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

EFL TEACHERS' VIEWS ON THE USE OF L1 IN ELT CLASSROOMS

THESIS BY
Rahime ÜZÜM

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Jülide İNÖZÜ
Member of Jury: Dr. Senem ZAİMOĞLU
Member of Jury: Dr. Deniz ELÇİN (Siirt Univ.)

MASTER OF ARTS

MERSİN / JUNE 2022

APPROVAL

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

We **certify** that thesis under the title of "**EFL Teachers' Views on the Use of L1 in ELT Classrooms**" which was prepared by our student **Rahime ÜZÜM** with number **20198020** is satisfactory **consensus/by majority of votes** for the award of the degree of **Master of Arts in** the Department of **English Language Education.**

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is Signed.)
Univ. Inside permanent member-Supervisor-Head of Examining Committee:
Prof. Dr. Jülide İNÖZÜ

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is Signed.)
Univ. Inside - permanent member: **Dr. Senem ZAİMOĞLU**

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is Signed.)
Univ. Outside - permanent member: **Dr. Deniz ELÇİN**
(Siirt University)

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

(The Original Copy Hold in the Institute Directorate is Signed.)

10 / 06 / 2022

Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇ
Director of Institute of Social Sciences

Note: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures and photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted for mother sources is subject to the Law of Works of Arts and Thought. No: 5846.

DEDICATION

To My Beloved Mother and Sister…

ETHICS DECLARATION

Student's

Name & Surname:	Rahime ÜZÜM
Number:	20198020
Department:	English Language Education
Program:	Master Thesis (**X**)
Thesis Title:	EFL Teachers' Views on the Use of L1 in ELT Classrooms

I hereby declare that:

I prepared this master thesis in accordance with the 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, and evaluations 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 my declaration).

10/ 06/ 2022

Rahime ÜZÜM

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

EFL TEACHERS' VIEWS ON THE USE OF L1 IN ELT CLASSROOMS

Rahime ÜZÜM

M.A. Thesis, Department of English Language Education
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Jülide İNÖZÜ
June 2022, 89 Pages

This study was planned to investigate the views of EFL teachers on the use of L1 (Turkish) in ELT classrooms. In addition to determining EFL teachers' views, their views were analysed according to several variables such as their length of teaching experience, educational degrees, and the departments from which they graduated. EFL teachers' preferred uses of L1 in ELT classrooms were also investigated. In this study, quantitative and qualitative data gathering techniques were used within a mixed-methods design. The quantitative data were gathered via a questionnaire developed by Tunçay in 2014, which was administered to 174 English teachers working at state schools in Siirt, Turkey. The qualitative data were collected via semi-structured interviews with 20 teachers who had previously completed the questionnaire. Quantitative data from the questionnaire were analysed using SPSS and qualitative data were analysed by content analysis. The findings indicated that EFL teachers preferred the use of Turkish in a balanced and appropriate way based on the proficiency levels of the students and the subject being taught in order to facilitate the language learning process. This study has also demonstrated that English teachers with different years of experience and different educational degrees shared similar attitudes regarding the use of Turkish in ELT classrooms. However, in terms of the affective dimensions of language learning, the graduates of ELT departments and graduates of other departments were found to have different attitudes. EFL teachers' practices of L1 showed that they employed Turkish mostly for metalinguistic and clarification purposes.

Keywords: use of mother tongue (L1), EFL teachers' views, EFL teachers' use of L1

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN DİL SINIFLARINDA ANA DİL (TÜRKÇE) KULLANIMINA İLİŞKİN FİKİRLERİ

Rahime ÜZÜM

Bu çalışma, İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği sınıflarda ana dilin (Türkçe) kullanımına ilişkin İngilizce öğretmenlerinin görüşlerini araştırmayı planlamıştır. İngilizce öğretmenlerinin görüşlerinin araştırılmasının yanında, öğretmenlik deneyimlerinin süresi, eğitim dereceleri ve mezun oldukları bölümler gibi çeşitli değişkenlere göre görüşleri de analiz edilmiştir. İngilizce öğretmenlerinin İngilizce derslerinde Türkçe kullanımına ilişkin tercih ettikleri durumlar da araştırılmıştır. Bu çalışmada, karma yöntem kapsamında nicel ve nitel veri toplama teknikleri kullanılmıştır. Nicel veriler Türkiye'nin Siirt ilindeki devlet okullarında görev yapan 174 İngilizce öğretmeni ile Tunçay tarafından 2014'te geliştirilen bir anket yoluyla toplanmıştır. Nitel veriler, ankete katılan 20 öğretmen ile yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yoluyla toplanmıştır. Anketten elde edilen nicel veriler, Sosyal Bilimler için İstatistik Paketi kullanılarak nitel veriler ise içerik analizi yöntemi ile analiz edilmiştir. Araştırmanın sonuçları, Türkçenin dil öğrenme sürecini kolaylaştırmak için öğrencilerin yeterlik seviyeleri ve öğretilen konuya göre dengeli ve uygun bir şekilde kullanımını tercih ettiklerini göstermiştir. Ayrıca, bu çalışmanın sonuçları, farklı bölümlerden mezun olmuş ve çeşitli deneyim ve eğitim düzeylerine sahip olan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği sınıflarda Türkçe kullanımına yönelik benzer tutumları paylaştıklarını ancak dil öğrenmenin duygusal boyutlarına yönelik tutumlar açısından, İngilizce Öğretmenliği bölümü mezunlarının ve diğerlerinin farklı tutumlara sahip oldukları bulunmuştur. İngilizce öğretmenlerinin Türkçe kullanımına ilişkin tercihleri, Türkçeyi daha çok üstdilbilimsel ve açıklama amaçlı kullandıklarını ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar kelimeler: ana dil kullanımı, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin görüşleri, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin ana dil kullanımı

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

EFL   **:** English as a Foreign language
ESL   **:** English as a Second Language
ELT   **:** English Language Teaching
SPSS   **:** Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
L1   **:** First Language of the Learner, Mother Tongue, Native Language
L2   **:** Target language, Foreign Language
GTM   **:** Grammar Translation Method
TPR   **:** Total Physical Response

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on EFL teachers' views on the use of the first language (L1) in English language teaching (ELT) classes. This chapter is intended to serve as an introduction, including background of the study of first language (L1) concepts, a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study and the research questions, the significance of the study, and a related overview of the literature on the use of L1.

Background of the Study

Within the realm of English language instruction, the use of L1 has been a longstanding controversial topic of debate among linguists and researchers (Solhi & Büyükyazı, 2011; Kayaoğlu, 2012; Hanakova & Metruk, 2017). That is to say, the use of L1 in L2 classrooms has always been an issue of contention, and as Hui (2010) and Almoayidi (2018) note, numerous theories and controversial opinions still exist on the use of L1 in foreign/second language education. Koçoğlu and Gaba (2015) argue that those views on this issue change from person to person and method to method. The debate has centred on whether or not the mother tongue (L1) needs to be included in the English teaching process. This argument has been dominated by two prominent schools of thought (Sali, 2014). According to Yphantides (2009), one of these schools of thought holds that using L1 greatly limits the range of target language input and output; thus, it needs to be removed from English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL) classroom education, implying that increased exposure to L2 results in improved target language (L2) acquisition. This monolingual principle or "English-only" premise has long prevailed in English language teaching (ELT). The other school of thought opposes this monolingual premise, calling for a bilingual or a code-switching principle by emphasising the pedagogical significance of L1 usage in language classes, pointing out that the use of only L2 in language classes may be harmful to L2 learners on both affective and cognitive levels (Butzkamm, 2003). Aside from those monolingual and bilingual approaches, some other scholars such as Nation (2003) and Hanakova and Metruk (2017) proposed a balanced approach that recognises the effects of L1 on the learning of L2 simultaneously and adjusts that balance to match the demands and levels of learners. In short, many studies have revealed that if used deliberately and functionally, L1 can be a practical tool for target language learning in the EFL/ESL context (Cook, 2001; Brooks & Lewis, 2009).

Statement of the Problem

EFL teachers also have divergent viewpoints on the usage of L1 in English language instruction (Yavuz, 2012). Paker and Karaaç (2015) argue that teachers' views and tendencies to use L1 in ELT classrooms vary significantly as they come from diverse educational backgrounds. In this regard, this study was undertaken to examine the perspectives held by EFL teachers on the usage of L1 in ELT classes in state schools in Siirt, Turkey, to explore whether they used L1 in their classrooms and whether they thought L1 use contributed to students' language learning processes or whether it should be avoided.

Various research has been conducted on EFL teachers' views on the use of L1 in ELT classrooms both globally and in the Turkish context (Grim, 2010; Yavuz, 2012; Mart, 2013; Nzwanga, 2000; Şahin & Şahin, 2019); however, as Hall and Cook (2012) state, the scholarly literature might not always reflect what is happening in various parts of the world. Consequently, this study was conducted in the context of state schools in Siirt, where almost no studies have examined EFL teachers' views on the use of L1 in ELT classrooms. Accordingly, since the participants of this study were EFL teachers working at state schools (primary, secondary, and high schools) in Siirt, the results of the present study will contribute to the increasing body of literature on EFL teachers' views on the use of L1 in ELT classrooms.

