurova University)

(Enstitüde Kalan Asıl Sureti İmzalıdır.)
Univ. Inside- Member of Jury: Dr. Zehra KÖROĞLU

(Enstitüde Kalan Asıl Sureti İmzalıdır.)
Univ. Outside- Member of Jury: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülden TÜM(Çukurova University)

I confirm that the signatures above belong to the academics mentioned.

(Enstitüde Kalan Asıl Sureti İmzalıdır.)

04/05/2020
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇ
Acting Director of Institute of Social Sciences

Note: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures, photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted from other sources, is subject to the law of Works of Art and Thought No: 5846.

DEDICATION

I dedicate my dissertation work to my deceased mother. Her words of encouragement and push for tenacity will always be ringing in my ears.
A special feeling of gratitude to my loving father
who tried to do his best for me.
My elder brother Doğan TANRISEVEN has never left my side and very special to me.
I also dedicate this dissertation to my dear wife Özlem TANRISEVEN
and my daughters
Eflin and Göksu TANRISEVEN,
who have great support for me in their little hearts.

ETHICS DECLARATION

Student's

Name & Surname: Ufuk TANRISEVEN
Number: 20188010
Department: English Language Teaching
Program: Master Thesis(x) Ph.D. Thesis( )
Thesis Title: Investigating the Teachers' Use of L1 in EFL Classes

I hereby declare that;

I prepared this master thesis in accordance with Çağ University Institute of Social Sciences Thesis Writing Directive,
I prepared this thesis within the framework of academic and ethics rules,
I presented all information, documents, evaluations and findings in accordance with scientific ethical and moral principles,
I cited all sources to which I made reference in my thesis,
The work of art in this thesis is original,
I hereby acknowledge all possible loss of rights in case of a contrary circumstance. (in case of any circumstance contradicting with my declaration)

04/05/2020
Ufuk TANRISEVEN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ for her continuous support of my study and related research, for her patience, motivation, and immense knowledge. Her guidance helped me in all the time of writing of this thesis.

Besides my advisor, I would like to thank the rest of my thesis committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülden TÜM andDr.Zehra KÖROĞLUfor their insightful comments and encouragement which inspired me to widen my research from various perspectives.

I owe thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Yavuz ÇELİK who has always inspired me with his presence, teaching approach and brotherhood. I am gratefully indebted to his spiritual support I have always felt with me.

I would like to thank my dear friends Faris HOCAOĞLU, Nermin HOCAOĞLU and Metin ÖZCAN who did not spare their support during the thesis writing process. I also extend my special thanks to Emrah ŞAVRAN for his support in my study.

Finally, I must express my very profound gratitude to my dear wife Özlem TANRISEVEN and my princess daughters Eflin and Göksu TANRISEVEN for providing me with unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of study and through the process of researching and writing this thesis. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them. Thank you all.

ABSTRACT

INVESTIGATING THE TEACHERS' USE OF L1 in EFL CLASSES

Ufuk TANRISEVEN

Master of Arts, Department of English Language Education
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ
May 2020, 83 pages

English has been acknowledged to be the global language of business, trade, science, and academic studies. In the development of English language competence, there has been an ongoing debate among the scholars on whether the mother tongue (L1) or the target language (L2) should be used in the instructional process. Two lines of thoughts have dominated on this debate. According to the proponents of monolingualism or "the English-only policy", the use of L1 prevents learners from acquiring the L2; therefore, L1 should be abolished from English as a second/foreign (ESL/EFL) classroom activities. On the other hand, the opponents of the English-only policy have claimed that L1 can be employed as a beneficial tool in learning the target language.

This study aims to investigate Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives on the use of L1 in foreign language classrooms, functions that the teachers' use of L1 serves in English classes, and the amount of L1 use, as perceived by English teachers. Mixed method research design was adopted in order to seek answers to the research questions, and two research instruments have been used to collect data. Data was collected from 43 English teachers working in the Private Beyza Boğaziçi School, Private İsmet Karaokur Simya College and Doğa College located in a province in Turkey, using purposeful sampling. In addition, six volunteering teachers were interviewed. The Use of L1Questionnaire, comprising three parts, was used to gather both quantitative and qualitative data, and semi-structured interviews were used to obtain qualitative data. Quantitative data from the closed-ended questions of the Questionnaire was analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 21.0 (SPSS 21.0 version), and descriptive statistics were employed to reveal mean and standard deviation scores on the

Likert scale questionnaire items. Qualitative data, on the other hand, were analysed using inductive content analysis method.

The findings have demonstrated that participants of the study avoid or limit the use of L1 systematically and recognize the need for giving priority to using L2 in EFL classrooms. Findings also suggest that L1 can be used as a facilitating tool in case of emergency for the sake of such functions as managing classrooms, giving instructions, checking for comprehension, establishing a friendly environment and initiating lesson using an icebreaker. The present study also identified two additional purposes of using L1; as an icebreaker and for health and safety issues. Finally, participants' perceptions of the amount of L1 use varied between 2-10% of the maximum lesson hour.

Key words: The mother tongue (L1), functions of mother tongue, target language (L2), monolingualism, English teachers.

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCENİN YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRETİLDİĞİ SINIFLARDA ANA DİL KULLANIMININ İNCELENMESİ

Ufuk TANRISEVEN

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ
Mayıs 2020, 83 sayfa

İngilizce tüm dünyada ticaret, bilim ve akademik çalışmaların ortak dili olarak kabul edilmektedir. İngilizce dil yeterliğinin gelişmesinde, ana dilin (L1) mi yoksa hedef dilin (L2) mi kullanılması gerektiği, süregelen bir tartışma konusudur. Bu süreçte tek dilliliği, yani sadece hedef dilin (İngilizce) kullanılması gerektiğini savunanlara göre, ana dilin kullanımı öğrencilerin hedef dili edinmelerini engellemektedir. Bu nedenle, bu görüş ikinci/yabancı dil (ESL/EFL) sınıflarında ana dilin kullanılmamasını önermektedir. Bu görüşe karşı çıkanlar ise, hedef dile maruz kalmanın bu dilin öğrenilmesi için yeterli olmayacağını ve ana dilin hedef dili öğrenmede faydalı bir araç olarak kullanılabileceğini savunmaktadır.

Bu çalışmanın amacı, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin derslerinde ana dil (Türkçe) kullanımına yönelik algılarını, bu öğretmenlere göre ana dilin derslerdeki işlevlerini ve bu öğretmenlerin derslerinde ana dili ne kadar kullandıklarını incelemektir. Bu çalışma, şu araştırma sorularını cevaplamayı amaçlamaktadır: (1) Öğretmenlerin, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğretirken ana dilin (Türkçe) kullanılmasına dönük algıları nelerdir?, (2) Öğretmenlere göre ana dil İngilizce derslerinde hangi işlevleri yerine getirmektedir? ve (3) İngilizce öğretmenlerinin derslerinde ana dil (Türkçe) kullanımının miktarı konusundaki görüşleri nelerdir? Bu çalışmanın örneklemi, Türkiye'de bir şehirde bulunan Özel Beyza Boğaziçi Okulu, Özel İsmet Karaokur Simya Koleji ve Doğa Koleji'nde görev yapmakta olan 43 İngilizce öğretmenidir. Katılımcılar, amaçsal örneklem yöntemi yoluyla seçilmiştir. Bunun sanı sıra, altı gönüllü katılımcı ile görüşmeler de yapılmıştır. Üç bölümden oluşan anket yoluyla nitel ve nicel veriler elde edilmiş ve görüşme yoluyla da nitel veriler toplanmıştır. Anketten elde edilen nicel

veriler SPSS 20,1 versiyonu ile değerlendirilmiş ve anketin Likert tipi maddelerinin değerlendirilmesinde betimsel istatistik kullanılarak ortalama ve standart sapma değerleri bulunmuştur. Nitel veriler ise içerik analizi yöntemi ile değerlendirilmiştir. Bu çalışmanın bulguları, katılımcı İngilizce öğretmenlerinin derslerinde ana dil (Türkçe) kullanmaktan sık sık kaçındıklarını ve hedef dilin (İngilizce) kullanılmasına öncelik verdiklerini göstermektedir. Bulgular, aynı zamanda, ana dilin sınıfı yönetmek, talimat vermek, öğrenmeyi kontrol etmek, arkadaş canlısı bir sınıf ortamı oluşturmak ve ders içi etkinlikleri başlatmak gibi amaçlarla da kullanılabileceğini göstermektedir. Bu araştırma, yabancı dil öğretiminde ana dilin iki yeni işlevini de ortaya koymaktadır. Bunlar, ana dilin (Türkçe) ders ya da etkinlik başlatıcı olarak ve sağlık ve güvenlik amaçlı kullanımıdır. Son olarak, katılımcılara göre, İngilizce derslerinde hedef dilin kullanılma oranının dersin süresinin en fazla %2-10'u kadar olabileceği ortaya çıkarılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ana dil (L1), anadilin kullanım amaçları, hedef dil (L2), tek dillilik, İngilizce öğretmenleri.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER III

3. METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER IV

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

CHAPTER V

ABBREVIATIONS

EFL : English as a Foreign Language

ELT : English Language Teaching

ESL : English as a Second Language

FLL : Foreign Language Learning

GTM : The Grammar Translation Method

L1 : First Language

L2 : Target Language

SD : Standard Deviation

SPSS : Statistical Package for Social Sciences

TPR : Total Physical Response

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

1. INTRODUCTION

The present study focuses on Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives of using L1 in language classes and the functions for which L1 serves in teaching English as a foreign language. This chapter presents background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study and research questions.

1.1. Background of the Study

English has been widely agreed to be the global language of business, trade, science, and academic studies (Graddol, 2006). The world-wide importance of English has grown to such an extent that it has become to play a significant component of the educational policy in many countries. As a result, governments around the world have introduced English as early as possible into their educational systems to develop communicative competence of the students so that they could effectively communicate in the target language.

In terms of the developing English language competence, the use of mother tongue (L1) or the target language (L2) has continued to be a controversial issue among many scholars. Two lines of views have dominated this debate. According to the scholars who supported "the English-only policy" (McMillan & Rivers, 2011), the use of L1 prevents learners from acquiring the target language; therefore, language teachers and learners should be discouraged from using L1 in English as a second/foreign (ESL/EFL) classroom activities. On the other hand, the opponents of the English-only policy have argued that exposure to L2 does not necessarily lead to L2 learning and that L1 can be employed as a beneficial tool in learning the target language (Phillipson, 1992; Atkinson, 1993; Cook, 2001a; 2001b;Brooks-Lewis, 2009).

On the other hand, recently there has been considerable interest in employing learners' L1 in English language learning and teaching. A global project was conducted to investigate practices in English instruction by Hall and Cook (2013). The results of the survey revealed that while most teachers agreed that English should be used in the classroom as the fundamental language, some of the teachers were found to use

students' L1 for various functions; explaining vocabulary, managing classroom activities, and developing a rapport with students.

In the twenty first century, the predominant methodology promotes the teachers' using mother tongue in EFL classes. Teachers are generally recommended to resort to the use of mother tongue to facilitate students' learning of EFL much easier and in a far more stress-free classroom environment (Brooks-Lewis, 2009). It is also argued that the mother tongue functions as a key and useful tool to mastering a foreign language provided that the teachers are well aware of the use of this tool effectively and for the maximum benefit of the students. Therefore, it may be argued that from a socio-cognitive perspective, L1 may provide social and cognitive zone which extends students' collaborative interaction while they are dealing with the language task. As a consequence, abolishing the use of L1 appears to be futile because the use of L1 serves several functions in learning the target language in contexts where English is taught and learned as ESL/EFL. As revealed by a number of studies (Harbord, 1992; Cook, 2001a;Butzkamm, 2003;Brooks-Lewis, 2009), in order to keep students attentive and interested in the classroom activities, teachers can use L1 while they are teaching, keeping in mind that the use of L1 should be purposeful and functional.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Foreign language teachers have to decide while teaching about whether to use L1 or L2. However, the debate over the role of L1 in EFL/ESL settings has not reached a conclusive outcome as maintained by Grim (2010). On the other hand, in Turkey, as in many other contexts such as China or Korea where English is used as a foreign language, the classroom is the main context for students' exposure to the target language and English teachers have a tendency to use too much L1, as revealed by a number of studies (Kırkgöz, 2017; 2019). As a result, the appropriate use of L1 in language classrooms remains as a major problem in many countries including Turkey.

In addition, as revealed by Coplan and Neokleous (2011), teachers may often have contradictory beliefs about whether to use L1 or L2 in their English lessons. Therefore, the findings from the present study can guide teachers' decision making process about the use of L1. Some suggestions will also be offered to foreign language teachers in order to support them in the appropriate use of L1 to address this particular problem.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The present study aims to find out the perceptions of English language teachers working in private schools towards the use of L1 (Turkish) in English language classrooms to see whether the use of L1 facilitates learning English or not. The study has been conducted with teachers working in private schools in a province in Turkey.

1.4. Research Questions

In accordance with the above-stated objectives, the present study aims to find answers to the following research questions:

1. What are the Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives on the use of L1 in foreign language classrooms?
2. What functions does the teachers' use of L1 serve in English classrooms?
3. What are the Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives on the amount of L1 to be used in foreign language classrooms?

1.5. Significance of the Study

Teachers play a key role in the education system. In Turkish context, students receive most of the foreign language input in the classroom environment from their teachers. Therefore, it is significant to explore teachers' opinions about using L1 in teaching English.

This study is significant in many aspects. First of all, findings from the present study can reveal useful information about the facilitating or inhibiting role of the use of L1 in English classes. What is more, findings might give insights into what functions teachers' use of L1 may serve. English teachers' perspectives about the reasons for using L1 in their classes may inform other teachers to adopt the use of L1 appropriately and purposefully in their lessons.

The present research holds significance especially in EFL contexts where teachers and learners share a common code, which is the native language and where teachers try to find opportunities to use more L2 in their classrooms (Duff & Polio, 1990; Polio & Duff, 1994). Finally, the answers to the above-listed research questions

might help remove Turkish EFL teachers concerns whether they should use L1 or not and, how much L1 is to be used, giving them guidelines about the use of L1 in EFL classrooms. In this respect, the present study is distinctive and unique in its own right due to a number of reasons. First, participants from various private schools participated in the study, and their perspectives on various aspects of the use of L1 were investigated.

Finally, this investigation was based on not only quantitative but also qualitative data, gathered with questionnaires and interviews. In this way, teachers' perspectives on the use of L1 have been be explored from multiple perspectives. Therefore, findings from the present study may offer insights into the adequate use of L1 for foreign language teachers in Turkey and beyond.

CHAPTER II

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents an overview of literature. The monolingual principle to language instruction, support for the use of L1 in language instruction and the view of L1 use in language teaching methods are presented. Finally, related studies conducted both globally and locally are discussed.

2.1. Introduction

The use of mother tongue in teaching foreign languages has been recently discussed in the field of English language teaching (ELT). As maintained by Littlewood and Yu (2011) the debate mainly relates to the role of L1 in EFL settings. This debate is dominated by two major lines of thought; the first one is the monolingual principle and the other line of thought takes an opposite view and sees a pedagogical value in using L1 in language classrooms (Harbord, 1992;Butzkamm, 2003).

2.2. The Monolingual Principle to Language Instruction

The monolingual principle or the L2-only language instruction holds the idea that using L1 would minimize the exposure to the target language input and output and that it should be abandoned. In support of this view, the supporters of monolingual view argue that using L1 in the classroom would be counterproductive and limit input and learners' production of L2 (Chaudron, 1988; Lightbown, 1991). Phillipson (1992) considers that view as the 'monolingual fallacy', which means that language is best taught in a monolingual environment.

As reported by Sampson, "the origins of 'English-only" classroom policies, which encourage learners to use L2 with a view to communicating with people, appears to date back to the Grammar-Translation method (2011). Çelik (2008) maintains that the idea of using only L2 in foreign language classes has originated especially in English-speaking countries where multinational language classes were common, and native-speaker teachers had limited command of learners' L1. Such classes consisted of

students with a variety of linguistic backgrounds and cultures, with the teacher having no common linguistic background with the students.

Until the late 1980's, it was popularly believed that classroom tasks had to be done in L2 in order to provide the learners maximum exposure to the language being learned and also opportunities to practice the target language in a real context (Swan, 1985). The main philosophy underlying this view was that using L1 in classroom would seriously prevent students' learning English as a foreign language, and thus L1 should be abandoned (Krashen & Terrel, 1983; Chambers, 1991) or used as little as possible when required (Halliwell & Jones, 1991).The issue of the Monolingual Approach to language learning and teaching is discussed by Cook (2001b,) and as a result three principals are offered:

1. The learning of an L2 should model the learning of an L1 (through maximum exposure to the L2).
2. Successful learning involves the separation and distinction of L1 and L2.
3. Students should be shown the importance of the L2 through its continual use. (p. 412)

The widespread acceptance of the abovementioned belief led to abandoning the idea of using L1 in language classrooms. Cook (2001a) expresses strong and weak forms related to the use of L1. Accordingly, the strongest form is to abandon using L1 from the classroom, but this can only be possible in situations where the teacher does not speak the students' L1. In relation to weak form, the idea is to minimize L1 in the classroom, that is, to use it as little as possible. In other words, it can be assumed that the judicious use of L1 cannot be a hindrance, but it can act as a facilitator of the effective language learning.

2.3. Support for the Use of L1 in Language Instruction

The other line of thought to foreign language teaching takes an opposite view and sees a pedagogical value in using L1. The proponents of this view argue that the extensive use of L2 could be harmful for learners' cognitive and affective developments (Harbord, 1992; Phillipson, 1992; Atkinson, 1993;Cook, 2001b;Butzkamm, 2003).

Over time, as non-native speakers of English teachers started to teach in contexts, which consisted of language learners from different linguistic backgrounds, researchers started to recognize the value of students' L1 as a potential linguistic resource, when used adequately instead of using it exclusively (Atkinson, 1993; Macaro, 2001; 2009). In opposition to the monolingual view, suggestions started to be offered to include L1 in L2 classrooms. It was argued that using L1 does not create a barrier to L2 learning; instead, it can be used to support the development of the L2 learner for linguistic aspects, cognitive development and affective reasons (Atkinson, 1987; Shamash, 1990; Elridge, 1996; Ferguson, 2003; Cummins, 2007; Qian, Tian, & Wang, 2009; Rivers, 2011). However, it was also argued that (Cook, 2001a; Macaro, 2001; Hitotuzi, 2006; Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009) some cautions should be taken when L1 is used in classrooms. This view is regarded as using L1 for specific aims. It was acknowledged that the amount of using L2 should be at a maximum level.Turnbull (2001) supports the view that the L1 can be employed along with the L2 as seen in the following extract:

> One could also argue that using the L1 can save time in the SL or FL classroom. I agree that it is efficient to make a quick switch to the L1 to ensure that students understand a difficult grammarconcept or an unknown word. (p.208)

To sum up, the overall perspective seems to be that the optimal use of L1, in other words, systematic and judicious use of L1, does have a crucial role to facilitate learning of the target language. This view of using L1 adequately runs contrary to the arguments of those scholars who strongly believe in monolingual approach and support English-only instruction principle.

2.4. The View of L1 Use in Language Teaching Methods

Throughout history, many methodological schools of thought have emerged; each had its own specific language teaching practices based on a particular theory. Some of these methodologies supported using students' L1 in ESL/EFL learning while others did not. This section briefly reviews some of these methodologies with a view to discussing how the role of L1 is viewed by these methodologies.

2.4.1. Grammar-Translation Method

As one of the first English language teaching methods, the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) depended mainly on the use of the learners' L1. In this method, the role of the first language is believed to be crucial, as the texts produced in L2 are translated into the students' native language. In addition, L1 translations are provided for vocabulary enhancement, and the classroom communication of all kinds is conducted mostly in students' L1. Teachers employing this method relied on translations from the target language into the L1.After the collapse of the GTM, succeeding approaches to methodology have either abolished using L1 use or suggested its minimal use in the foreign language classroom (Çelik, 2008), as described below.

2.4.2. Direct Method

The objective of the Direct Method is to help students to communicate in the target language. As a principle, the direct method pioneered the idea that L1 use should be avoided and that meaning can be established through contextual language teaching and learning, with the use of demonstration and visual aids. In this method, students are encouraged to communicate and express meaning directly in the target language by making direct connections between the languages(Richards& Rodgers, 1986).

2.4.3. The Audio-Lingual Method

This method is founded on the principle of using repetition through drills. The fundamental objective of this language instruction is to prevent the students' bad habit formation; because it is thought that using L1 would interfere with the students' acquisition of L2. Accordingly, it is argued that L1 should not be utilized in classroom since it is thought that it will decrease any potential of students with their attempt to improve the target language(Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

2.4.4. Silent Way

In this methodology, the students' L1 is employed to give directions to students when essential and to help them improve their pronunciation. Feedbacks, comments and mostly oral evaluations are given in L1. Starting with a cognitive-affective perspective of humanistic approaches, a loosening up can be observed in general attitudes toward the importance of L1 in language as well as an integration of L1 to facilitate acquisition. Likewise, the Suggestopedia, another humanistic methodology, developed by Georgi Lozanov (1978), approves using L1 for teaching and learning purposes, as it allows a text in the target language to be used along with a parallel text in L1 (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The goal of the teachers employing this teaching method is to help students deal with possible barriers to learning, as supported by Larsen-Freeman (2000):

> Knowledge students already possess of their native language can be exploited by the teacher of the target language. For example, the teacher knows that many sounds in the students' native language will be similar, if not identical, to sounds in the target language; he assumes, then, and that he can build upon this existing knowledge to introduce the new sounds in the target language. (p. 67)

2.4.5. The Communicative Approach

The Communicative Approach does not particularly support using students' mother tongue in the classroom. In principle, the methodology encourages the teachers to convey meaning through authentic materials, pictures, realia, games, role playing, information gap and problem solving tasks. However, the judicious use of learners L1 is permitted to assist what the student wants to say in the early stage in learning to upgrade students' self-efficacy. As mentioned by Richards and Rodgers (2001),"L1 equivalent of the L2 words are provided, when needed in order to clarify their meaning, and to allow students some degree of freedom so that they can produce the L2 words in varied contexts to generate new expressions" (p.12).

2.4.6. Total Physical Response

Developed by James Asher (1996), a professor of psychology in California, Total Physical Response (TPR), as a language teaching method, is based on coordinating speech and action. The TPR principles are usually introduced in the students' L1, and later the meaning is clarified by means of non-verbal expressions; namely, movements and actions.

2.4.7. Natural Approach

In Natural Approach, students' first language is not viewed as a vital component of learning L2 (Çelik, 2008). Similar to the Direct Method, the Natural Approach promotes the idea of making the input comprehensible by establishing the relevant context in the language classroom and disagrees with the idea that L1 can play a role in language acquisition process (Krashen & Terrel, 1983). Language acquisition theories such as *The Input Hypothesis* (Krashen, 1985) claim that acquisition can only occur in a target language environment where the language in question is actually spoken, and thus, using L1 the mother tongue cannot possibly play any part in this process.

To summarize, as evidenced from the above discussion, some methods such as Direct Method and Natural Approach support the monolingual principle (Howatt, 1984). On the other hand, Audio-Lingualism, the Silent Way and Communicative Language Teaching claim that English should be the primary language of instruction that should allow using L1 when needed to facilitate language learning. It is also argued that using L1 should serve a purpose and not be used randomly (Franklin, 1990).

2.5. Studies on the Use of L1

Using L1 has been investigated in various ESL/EFL teaching contexts; both globally and locally. This section provides the major studies conducted abroad and in the Turkish context.

2.5.1. Relevant Studies Conducted Globally

The ongoing debate in connection with using L1 in foreign language classrooms has attracted researchers' interest to identify what functions the use of L1 serve. A number of studies on using L1 in L2 classrooms has indicated that L1 has a role to play

in teaching L2, and it serves a number of functions, from managing the lesson and maintaining discipline to making explanations about L2 grammar (Canagarajah, 1995; Pennington, 1995; Liu, Ahn, Baek & Han, 2004; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Qian et al., 2009;Forman, 2010, 2012).

A review of the literature reveals valuable insights into the functions of L1 in ESL/EFL classrooms, indicating that teachers use L1 for numerous reasons. Qian et al. (2009) studied the way Chinese primary school teachers used L1 in a Chinese primary school. It was found that teachers' objectives in using L1 were due to "give clear instructions" and "elicite more responses from students". Similarly, Greggio and Gil (2007) conducted a qualitative research to investigate the use of English and Portuguese in a beginner and a pre-intermediate EFL classroom. By observing 12 lessons, the researchers analysed teacher and student talk, and suggested that code switching during interaction between teacher and student may help to facilitate interaction among classroom participants as well as foreign language learning. The study also revealed that "teachers tend to switch to L1 especially in four instances a) when explaining grammar; b) giving instructions; c) monitoring/assisting the students; and d) correcting activities" (p. 375). In a similar study, Moghadam, Samad and Shahraki (2012) found that teachers' code switching served three main functions: to check student understanding, to clarify meaning and to socialize.

In addition, Grim (2010) compared 11 French high school and college teachers through 15 hours of lesson observation to identify the functions of L1 in teachers' speeches, and to determine any possible differences between high school teachers' and college instructors' using L1 in their instruction. It was found that teachers used L1 for metalinguistic explanation, classroom management, establishing empathy and solidarity. Other instances of using L1 were to explain instruction with subsequent translation.

In another study, Rezvani and Rasekh (2011) investigated this phenomenon in the Iranian educational context. The researchers found that Iranian EFL teachers working in Iranian elementary EFL classrooms frequently switched to L1 for several reasons. It was also pointed out that using L1 was useful because there was a better interaction among students and teacher.

In a related study, Copland and Neokleous (2011) reported using L1 in private language schools taught by four teachers to intermediate level learners (aged 14) in a Cypriot context. One lesson from each of these four teachers was observed, and later on

interviewwas held with the same teachers. The analysed classroom data and interview with the teachers demonstrated that the teachers used L1 for 11 functions. These functions included logistics (organizing), explaining/revising language skills and systems, instructions, question and answer, reprimands, jokes, praise, translating, markers, providing hints and giving opinions. In addition, it was found that the amount of L1 used by the teachers was changeable from teacher to teacher.

Furthermore, similar studies demonstrate that using L1 provide several benefits such as lowering students' anxiety and giving affective support. For example, Levine (2003) reports that meaningful use of own-language reduced beginner level learners' anxiety in Hong Kong; thus, creating less threatening classroom atmosphere. Similarly, a positive effect of own-language use is reported by Nikula (2007) in teaching English to Finnish learners. The researcher used the learners' own language to have close relationship with students and to present cultural issues more easily. It was concluded that that using own-language for affective and interpersonal reasons was highly useful in the monolingual class. Also, it was suggested that a number of contextual factors, such as learners' proficiency level in L2, their motivation and the quality of the instructional materials were factors that influenced teachers' decisions about using L1 (Song & Andrews, 2008; De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009).