Purpose of the Study

This study aims to determine the views of EFL teachers on the use of L1 (Turkish) in ELT classrooms. In particular, it concentrates on the views of EFL teachers on the use of L1 by exploring their attitudes regarding the use of only English, comparisons between L1 and L2, and contributions of L1 usage regarding the students' language learning processes, affective aspects such as anxiety or motivation, and student-teacher interactions. In addition, teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 are compared to see whether the teachers' length of experience, the departments they graduated from, and their educational degrees affect their use of L1 in the classroom. It is also aimed to investigate EFL teachers' preferred practices regarding the use of L1 in ELT classrooms. The following research questions were developed to assist in the accomplishment of these goals:

1. What are EFL teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 in ELT classrooms?

2. What are EFL teachers' attitudes regarding the contribution of the use of L1 to students' language learning processes?

3. What are EFL teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 in terms of the affective dimensions of language learning?

4. What are the variables affecting EFL teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 in ELT classrooms?

   a) Does the length of teaching experience affect teachers' L1 use in the classroom?

   b) Do the departments from which teachers graduated affect their L1 use in the classroom?

   c) Do the educational degrees of teachers affect their use of L1 in the classroom?

5. What are the teachers' preferred practices regarding the use of L1 in ELT classrooms?

Significance of the Study

This study is noteworthy in many ways. First, in Turkey, the classroom setting is the sole source of foreign language input for many students. The students receive this input from their teachers, which means that EFL teachers play a vital role in students' English language learning. As a result, it is critical to ascertain EFL teachers' perspectives and preferred practices regarding the use of Turkish in English instruction.

Secondly, in addition to examining EFL teachers' views and preferred practices regarding the use of L1 in the context of Turkish state schools, the current study is significant in comparing EFL teachers' views in terms of different variables such as their length of teaching experience, educational degrees, and departments they graduated from by using qualitative and quantitative data to explore their views from multiple perspectives. In this way, this study contributes to the EFL context on the use of L1, and it may serve as a reference for researchers interested in learning about and studying EFL teachers' views on the usage of L1 in ELT classrooms.

Finally, Yavuz (2012) claims that although the recent theory has changed from "always English" to "teach English in English but do not ignore the native language" (p. 4340), this shift has had minimal impact on Turkish EFL teachers in both theory and in practice, as there are still those opposing the use of L1 and believing that English-

only classrooms are more effective for learners. Moreover, EFL teachers still face the question of whether to allow, restrict, or prohibit the use of L1 in their classrooms (Yavuz, 2012). In this respect, teachers in similar settings may find the results of the present study helpful in boosting their awareness and implementing new practices in their classrooms.

Literature Review

People have learned a variety of languages throughout history for many reasons. Richards and Rodgers (2001) note that people had attempted to learn classical languages such as Latin and Greek before the 16th century as those had long been academic languages in a wide variety of areas. However, after the 16th century, primarily due to political developments, classical languages began to lose popularity and countries in which French, Italian, and English were spoken began to establish a dominant position globally, as did their languages, which played a significant role in language learning (Tunçay, 2014). The growth of technology, industry, and business, along with the colonial expansion of English-speaking countries, made English grow swiftly and become dominant both abroad and at home, eventually becoming the language of international communication (Acar, 2020). As a result, the search for the best technique for teaching English began, resulting in the birth of numerous language teaching approaches and methodologies based on various assumptions (Taşkın, 2011). Within the scope of these approaches and methodologies, the role of L1 in L2 teaching has been discussed and different views have been presented according to the tenets of each method and approach. While some of these methods and approaches favour using L1 in ESL/EFL classrooms as a methodological tool, some methods reject L1 usage, leading to it being eliminated or minimised, which remains a controversial topic.

The Use of L1 in Language Teaching Methods

As stated above, different methods and approaches have been developed throughout the history of language teaching in which the role of L1 has been presented differently. Nazary (2008) categorises those approaches and methods into three groups as "traditional, alternative, and current communicative methods" (p. 141). The classical methods are the grammar-translation method, the audio-lingual method, and the direct method. The alternative methods include suggestopedia, the silent way, total physical

response, and community language learning. Additionally, current communicative approaches include the communicative approach and the natural approach.

Each of these approaches and methods has its own set of ideas and principles for language education; in this section, the specific topic of L1 in L2 instruction will be examined within the context of each of these methods.

The Grammar-Translation Method. According to Pablo et al. (2011), the grammar-translation method (GTM) was developed in the 18th century, and between the middle of the 1800s and the middle of the 1900s, it dominated foreign language teaching methodology. Larsen-Freeman (2000, as cited in Nazary, 2008) states that in the GTM, the language used in the classroom is predominantly the students' first language as texts are translated into the learners' language to clarify the meaning of the target language. In the same vein, Cook (2001) argues that in the GTM, foreign language teaching is achieved via memorising grammatical rules, working on vocabulary, doing translations, and using the learners' first language. In the GTM, the instruction tool is L1 and the oral production of L2 is not necessary. Moreover, Linday and Knight (2006, as cited in Pablo et al., 2011) claim that the instructor gives no compulsory lectures in the target language; as a result, the target language is not used for communication.

In the mid-19th century, criticism of the GTM prompted the development of other methods that highlighted the importance of oral proficiency (Richards & Rogers, 2001). Gouin's direct method was one of these methods.

The Direct Method. The direct method was developed in the early 20th century in reaction to the GTM as the latter neglected speaking skills and pronunciation. Lindsay and Knight (2006, as cited in Pablo et al., 2011) claim that the direct method focuses on the target language and favours the conducting of lessons in that language. Consequently, a significant volume of comprehensible input and a large amount of oral interactions are highlighted instead of translation and L1 usage in target language instruction (Richards & Rogers, 2001). Thus, L1 is banned in these ELT classrooms and the exclusive usage of the target language is promoted.

In the mid-20th century, however, the direct method was deemed ineffective in public education (Erdoğan, 2015) and the teaching of second languages underwent a paradigm shift, resulting in new attempts to change the methods of language instruction. Another significant method called the audio-lingual method was developed.

Audio-Lingual Method. Richards and Rodgers (2001) claim that the audio-lingual method is rooted in structuralism and behaviourism, which are based on the formation of habits through mimicry, memorisation, drills, and reinforcement in language teaching. According to Larsen-Freeman (2000, as cited in Nazary, 2008), the only language to be spoken in the classroom is the target language, and, as argued by Richards and Rodgers (2001), the use of L1 is not approved in the classroom because it is believed that the use of L1 will undermine students' efforts to develop their target language. Accordingly, Richards and Rodgers (1986, as cited in Pablo et al., 2011) claim that both teachers and learners are not supposed to use L1 in the second language learning process, and proponents of the audio-lingual method suggest the maximum practising of the target language. Similarly, Yavuz (2012) states that this method avoids using L1 at any cost since it would lead to the development of poor habits and interfere with the teaching of L2.

Omaggio-Hadley (1993, as cited in Erdoğan, 2015) asserts that although the audio-lingual method drove second language teaching until the late 20th century, discontentment with the memorisation activities among both teachers and learners led to this method losing popularity. Additionally, the emergence of cognitive learning and Chomsky's theory of universal grammar, claiming that people have an innate capacity for language learning, brought the method into question (Cook & Singleton, 2014).

The Silent Way. In the 1960s, the silent way was introduced by Caleb Gattengo with a cognitive-affective perspective. In this method, the teacher remains silent and the responsibility of learning is on the learners. According to Omaggio-Hadley (1993, as cited in Erdoğan, 2015), the target language is the primary communication tool and the teachers stay silent, using neither the target language nor L1, to make learners construct their L2 systems. Moreover, Larsen-Freeman (2000, as cited in Nazary, 2008) states that the L1 is only used while giving instructions in essential situations and for feedback on the learners' pronunciation.

Suggestopedia. In the late 1970s, suggestopedia was developed by Georgio Lozanov. In this method, which takes a humanistic approach, the psychological blocks of students are to be eliminated and the language-learning atmosphere should be conducive to relaxation. In suggestopedia, new information is presented through dialogues that depict everyday language use in the target language in the classroom. Larsen-Freeman (2000, as cited in Nazary, 2008) explains that native language

translation is used to clarify the meaning of these dialogues and L1 is employed when necessary; however, as the course progresses, the teachers minimise the use of L1.

Total Physical Response. The total physical response (TPR) method was introduced by James Asher. The main goal of TPR is to unite linguistic acquisition and motor activity. Larsen-Freeman (2000, as cited in Nazary, 2008) states that although the instruction of the lesson at the beginning is in the students' L1, after the lesson's introduction, the native language is rarely used and meanings are clarified through movements and actions.

Community Language Learning. With community language learning, L1 is inseparably used with L2 in the process of language teaching. As Curran notes, alternation between L1 and L2 exists during the teaching process (1976, as cited in Erdoğan, 2015). Larsen-Freeman (2000, as cited in Nazary, 2008) further explains that students' sense of security is increased by the use of L1 in community language learning, wherein the aim of L1 is to act as a link between the familiar and the unknown. Additionally, directives in the classroom and periods in which students communicate and share their views utilise L1.

The Communicative Approach/Communicative Language Teaching. Tunçay (2014) states that, in the methodological circles of the late 20th century, a broader set of factors collectively referred to as the communicative approach challenged the adherence to the audio-lingual method. According to Pablo et al. (2011), the method that changed the perspective of language teaching from learning about a language to using the language as a communicative tool was communicative language teaching, which started to dominate ELT throughout the world. Larsen-Freeman (2000, as cited in Nazary, 2008) states that the judicious use of the students' L1 is permissible in the communicative approach. In this regard, Richards and Rogers (2001) mention that, when necessary, the L1 equivalents of L2 terms are supplied to clarify meanings and provide learners with some degree of flexibility to construct words in L2 in varied circumstances to produce new expressions. The natural approach is one of the methods employed within the context of the communicative approach (Tunçay, 2014).

Natural Approach. The natural approach was influenced by Krashen's monitor model, which states that L2 needs to be learned naturally; learners need to be exposed to the target language without the use of L1 based on the belief that the use of L1 diminishes the necessary target language input (Richard & Rodgers, 2001). Similar to the direct method, this approach emphasises the need to give the required context in the

classroom by using the target language. Accordingly, in the natural approach, the use of L1 is not deemed necessary for L2 acquisition (Çelik, 2008).

To summarise, the use of L1 in the L2 context has been approached in various ways according to the methods mentioned above, and it has been either banned or minimised over time. As the preceding discussion demonstrates, methods such as the direct method, audio-lingual method, and natural approach strictly forbid the use of L1. However, other methods tolerate different levels of L1 usage, such as using it to deliver instructions in the silent way, explaining dialogue in suggestopedia, promoting learners' comfort in community language learning, and using it reasonably in communicative language learning.

Monolingual Approach, Bilingual Approach, and Balanced Approach

Monolingualism and bilingualism are two paradigms establishing the foundation for L1 learning in language classrooms. Monolingualism is described as the use of only one language (Saville-Troike, 2012), while bilingualism entails using two languages (both L1 and L2) in language learning processes to facilitate the teaching of the target language (Madrinan, 2014). In addition to monolingual and bilingual approaches, a more recent approach called the balanced approach (Nation, 2003) was proposed by some researchers, recognising the effects of L1 while simultaneously enhancing the application of L2 by adjusting that balance to meet the needs and levels of learners. The following sub-sections will examine the monolingual, bilingual, and balanced approaches and associated viewpoints and studies.

Monolingual (English-Only) Approach. Although a definitive consensus has not been reached, the role of L1 in teaching L2 has been a methodological problem debated throughout the history of second language acquisition. According to Hawks (2001, as cited in Erdoğan, 2015), before the 19th century, education in foreign languages traditionally focused on teaching students how to read and write rather than how to communicate verbally; thus, the usage of L1 to learn L2 was widespread and unquestionably acknowledged. However, in the 20th century, the large numbers of people migrating to the USA and the UK resulted in the emergence of multilingual classes, and the trend of using L1 started to be replaced with the use of only L2, which forced instructors to rethink language teaching. Moreover, the British colonial period in the 20th century made English the dominant culture in British colonies, and English was assumed to be superior to all other languages, which led to the idea that English was the only language to be spoken during lectures. In addition, since the teachers of the second

language were generally monolingual, the monolingual teaching of language increased at that time. As a result, monolingual or English-only teaching of language emerged and was strengthened. Philipson (1992, as cited in Auerbach, 1993) argues that great effort was wasted in the 1950s and 1960s in the attempts to spread British neo-colonial control and develop ELT. In 1961, a meeting was conducted at Makere University in Uganda and the Makere Report was subsequently issued. It included five principles that have become pillars of the hegemony of English worldwide and orient the English language teaching world. These five principles are as follows (Phillipson, 1992, as cited in Auerbach, 1993):

1. English is best taught monolingually.

2. The ideal teacher of English is a native speaker.

3. The earlier English is taught, the better the results.

4. The more English is taught, the better the results.

5. If other languages are used too much, the standards of English will drop (p. 4).

These principles were interrelated and vigorously defended in the English-only or monolingual approach. Even though Phillipson (1992, as cited in Auerbach, 1993) labels these tenets as five fallacies, they have widely been regarded as facts and have formed the foundations of the best way to teach a language; their influence is still apparent everywhere English is taught. Consequently, an English-only policy or monolingual approach to language learning was widely respected in ELT and English-only classrooms were favoured worldwide, with L1 usage regarded as something to be avoided and discouraged (Taşkın, 2011). According to Howatt (1984, as cited in Cook, 2001, p. 404), "the monolingual principle, the unique contribution of the twentieth century to classroom language teaching, remains the bedrock notion from which the others ultimately derive". Avoiding L1 was at the heart of many language teaching methodologies in the 20th century. For instance, as mentioned above, the direct and audio-lingual methods were the dominant methodologies, eliminating L1 in language classrooms (Cook, 2001). Furthermore, Philipson (1992, as cited in Auerbach, 1993) asserts that when English teachers use L1, they may feel ashamed, as if they have done something wrong.

According to Cook (2001), the monolingual approach is based on three main arguments, as follows:

1. L2 could only be learned in the same way L1 is learned with constant exposure to the target language. This argument was supported by the hypotheses of comprehensible input and the natural order of acquisition of Krashen (1981, as cited in Lightbown & Spada, 2013), suggesting that children acquire their first language by sole exposure to the target language; thus, adults might also learn L2 in the same manner.

2. It was essential to differentiate and separate L1 and L2 for successful L2 learning. This argument was founded on the premise that the learner's native language and the target language exist in distinct parts of the mind, and thus it was essential to maintain them separately for optimal language acquisition. This argument favoured the contrastive analysis hypothesis (Lado, 1957 as cited in Lightbown & Spada, 2013; Hui, 2010), suggesting that transfer from L1 might negatively influence L2 learning. Therefore, Cook (2001) claims that the proponents of education in only the target language suggested that comparisons of grammar between L1 and L2 and translation needed to be avoided. Instead, vocabulary miming and language modifications would help learners develop a separate system in their minds for the second language.

3. Classroom interaction between the teacher and students was the only source of the target language for many learners; as a result, they needed to be exposed to the target language exclusively for better learning (Krashen, 1982). This argument was the most persuasive of the three arguments on which most studies supporting L2-only policies were based.

Because of the general acceptance of the above arguments, the idea of employing L1 in language classrooms has been abandoned and the importance of the exclusive use of the target language for second language/foreign language learning has been highlighted by many researchers. In this regard, Nazary (2008) claims that monolingual teaching prioritises the target language and emphasises the permanent use of the target language by learners, and a distinction between native and target language might be seen as a sign of success. Additionally, Turnbull (2001) argues that most foreign language environments lack good opportunities for input and interaction and that the teachers are the only source of the target language; as a result, the target language should be the dominant language of instruction. McDonald (1993) supports the position taken by Turnbull (2001) and argues that the only acceptable setting in which learners could be introduced to L2 is the classroom environment; if the teachers prefer L1, learners will have no chance to experience the actual use of L2. Similarly, Ellis (2008, as cited in Almoayidi, 2018) claims that if teachers are willing to use L1 in the classroom, learners

will lose the chance to practise the target language, and the more exposure the students have to L2, the faster they will learn. In this case, Atkinson (1993, as cited in Hanakova & Metruk, 2017, p. 3) claimed, "Every second spent using L1 is a second not spent using English and every second counts!"

Furthermore, other studies, such as those conducted by Littlewood and Yu (2009) and Krashen (1982), demonstrated that in order to gain the most outstanding value, immersion in L2 is required for second language learners. Within this scope, Almoayidi (2018) claims that learning L2 through L2 makes learning more beneficial, fun, and better for learners as they communicate their thoughts in a new language. Harmer (2007) also identifies three drawbacks of using L1 in the classroom. First, children have fewer opportunities to replicate natural language as their exposure to L2 decreases. Second, teachers might struggle to use students' L1 if they do not speak that language themselves, and third, proper communicative speaking activities are insufficient. According to Yphantides (2009), teachers do not simply adhere to an English-only method because of pressure from their institutions; they also believe that excluding L1 will enable their students to acquire L2 more quickly.

On the other hand, the monolingual approach has been met with some criticism. Indeed, support for the English-only orthodoxy has waned in recent years, with some educators in second language pedagogy, such as Auerbach (1993), Cook (2001), Macaro (2001), and Nation (2003), advocating for a more bilingual and balanced approach to language instruction. The following sub-section will discuss bilingual and balanced approaches and how the position of L1 is argued in language classrooms.

The Bilingual (Code-Switching) Approach. Although some academics and linguists supported the monolingual method, it encountered significant criticism and opposition for many reasons, which has validated the use of the bilingual approach in ELT. Pachler and Field (2013) argue that no empirical evidence supports the claim that teaching in a single language is beneficial. On the other hand, Namaghi and Norouzi (2015) claim that L1 as a facilitative tool for target language teaching and learning is supported theoretically and empirically.