Teachers' perceptions of using L1 have also been investigated by other studies. In general, it has been found that teachers hold positive perceptions towards using L1 in L2 classroom (De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; McMillan & Rivers, 2011). For instance, Kim and Petraki (2009) studied teachers' perceptions towards using L1 in a Korean school in Vietnam, by using observations, interviews, and questionnaires to collect the data. They revealed that teachers who were native speakers of English thought that using the first language is sometimes useful. Not surprisingly, the study also revealed that the Korean-speaking teachers used the first language in classes more often than English-speaking teachers did. These results seem to support the view that native English-speaking teachers have a tendency to use the first language less compared to non-native English teachers. Teachers stated that the main use of the L1 in English classes is to explain the meaning of new words and expressions, to manage the lessons, and to explain grammar rules. Similarly, Yao (2011) puts forward the idea that teachers as well as students have positive opinions about teachers' switching to L1 in EFL classrooms.

2.5.2. Relevant Studies Conducted Locally

Using L1 and the functions for using it have also attracted the interests of researchers in Turkey. The study carried out by Moran (2009) reveals that EFL teachers shifted to Turkish mostly for two main reasons; for classroom management and to establish rapport with students. Likewise, Şenel (2010) noted that teachers tended to use L1 to make the meaning of complex language items clearer, to check for comprehension, and to explain the meanings of new vocabulary.

The L1 use of the Turkish EFL teachers was also investigated by other studies. Sali (2014) examined the teachers' perspectives of using L1 and the functions for which L1 is used in three Turkish EFL classrooms in a public secondary school in Turkey. Data was collected from 15 audio-recordedlessons. In addition, semi-structured interviews were administered to teachers. The researcher presented her findings in three functional categories. The first functional category was academic, which means that the teachers used L1 for explaining the subject of the lesson. The second category was managerial, which refers to the time when the teachers aimed to regulate classroom interactions efficiently. Teachers were also found to use L1 for social/cultural functions when they changed the focus of the lesson to establish rapport with the students. It was also reported that there were many interrelated reasons affecting the teachers' decisions as to when and why to use L1.

In a related study, Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) recorded classroom talk and they found that teachers using L1 in foreign language classrooms have some pedagogical purpose. For example, using their choice of language (L1 or L2), learners can indicate their agreement or disagreement with their teacher's methodological aim. To determine the functions of L1 use, Timuçin and Baytar (2015) observed classes of four English teachers teaching adult learners at a state university and audio-recorded the lessons to find out the instances of L1 and the functions of switches. The researchers identified 129 instances in which the teachers code-switched as identified from the recorded actual teaching hours. The analysis of L1 use showed that teachers used L1 generally for pedagogical purposes. The most frequently used instances of L1 were for translation, followed by checking understanding, for classroom procedures, explaining grammar and classroom management purposes.

Using lesson observations and interviews with five English teachers working in Turkish public secondary schools, Kırkgöz (2017) investigated the teachers'

perspectives on the use of L1 and functions that the teachers' use of L1 serve. Using the transcribed lessons, she identified instances of L1 use and subdivided the utterances into different categories. The most common functions for which teachers used L1 included giving instructions, classroom management, explaining aspects of the English language, and establishing rapport. Some other functions of L1 use were also observed, to a limited extent. These were comprehension checks, praise, and translation, drawing attention, monitoring, and reviewing. The participant teachers in this specific study expressed their agreement that the main medium of communication in the EFL classroom should be English. Yet, they also believed that the use of Turkish can serve as a tool to achieve greater comprehension when explaining complex grammar structures, giving instructions, maintaining discipline, and establishing effective teacher-student rapport.

More recently, Şahin and Şahin (2019) examined the views of English language teachers about the use of L1 in EFL classes in Malatya province, Turkey. Participants were 34 teachers teaching in both public and private primary, secondary and high schools. Using semi-structured interviews, the researchers found out that most teachers believed that L1 should be used in foreign language classes. Almost half the participants stated that mother tongue should be used especially while giving grammar rules. With regard to when not to use mother tongue, some of the participants stated that during the speaking and listening activities mother tongue should not be allowed. A small number of the participants stated that mother tongue should never be used even when students did not understand anything.

2.6. Summary

This section has presented an overview of the main studies carried out in different educational contexts related to the EFL teachers' using L1, functions for using L1, and teachers' perspectives on using L1 in language classes. As understood from the above discussion, there seems to be a place for using of L1 in L2 classes so long as Englishis used as the primary language of instruction.

CHAPTER III

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the research design, context and participants of the study. In addition, instruments used for data collection, data collection procedure itself, and analyses of data are described.

3.2. Research Design

The present study adopts a mixed method research design in order to investigate teachers' perspectives about using L1 (Turkish), the functions for which L1 is used by the teachers in English classes, and the amount of L1 that the participants perceive to be appropriate in EFL classes. Mixed method research refers to an approach that uses a combination of methods from quantitative and qualitative approaches (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie & Turner, 2007). As maintained by Kemper, Stringfield and Teddlie (2003), "the nature of most research conducted in the social sciences lends itself to using mixed methods research procedures" (p.273). The main reason for utilizing mixed method research is that it combines "elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches in data collection and data analysis techniques with a view to obtaining breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration" (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie & Turner, 2007, p. 123). Another reason for using mixed method in the present study is to compensate for the possible drawbacks of using merely questionnaire or interviews as data collection tools.

Summary of the research questions and methodological approaches are illustrated in Table 1, below.The three research questions of the study and corresponding aims to each of the research questions are presented. In addition, methodological approaches applied and data collection tools used to collect information from the research participants are demonstrated.

Table 1

Summary of Research Questions and Methodological Approaches

Research Questions	**Aims**	**Methodological Approaches**	**Data Collection Tools**
1. What are the Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives on the use of L1 in foreign language classrooms?	To determine teachers' views on the use of L1 in English lessons.	Qualitative Approach Quantitative Approach	Interviews Questionnaire
2. What functions does the teachers' use of L1 serve in English classes?	To identify functions teachers use of L1 for	Qualitative Approach Quantitative Approach	Interviews Questionnaire
3. What is the perceived amount of L1 use in English classes?	To examine the amount of L1 use perceived by teachers	Qualitative Approach Quantitative Approach	Interviews Questionnaire

As illustrated in Table 1, the present research aimed to address three questions, and each research question had its own specific purposes in relation to the objectives of the study. A mixed method research design was used to seek answers to research questions. For the research questions, qualitative and quantitative approaches were related in a coherent manner to complement results from each other. Overall, both quantitative and qualitative data were collected via the questionnaire and semi-structures interviews in order to investigate the teachers' use of L1.

3.3. The Context of the Study

The research contexts for this study are Private Beyza Boğaziçi School, Private İsmet Karaokur Simya College and Doğa College located in a province in Turkey; thus, representing a specific case. English is included in the school curriculum as a compulsory school subject as in all other schools in Turkey. Each school has highly adequate teaching and learning facilities, and each has around seven hundred students and 14 English teachers.

3.4. Participants

The participants in this study are English teachers working in the afore-mentioned schools. A total of 42 English teachers, mostly Turkish native speakers of English, participated in the study. The EFL teachers taking part in the study were chosen using purposeful sampling, which is one of the most cost-effective and time-effective sampling methods (Creswell, 2014). The reason for using purposeful sampling is that there is limited number of such schools in the province where the researcher conducted this study. Therefore, considering accessibility and proximity of the schools, the researcher collected data from these private schools located in Kahramanmaraş.In addition, the researcher himself has been working in one of these schools.

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

In this study, two research instruments have been used to collect data; a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The rationale for choosing a questionnaire as a research instrument is that questionnaire is the most commonly used research instrument to collect quantitative data. As pointed out by Dörnyei (2003), "asking questions is one of the natural ways of gathering information" (p.3). Another benefit of using a questionnaire is that it can be handed out to a large population, and it can also enable us to obtain data in an easy and quick manner (Balnaves&Caputi, 2001).

3.5.1. The Questionnaire

In the preparation of the closed-ended items in the questionnaire, a thorough review of literature was conducted.The items in the questionnaire were mostly adapted from the studies of Levine (2003), Van der Walt (2006),Sali (2011) and Kırkgöz (2017). These studies were chosen as they are closely related to the purposes of the present study.

For the sake of validity, the designed questionnaire was reviewed by the supervisor of the thesis, as well as five English teachers with a master's degree to obtain expert opinion. The experts were requested to review each item in the questionnaire to check for appropriacy of each statement. After this process has been completed, some

modifications were made on the statements, and the feedback received was used to decide on the final version of the questionnaire.

Apilot study was conducted to give the researcher information about whether the questionnaire items are yielding the intended information. A total of 20 participants with similar characteristics to the research population from different private schools joined the pilot study. To ensure reliability and consistency of the questionnaire, Cronbach's Alpha value was calculated, which was found to be.859. This shows that the adapted questionnaire was reliable and valid to be used in the actual study.

3.5.2. Interviews

In the present study, semi-structured interviews were implemented in order to obtain more in-depth information and rich data concerning the research topic. According to Cohen et al. (2007), semi-structured interviews allow the researcher to provide prompts to make the interviewee elaborate, clarify and give detailed responses. Eight of the volunteered teachers were individually interviewed. Teachers' perspectives with regard to using L1 in English classes were elicited through their responses to interview questions. In addition, responses to interview questions were used to triangulate the data obtained from the questionnaire. All interviews were conducted in English, and they were transcribed to proceed with the data analysis process.

The interview questions were prepared by the researcher to make a coherent connection between the items in the questionnaire. As stated earlier, the rationale for using a mixed methods approach is that it aims to integrate the findings of both quantitative and qualitative approaches to enable making an interpretation of the data from various perspectives (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2014). Five experts were consulted to have their opinions of the interview questions; the supervisor of the thesis, three doctoral students and one English teacher to ensure that the questions are appropriate and comprehensible for the interviewees.

3.6. Data Collection Procedures

As aforementioned, a questionnaire specifically developed for the present study was used to search answers for the research questions (see Appendix 2 forThe Questionnaire for the Use of L1 Questionnaire). Data was collected from Private Beyza Boğaziçi School, Private İsmet Karaokur Simya College and Doğa College located in

central Kahramanmaraş Province using "purposeful sampling" (Patton, 2002, p. 243). The researcher himself had been teaching in one of the schools. Therefore, during the sampling process, accessibility of the schools and willingness of teachers were considered important factors that contribute to the study.

The researcher followed all ethical considerations. All English teachers working in those private schools were conducted with the Use of L1 Questionnaire after being granted permission by Maraş Provincial Directorate of National Education. In addition, the written ethical approval from the school directors was obtained to proceed with the survey. The data were collected during the 2019-2020 academic year. Prior to implementing the questionnaire, the research participants were provided information about the objectives of the study, and for ethical reasons they were asked to sign the consent form (See Appendix 3) prepared by the researcher, which indicates participants' consent to participate in the study. In addition, both the teachers and the school administration were ensured that the results of the study would be used solely for the present study.

3.7. Data Analysis

Data analysis took place in two stages: First quantitative data from the closed-ended questions of the Use of L1 Questionnaire was analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 21.0 (SPSS 21.0 version) to obtain the necessary statistical information. Descriptive statistics were employed to reveal mean and standard deviation scores of the 15 Likert scale questionnaire items. A numerical value was given for each single variable in the closed-ended questions to be able to code the data in the SPSS. To describe demographic information of the participants, frequencies in relation to gender, age, year of experience and the grade that they teach were calculated. Then, the mean scores and standard deviation for each closed-ended item were calculated. The findings are presented and discusses in Chapter 4.

Next, qualitative data from the open-ended section of the questionnaire was analysed using content analysis. Finally, qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews were analysed using the same method of analysis. More details about data analysis are given in the following section.

3.7.1. Analysis of Descriptive Statistics

To analyse quantitative data, SPSS 21.0 with descriptive statistics was used. The reason for using descriptive statistics is to identify teachers' perceptions of using L1, as well as the functions that the teachers' use of L1 serves in language classrooms. Findings obtained from this analysis helped the researcher answer research question 1 and 2.

Interviews were carried out as face to face conservation with respondents. Semi-structured interview method was utilized in order to get a comprehensive view of respondents' perspectives regarding the topic and to let the participants express their views freely. All of interviews conducted were recorded, they were then transcribed verbatim, and the findings are presented in Chapter IV.

3.7.2. Analysis of the Qualitative Data

In order to analyse qualitative data from the open-ended questions in the questionnaire, inductive content analysis was utilized. This means that themes and categories emerging from the data were identified using constant comparison method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This method of analysis involves inductive category coding in which codes emerging from the data are constantly compared and contrasted with each other within and across the data. Analysis of the qualitative data was carried out according to the procedures defined by Creswell (2014):

1. Organize and prepare the data for analysis
2. Read or look at all the data
3. Start coding all of the data
4. Use the coding process to generate a description of the setting or people as well as categories or themes for analysis.
5. Advance how the description and themes will be represented in the qualitative narrative
6. Make an interpretation in qualitative research of the findings or results (p. 247).

Different codes were assigned to represent the participants such as P1 (Participant 1) and P2 (Participant 2). Then the participants' responses to each open-ended question were read several times by the researcher in order to get a general sense

of understanding, and they were filed separately for each question. This analysis was repeated for each single open-ended question. The findings were categorized under themes derived from the data according to the research questions.

As for the interviews, interviews were transcribed and the participants' responses to each interview question were recorded. The transcripts of the interviews were first read thoroughly, and the same method of analysis described above was applied to analysing the qualitative data obtained from the interviews. In line with the procedures listed above, the raw qualitative data obtained from the questionnaire and interviews was analysed. They were interpreted, and findings were reported supported by relevant excerpts. The findings from the open-ended questions and interviews were analysed separately.