Miles (2004) supports the bilingual approach's employment and criticises the monolingual approach on three points: "1. It is impractical. 2. Native teachers are not necessarily the best teachers. 3. Exposure alone is not sufficient for learning" (p. 12). In other words, Miles (2004) asserts that the monolingual approach is not practical because native teachers' English may sometimes be inadequate or not very good; as a

consequence, enforcing an English-only rule could reduce instructional quality. In support of this claim, according to Phillipson (1992, as stated in Auerbach, 1993), there is no scientific evidence to support the idea that a native teacher is a perfect teacher, and Phillipson claims that non-native teachers are superior to native teachers in terms of language teaching because they previously learned the target language themselves and could foresee potential problems. Hence, they have a better understanding of learners' expectations. Philipson (1992, as cited in Auerbach, 1993) furthermore argues that exposure to the target language alone does not ensure language learning because the process of input becoming output seems to be influenced by several factors, such as materials, methodologies, interactions, and teachers.

Additionally, researchers such as Cook (2001), Macaro (2005), Auerbach (1993), and Butzkamm (2003) have adopted a pedagogical and scaffolding approach to this issue. They criticise the idea that English needs to be taught in English by asserting that the use of L1 helps learners in linguistic, cognitive, social, and affective ways. Swan (1985, as cited in Yavuz, 2012) asserts that when students learn a new language, they frequently seek to grasp new L2 structures by comparing them to corresponding L1 structures. This, they argue, is a perfectly reasonable justification for using L1 references. In this respect, Anton and DiCemella (1998, as cited in Solhi & Büyükyazı, 2011) claim that the use of L1 in the L2 classroom supports learners cognitively and helps them interpret and evaluate the language to a higher degree. According to Harper and Jong (2004), L1 may be a handy tool when teaching older students as they already have a linguistic and cognitive system, and ignorance of that source would be a mistake.

Additionally, Cook (2001) points out that switching between language systems is an inevitable element of dialogue in a setting with speakers of multiple languages; thus, treating L1 as a resource rather than a handicap could open new doors for teachers and students if used prudently. Atkinson (1987), Harbord (1992), and Scrivener (2005) support that view and claim that if L1 is used appropriately, it could affect L2 learning positively (as cited in Hanakova & Metruk, 2017). Atkinson (1987, as cited in Kocoğlu & Gaba, 2015) also notes that the issue of L1 usage in L2 classrooms had been neglected, and it had never received the consideration it required. He suggests that exercises involving translation might be beneficial in assisting adult learners in developing fluency. Furthermore, Namaghi and Norouzi (2015) claim that both the theoretical viewpoints and the empirical studies relevant to the use of L1 in language

education explicitly demonstrate that in some instances, in spite of the prejudiced disapproval of the use of L1, it might be a powerful tool that fulfils a multitude of roles to help teachers improve the target language skills of language learners.

Pachler and Field (2013) also state that an English-only rule might create stress and barriers between students and teachers, and there are various circumstances in which it is neither appropriate nor feasible. Additionally, Mahmutoğlu and Kıcır (2013) state that "English-only classrooms" could be detrimental in terms of student-teacher interactions (p. 51). In support of this, Harmer (2007) argue that using L1 facilitated essential interaction between teachers and students, allowing for discussion about learning and improving the classroom's social climate. Meyer (2008) suggests that L1 should be used when necessary to reduce the amount of anxiety. Similarly, Burden (2000, as cited in Hanakova & Metruk, 2017) states that if it is aimed to use more L2 in the classroom and not give simple explanations in L1, it might negatively influence students and cause frustration for them. In the same scope, Scott and Fuente (2008) argue that using the target language exclusively has a negative effect on learners because it imposes a high cognitive load, restricting their involvement in collaborative tasks. In addition, they claim that prohibiting the use of the first language makes the languages compete and hence causes "frustration and cognitive strain" (p. 110).

It can be inferred that if students are only exposed to L2 during the teaching process, it may cause incomprehension and resentment.

On the other hand, Auerbach (1993) criticises English-only policies from a political viewpoint. She asserts that the English-only premise is a matter of power and needs to be reconsidered in light of the political rather than pedagogical factors that determined this policy. She emphasises that practices grounded pedagogically had their origins in ideological tendencies, which she claims perfectly illustrate Fairclough's idea of the hidden control of ideology. In addition, Auerbach (1993) rejects the monolingual approach to ESL because it might impede English acquisition and restrict students' skills to use their linguistic resources and abilities. She also notes that:

Focusing only on infantile uses of language and ignoring the possibility of critical reflection could help keep inequalities going outside the classroom, creating a group of people who can only do the least skilled and least language/literacy-based jobs (p. 10).

Moreover, Auerbach (1993) argues that with L1, a safe classroom environment is created while teaching the target language, and Wood et al. (1976) propose that L1 helps learners throughout the learning process and the completion of assignments.

However, the views supporting the usage of L1 in ELT classrooms should not be considered as arguing that the target language needs to be minimised in ELT classrooms; instead, L1 should be used as a facilitating tool to maximise the teaching of the target language (Cook, 2001; Macaro, 2005).

As seen from the above discussions, both the monolingual approach and the bilingual approach have significant educational, social, and psychological grounds.

Balanced Approach. Nation (2003) is among the authors who have attempted to find a solution to the arguments about the use of L1. He suggests a third approach called the "balanced" approach, in contrast to both the monolingual and bilingual approaches. He believes that a balanced approach is required, acknowledging the usefulness of L1 and highlighting the critical importance of L2 use in the classroom. He also suggests that teachers must demonstrate respect for learners' native languages and refrain from doing anything that makes L1 appear inferior to English.

Similarly, Hanakova and Metruk (2017) also suggest a balanced approach that both recognises the effects of L1 and enhances the application of L2 simultaneously:

It seems likely that a balanced approach that carefully uses L1 to help and improve

the learning and absorption of L2 could be the answer to this problem. This balance

could be changed to fit the needs and levels of each learner (p. 1).

That is, there should be no overemphasis on L1. L1 needs to be used to increase the learners' awareness of the similarities and disparities between L1 and L2. By using and choosing manageable and teachable tasks for learners, teachers' overuse of L1 can be prevented. In this respect, Solhi and Büyükyazı (2011) and Yavuz (2012) assert that judicious use of L1 in ELT classrooms could facilitate teaching and learning processes. In addition, Zülfikar (2018) claims that appropriate and comprehensive use of L1 in the classroom could be fruitful for teaching a foreign language.

In terms of using L1 in the classroom in a balanced way, Harmer (2001, as cited in Hanakova & Metruk, 2017, p. 4) proposes some points that must be given importance: "students' level, previous experience, the stage of course, and the stage of the lesson". For instance, he asserts that if L1 is used during a reading activity to comprehend the target language, it is beneficial; however, it is futile to use it during a fluency exercise.

Moreover, he claims that learners generally use their L1 in the language learning process; as a result, it is of no use to prohibit L1 in the classroom. By the same token, Connick-Hirtz (2001, as cited in Nazary, 2008) offers the following criteria for teachers to consider when deciding to employ L1 for L2 instruction:

What is the learner's first language?

What is the learner's age?

Are we teaching beginners or advanced levels?

What is the ratio of students/teaching time per class?

How long is the learner going to study the second language?

What are his/her learning purposes?

Is it one nationality or a mixed nationality group?

What is the institution's pedagogical policy?

What kind of educational background does the learner have?

In what kind of social context is the teaching of L2 taking place? (p. 139)

Willis (1991) is also among the researchers trying to find a solution to the debated issue of L1 use in ELT classrooms and assist teachers in using L1 appropriately and systematically. She offers some methods that involve "using gestures, tone of voice, using simple language, repeating, paraphrasing, providing many examples and using visual aids, allowing learners time for independent thought, and developing routines for diverse activities, and demonstration to help students understand instructions better" (as cited in Hanakova &, Metruk 2017, p. 4). These strategies are believed to reduce the reliance on L1 usage and thus maximise L2 in the language classroom in a balanced way.

As understood from the above discussion, considering the views of scholars on this issue, it can be said that no specific consensus exists regarding the right or wrong use of L1.

Suggested Uses of L1 in EFL/ESL Classes

Apart from highlighting the benefits of L1 usage, some attempts have been made to define the precise circumstances in which the mother tongue should be utilised or avoided. In this respect, Dendrinos (2006) notes that L1 might be employed to evaluate

the teaching and learning processes, develop L2 fluency, introduce new terms, or convey usage norms to facilitate the learning process. Similarly, Cook (2001) asserts that instructors need to utilise the mother tongue to communicate meaning and manage the classroom. Moreover, Harbord (1992) proposes three reasons for using L1 in the classroom: "facilitating communication, promoting teacher-student relationships, and facilitating L2 learning" (p. 352). According to Harbord (1992), the primary rationale for adopting L1 in the classroom is to reduce time and confusion.

Additionally, Collingham (1988, as cited in Auerbach, 1993) agree with the uses listed by Harbord (1992) and add that L1 could be used while teaching vocabulary, explaining grammar and functions, lowering L2 production inhibitions or emotional blockages, and finding appropriate words and phrases to use in various contexts. Atkinson (1987, as cited in Yavuz, 2012), regarded as one of the pioneers of the use of L1 in L2 classes, elaborates further and suggests a list of appropriate uses for incorporating L1 into EFL classes (p. 4342).

Table 1

Suggested Uses for L1 in the EFL Classroom by Atkinson (1987)

---

1. **Eliciting Language**
"How do you say `X' in English?"
2. **Checking comprehension**
"How do you say `I have been waiting for ten minutes in Spanish?" (Also used for comprehension of a reading or listening text.)
3. **Giving complex instructions to basic levels**
4. **Co-operating in groups**
Learners compare and correct answers to exercises or tasks in the L1. Students, at times, can explain new points better than the teacher.
5. **Explaining classroom methodology at basic levels**
6. **Using translation to highlight a recently taught language item**
7. **Checking for sense**
If students write or say something in the L2 that does not make sense, have them try to translate it into the L1 to realise their error.
8. **Testing**
Translation items can be helpful in testing mastery of forms and meanings.
9. **Developing circumlocution strategies**
When students do not know how to say something in the L2, have them think of different ways to say the same thing in the L1, which may be easier to translate.

Prodromou (2002) concludes that L1 is utilised for various purposes, including assessing comprehension, clarifying complicated concepts, mistake analysis, building confidence, and justifying language acquisition efforts. The use of L1 has been the subject of numerous investigations in EFL/ESL settings. The next section will present some studies on L1 usage in EFL/ESL classes.

Studies on the Use of L1 in Foreign/Second Language Classrooms

This section highlights some significant studies performed in Turkey and in other countries relevant to EFL/ESL teachers' L1 usage, L1 functions, and teachers' opinions on L1 use in language teaching.

A review of the literature offers insightful information about the functions of L1 in ESL/EFL classrooms, suggesting that teachers employ L1 for a variety of purposes, including defining abstract words, giving instructions, clarifying grammatical rules, managing time effectively, explaining complex subjects, avoiding fossilisation, discussing disciplinary issues, and lowering students' anxiety levels (Solhi & Büyükyaz, 2011; Sali, 2011; Taşkın, 2011; Mart, 2013; Tunçay, 2014; Timuçin & Baytar, 2015).

Nzwanga (2000) conducted a study in the setting of an intermediate college French course investigating L1 use by three teachers and their students. According to this study, although the teachers had negative attitudes regarding the use of L1 in language classes and they avoided L1, especially during communicative activities, code-switching in English (L1) was utilised to improve students' reflections, pursue both discoveries and rote learning, overcome communication gaps, translate, and explain specific points. It was concluded that "the use of L1 was inevitable both as a communication and instructional tool in language classrooms" (p. 109).

Similarly, Thompson (2006) analysed sixteen Spanish teachers' circumstances while using L1 to understand the teachers' perceptions and examine their conversations. He concluded in that study that the level of instruction could affect the extent and kind of L1 usage in that, at the beginner level, L1 was primarily utilised for grammatical instruction, whereas at the advanced level, L1 was initially employed for new vocabulary translation.

Likewise, Greggio and Gil (2007) conducted a qualitative study to analyse the use of English and Portuguese in an EFL classroom for beginners and pre-intermediate students. By observing 12 lessons, it was found that code-switching promoted interactions between learners and teachers, thus facilitating foreign language learning.

Additionally, it was discovered that teachers frequently switched to L1 while teaching grammar, providing directions, supervising and assisting learners, and making adjustments to tasks.

Furthermore, Grim (2010) conducted a study with 11 French high school and college teachers. The teachers were observed for 15 hours. The aim was to discover the roles of L1 in the speeches of teachers and to determine whether there were any differences between the ways in which teachers in high schools and colleges employed L1 in their lessons. It was concluded in this study that the teachers employed L1 for metalinguistic explanations, controlling the classroom, evoking sympathy, fostering a sense of community, and clarifying instructions with translation.

Sali (2014) conducted a study to investigate teachers' viewpoints on L1 use and the functions for which L1 was used. The research took place in three Turkish EFL classrooms at a state secondary school in Turkey. Fifteen lessons were audio-recorded and semi-structured interviews were conducted to gather data. It was discovered that L1 was used to convey the lesson's subject, regulate classroom dynamics, and develop rapport among students. Additionally, it was observed that numerous linked factors influenced teachers' decisions on the time and reasons for employing L1. In a related study, Şenel (2010) found that teachers regularly used L1 to clarify the meaning of difficult language items, measure comprehension, and explain new vocabulary meanings.

Other studies have examined the attitudes of teachers regarding the use of L1 in language classrooms. Song (2009, as cited in Koçoğlu & Gaba, 2015) conducted a study with teachers in an institution of education regarding their attitudes about L1 in L2 classrooms and found that the teachers had varying perspectives shaped by their own experiences and teaching philosophies. Teachers' views varied from neutral to adverse and favourable.

In a similar vein, Schweers (1999) conducted a study among Spanish speakers in classrooms in Puerto Rico. He found that learners favoured using L1 because, with L1, they felt more comfortable and less confused while learning English. Schweers also discovered that the teacher who was the most experienced used L1 most in the language teaching process.

Recently, Şahin and Şahin (2019) studied EFL teachers' opinions on the usage of L1 in EFL classes in the Turkish province of Malatya. Thirty-four teachers from state and private schools participated in the study. Semi-structured interviews were used for

collecting data. The researchers discovered that most instructors thought that L1 needed to be utilised in foreign language classrooms. Nearly half of the teachers stated that the mother tongue needed to be used, mainly while teaching grammatical principles, but that it should not be used in speaking and listening exercises. Only a few participants rejected the use of L1, even when the students could not comprehend anything.

Similarly, Kayaoğlu (2012) carried out a study with 44 instructors in a university in Turkey and reported the teachers' positive attitudes regarding the use of Turkish, and he supported the informative and pedagogical role of L1. He also added that Turkish could be applied in teaching grammar; however, it should be excluded from work on speaking and listening skills.

Tunçay (2014) conducted a study on teachers' attitudes and practices regarding L1 use in EFL classrooms in a university in Eskişehir, Turkey. One hundred twenty teachers participated. This quantitative study indicated that the teachers generally had unfavourable opinions about the use of L1, particularly as a communication tool; nevertheless, teachers did not think that L1 had a detrimental influence on L2 acquisition and they favoured it as a methodological tool. In general, they thought they should engage in as much L2 interaction as possible with learners.

Acar (2020) conducted a recent study to investigate the opinions of four ELT instructors working at various private institutions on using their mother tongue in L2 classrooms. Semi-structured interviews were used in this study. The findings indicated that EFL teachers possessed favourable opinions of utilising their mother tongue when it was limited and intentional. Furthermore, English-only policies were found to have a detrimental influence on teachers. In other words, even if the usage of L1 in the L2 classroom was permitted, EFL teachers experienced guilt.

Several studies indicated that utilising L1 might reduce students' anxiety and provide emotional support. Levine (2003) discovered a high negative association when he used an anonymous survey administered over the internet to analyse the connection between target language use and students' anxiety. Scott and Fuente (2008) carried out a study with intermediate students and concluded that the students who were permitted to interact and co-operate in their L1 performed better than the students who used the target language to complete grammar tasks. Moreover, Scott and Fuente (2008) suggested in this study that when L1 was used as a learning tool, it could help students perform better and reduce their cognitive load.

Similarly, Yavuz (2012) conducted a study with 12 English teachers at 12 different primary schools in Balıkesir, Turkey, asking about their attitudes regarding the use of L1 in teaching L2. This study concluded that EFL teachers emphasised the importance of using L1 in structural instruction, and when it came to communicative instruction, they preferred to use English in general. Additionally, it was demonstrated that using L1 prior to teaching helped students and teachers overcome psychological blocks and created a low-stress learning environment.

On the other hand, several studies concluded that the use of L2 in the classroom assists learners in the language acquisition process. In their studies, Voicu (2012) and McDonald (1993) argued that teachers and learners generally preferred to use L1 when encountering a problem in the classroom, which might create a habit for them and inhibit the students' progress in language learning. Additionally, Wong (2010) conducted a study with learners of English in Hong Kong and found that they favoured an English-only approach in the classroom, which also contributed to their acquisition of English. Similarly, Kharma and Hajjaj (1989, as cited in Almoayidi, 2018) conducted a study with Arabic learners and concluded that L1 needed to be avoided in the classroom as it contradicted the aim of L2 learning, which is acquiring L2 competence. Thus, if L1 were used in the classroom, it would prevent learners from acquiring that competence.

This chapter has introduced the present study by outlining its background, presenting the problem and objective, and providing a description of its significance. Additionally, the relevant literature regarding L1 usage in language teaching methods has been reviewed. The monolingual approach, bilingual approach, and balanced approach have been discussed with their justifications. Suggested uses of L1 in EFL/ESL classes and several studies on the use of L1 conducted both globally and in Turkey, addressing L1 functions and teachers' opinions on L1 use in language classes, have also been explored. In the next chapter, the research methodology is presented in detail.

2. METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides detailed methodological information on the design, setting, participants, data collection instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis of this study.

2.1. Research Design of the Study

The current study was planned to investigate EFL teachers' views on the use of L1 in ELT classrooms. It focused on the perspectives of EFL teachers on the use of L1 in general, as well as their views on students' language learning processes and affective dimensions of language learning. Moreover, the viewpoints of teachers on the use of L1 were compared considering the three variables of years of teaching experience, educational degrees, and departments from which they graduated in order to evaluate whether there was any difference in their perspectives on the use of L1. Additionally, it was aimed to ascertain EFL teachers' preferred practices for the usage of L1 in ELT classrooms.