Data analysis was first performed by the researcher. In order to achieve inter-rater reliability, another researcher analysed a small portion of the interview data. A high degree of agreement was achieved between the researcher and the co-rater. In addition, the supervisor of the study checked a sample of the data. For intra-rater reliability, the researcher reviewed the whole interview data after a certain time had passed from the initial analysis. In light of all these, all of the categories were checked again and finalised.

To conclude, this chapter has given information regarding the methodology of the present study. The design of the study, participants and context of the study, data collection instruments, and data analysis methods were described. The next chapter deals with findings obtained from the questionnaires and interviews.

CHAPTER IV

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This chapter presents the main findings obtained through the Use of L1 Questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. Firstly, findings from the questionnaire are examined. Following this, data findings from the semi-structured interviews with the teachers are presented. In order to address the research questions, mixed method research was utilized which required a quantitative and qualitative approaches to collecting data; thus, the data was examined by means of descriptive statistics and inductive content analysis. This section first presents information about the participants' background, and later the findings of each of the three research questions will be presented respectively.

4.1. Analyses of the Questionnaire

The quantitative data from the questionnaire were subjected to statistical analysis via SPSS. Descriptive statistics were employed to reveal mean and standard deviation scores of the Likert-scale questionnaire items. To describe demographic information of the participants, frequencies in relation to gender, age, year of experience and the grade that they teach were calculated.

4.1.1. Background of Participants

Demographic information about the participants was obtained by using the responses to four items in the first section of the questionnaire. These items were about gender, age, years of teaching experience and whether the participants teach at the primary level, secondary level or both. Descriptive statistics concerning the background information about the participants are given in Table 2 below:

Table 2.

Demographic Information about Participants

Variables		f
Gender	Female	21
	Male	21
Age range	25-30	20
	31-35	14
	36-40	7
	41-45	1
Year of experience	1-5	16
	6-10	17
	11-15	5
	16-20	4
The grade they teach	Primary	1
	Secondary	25
	Both	16

Table 2 demonstrates personal information of 42 participants. As seen in the table, the distribution of female and male participants is equal in number. Namely, there are 21 female and 21 male participants. Most of the participants are at the age of either 25-30 (f: 20) or 31-35 (f: 14). In terms of the year of teaching experience, most of them (f:17) have 6-10 years of experience, which is followed by 1-5 years of experience (f:16). It is obvious that most of the participants (f:25) teach in secondary schools. 16 of them teach both primary and secondary school students, whereas one of the participants is seen to teach only primary school students.

4.2. Research Question 1: What are the Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives on the use of L1 in foreign language classrooms?

Data for this question was obtained from the questionnaire which aimed to elicit participants' views for what purpose(s) they used Turkish. In addition, interview data provided some complementary information.

4.2.1. Results of the T-test

The first research question aimed to find out the teachers' perspectives on using L1 in foreign language classrooms. In order to obtain data for the first research question, both quantitative and qualitative data were analysed, as will be illustrated in this section. As stated in Chapter 3, descriptive statistics were employed to reveal mean and standard deviation scores of the 15 questionnaire items. Table 3 presents findings from the 15-item Likert-scale questionnaire.

Table 3.

Results Regarding the Opinions toward the use of L1 in L2 Classroom

Items	**Mean**	**SD**
1. Turkish should be used in English classes	2.86	1.39
2. Use of Turkish prevents students from learning English**)**	3.50	1.53
3. Use of Turkish in classroom helps students to learn English more effectively	2.95	1.58
4. Students can understand English grammar better when explained in Turkish	3.55	1.64
5. Use of Turkish motivates students to participate more in classroom tasks and activities	3.02	1.60
6. Students should be permitted to use Turkish in pair/group activities to communicate efficiently	2.73	1.45
7. Teachers should use Turkish to explain difficult vocabulary	3.50	1.63
8. Use of Turkish helps students understand the teacher's instructions more easily a	3.21	1.58
9. Use of Turkish helps establish better relationship with the teacher	3.36	1.68
10. Use of Turkish lowers students' stress and anxiety	3.69	1.84
11 Use of Turkish helps the teacher to review the previously learned subject	3.04	1.27
12 Use of Turkish helps the teacher check comprehension	2.93	1.37
13. Use of Turkish helps the teacher to organize the classroom better	2.90	1.36
14. Use of Turkish helps the teacher to correct student errors	3.04	1.34
15. Use of Turkish helps the teacher to give opinions	3.09	1.36

In the questionnaire, items 1, 2, 3 and 6 are intended to elicit participants' general perspectives regarding the use of L1. Using the functional categories of Sali (2014), the remaining statements are grouped under "academic", "managerial", and "social/affective "functional categories. Academic functions of L1 use are related to the ways the subject of the lesson is communicated; these were composed of the items 4, 7, 11, 12 in the questionnaire. Managerial functions "served the purpose of managing the lesson and student behaviour efficiently" (Sali, 2014, p. 311), as indicated by items 8, 13 and 14 in the questionnaire. Social/affective functions of the use of L1 are related to the teacher's establishing rapport with the students, and they corresponded to items 9, 10 and 15.

Concerning the teachers' general opinion of using L1, as understood from Table 3, teachers unanimously agreed to Item 2 in the questionnaire, which is about "use of Turkish prevents students from learning English" with a high mean value ($\bar{X}$:3.50). However, they moderately agreed to item 3 related to the "use of Turkish in classroom helps students to learn English more effectively" ($\bar{x}$: 2.95); next to item 1 "Turkish should be used in English classes" ($\bar{x}$: 2.86), and finally item 6 with the lowest mean in this category "students should be permitted to use Turkish in pair/group activities to communicate efficiently" ($\bar{x}$: 2.73).

Regarding the participants level of agreement to the academic functions of the use of L1, teachers agreed most to item 4 stating that "students can understand English grammar better when explained in Turkish" with the highest mean ($\bar{x}$:3.55); followed by item 7 indicating that "teachers should use Turkish to explain difficult vocabulary" ($\bar{x}$:3.50), next to item 11 which states that "use of Turkish helps the teacher to review the previously learned subject" ($\bar{x}$:3.04), and finally they moderately believed that "use of Turkish helps the teacher check comprehension ($\bar{x}$:2.93), as explained by item 12.

Three statements on the questionnaire aimed to investigate teachers' perspectives of using L1 regarding managerial functions. Accordingly, teachers' agreement was the highest to item 8 stating that "use of Turkish helps students understand the teacher's instructions more easily ($\bar{x}$: 3.21), followed by item 14, which indicated that "use of Turkish helps the teacher to correct student errors" with mean value ($\bar{x}$: 3.04), and finally teachers moderately believed that "use of Turkish helps the teacher to organize the classroom better" ($\bar{x}$: 2.90), as stated by item 13 in the questionnaire.

The final functional category was social/affective corresponding to items 9, 10 and 15 on the questionnaire. In terms of affective function of using L1, teachers mostly agreed that "use of Turkish lowers students' stress and anxiety" with a high mean score($\bar{x}$: 3.69), next to item 9 stating that "use of Turkish helps establish better relationship with the teacher" ($\bar{x}$: 3.36), and finally the participants' level of agreement was found to be rather high to item 15 stating that "use of Turkish helps the teacher to give opinions" ($\bar{x}$: 3.09).

To sum up, mean scores seem to be moderately high ranging from 2.73 to 3.69. When items are analysed separately, it can be seen that the highest mean score belongs to Item 10 indicating that use of Turkish lowers students' stress and anxiety for most participants ($\bar{x}$:3.69). In addition, the majority of participants believe that the use of Turkish prevents students from learning English ($\bar{x}$: 3.50), students can understand English grammar better when explained in Turkish ($\bar{x}$: 3.55), and teachers should use Turkish to explain difficult vocabulary ($\bar{x}$: 3.50).

4.2.2. Analyses of the Open-Ended Questions from the Questionnaire

The first open-ended question was directed to the participants to elicit their opinion about using "only English" in their lessons. Findings revealed that teachers were almost equally divided in their perspectives related to only English principle. Different comments provided by 23 teachers in favour of L1 use were mainly justified in relation to "creating an authentic learning environment" as illustrated below:

> Excerpt 1:
> *I believe that using English is the only way to create the real English learning atmosphere. I always tell my students Can you please think about the people who go abroad to learn English? Why do they do it? When they say because we have to communicate there. Yes that is right without paying thousands of dollars we can create the same atmosphere here.*(P39)

Excerpt 2:

I totally agree to use English in the lesson. The children wrap their heads around that language when spoken or being used by the teacher.(P10)

Excerpt 3:

I strongly agree with "only English" in and outside the classroom. I believe that it is not possible to learn English using L1 (P13): It is the most effective and efficient way to teach English.(P6)

Two teachers avoided the use of L1 in their lessons as much as possible. The teachers justified their practice by using different methods and techniques, as reported in Excerpts 4 and 5, below:

Excerpt 4:

By using a wide range of approaches,we can manage to fulfil grasping the attention of especially young learners. If the teacher comprehends the full scale ability in L2 teaching they will not need to use L1.(P6)

Excerpt 5:

Only English should be used to capture the attention of young learners.(P12).

Although only English is considered to be an effective way of teaching, the remaining participant teachers reported that as students are learning English in a foreign language context, there were moments when they had to resort to L1 to support student learning. Teacher informants generally expressed a preference for L2 use to explain complex grammar items, to teach vocabulary, clarify instructions and to avoid boredom. One teacher summed up the general perspectives as illustrated in excerpt 6:

Excerpt 6:

I am against the idea that using only L2 is a good way of teaching English. We, as language teachers, are sometimes in need of using our mother tongue for some reasons. I do not mean talking Turkish in class, but we may need code switching for teaching complex grammar items, high level vocabulary which cannot be taught easily or we sometimes need it for classroom management especially at the young learner level.(P1)

According to one participant, using English is seen very important. But doing this with Turkish students is thought very difficult. If the students had difficulty in learning something, the participant thought that the teacher experiences difficulty, too. As a result, the participant felt the need to use Turkish. Taking a similar view, another participant reported that "If you teach English as a foreign language, you can use only English but there can be some moments when we need to use L1" (P12).

These comments seem to illustrate that most teachers strongly prefer using L2 while teaching English. Yet, in moments of teaching difficult grammar items, vocabulary and giving instruction, the use of L1 is reported to be inevitable.

4.2.3. Analyses of the Interview

With regard to the first question which asked participants' opinion about using only English in their lessons, all teachers agreed on using L2 as much as possible and using L1 judiciously; that is, only when needed and in case of an emergency. One of the participants stated her view in Excerpt 7, below:

Excerpt 7:

Actually, it is changeable because for the young learners, you have to use your own language to teach English because they don't have enough, they are not enough for their own language skills, so you have to explain the meaning of lexical and semantic meaning. (P2)

A similar view was held by P12. As seen in the following excerpt, the participant reported the necessity of using only L2 in order to give students exposure to the target language.

Excerpt 8:

I think it is necessary to talk only English in the lessons. So, it's the only way to teach someone how to use the language they are learning. Also in my humble opinion, the students must try to talk in English during the lessons. (P12)

According to some participants, the students' level of proficiency in English was

an important factor in their decision whether to use L1 or not. As understood from the following two excerpts, two participants stated that the use of L1 depended on the level of the students:

Excerpt 9:

In my opinion it's compulsory as our students don't have a chance of using the target language in social lifeyou know and in this way they have the chance of getting into real life conversation in the classroom.(P3)

Excerpt 10:

Err well if it is an English lesson, you know I am using English, it is ideal it is perfect. If it was Turkish for example if it was a Turkish lesson, you know, teachers use Turkish but it is an English lesson I do agree that I use only English in English lessons, so yes it is a good idea to use only English. (P6)

4.3. Research Question 2: What functions does the teachers' use of L1 serve in English classrooms?

To address this research question, data was gathered from the open-ended question in the questionnaire which aimed to elicit participants' views for what purpose(s) they used Turkish. Interview data provided some supporting information

4.3.1. Findings from the Questionnaire

Comments provided by the teachers were identified under six categories: to teach difficult grammar (f: 12), to practice vocabulary and enhance pronunciation (f: 12), to check comprehension (f: 5), to give instruction (f: 5), to maintain discipline (f: 5), to make students feel comfortable, and connected to their teacher (f: 3), as illustrated below:

In relation to grammar, participants resorted to L1 when they faced with explaining difficult language items and rules of the games. It was stated that L1 was used particularly when teaching English to young learners in primary classes, as illustrated by the Excerpts 11, and 12 given below:

Excerpt 11:

In my opinion teaching English to Turkish students is a very hard task. In my lessons I use only English in speaking or telling stories, the topics that they have to use their imagination. If I must teach them grammar I use L1, because that is the only way they can relate to grammar topics with their own language.(P5)

Excerpt 12:

Teaching present perfect is hard without English since in Turkish there is no grammar pattern like. (P8)

In relation to teaching vocabulary one participant stated that "only English is the most useful technique but I use L1 to explain difficult vocabulary" (P11). Another participant reported that "to explain difficult vocabulary and translate difficult sentences" and for some participants L1 was resorted to for "idioms" (P3). For many participants use of L1 appeared to be the last resort "I first teach the new words using English and body language. If it does not help I give the Turkish meaning (P22).