This descriptive study employed a mixed-methods research design to allow for a breadth of information to explore the topic in-depth and enhance the richness of the research findings. Mixed-methods research utilises a form of design in which the researcher integrates quantitative and qualitative research methodologies into a single study in order to achieve breadth and depth of insight and confirmation (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Utilising multiple data collection methods together also increases the validity and acceptability of the data, and it mitigates the potential drawbacks of relying on only questionnaires or interviews for data collection (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Therefore, in this research, quantitative and qualitative data gathering techniques were coherently employed to supplement the findings of both approaches.

2.2. Research Setting and Participants

This study was conducted in state schools in Siirt, a city in the southeast of Turkey. Siirt is a multilingual city where people speak Turkish, Kurdish, and Arabic. In state schools in all of Turkey and consequently in Siirt, Turkish is the official language and the language of education. On the other hand, English is taught as a foreign language

(EFL) and it is incorporated into the school curriculum, being an obligatory course at all levels of education (Kırkgöz, 2007). Instruction in English begins in the second year of primary school and continues through secondary and high school, with the duration and number of hours varying according to the curriculum depending on the students' grade levels (Eraslan, 2018). According to Ayaz et al. (2019), the English language curriculum is designed by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) for primary, secondary, and high schools based on the principles of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), aiming to provide students with communicative abilities, language ability, and autonomy. The MoNE creates and disseminates educational materials, including curricula and textbooks, for state schools. The books are distributed to students free of charge each year. Four main skills and forms of language are integrated within the textbooks (Ayaz et al., 2019). Graduates from different departments of universities can work as English teachers at state schools. Among these departments, the objective of English language teaching departments is to educate student teachers with the language teaching skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary for teaching English. Education in this department takes four years, during which teacher candidates are provided with content/field knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and general knowledge regarding teaching the language to students of all ages in primary, secondary, and high schools (Karakaş, 2012). After graduation, these teacher candidates can work as EFL teachers in state schools after passing the examination for public personnel selection (KPSS: *Kamu Personeli Seçme Sınavı*). Apart from the English language teaching department, graduates of other departments such as English language and literature, American culture and literature, English linguistics, and translation and interpretation may also work in state schools as English teachers. However, they need to obtain a pedagogic formation certificate since the curricula of those departments have different objectives and do not include courses in teacher education (Öztürk & Aydın, 2019). As a result, the graduates of these departments study for one additional year in a pedagogical formation certificate program (İbrahimoğlu, 2018) and, later on, if they pass the KPSS, they can work in state schools.

This study was planned to determine the views of EFL teachers in ELT classes; as a result, to select the participants, a non-random approach with a purposive sampling procedure was applied. According to Creswell (2009), purposive sampling is one of the most time and cost-efficient methods. The reason for using purposive sampling is that

the views of English teachers working at state schools were sought. Therefore, English teachers working at state schools were the participants of the study. Additionally, as the researcher herself was working at a state school in Siirt, the participants of this study were specifically English teachers working in Siirt's state schools to ensure accessibility. A total of 174 English teachers working at state primary, secondary, and high schools in Siirt participated in the study. The participants varied based on their years of experience, the departments they graduated from, and their educational degrees. While 87 (50.0%) of the participants had 0-5 years of teaching experience, 55 (31.6%) of the participants had 6-10 years of experience and 32 (18.4%) had 11 or more years of teaching experience. While 119 (68.4%) of the participants were graduates of English language teaching departments, 55 (31.6%) of the participants were graduates of other departments including English language and literature, English linguistics, American culture and literature, and translation and interpretation. Moreover, 153 participants (87.9%) had a BA degree while 21 (11.1%) had an MA or PhD degree. Table 2 summarises the demographic information of the participants.

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Variables		*N*	*%*
	0-5 years	87	50.0
Teaching Experience	6-10 years	55	31.6
	11 + years	32	18.4
	1. English Language Teaching	119	68.4
Department Graduated	2. English Language and Literature + American Culture and Literature + English Linguistics + Translation and Interpretation	55	31.6
	BA (Bachelor's)	153	87.9
Education Level	MA (Master's)+ PhD (Doctorate)	21	11.1

For the interviews, a convenience sampling model was applied while selecting participants. According to Dörnyei (2019), convenience sampling is a type of non-random sampling in which members of the target group possess specific practical criteria, such as being easily accessible, being located close to the study site, being

available at a specific time, or being willing to take part in the study. Individuals who completed the questionnaire were asked whether they would be willing to take part in an interview. Twenty teachers agreed and were interviewed to gather qualitative data. All of the teachers interviewed for the study were non-native English teachers teaching English as a foreign language with different years of teaching experience, educational degrees, and departments. Seven of these teachers had teaching experience ranging from 0 to 5 years, 11 teachers had experience from 6 to 10 years, and two teachers had experience from 11 to 15 years. They had a variety of educational backgrounds, ranging from bachelor's to master's degrees. Thirteen teachers had a bachelor's degree while seven teachers had a master's degree. Furthermore, 15 teachers had graduated from an English language teaching program, three from English language and literature, one from translation and interpretation, and one from English linguistics.

2.3. Data Collection Procedure of the Study

This descriptive study was conducted with state school English teachers in the Siirt province of Turkey to identify their views on the use of L1 in ELT classrooms. The data collection process was initiated after ethical approval was received, first from the ethics committee of Çağ University (see Appendix A) and later from the Siirt Provincial Directorate of National Education (see Appendix C). Following the granting of all necessary permissions, the online format of the questionnaire was prepared with a web-based tool, Google Forms, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, for which the government had implemented periodic nationwide curfews. In the questionnaire, the participants were informed about the purpose of the study and they were told that the confidentiality of their replies would be maintained and replies would only be used for this study. The link to the questionnaire was shared with English teachers working at state schools in Siirt via messaging apps WhatsApp and Telegram by the researcher and the Siirt Provincial Directorate of National Education between 22 January and 3 February during the 2020-2021 academic year. A total of 174 English teachers completed the questionnaire. After data collection, comprehensive analysis was conducted.

After the analysis of the questionnaires, 20 English teachers were interviewed. Before the interviews, for ethical reasons, the consent form prepared by the researcher (see Appendix F) was sent to the teachers and they were informed again about the aim

of the study and the intended use of the data. The participants were assigned codes such as P1 (participant 1) and P2 (participant 2) to protect their anonymity and confidentiality. Due to the continuing spread of the COVID-19 pandemic worldwide, the interviews were done online using the Zoom platform. The interviews were intended to be conducted in English; however, at the request of some participating teachers, both Turkish and English were used to allow the teachers to feel more comfortable and express themselves better. All interviews were recorded and transcribed in order to move forward with the data analysis procedure. The following sections present details about the questionnaire and interviews.

2.4. Data Collection Instruments

2.4.1. Questionnaire

As mentioned above, the quantitative data for this study were collected via a questionnaire. The questionnaire was used to enable easy access to a large population and facilitate data collection (Balnaves & Caputi, 2001). For the present study, teachers were given the questionnaire developed by Tunçay (2014) with a Cronbach alpha value of 0.80. They were asked to share their views and experiences about the use of L1 in ELT classrooms. The original questionnaire consisted of two parts. For the current study, the researcher also added a section for background information to the beginning of the questionnaire to obtain demographic information about the participants. The first part of the questionnaire includes 19 items in the form of a Likert-type scale. The aim of this part is to collect data on general attitudes regarding the use of L1 in EFL classrooms. These questions were classified into three categories by Tunçay (2014):

1. Teachers' attitudes towards the use of L1 in general (items 1, 7, 12, 15)

2. Teachers' attitudes towards the learners' progress (items 2, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19)

3. Teachers' attitudes related to humanistic needs (items 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 18)

In this part of the questionnaire, participants were asked to share their thoughts on the use of L1 in ELT classrooms by selecting the most appropriate responses on a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree".

The second part of the questionnaire has a checkmark format and contains 15 items about teachers' practices in the use of L1 in the classroom. The participating teachers were asked to mark the statements that best reflected their use of L1 in the classroom (see Appendix D).

2.4.2. Interviews

Following the analysis of the data acquired with the questionnaire, semi-structured interviews were used to acquire qualitative data for this study. According to Croker and Heigham (2009), semi-structured interviews enable researchers to explore participants' experiences and perspectives in various ways and enable researchers to be flexible in examining certain elements in greater depth. By the same token, Creswell (2009) asserts that conducting interviews is a technique that establishes a connection between participants and researchers, which encourages the researcher to take a close and active look at the participants' reactions and suggestions.

For the present study, seven open-ended questions (see Appendix E) were prepared by the researcher for the semi-structured interviews. The interview questions were reviewed by the thesis supervisor and three English teachers with master's degrees to ensure validity and obtain expert opinions. During the interviews, prompting questions were also posed to the participants in order to obtain detailed information about the teachers' views on the use of Turkish in ELT classrooms and to further clarify some points that arose from the questionnaire's findings. In addition, the responses to interview questions were utilised to triangulate the data obtained from the questionnaires.

2.5. Data Analysis

In this study, both qualitative and quantitative data were gathered and analysed. The quantitative data were analysed using SPSS for Windows. Before beginning the questionnaire analysis, the items were checked to ensure whether they were reliable. The relevant Cronbach alpha values are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Reliability Analysis of the Scales Used in This Study

Scale	Number of Items	N	Cronbach's Alpha
Attitudes	19	174	.797
Practices	15	174	.759

Depending on the alpha (α) coefficient obtained by performing reliability analysis, the reliability of a scale is evaluated as follows (Kalaycı, 2018):

If $0.00 \leq \alpha < 0.40$, the scale is not reliable;

If $0.40 \leq \alpha < 0.60$, the reliability of the scale is low;

If $0.60 \leq \alpha < 0.80$, it is quite reliable;

If $0.80 \leq \alpha < 1.00$, it is a highly reliable scale (p. 405).

When the results of the reliability analysis were examined, the Cronbach alpha value for the 19-item Likert-type scale was seen to reflect reliability at the level of 0.797. Additionally, the Cronbach alpha value of the second section consisting of 15 statements was seen to be quite reliable at the level of 0.759, which indicated that the items in the questionnaire could be trusted to provide accurate information.

The normal distribution of the data was also evaluated before any statistical analysis was performed to answer the research questions. Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) and George and Mallery (2010) argue that kurtosis and skewness values provide more accurate results than other normality tests like the Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Shapiro-Wilk tests in investigations using Likert-type scales. Data are considered to have a normal distribution if their values for kurtosis and skewness fall within the range of -2.0 to +2.0. In this context, parametric tests were utilised for statistical analysis. The kurtosis and skewness values of the data from each subscale of the questionnaire are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for the Scales and Subscales Used in This Study

Scales / Subscales	N	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Teachers' Attitudes towards the Use of L1 in General	174	2.68	.41	.223	.664
Attitudes about the Learners' Language Learning Process	174	2.50	.37	-.124	.455
Attitudes Related to Affective Dimensions of Language Learning	174	2.61	.37	.028	1.143

As seen in Table 4, the skewness and kurtosis values were between -2.0 and +2.0, while the mean scores of the subscales ranged from 2.50 to 2.68. Consequently, parametric tests were used for statistical analysis in this study.

Frequencies and percentages for the participants' years of teaching experience, the departments they graduated from, and their educational degrees were calculated as demographic information. The first main part of the questionnaire was a Likert-type scale, with items assessed with values ranging from 1 to 4. Statements were ranked as follows: strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, agree = 3, strongly agree = 4. During the analysis of this section, since seven items (1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 16, 17) had meanings that were in an opposite order compared to the rest of the questionnaire, they were reverse-coded using SPSS before being analysed quantitatively. In addition to analysing each item in the first section individually, the items were categorically compared based on the variables of the teachers' years of experience, the departments they graduated from, and their educational degrees. Thus, t-tests and one-way ANOVA were used to determine significant differences by looking at the p-values of the results. The results were compared at the 0.05 level of significance. The second part of the questionnaire was in checkmark format. There were 15 statements about the teachers' practices for L1 usage in the classroom. Teachers ticked the statements that reflected when they preferred to use L1. A numeric value was assigned to enter the data in SPSS: no = 0, yes = 1. The collected data were tabulated as percentages, and each statement's percentage and its corresponding group's percentage were determined and presented individually.

Qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews. As described above, the participants' answers to each interview question were recorded and transcribed verbatim. The transcribed interview data were analysed qualitatively via content analysis. That is, the textual data were first read thoroughly several times, which helped see the findings holistically and organise them properly. Later, each participant's answers to all questions were read and coded. Finally, all codes were categorised within four themes to interpret and report the findings. The findings were reported in line with the themes and supported by relevant excerpts from the participants' responses.

After the researcher conducted the first round of data analysis, another researcher analysed a subset of the interview data to establish inter-rater reliability. Furthermore, the supervisor of the study validated a random sample of the data. After a specified

amount of time had elapsed since the initial analysis, intra-rater reliability was established by re-examining all interview data.

This chapter has presented descriptive information pertaining to the design and context of the study, the participants, the data collection instruments, the procedures for collecting the data, and the data analysis. The findings obtained from the questionnaires and interviews are presented in the next chapter.

3. FINDINGS

This chapter presents the results of the analyses of the data obtained from the questionnaire administered to 174 English teachers and in-depth semi-structured interviews conducted with 20 English teachers working at state schools in Siirt. The analyses were performed for both quantitative data and qualitative data, and they were used to answer the following research questions:

1. What are EFL teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 in ELT classrooms?
2. What are EFL teachers' attitudes regarding the contribution of the use of L1 to students' language learning processes?
3. What are EFL teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 in terms of the affective dimensions of language learning?
4. What variables affect EFL teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 in ELT classrooms?
   a) Does the length of teaching experience affect the teachers' L1 use in the classroom?
   b) Do the departments from which the teachers graduated affect their L1 use in the classroom?
   c) Do the educational degrees of teachers affect their use of L1 in the classroom?
5. What are the teachers' preferred practices regarding the use of L1 in ELT classrooms?

Findings from the Analysis of the Questionnaire

As previously stated, the quantitative data from the completed questionnaires were statistically analysed using SPSS. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to reveal the findings on the attitudes of English teachers regarding the usage of L1.

Analyses of the 19-item Likert-type scale section of the questionnaire were conducted using descriptive statistics such as the percentages, means, and standard deviations of teachers' responses to each item, as presented in Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7. To make the findings more meaningful, while reporting them, the percentages of "strongly disagree" and "disagree" were combined and interpreted in one category as "disagree". In the same vein, the percentages of "agree" and "strongly agree" were

combined and evaluated as "agree". Furthermore, in order to maintain the flow of the reporting, items were classified by common themes while reporting the findings.

Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Use of L1 in General

In the first part of the questionnaire, items 1, 7, 12, and 15 were intended to elicit teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 in general (see Table 5).

Table 5

Teachers' Attitudes Regarding the Use of L1 in General

Items	N	M	SD	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %
1. Teachers should only use the target language in their classrooms.	174	2.42	.73	9.8	42.5	43.1	4.6
7. Comparing English with Turkish causes confusion among the students.	174	2.52	.80	11.5	32.8	47.7	8.0
12. Using only English is challenging for the students.	174	2.90	.65	3.4	16.7	66.1	13.8
15. If the teachers use Turkish in the classroom, students have doubts about the teachers' English proficiency.	174	2.90	.71	1.7	25.3	54.0	19.0

Note. N= Number of participants, 1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Agree, 4= Strongly Agree

As seen in Table 5, items 1 and 12 asked about teachers' views on the use of only the target language (English) in the classroom. The percentages of the responses to item 1 indicated that 47.7% of the teachers agreed that teachers should use only English, while 52.3% of the teachers disagreed with the statement. This finding showed that participants were basically divided on whether teachers should use only the target language in the classroom, which meant they were uncertain about the matter. As for item 12, the majority of the teachers (79.9%) agreed that "using only English in the classroom is challenging for the students" with a mean value of M = 2.90, which meant that teachers' perspectives on this issue were more firm as the majority of them found the use of only English difficult for the students.

After analysing the responses to item 7, which was about comparisons between English and Turkish, it was seen that 44.3% of the teachers disagreed that comparing English with Turkish caused confusion among students, while 55.7% of the teachers

agreed with this statement. In other words, more than half of the teachers were of the opinion that students were confused by comparisons between Turkish and English.

Participants were asked if they thought teachers' use of Turkish in the classroom would cause students to question teachers' English proficiency in item 15. The responses to this item indicated that 73.0% of the participants agreed with this statement, with a mean score of M = 2.90, which meant that most of the participants were in agreement with the idea that if teachers used Turkish in the classroom, students' confidence in teachers' ability to communicate in English could be lowered.

Teachers' Attitudes Regarding the Use of L1 in Terms of Its Contribution to Learners' Language Learning Processes

In the first part of the questionnaire, items 2, 9, 10, 16, 17, and 19 were included to obtain teachers' views on the usage of L1 in terms of its impact on students' language learning processes (see Table 6).

Table 6

Attitudes Regarding the Contributions to Learners' Language Learning Processes

Items	N	M	SD	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %
2. Switching to Turkish in their classroom has negative effects on the progress of the learner language.	174	2.58	.67	5.7	34.5	55.2	4.6
9. Being exclusively exposed to English input does not guarantee their acquisition.	174	2.47	.70	6.9	43.7	44.3	5.2
10. Learners' native language should be treated as a resource.	174	2.80	.61	2.9	21.8	67.2	8.0
16. If teachers use Turkish and English for giving instructions, students will wait for the Turkish translation, and they will not pay attention to English.	174	2.22	.70	14.9	48.3	35.6	1.1
17. Using only English helps students learn the language faster.	174	2.23	.72	15.5	47.1	35.6	1.7
19. Comparing English with Turkish facilitates language acquisition.	174	2.71	.65	.6	37.4	51.7	10.3

Note. N= number of participants 1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Agree, 4= Strongly Agree

The descriptive analysis of the items related to teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 in terms of contributions to students' language learning processes is shown in Table 6. Items 9 and 17 were concerned with the impact of exclusive exposure to and use of English on language learning. For item 9, 49.5% of the teachers agreed that the acquisition of English is not assured by exclusive exposure to English input; however, 50.5% of the teachers disagreed with that statement. These results showed a division of opinion among the teachers in that they were uncertain about whether or not exclusive exposure to English ensured students' success in learning English. Regarding whether using only English allows students to acquire the language more quickly, the responses to item 17 indicated that 62.6% of the teachers disagreed. In other words, a considerable number of teachers were in agreement that restricting instruction to only English was not an effective method for helping students learn the language faster.