Regarding giving instructions, teachers commented that they use L1 when students are confused about the teacher instruction. This function of using L1 is explained by the participants in the following Excerpts:

Excerpt 13:

When giving simple instructions to children and it still has not been understood by them after several repeats. Turkish gets used when there are behavioural issues in the class.(P10)

Excerpt 14:

Especially in giving instructions I use L1. When explaining a word they do not understand. Generally I use gestures pictures mimes when I teach a word but sometimes it is not possible so I use L1.(P12)

Among the functions, for which participants used L1 was to check whether students have comprehended the subject or not. Accordingly, some participants reported

that they shifted to L1 in order to check comprehension, as revealed by the following excerpts:

Excerpt 15:

At the end of the lesson just to check whether students have understood. I only use when the subject is hard for the students to understand.(P27)

Excerpt 16:

It is the students' main language so it gives them a better understanding. I have students that have different levels of English so to be clear I sometimes have to use Turkish when teaching lower levels like. (P1)

Another reason for using L1 was to maintain discipline. As part of maintaining discipline participants stated that they switched to L1 to catch children's attention, to initiate the lesson, and for maintaining discipline. Excerpt 17 illustrates participant's view related to this:

Excerpt 17:

In case of an emergency for instance when there is a kid in need. Or, if there is an instant need for Turkish explanation, particularly, when I'm dealing with eight graders. When dealing with other levels (5-7) we do not need to use L1. In fact, I use L1 as an icebreaker and to clarify instructions. (P14)

Although participants accepted that they use L1 in case of an emergency, there was a general agreement among them for using it very carefully and purposefully. The following participant expresses this issue very explicitly in Excerpt 18:

Excerpt 18:

Instead of using Turkish as a classroom language, I prefer using it very economically; I mean I just apply L1 when it is inevitable not to use it. I mainly use it to grab my students' attention when they feel tired at the end of the day. They are generally not eager to participate in the lesson in the last hour, so I warn my students by saying 'Yasin, uyan!' or I use some Turkish words as a key word to make my students understand the context of the grammar items that I introduce. For example, when I teach passive voice, I say 'this is edilgen yapı in our language' to clarify the topic. I generally use it at the word level, not more. I

never teach something in Turkish or explain something in Turkish completely.(P6)

The final category for using L1 was related to "making students feel comfortable and connected to their teacher". Three participants asserted that occasional use of L1 helps them to build rapport with students, and avoid boredom. This function of using L1 is clearly explained by the following participants:

Excerpt 19:

I want to mention about primary school. We can use L1, but sometimes L2. Students get bored of listening to English all the time. (P17)

Excerpt 20:

When you think of exposing students to English yes it is very helpful to speak only English in classrooms. I mean for situations that require making students feel comfortable and connected to their teacher, using L1 is appropriate. (P34)

The same teacher further referred to the need to consider the learner's level of proficiency and the pressure they felt to complete certain subjects. This view of using L1 is summed up by the following participant (P2):

Excerpt 21:

But not all students have the capacity or enough level to understand English so I think it can be valuable to use both English and Turkish in classrooms. Especially, in a short time we want to test learning. Learning teaching English is a process. Turkish families do not have enough patience. (P12)

4.3.2. Findings from the Interview

Findings from the semi-structured interviews with the participants are presented in this section. Regarding the second question which asked what purposes participants used L1 in their lessons, reasons where pointed out as under compulsory situations, to lower student anxiety, and according to student proficiency level, when explaining grammar and sometimes vocabulary, and finally classroom management purposes.For example, P1 stated her opinion in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 22:

Actually if it is necessary I use it in order not to causeany anxiety for example talking about the complex subjectsyou know explain the Turkish translation of the keywords, and unknown words. (P7)

The same participant teacher reported that when a student does not know the meaning of keywords related to complex grammar subjects thatthe teacher is explaining, the student may feel anxious. In such cases the teacher feels the need to translate some keywords into Turkish to make students understand the topic better. The same participant illustrated using L1 for explaining grammar with an example given in Excerpt 23:

Excerpt 23:

If they are A1 or A2 level… only for explainingthe grammar rules for example perfect tense we don't have that tense in our own language in Turkish so to explain where to use only like we want to say if we have to use perfect tense in English I just tell them those spots that's all. (P3)

There seemed to be a tendency among the participants to switch to L1 for young learners of English. The participants agreed that the level of the students is important in their decision to use L1, as reported by P1 below:

Excerpt 24:

I tend to use Turkish in my lessons with first graders and I do that because they are very small and they have no background in English, so it is kids just started schools and they are learning how to read and write in Turkish, so English is a new language for them and I do this about ten per cent of my lessons with year ones in Turkish and ninety per cent in English. (P1)

In relation to using L1 for classroom management purposes, two participants reported that they tended to resort to L1 to manage the lessons more effectively. One of the participants' opinions is illustrated in Excerpt 25:

Excerpt 25:

Just to tell classroom rules. Yeah because they are year one, they are very small. You know there is behaviour issues in the classroom and that is when I use Turkish but with my lessons I tend to use a lot of English as well like I said because they are just year ones, I use a lot of music and dancing, flashcards, that's all in English not in Turkish. (P11)

Related to whether the participants of the present study find the use of L1 beneficial, the participants stated that they attempted to avoid the use of L1 as much as possible. However, they found it useful only under difficult circumstances. The following participant sums up the opinion of other interviews byreferring to one of his experiences.

Excerpt 26:

In my first year of teaching I was teaching two different classes but same level in one class I tried to explain some grammar rules in English but none of the students understood what I was explaining and then in the second class I just taught in Turkish and they got the idea of the usage of the grammar rules and then we read some things concerning that I mean tense then they understood better and they improved faster actually so for the first levels beginning levels we should really explain the grammar rules in Turkish when they get the idea of like five tenses simple present tense future tense and past tense then we can just teach anything in English.(P8)

With reference to the above experience, the participants agreed on the usefulness of L1 when it was needed. In this particular case, he found the use of L1 beneficial because some of these children did not have any background, this may be because they are very small or this may be because they come from government schools. Though he tried his best, he could still see a child struggling and finding it hard to understand the teacher. His use of Turkish, when he felt the need to do so facilitated the student's understanding of the subject thus creating a much relaxed learning environment.

Interview data also provided supportive evidence in relation to whether the use of L1 is helpful. Most participants (f: 7) commented on the use of L1 for academic reasons mentioned earlier; teaching difficult grammar points and vocabulary, giving

instructions, checking students' comprehension. Concerning the use of L1 in grammar and vocabulary teaching and giving instructions, the following participants' comments are exemplary opinions:

Excerpt 27:

Using Turkish hinders students' progress in the long run. On rare occasions main course teachers should use Turkish to explain difficult grammar rules and vocabulary teaching Turkish is beneficial. (P5)

Excerpt 28:

Definitely, but to a certain level. When translating a word or a sentence into Turkish it benefits the children. They have 'o yes' moment. And it may make more sense if translated into Turkish. If the children understand the meaning of the term then they understand the sentence which allows them to understand the paragraph maybe if it does not get translated that children are going to sit and not have a go and may find English for entertaining. While giving instruction L1 is indispensable.(P10)

There were also participants who believed that L1 can be usefulwhen giving written feedback. For example, the following participant reports using L1 in such a situation:

Excerpt 29:

It is definitely beneficial to use Turkish in lessons. I benefit it more when I teach writing. Introducing the topic is not a big deal, but when it comes to giving feedback to the students, it becomes a huge problem at low levels. I prefer using error correction codes to give feedback, but the students are not able to understand every single symbol on their own at first. They need my help and for complex errors like 'subject-verb agreement' I explain the problem by using Turkish. Another important thing I've observed so far is that students have better relationships with the teachers using L1 in their classes than the ones who do not prefer using it. I think they feel comfortable when they hear even a word in their mother tongue. That's why I support using L1.(P1)

In addition, the challenge of stimulating interest at the start of the lesson and maintaining interaction in L1 as a strategy for encouraging L2 use have also been discussed by some participants. Excerpts below illustrate these functions of the use of L1:

Excerpt 30:
I use L1 as an icebreaker and to clarify instructions.(P19)

Excerpt 31:
Not for teaching a second language but for warning students. Also I use L1 in case of emergency. For health and safety issues.(P21)

Some participants stated that L1 can help the teacher create a more relaxing classroom environment by decreasing student stress and anxiety. This function of the use of L1 is illustrated by the participants' excerpts, presented below:

Excerpt 32:
I believe using L1 makes the students feel relaxed. However the language of instruction should be mainly in English. In this way students have greater exposure to the target language.(P3)

Excerpt 33:
Yes it's beneficial. Students' anxiety gets lower and they understand the lesson easily. Students feel relaxed when L1 is used partly and they participate more when I explain it in L1, because children tend to connect their mother tongue with the target language.(P27)

Besides the function to create a more relaxed and less stressful learning environment, some participants believed that the occasional use of L1 creates a break from the extensive exposure to L2. One of the participants highlights this point very clearly in the excerpt given below:

Excerpt 34:

Teaching English is not easy and if you teach English with fully English, students are bored easily. So Turkish makes them breath during lesson.

4.4. Research Question 3: What is the Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives on the amount of L1 used in foreign language classrooms?

In order to address this research question, data was obtained from two sources. These sources include open-ended question in the questionnaire and the interview.

4.4. 1. Data from the Questionnaire

Findings obtained from the questionnaire clearly reveal teachers' awareness of the dangers of overuse of L1, because they reported that the whole point of the class is for learners to be practising English, and they agreed that L1 should be used as little as possible. In relation to the amount of L1 use some teachers (f: 18) stated that L1 should not be used at all. They believed that the use of the learner's L1 would be counterproductive to the learning process and "L1 should never be used at all" as articulated by P6.Almost half of the teachers (f: 24) expressed their opinions for the amount of L1 use ranging from 5-15%, as in the excerpts below:

Excerpt 35:

I am not the authority, but if a percentage is to be said, I can say 10 % at most. The classroom language should be English, but for some important points for the flow of our lesson plan, we should apply it in our lessons.(P5)

Excerpt 36:

I cannot say the exact amount let's say 5%.Not a lot. However, if you feel like the student is very capable of answering or completing the activity if given Turkish examples, Turkish should then be used most definitely. (P10)

Excerpt 37:

Students should be exposed to English in lesson. If we insist on using English they try to understand from mimes and gestures. We can use L1 at some points but not too much. English should be used mostly.(P12)

Findings from the open-ended questions confirmed information gathered through the closed-ended questions obtained in the questionnaire. The second open-ended question aimed to find out whether teachers use Turkish in their lessons. In line with this question, there were two categories of responses; just over half of the teachers (f: 22) reported that they use L1 and the remaining teachers (f: 20) stated that they never use L1. Those who used L1 stated that they use it "when needed" (f: 6), "very little" (f: 6), and sometimes (f: 10). On the other hand, the participants who held an opposite view (f: 20) expressed their opinions in terms of "never" (f: 8), rarely (6) and limited (f: 6), as illustrated below:

Excerpt 38:
I'm totally against it. In some situations I have to use L1 but I try to use L2 mostly. When I'm with exam group, kids need it for sure. (P15).

The teacher's comment of the limited use of L1 seems to indicate the fact that L1 is used in case of an emergency. The participant clearly expresses his opinion related to this issue, in the excerpt given below:

Excerpt 29:
I am teaching at kindergarten when I come across a health and safety issue the most important thing is safety of the students, some warning might be in Turkish for them to see the danger, etc. (P21)

Similar comments are made by other teachers. To illustrate, P32 stated that he used L1 whenever he felt that his students are confused about the instructions given. Likewise, according to P39, when his students give up understanding or make a request from him to explain a particular point in Turkish, he switched to L1 from time to time but he admitted that he did not find it right.

4.4.2. Findings from the Interview

The final interview question that the participants were asked was related to what they thought about the amount of Turkish during English lessons. Similar to findings obtained from the open-ended questions in the questionnaire, interview with six participants revealed that the teachers agreed that the lessons should be conducted

mostly in English and the use of L1 should be limited to compulsory situations; “only when needed”, “only when a student doesnot know or doesnot understand anything about the subject” or “does not understand the point of the subject”. However, when the need emerges, the amount of L1 could be between 5-10% of the class time.The following interview excerpt illustrates the participant’s perspective:

Excerpt 40:

The teacher must not use Turkish or any type of L1 in English classes or other types of language classes. Because if the audiences I mean class know you can speak the language they won’t be acknowledged to talk English or the language. So it will be bad for their speaking abilities. (P2)

For students below the level A2 about 10% of L1 use was thought to be appropriate; however, for those above the level A2, most participants agreed that English should be used only.Participants’ perspectives in relation to the amount of L1 use are presented in the following excerpts.

Excerpt 41:

Their learning styles, yes. The children’s behaviour, their emotional, social well-being that day …, so I tend to use ten per cent Turkish in my lessons ninety per cent English but depending on the children that day. (P4)

Excerpt 42:

The amount of L1 should be used minimum. It can be used to lower students’ anxiety and stress, if needed. Also, the amount of Turkish must be restricted to emergency cases. I mean it should be used to make students feel connected to the teacher and to gain trust during the stages of teaching. (P27)

This chapter has presented the main research findings in relation to the related literature and in line with the three research questions. The following chapter deals with the conclusions drawn from the findings along with implications, limitations and suggestions for further studies.

CHAPTER V

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents summary of the whole study. It also includes discussion of the main findings in accordance with research questions. In addition, relevant previous studies are discussed and related to the findings of the present study. Finally, implications and recommendations are given along with the limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research are presented.

5.2. Summary of the Study

The present study aimed to investigate Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives about the use of L1 (Turkish) in EFL classes. In addition, the study intended to identify the functions for which L1 was used by the teachers in English classes, and the amount of L1 use that the participants perceive to be appropriate in their lessons. The research contexts for this study are Private Beyza Boğaziçi School, Private İsmet Karaokur Simya College and Doğa College located in Kahramanmaraş province in Turkey.Considering this province as a case, a mixed method research design was adopted. The Use of L1 Questionnaire was applied to 42 English teachers working in these private schools, and a semi-structured interview was held with volunteering teachers.

Quantitative data from the questionnaire was analysed using statistical analysis via SPSS. Descriptive statistics were employed to reveal mean and standard deviation scores of the Likert-scale questionnaire items. To describe demographic information of the participants, frequencies in relation to gender, age, year of experience and the grade that they teach were calculated. Qualitative data from the open-ended questions and interview questions were analysed using inductive content analysis.

5.3. Discussion of the Findings with Reference to Research Questions

The main objectives of this study were to investigate Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives on the use of L1, functions for which the teachers' use of L1 in English classes and the amount of L1 use, as perceived by English teachers. In this section,findings from the three research questions are presented, respectively.

5.3.1. Research Question1: What are the Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives on the use of L1 in foreign language classrooms?

As revealed from the findings on the Likert part of the questionnaire, participants unanimously agreed that use of Turkish prevents students from learning English with a high mean value ($\bar{x}$:3.50). In relation to the use of Turkish in pair/group activities, teachers moderately agreed with that the use of Turkish helps students to participate in classroom tasks and activities more, and use of Turkish in classroom helps students to learn English more effectively ($\bar{x}$: 2.95). However, teachers did not particularly think that Turkish should be used in English classes ($\bar{x}$: 2.86).

Half of the participants' responses to open-ended questions showed that teachers were in favour of "only English" principle due to a number of reasons. They believed that "using L2 creates an authentic learning environment", and "it is an effective way to teach English". They also thought that by applying different approaches, the use of L1 can be avoided. Semi-structured interview findings confirmed teachers' agreement that English should be used in lessons as much as possible and use L1 be limited to emergency situation and when needed. The remaining teachers generally expressed a strong preference for L2 use but acknowledged that in moments of difficulty such as explaining complex grammar items, vocabulary teaching, clarifying instructions and for avoiding boredom, it was inevitable to switch to L1. Participants who adopted English-only policy also proposed that L2 is learned through maximum exposure in the class and they stated that L1 must be avoided not to overshadow students' exposure to L2. They also thought that teachers' use of L1 makes students lazy, and interferes with their EFL learning.

To sum up, participants to this study preferred the idea of avoiding or limiting the use of L1 systematically and recognized the need for L1 use in EFL classrooms where teachers and language learners share the same L1. Teachers' opinion is consistent with the argument proposed by several scholars such as (Butzkamm (1998),

Phillipson (1992), Atkinson (1993), Cook (2001a; 2001b), Macaro (2005), and McMillan and Turnbull (2009) who proposed that teachers can use the L1 judiciously and "expert code switching can improve the quantity and quality of TL comprehension and production" (McMillan & Rivers, 2011, p. 260). The findings are also in line with the study conducted by Ford (2009) in Japan, which involved interviewing 10 teachers about using of L1 in their classrooms. The present findings also confirm the study by Kim and Petraki (2009) which revealed that teachers' believed that the first language is sometimes useful in a Korean school in Vietnam.

5.3.2. Research Question2: What functions does the teachers' use of L1 serve in English classrooms?

Findings from the questionnaire and interviews are used to address this research question. Data from the Likert scale part of the questionnaire were analysed under three categories: Academic, managerial, and social/affective functions. In relation to the academic functions, teachers' level of agreement was high to the statements "students can understand English grammar better when explained in Turkish" ($\bar{x}$: 3.55), "teachers should use Turkish to explain difficult vocabulary" ($\bar{x}$: 3.50), and "use of Turkish helps the teacher to review the previously learned subject" ($\bar{x}$: 3.04). However, teachers moderately agreed to the idea of "using Turkish helps the teacher check comprehension ($\bar{x}$: 2.93). These findings in terms of and the teachers' use of L1 for explaining grammar, giving instructions are in line with the study conducted by Greggio and Gil's (2007) which investigated the use of English and Portuguese EFL classroom. Similar findings are observed from the Turkish context in the study done by Şenel (2010) who found that teachers used L1 to clarify complex language items, and to explain the meanings of new vocabulary. Consistent with the present study, a study conducted by Timuçin and Baytar (2015), and Sali (2014) found that Turkish teachers tend to resort to L1 for such functional purposes.

In the present study, similar findings were obtained for the use of L1 regarding managerial functions. Participants highly agreed that "use of Turkish helps students understand the teacher's instructions more easily" ($\bar{x}$: 3.21), and "use of Turkish helps the teacher to correct student errors" with mean value ($\bar{x}$: 3.04), and a moderate level of agreement was found for "use of Turkish helps the teacher to organize the classroom better ($\bar{x}$: 2.90).

With regard to teachers 'perspective for the social/affective function, teachers mostly agreed that "use of Turkish lowers students' stress and anxiety with a high mean score ($\bar{x}$: 3.69), and "use of Turkish helps establish better relationship with the teacher" ($\bar{x}$: 3.36). Finally they agreed that "use of Turkish helps the teacher to give opinions" ($\bar{x}$: 3.09).

To sum up, mean scores seem to be moderately high ranging from 2.73 and 3.69. The highest mean score belongs to Item 10 indicating that "use of Turkish lowers students' stress and anxiety for most participants" ($\bar{x}$:3.69). In addition, the majority of participants believe that the use of Turkish prevents students from learning English ($\bar{x}$: 3.50), students can understand English grammar better when explained in Turkish ($\bar{x}$: 3.55), and teachers should use Turkish to explain difficult vocabulary ($\bar{x}$: 3.50).

Open-ended section of the questionnaire provided supportive evidence. Teachers were found to use L1 to teach difficult grammar (f: 13), practice vocabulary and improve student pronunciation (f: 12), to check comprehension (f: 6), to give instruction (f: 5), to maintain discipline (f: 5), to make students feel comfortable and teachers sometimes used L1 to be connected to students and to avoid boredom (f: 5). Two additional functional categories were identified; three teachers used L1 as a function of icebreaker to initiate the lesson effectivelyand two teachers used L1 for health and safety issues. Related to lowering students' anxiety and giving affective support of L1, similar findings are observed in the study conducted by Levine (2003)who found that meaningful use of L1 decreased learners' anxiety and created a friendlier classroom atmospherein Hong Kong context. Likewise, Nikula (2007) reports similar findings in relation to Finnish learners of English.

Those participants who used L1 in their lessons commented on its usefulness for academic, managerial and social/affective functions. Related to academic functions, teachers found it beneficial when teaching grammar, and difficult vocabulary. Teachers also used L1 to provide written feedback particularly to low proficiency students. It was also believed that students feel more comfortable when they hear their mother tongue as a kind of break from an extensive exposure to L2. Hence, the use of L1 lowered student anxiety and helped establish better relationships with the teachers. Some teachers also stated that mother tongue was useful at certain stages in the lesson such as when used as an icebreaker, to clarify instructions, to check student's comprehension. The results indicated that although the teachers tried to use English mostly, they used L1 consciously to make a friendlier atmosphere in which the students feel relaxed and

learning takes place in a more effective environment. The teachers also asserted that L1 lowered the amount of stress and worry in studentsparticularly while they made mistakes in L2.

The findings of the present study illustrate teachers' agreement on giving priority to L2. However, findings also suggest that L1 can be used as a facilitating tool in EFL classrooms in times of emergency for functions such as managing classrooms, giving instructions, checking for comprehension, establishing a friendly environment and initiating lesson using an icebreaker. These findings are similarly reported in the previous studies such as Cook (2001a), Kraemer (2006) and De la Campa and Nassaji (2009). In addition, Kırkgöz (2017) identified the most common functions for using L1 as giving instructions, classroom management, explaining aspects of the English language, and establishing rapport and to limited extent comprehension checks, praise, translation, drawing attention, monitoring, and reviewing.

It is important to point out that the results of the present study revealed two other purposes of using L1; an icebreaker and for health and safety issues. It can be noted that this finding is important as it can give insights into English teachers regarding the use of L1 in such circumstances.

5.3.3. Research Question3: What are the Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives on the amount of L1 to be used in foreign language classrooms?

As revealed from the responses to open-ended questions, participants were aware of the dangers of overusing L1, because they reported that the classroom was the main context where the students are exposed to L2. Hence, many teachers believed that the use of Turkish would be counterproductive to the learning process. The participants also agreed that using L1 excessively should be avoided in EFL classrooms, as it affects negatively the main purpose of learning English in an EFL teaching context like Turkey.

As a consequence, the participants in this study agreed that L1 should be used rarely, when needed, and judiciously. In relation to the amount of L1 use, most teachers agreed that the amount of L1 use could be between 2-10% of the class time, at most. For example, one teacher stated that "the classroom language should be English, but for some important points for the flow of our lesson plan, we should apply L1 in our lessons". In agreement with this, another teacher reported that "students should be exposed to English in the lesson. If we insist on using English they try to understand

from mimes and gestures. We can use L1 at some points but not too much". Interview responses confirmed findings from the questionnaire. Four interviews agreed on limited use of L1, which was 10%, maximum. One interview justified his opinion stating that "in my opinion it's compulsory to use L2 in lessons as our students donot have a chance of using target languagein social life,outside the classes and in this way they have the chance of getting into real life conversation in the classroom". Another interview expressed the reason for avoiding L1 pointing out that "because if the audiences, I mean the students know that you can speak the language they won't be acknowledged to talk English. So it will be bad for the students' speaking abilities".

The findings of this study are consistent with some earlier research which report 11.3% use of English as L1 in German-as-a-foreign language courses (De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009), and 4.8 % L1 use by the teachers and 2.1 % L1 use by the students in the total lesson and 6.9 % L1 use by the teachers and 3.1 % by the students in the total talk of an L2 classroom (Macaro, 2001). In addition, the participants' perspective on this issue was consistent with those scholars (Atkinson, 1987; Cook, 1991; Wells, 1999; Swain & Lapkin, 2000;Cook 2001a) who warned against excessive L1 use; but proposed optimal use of L1.Allwright and Bailey similarly observe that 'banishing the learners' first language . . . deprives [them] of their normal means of communication and so of the ability to behave fully as normal people' (1991, p. 173).

The findings seem to suggest that as advocated by Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009, p. 13); there seems to be not only a 'flexible and less rigid attitude' towards own-language use, but the systematic exploitation of the potential of learners' own language(s) 'where that is appropriate'. In a similar vein, participants in this study believed that L1 use could support L2 learning; yet, they strongly cautioned that L1 should not be used excessively. It can be suggested that using mother tongue in EFL classroom can be a useful pedagogical resource.

5.4. Implications

The present study aimed to investigate EFL teachers' perspectives of L1 threeprivate schools in a province in Turkey. In the light of findings, the study offers several implications for teacher educators at the universities, practicing teachers, teacher trainers and the foreign language curriculum designers with regard to using L1 in EFL

classes. The implications specifically offer suggestions to increase L2 use while developing strategies to optimize functions of L1.

Teacher educators can give prospective teachers concrete guidance as to when the use of L1 may be beneficial and when it should be avoided. This is particularly significant when the aim of teaching EFL is to promote communicative competence of the students as highlighted in the foreign language curriculum in Turkey. Teacher candidates need to be familiarized with and feel confident about the critical moments when engaging with L1 for effective pedagogical tool. In recent years, researchers such as Edstrom's (2006) have made calls for 'purposeful' own-language use. Therefore, future teachers need to be illustrated with real life examples about when and why' the learners' own language might be used.

A similar suggestion can be offered to practicing teachers. Teachers can be recommended to make much effort to enhance students' communication skills in English, as recommended by the foreign language curriculum (MEB, 2013). Teachers' maximum use of L2 can be facilitated through teacher training programmes. Teachers need to know that they can support their practices through various approaches and using nonverbal communication such as gestures and mimes effectively to help students' acquisition of L2 in the classroom context.

Another important recommendation should be about where the use of L1 can be acceptable or possibly encouraged so that it can function as a useful pedagogic tool. Grim (2010) claims that "teachers use the L1 often without any rationale" (p.193). Likewise, to avoid the foreign language teachers' casual use of L1, teachers can be helped to take advantage of their existing L1 to facilitate student learning of L2, judiciously rather than excessively.

Based on the findings from the present study curriculum designers can provide specific guidelines for the teachers' possible uses of L1 in English classes. Since the foreign language curriculum in Turkey gives priority to the development of students' communicative competence, curriculum designers can specify the amount of Turkish that could be acceptable in language classes and give teachers strict guidelines on when to avoid using it.

5.5. Suggestions for Further Research

This study mainly focused on investigating teachers' perspectives of using L1, the functions for which L1 is used, and the amount of L1 teachers think could be used in EFL classes in three private schools located in one province in Turkey. Yet, data provided in-depth information and investigated the use of L1 in language classes from various perspectives using different research tools. Future research could be conducted in different private and public schools to see the differences and similarities on this topic in different types of schools.

In the present study, questionnaires and interviews are utilized as main data collection tools. Hence, video-recorded observations in EFL classes could be conducted to have an opportunity to see the actual use of L1 by teachers and students. In addition, longitudinal studies might be arranged to observe the effects of using L1 and L2 in foreign language classes.

Finally, exploring only teachers' perspectives may be insufficient to be fully informed about the complete picture of the useof L1. Therefore, future research could focus on exploring students' perspectives also in order to find out possible match between the perspectives of both teachers and students with a view to having more comprehensive information about the use of L1 in foreign language classes.

5.6. Limitations of the Study

When the number of participants is considered, more participants could be involved in the study to obtain broader understanding of the issue of L1. Moreover, observation could be used as an additional data collection tool to have a more comprehensive picture of the subject in action.

While accepting such limitations, the present study can be considered to be distinctive and original in its own right owing to a number of reasons. First, participants from three private schools participated in the study and their perspectives on various aspects of the use of L1 were investigated. In addition, this investigation was based not solely on quantitative data but qualitative data was also used from the questionnaire and interviews. In this way, teachers' perspectives on using L1 were explored from multiple perspectives. Therefore, findings from the present study can offer insights for foreign language teachers in Turkey and beyond, to support them in the appropriate use of L1 to address this particular problem.

6. REFERENCES

Allwright, D.,& Bailey, K. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Asher, J. (1996). Learning another language through actions (5th Ed.). Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.

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

Atkinson, D. (1993). *Teaching monolingual classes*. Harlow: Longman.

Brooks-Lewis, K. A. (2009). Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning. *Applied Linguistics, 30*(2), 216–235.

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

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

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

Canagarajah, A. S. (1995). Functions of code-switching in ESL classrooms: socializing bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 6*(3), 173-195.

Centeno-Cort´es, B., & Jim´enez Jim´enez, A. (2004). Problem-solving tasks in a foreign language: The importance of the L1 in private verbal thinking. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 14*(1), 7–35.

Chambers, F. (1991). Promoting use of the target language in the classroom. *Language Learning Journal, 4*, 27-31.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. (1991). *Second language learning and language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.

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

Cook, V. (2001b). *Second language learning and language teaching.* London: Arnold Publishers.

Coplan, F., & Neokleous, G. (2011). L1 to teach L2: Complexities and contradictions *ELT Journal*, *65*(3), 270-280.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th Ed.),Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

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

Çelik, S. (2008). Opening the door: An examination of mother tongue use in foreign language classrooms. *Hacettepe University, faculty of Education Journal, 34,* 75-85.

De La Campa, J. C., & Nassaji, H. (2009). The amount, purpose, and reasons for using L1 in L2 classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals, 42*(4), 742-759.

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

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal, 50*(4), 303–311.

Ferguson, G. (2003). Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts: Functions, attitudes and policies. *AILA Review, 16*, 38-51.

Forman, R. (2010). Ten principles of bilingual pedagogy in EFL. In A. Mahboob (Ed.), The NNEST Lens: Non-native English speakers in TESOL (pp. 54–86). UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Forman, R. (2012). Six functions of bilingual EFL teacher talk: animating, translating, explaining, creating, prompting and dialoguing. *RELC Journal, 43*(2), 239-253.

Franklin, C. E. M. (1990). Teaching in the target language. *Language Learning Journal*, *2*, 20-24.

Ford, K. (2009). Principles and practices of L1/L2 use in the Japanese university EFL classroom. *JALT journal, 31*(1), 63-80.

Graddol, D. (2006). *Why global English may mean the end of 'English as a Foreign Language*. British Council Publication.

Greggio, S., & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and learners' use of code switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: A qualitative study. *Linguagem & Ensino, 10*(2), 371-393.

Grim, F. (2010). L1 in the L2 Classroom at the secondary and college levels: A comparison of functions and use by teachers. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *7*(2), 193-209.

Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2013). *Own language use in ELT: Exploring global practices and attitudes'*. British Council ELT Research Paper 13-01. London: British Council.

Halliwell, S., & Jones, B. (1991). *On target teaching in the target language*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal, 46,* 350- 355.

Hitotuzi, N. (2006). The learner's mother tongue in the L2 learning-teaching. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 7,* 161-171.

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

Kayaoğlu, M. N. (2012). The use of mother tongue in foreign language teaching from teachers' practice and perspective. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 32,* 25–35.

Kim, Y., & Petraki, E. (2009). Students' and teachers' use of and attitudes to L1 in the EFL classrooms. *Asian EFL Journal, 11*(4), 58-89.

Kırkgöz, Y. (2017). English Teachers' Uses of First Language in Turkey. In M. Dantas-Whitney, &S. Rilling (Eds.), *Insider Accounts of Classroom Life Secondary Education* (pp 101-106). Alexandria, Va: TESOL Press.

Kırkgöz, Y. (2017). Kırkgöz, Y. (2019). Fostering Young Learners Listening and Speaking Skills. In S. Garton and F. Copland (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Teaching English to Young Learners* (pp. 171-187). New York: Routledge.

Kraemer, A. (2006). Teachers' use of English in communicative German language classrooms: a qualitative analysis. *Foreign Language Annals, 39,* 435-450.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.

Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T.D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Hayward, CA. The Alemany Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levine, G. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *The Modern Language Journal 87(*3), 343–364.

Lightbown, P.M. (1991). What have we here? Some observations on L2learning. In R Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), Foreign language pedagogy research: A commemorative volume for Claus Faerch (pp. 197-212). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

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

Liu, D., Ahn, G. S.,Baek,K.S.,& Han,N.O. (2004). South Korean high school English teachers' code switching: Questions and challenges in the drive for maximal use of English in teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(4), 605–638.

Lozanov, G. (1978). *Suggestology and suggetopedy: Theory and practice.* United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

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

Macaro, E. (2005). 'Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: a communication and learning strategy' in E. Llurda (Ed.), Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession. NewYork: Springer.

Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning (pp.35-49). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

McMillan, B., & Turnbull, M. (2009). Teachers' use of the first language in French immersion: Revisiting a core principle. In: Turnbull, M., DaileyO'Cain, J. (Eds.), First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning (pp. 15-34). Multilingual Matters, Bristol.

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

MEB (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı) (Turkish Ministry of National Education) (2013). *English Language Curriculum for Primary Education Grades 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.* Ankara: Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı.

Moghadam, S. H., Samad, A. A., & Shahraki, E. R. (2012). Code switching as a medium of instruction in an EFL classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(11), 2219-2225.

Moran, G. (2009). *Teachers' code switching and its functions in foreign language classrooms.* Master's thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Nassaji, H. (2009). Effects of recasts and elicitations in dyadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. *Language Learning, 59,* 411-452.

Nikula, T. (2007). Speaking English in Finnish content-based classrooms. *World Englishes, 26*(2), 206–223.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd Ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

Pennington, M. C. (1995). *Eight case studies of classroom discourse in the Hong Kong secondary English class*. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Department of English

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Polio, C. G.,& Duff,P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target-language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 313–326.

Qian, X., Tian, G., & Wang, Q. (2009). Codeswitching in the primary EFL classroom in China-two case studies. *System 37*, 719-730.

Rezvani, E., & Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2011). Code-switching in Iranian elementary EFL classrooms:An exploratory investigation. *English Language Teaching, 4*(1), 18-25.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C.,& Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd Ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, D. J. (2011). Politics without pedagogy: questioning linguistic exclusion. *ELT Journal*, 65(2), 103–113.

Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System, 42,* 308–318

Sampson, A. (2011). Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT Journal, 3,* 1-11.

Shamash, Y. (1990). Learning in translation: Beyond language experience in ESL. *Voices, 2*(2), 71-75.

Song, Y., & Andrews, S. (2008). *The L1 in L2 learning: Teachers' beliefs and practices*. Munich: LINCOM Europa.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.),*Principles and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M.,& Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 251–274.

Şahin, M., & Şahin, T. (2019). A Research on the Use of Mother Tongue in English Language Classrooms (Example of Malatya Province), IBAD *Journal of Social Science, 5*, 379-396.

Şenel, M. (2010). Should foreign language teaching be supported by mother tongue? *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 6*(1), 110-120.

Timuçin, M., & Baytar, İ. (2015). The Functions of the Use of L1: Insights from an EFL Classroom, *Kastamonu Education Journal, 23*(1), 241-252.

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign teaching, but …. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*(4), 531-538.

Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(3), 302-325.

Wells, G. (1999). Using L1 to master L1: A response to Antom and Dicamilla's "Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom." *The Modern Language Journal*, *83*(2), 248-254.

Yao, M. (2011). On attitudes to teachers' code-switching in EFL classes. *World Journal of English Language, 1*(1), 19-28.

7. APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Ethics Committee Permit Document

T.C

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

TEZ / ARAŞTIRMA / ANKET / ÇALIŞMA İZNİ / ETİK KURULU İZİNİ TALEP FORMU VE ONAY TUTANAK FORMU

ÖĞRENCİ BİLGİLERİ	
T.C. NOSU	13675303536
ADI VE SOYADI	UFUK TANRISEVEN
ÖĞRENCİ NO	20188010
TEL. NO.	0544 427 83 16
E - MAİL ADRESLERİ	ufukthegod7@gmail.com
ANA BİLİM DALI	İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ
HANGİ AŞAMADA OLDUĞU (DERS / TEZ)	TEZ
İSTEKDE BULUNDUĞU DÖNEME AİT DÖNEMLİK KAYDININ YAPILIP-YAPILMADIĞI	2019 / 2020 GÜZ DÖNEMİ KAYDI YENİLENMİŞTİR.
ARAŞTIRMA/ANKET/ÇALIŞMA TALEBİ İLE İLGİLİ BİLGİLER	
TEZİN KONUSU	İNGİLİZCE SINIFLARINDA ÖĞRETMENLERİN ANA DİLİ KULLANIMI
TEZİN AMACI	İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN DERSTE TÜRKÇE'Yİ KULLANIMLARININ İNCELENMESİ
TEZİN TÜRKÇE ÖZETİ	İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN DERSTE TÜRKÇE'Yİ KULLANIMLARININ SEBEPLERİ, FAYDALARI VE ZARARLARI İNCELENECEKTİR.
ARAŞTIRMA YAPILACAK OLAN SEKTÖRLER/ KURUMLARIN ADLARI	ARAŞTIRMA EĞİTİM SEKTÖRÜNDE OLUP KAHRAMANMARAŞ KAHRAMANMARAŞ ÖZEL BEYZA BOĞAZİÇİ OKULU, KAHRAMANMARAŞ ÖZEL DOĞA KOLEJİ, KAHRAMANMARAŞ ÖZEL İSMET KARAOKUR SİMYA KOLEJİ ARAŞTIRMAYA DAHİL EDİLECEKTİR.
İZİN ALINACAK OLAN KURUMA AİT BİLGİLER (KURUMUN ADI- ŞUBESİ/ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ - İLİ - İLÇESİ)	KAHRAMANMARAŞ ÖZEL BEYZA BOĞAZİÇİ OKULU, KAHRAMANMARAŞ ÖZEL DOĞA KOLEJİ, KAHRAMANMARAŞ ÖZEL İSMET KARAOKUR SİMYA KOLEJİ.
YAPILMAK İSTENEN ÇALIŞMANIN İZİN ALINMAK İSTENEN KURUMUN HANGİ İLÇELERİNE/ HANGİ KURUMUNA/ HANGİ BÖLÜMÜNDE/ HANGİ ALANINA/ HANGİ KONULARDA/ HANGİ GRUBA/ KİMLERE/ NE UYGULANACAĞI GİBİ AYRINTILI BİLGİLER	UYGULANACAK ANKET ÇALIŞMASI KAHRAMANMARAŞ ONİKİŞUBAT İLÇE MİLLİ EĞİTİM MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE BAĞLI OLAN ÖZEL BEYZA BOĞAZİÇİ OKULU, KAHRAMANMARAŞ ÖZEL İSMET KARAOKUR SİMYA KOLEJİ VE KAHRAMANMARAŞ ÖZEL DOĞA KOLEJİ İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNE UYGULANMIŞTIR. BEYZA OKULU'NDA ANA SINIFI, İLK VE ORTA OKULDA AKTİF OLARAK DERSE GİREN İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMELERİNE, KAHRAMANMARAŞ ÖZEL İSMET KARAOKUR SİMYA KOLEJİ VE KAHRAMANMARAŞ ÖZEL DOĞA KOLEJİ'NDE İSE ANA SINIFI, İLKOKUL, ORTAOKUL VE LİSEDE AKTİF OLARAK DERSE GİREN İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNE UYGULANMIŞTIR.
UYGULANACAK OLAN ÇALIŞMAYA AİT ANKETLERİN/ ÖLÇEKLERİN BAŞLIKLARI/ HANGİ ANKETLERİN - ÖLÇELERİN UYGULANACAĞI	UYGULANACAK ANKET ÇALIŞMASI ÜÇ BÖLÜMDEN OLUŞMAKTADIR. BİRİNCİ BÖLÜM KATILIMCININ CİNSİYET, YAŞ VE DENEYİM YILINI KAPSAMAKTADIR. İKİNCİ BÖLÜM ON SORUDAN OLUŞAN ALTI NOKTA LIKERT ÖLÇEKLİ SORULARDAN, ÜÇÜNCÜ BÖLÜMDE İSE BEŞ ADET KATILIMCILARIN DERS ESNASINDA ANA DİLLERİ OLAN TÜRKÇE'Yİ KULLANIMLARI, VARSA FAYDA VE ZARARLARIYLA ALAKALI AÇIK UÇLU SORULARI İÇERMEKTEDİR. CRONBACH ALFA DEĞERİ ANKET ÇALIŞMASININ GÜVENİLİRLİĞİNİ ARTTIRMAK İÇİN KULLANILACAKTIR. VERİ ANALİZİ İÇİN SPSS 21.0 BETİMSEL İSTATİSTİK VE BAĞIMSIZ ÖRNEKLENDİRME TESTİ KULLANILACAKTIR.
EKLER (ANKETLER, ÖLÇEKLER, FORMLAR, ... V.B. GİBİ EVRAKLARIN İSİMLERİYLE BİRLİKTE KAÇ ADET/SAYFA OLDUKLARINA AİT BİLGİLER İLE AYRINTILI YAZILACAKTIR)	İNGİLİZCE DERSİNDE ANA DİL KULLANIMI ANKETİ EK 1 (3 SAYFA), ONAM FORMU EK 2 (1 SAYFA)

SOBE-96

ÖĞRENCİNİN ADI - SOYADI: Ufuk TANRISEVER	ÖĞRENCİNİN İMZASI: (Enstitüde Kalan Asıl Sureti İmzalıdır.) TARİH: 23 / 12/ 2019

TEZ/ ARAŞTIRMA/ANKET/ÇALIŞMA TALEBİ İLE İLGİLİ DEĞERLENDİRME SONUCU

1. Seçilen konu Bilim ve İş Dünyasına katkı sağlayabilecektir.

2. Anılan konu İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı faaliyet alanı içerisine girmektedir.

1.TEZ DANIŞMANININ ONAYI	2.TEZ DANIŞMANININ ONAYI (VARSA)	SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRÜNÜN ONAYI	A.B.D. BAŞKANININ ONAYI
Adı - Soyadı:Yasemin KIRKGÖZ	Adı - Soyadı: ……	Adı - Soyadı: Murat KOÇ	Adı - Soyadı: Şehnaz ŞAHİN KARAKAŞ
Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: ……	Unvanı: Doç. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.
İmzası : (Enstitüde Kalan Asıl Sureti İmzalıd	İmzası: ……	İmzası:(Enstitüde Kalan Asıl Sureti İmzalıdır.)	İmzası:(Enstitüde Kalan Asıl Sureti İmzalıdır.)
… / ….. / 20….	…. / …. / 20….	……. / …….. / 20……	…. / …. / 20….

ETİK KURULU ASIL ÜYELERİNE AİT BİLGİLER

Adı - Soyadı: **Mustafa BAŞARAN**	Adı - Soyadı: **Yücel ERTEKİN**	Adı - Soyadı: **Deniz Aynur GÜLER**	Adı - Soyadı: **Ali Engin OBA**	Adı - Soyadı: **Mustafa Tevfik ODMAN**
Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.
İmzası : (Enstitüde Kalan Asıl Sureti İmzalıdır.)	İmzası : (Enstitüde Kalan Asıl Sureti İmzalıdır.)	Kalan Asıl Sureti İmzalıdır.)	İmzası : ……	İmzası : ……
…… / ….. / 20…..	…… / ….. / 20…..	… / ….. / 20…..	…. / ….. / 20…..	… / ….. / 20…..
Etik Kurulu Jüri Başkanı - Asıl Üye	**Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi**	**Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi**	**Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi**	**Etik Kurulu Jüri Asıl Üyesi**

OY BİRLİĞİ İLE		
OY ÇOKLUĞU İLE	x	Çalışma yapılacak olan tez için uygulayacak olduğu Anketleri/Formları/Ölçekleri Çağ Üniversitesi Etik Kurulu Asıl Jüri Üyelerince İncelenmiş olup, 13 / 10 / 2019 - 24 /02. / 2020. tarihleri arasında uygulanmak üzere gerekli iznin verilmesi taraflarımızca uygundur.

AÇIKLAMA: BU FORM ÖĞRENCİLER TARAFINDAN HAZIRLANDIKTAN SONRA ENSTİTÜ MÜDÜRÜNE ONAYLATILARAK ENSTİTÜ SEKRETERLİĞİNE TESLİM EDİLECEKTİR. AYRICA YAZININ PUNTOSU İSE 12 (ON İKİ) PUNTO OLACAK ŞEKİLDE YAZILARAK ÇIKTI ALINACAKTIR.

Appendix2. THE USE OF L1 QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Colleague,

The aim of this questionnaire is to obtain your opinions regarding the use of L1 (Turkish) while teaching English. The questionnaire has **three sections**. In Section 2 of the questionnaire, there are 15 statements, and in Section 3 there are 5 open-ended questions. Please answer each item in the questionnaire as sincerely as possible. Your answers will remain anonymous and they will be utilized merely for my research study.

Thank you for your assistance.

Ufuk TANRISEVEN

SECTION I - Your Background

Gender		**Years of Experience**	
Female		1-5 years	
Male		6-10 years	
Age		11-15 years	
25-30 years		16-20 years	
31-35 years		21-25 years	
36-40 years		26-30 years	
41-45 years		Over 30 years	

The university you graduated from:_____

Do you teach in_____

a) Primary level (1-4 classes/grades) _____
b) Secondary level (5-8 classes/grades) ____
c) Both primary and secondary levels _____

SECTION 2- Your Views on the use of L1 (Turkish)

This section contains statements regarding the use of L1 (Turkish) in the classroom: As the teacher of English, please use the scale to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the given statements.

	1. Strongly Disagree	**2. Disagree**	**3. Neither agree nor disagree**	**4. Agree**	**5. Strongly Agree**
1. Turkish should be used in English classes.					
2. Use of Turkish prevents students from learning English.					
3. Use of Turkish in classroom helps students to learn English more effectively.					
4. Students can understand English grammar better when explained in Turkish.					
5. Use of Turkish motivates students to participate more in classroom tasks and activities.					
6. Students should be permitted to use Turkish in pair/group activities to communicate efficiently.					
7. Teachers should use Turkish to explain difficult vocabulary.					
8. Use of Turkish helps students understand the teacher's instructions more easily.					
9. Use of Turkish helps establish better relationship with the teacher.					
10. Use of Turkish lowers students' stress and anxiety					
11 Use of Turkish helps the teacher to review the previously learned subject.					
12 Use of Turkish helps the teacher check comprehension,					
13. Use of Turkish helps the teacher to organize the classroom better.					
14. Use of Turkish helps the teacher to correct student errors.					
15. Use of Turkish helps the teacher to give opinions.					

SECTION 3- Your Views on the use of L1 (Turkish)

This section contains open-ended questions regarding the use of L1 (Turkish) in the classroom. As the teacher of English, please explain your personal opinion about each question in as much detail as possible.

1. What is your opinion about using “only English” while teaching English in your lessons?
2. Do you use Turkish in your lessons?
3. If so, you when and for what purpose(s) do you use Turkish while teaching English? Please give examples.
4. Is it beneficial to use Turkish in your English lessons? If so, please explain the reasons?
5. In your opinion, what should be the amount of Turkish used in English lessons?

Appendix 3. The Interview Questions

Section 1: Personal Information

1. Which language do you prefer for this interview?
2. Please give me some information about yourself.
3. What is your year of teaching experience in teaching in this school?
4. What levels/classes do you teach?

Section 2: Teachers' opinion about the use of L1

1. Could you please talk about your general opinion about using only English in your lessons?

2.Do you ever use Turkish while teaching English?

3. If so, when in your lessons do you use Turkish? Also please explain the reasons why you use Turkish and give examples.

4. In your opinion is it useful to use Turkish in your English lessons? If so, please explain the reasons?

5. Please explain the amount of Turkish in your lessons?

Section 3: Final Comments on the use of L1

1. Is there anything else would you like to add?
2. Thank you very much for your valuable answers

Appendix4. Consent Form

Consent Form

[Çağ University]

Proposal: **Investigating the Use of L1 in EFL Classes**

Responsible Researcher/Supervisor: [Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ

Additional Researchers: [*List any staff or students who may be involved in the project in anyway. This includes processing data. Include name and role]*

Name of Participant: _____

1. I consent to participate in this project, the details of which have been explained to me, and I have been provided with a written plain language statement to keep. I understand that the purpose of this research is to investigate [**Investigating the Use of L1 in EFL Classes**]
2. I understand that my participation in this project is for research purposes only.
3. I acknowledge that the possible effects of participating in this research project have been explained to my satisfaction.
4. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from this project anytime without explanation or prejudice and to withdraw any unprocessed data that I have provided.
5. I have been informed that the confidentiality of the information I provide will be safeguarded subject to any legal requirements; my data will be password protected and accessible only by the named researchers.
6. I understand that despite the small number of participants involved in the study, my anonymity is guaranteed.
7. I understand that after I sign and return this consent form, it will be retained by the researcher.

Participant Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix 5. Appendix E:Approval from Çağ University

T.C.
ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY

SAYI : 23867972/ 85 – 59
KONU: Tez Anket İzni Hakkında

15.01.2020

KAHRAMANMARAŞ VALİLİĞİNE
(Kahramanmaraş İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü Dikkatine)

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi olan (20188010 numaralı) **Ufuk TANRISEVEN "İngilizce Sınıflarında Öğretmenlerin Ana Dili Kullanımı "** konulu tez çalışmasını Çukurova Üniversitesi öğretim elemanı Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ danışmanlığında yürütmektedir. Adı geçen öğrencinin tez çalışması kapsamında **Kahramanmaraş Özel Beyza Boğaziçi Okulu, Özel Doğa Koleji ile Özel İsmet Karaokur Simya Koleji bünyesinde ders veren İngilizce Öğretmenleri kapsamak üzere** kopyası Ek'lerde sunulan bir anket uygulaması yapmayı planlamaktadır. Tez çalışması kapsamında yukarıda belirtilen anketin uygulayabilmesi için gerekli iznin verilmesi hususunu bilgilerinize sunarım.

(Enstitüde Kalan Asıl Sureti İmzalıdır.)
Prof. Dr. Ünal AY
Rektör

EKLERİ: Üç Sayfa tez anket formları ile İki sayfa tez etik kurul izin formunun fotokopileri.

DAĞITIM:
Gereği:
Özel Beyza Boğaziçi Okulu Müdürlüğüne
Özel Doğa Koleji Müdürlüğüne
Özel İsmet Karaokur Simya Koleji Müdürlüğüne

Bilgi:
Kahramanmaraş Valiliğine
(Kahramanmaraş İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü Dikkatine)

A.Yaşar Bayboğan Kampüsü, Adana - Mersin Karayolu 33800 Yenice-Mersin/Türkiye T. +90 (0324) 651 48 00 Fax:+90 (0324) 651 48
www.cag.edu.tr

Appendix 6. Survey Permissions from Schools

T.C

KAHRAMANMARAŞ VALİLİĞİ

ÖZEL BEYZA BOĞAZİÇİ OKULLARI

Sayı: 99977802-395.[01]/07 27.01.2020

Konu: Tez Anket İzni Hk.

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ'NE

İlgi: 23867972/89-59 sayı 15.01.2020 tarihli yazınız.

İlgi yazınızda belirtilen tez anketini okulumuz Özel Beyza Boğaziçi Okulları'nda uygulamanızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Beyza Boğaziçi Okulları Müdürü

Ali KAHYA

317

T.C

KAHRAMANMARAŞ VALİLİĞİ

BEYZA BOĞAZİÇİ OKULLARI

Sayı: 39977800-355.[01]/01 27.01.2020

Konu: Tez Anket İzni Hk.

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ'NE

İlgi: 23867972/89-59 sayı 15.01.2020 tarihli yazınız.

İlgi yazınızda belirtilen tez anketini okulumuz Beyza Boğaziçi Okulları'nda uygulamanızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Beyza Boğaziçi Okulları Müdürü

ALİ CAHYA

T.C. MİLLİ EĞİTİM BAKANLIĞI 1923 ONİKİŞUBAT ORTAOKULU BEYZA BOĞAZİÇİ İLKOKULU

317

T.C

KAHRAMANMARAŞ VALİLİĞİ

DOĞA KOLEJİ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

Sayı: 99982906/10 27.01.2020

Konu: Tez Anket İzni Hk.

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ'NE

İlgi: 23867972/89-59 sayı 15.01.2020 tarihli yazınız.

İlgi yazınızda belirtilen tez anketini okulumuz Kahramanmaraş Doğa Koleji'nde uygulamanızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Kahramanmaraş Doğa Koleji Müdürü

T.C

KAHRAMANMARAŞ VALİLİĞİ

KAHRAMANMARAŞ DOĞA KOLEJİ

Sayı: 99982303/11 27.01.2020

Konu: Tez Anket İzni Hk.

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ'NE

İlgi: 23867972/89-59 sayı 15.01.2020 tarihli yazınız.

İlgi yazınızda belirtilen tez anketini okulumuz Kahramanmaraş Doğa Koleji'nde uygulamanızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Kahramanmaraş Doğa Koleji Müdürü

317

T.C

KAHRAMANMARAŞ VALİLİĞİ

KAHRAMANMARAŞ DOĞA KOLEJİ

Sayı: 39982305/11 27.01.2020

Konu: Tez Anket İzni Hk.

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ'NE

İlgi: 23867972/89-59 sayı 15.01.2020 tarihli yazınız.

İlgi yazınızda belirtilen tez anketini okulumuz Kahramanmaraş Doğa Koleji'nde uygulamanızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

Kahramanmaraş Doğa Koleji Müdürü

317

T.C

KAHRAMANMARAŞ VALİLİĞİ

ÖZEL İSMET KARAOKUR SİMYA KOLEJİ

Sayı: 99960846/04 27.01.2020

Konu: Tez Anket İzni Hk.

ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ'NE

İlgi: 23867972/89-59 sayı 15.01.2020 tarihli yazınız.

İlgi yazınızda belirtilen tez anketini okulumuz Özel İsmet Karaokur Simya Koleji'nde uygulamanızda bir sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinize arz ederim.

İsmet Karaokur Simya Koleji Müdürü

Muhammet Kasap
Genel Müdür

317

8.CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name & Surname **:** Ufuk TANRISEVEN

Date/Place of Birth **:** 1980 / Adana, Seyhan

E-mail **:** **ufukthegod7@gmail.com**

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

2018 – 2020 **:** MA, Çağ University Institute of Social Sciences, English Language Teaching

2000 – 2005 **:** BA, Atatürk University, Faculty of Science and Literature, English Language and Literature Department

WORK EXPERIENCE

2019-Still **:** Group Leader, Private Beyza Boğaziçi Schools, Kahramanmaraş

2018-2019: Group Leader, Private Altın Bilgi Schools, Kahramanmaraş

2015-2018 **:** Head of Department, Simya College,Kahramanmaraş

2010-2015 : Group Leader, Private Kipaş Educational Institutions, Kahramanmaraş

2008-2010 : English Teacher, Private Özderya College, Kahramanmaraş