Items 2, 10, 16, and 19 investigated teachers' perspectives on the usage of Turkish regarding its impacts on students' language learning processes. For item 2, more than half (59.8%) of the participants were in agreement that switching to Turkish negatively affected the learner's language. On the other hand, in their responses to items 10, 16, and 19, a considerable number of participants seemed more positive about using Turkish in the classroom. That is, the responses to item 10 indicated that the majority of teachers (75.2%) agreed that Turkish should be treated as a source in the classroom, with a mean value of M = 2.80, which shows that the participants' level of agreement was high for this item. Likewise, for item 16, 63.2% disagreed that if teachers used Turkish and English to give instructions, students would wait for the Turkish translation without paying attention to English. In other words, most of the teachers disagreed that students would ignore English instructions and wait for Turkish translations to be made by the teacher. Regarding the teachers' views on whether comparisons between English and Turkish facilitated language learning acquisition, the responses to item 19 showed that a large number of the teachers (62%) were in agreement about this.

Although many teachers agreed on the facilitative role of comparing English and Turkish as stated in item 19, this finding contradicted the results for item 7 in Table 5. For item 7, 55.7% of the teachers agreed that comparing English and Turkish caused confusion among students, which showed that the teachers were unsure about comparisons between Turkish and English in terms of whether they promoted language learning or created confusion for students.

***Teachers' Attitudes Regarding the Use of L1 in Terms of the Affective Dimensions of
Language Learning***

With items 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, and 18 in the first part of the questionnaire,
teachers' perspectives on the use of L1 in terms of the affective dimensions of language
learning were investigated, as seen in Table 7.

Table 7

Attitudes Regarding Affective Dimensions of Language Learning

Items				*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*
	N	*M*	*SD*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*
3. If the teachers speak only in English, the students will be demotivated.	174	2.56	.64	4.6	37.9	53.4	4.0
4. If the teacher does not switch from English to Turkish, students will feel that their social identity is not respected.	174	1.98	.70	24.1	54.0	20.7	1.1
5. Using only English makes students anxious.	174	2.78	.72	5.7	21.8	60.3	12.1
6. Using only English widens the gap between the students and the teachers.	174	2.59	.72	6.9	33.3	52.9	6.9
8. If the teacher uses only Turkish, the students will be demotivated.	174	2,86	.67	3.4	19.5	63.8	13.2
11. Code-switching is a natural part of a conversation that takes place in a multilingual context, so it is very normal to switch from English to Turkish in the classroom.	174	3.08	.55	-	11.5	68.4	20.1
13. Ignoring the native language of the learners is also ignoring their culture.	174	2.25	.85	20.1	41.4	31.6	6.9
14. Using Turkish sometimes to express themselves better in the class is a humanistic need of the students which should be respected.	174	3.10	.58	1.1	8.6	68.4	21.8
18. Ignoring the native language of the students and using the target language exclusively is a kind of linguistic imperialism.	174	2.29	.61	5.7	61.5	29.9	2.9

Note. N = Number of Participants, 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree

In Table 7, items 3 and 8 were intended to determine the teachers' thoughts about
the usage of only English or Turkish in the classroom regarding students' motivation.
Whether or not using only English would demotivate students was addressed with item
3; 57% of the teachers agreed with the statement. That is, more than half of the teachers
thought that students would lose interest if teachers spoke only English. When Turkish
was the only language in question, the majority of teachers (77%) thought that it

demotivated students in language learning. In light of these findings, in terms of the use of only English, it seemed that teachers moderately agreed that the use of only English demotivated students; however, for the use of only Turkish, the rate of agreement was higher in terms of its negative effect on the motivation of students (M = 2.86).

With item 5, the questionnaire also inquired about teachers' perspectives on whether using only English caused students to become anxious. In this regard, the majority of the teachers (72.4%) agreed that using only English as a medium of instruction caused learners to feel anxious.

Teachers' opinions about the impact of the use of only English regarding students' social identities, teacher-student relationships, and humanistic needs were elicited with items 4, 6, 11, and 14. The responses to item 4 indicated that 78.1% of the participants disagreed that if teachers did not switch from English to Turkish, students would feel that their social identity was disrespected. This finding showed that the majority of teachers did not believe that using only English was an action of disrespect against students' social identities. Concerning item 6, which stated that using only English widened the gap between students and teachers, 59.8% of the teachers responded "agree" or "strongly agree". In other words, more than half of the teachers thought that the use of only English resulted in a greater distance between students and teachers. In response to item 11, a vast majority of teachers (88.5%) agreed that code-switching was a natural part of conversation in multilingual contexts, so it was very normal to switch from English to Turkish in the classroom as the participants were of the view that use of L1 was perfectly appropriate in an environment where different languages are spoken (M = 3.08). The teachers seemed to have the same inclination in their responses to item 14, for which a great majority (90.3%) agreed that using Turkish sometimes to express themselves better in the classroom was a humanistic need of the students that should be respected. That is, teachers were almost in complete agreement in their support of students' occasional use of Turkish to express themselves more effectively (M = 3.10).

The participants' were also asked whether ignoring the native language of students was an action of refusing their culture and a concern of linguistic imperialism. In response to item 13, 61.5% of the participants disagreed that ignoring students' native language meant ignoring their culture. Namely, most teachers believed that the use of only English in the classroom was not an issue of refusing students' culture. The teachers appeared to have the same leaning in their responses to item 18, which asked

whether ignoring Turkish in the classroom was an issue of linguistic imperialism. Most of the teachers (67.2%) disagreed with this statement. In other words, most of the teachers disagreed with the idea that the exclusive use of English was related to linguistic imperialism.

Variables Affecting EFL Teachers' Attitudes Regarding the Use of L1 in ELT Classrooms

Teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 were compared in terms of length of teaching experience, the departments they graduated from, and their educational degrees. The demographic information related to those characteristics of the participants is presented in Table 2. The inferential statistics regarding the results of ANOVA and t-tests for these groups are shown in Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10.

Table 8

Comparison of Attitudes Regarding the Use of Native Language in Terms of Teaching Experience

Scales/Subscales	*Groups*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Teachers' Attitudes Regarding the Use of L1 in General	0-5 years	87	2.68	.37	1.51	.223
	6-10 years	55	2.74	.43		
	11+ years	32	2.58	.46		
Attitudes Regarding the Contribution to Learners' Language Learning Processes	0-5 years	87	2.51	.37	0.31	.730
	6-10 years	55	2.53	.41		
	11+ years	32	2.46	.34		
Attitudes Regarding Affective Dimensions of Language Learning	0-5 years	87	2.62	.34	0.18	.834
	6-10 years	55	2.61	.41		
	11+ years	32	2.58	.34		

Note. Significance at p <.05

As seen in Table 8, regarding the length of teaching experience, the ANOVA results indicated no significant difference between the three considered groups in terms of teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 (p >.05). That is, teachers with varying years of teaching experience held similar views on the use of L1.

Table 9

Comparison of Attitudes Regarding the Use of Native Language in Terms of

Departments Teachers Graduated From

Scales/Subscales	Groups	N	M	SD	t	p
Teachers' Attitudes towards the Use of L1 in General	1. English Language Teaching	119	2.72	.37	1.82	.070
	2.English Language and Literature+ American Culture and Literature+ English Linguistics+ Translation and Interpretation	55	2.60	.48		
Attitudes about the contribution to Language Learning Process	1.English Language Teaching	119	2.54	.41	1.79	.075
	2.English Language and Literature+ American Culture and Literature+ English Linguistics +Translation and Interpretation	55	2.43	.28		
Attitudes Related to Affective Dimensions of Language Learning	1. English Language Teaching	119	2.66	.37	2.41	.017
	2.English Language and Literature+ American Culture and Literature+ English Linguistics+ Translation and Interpretation	55	2.51	.33		

Note. Significance at p<.05

As seen in Table 9, the t-test results indicated that the difference between graduates of English language teaching departments and other departments was statistically significant for attitudes regarding the use of L1 in terms of affective dimensions of language learning (t = 2.41; p <.05). That is, the graduates of ELT departments and other departments had different views in this case.

Table 10

Comparison of Attitudes Regarding the Use of Native Language in Terms of

Educational Degrees

Scales/Subscales	Groups	N	M	SD	t	p
Teachers' Attitudes Regarding the Use of L1 in General	BA (Bachelor's)	153	3.24	.42	1.24	.217
	MA (Master's) + PhD (Doctorate)	21	2.95	.53		
Attitudes Regarding Contributions to Learners' Language Learning Processes	BA (Bachelor's)	153	2.69	.38	0.67	.501
	MA (Master's) + PhD (Doctorate)	21	2.63	.60		
Attitudes Regarding Affective Dimensions of Language Learning	BA (Bachelor's) MA (Master's) + PhD (Doctorate)	153	2.51	.37	0.31	.753
		21	2.48	.40		

Note. Significance at p <.05

As seen in Table 10, the difference between teachers with BA degrees and other educational degrees (MA and PhD) in terms of their attitudes regarding the use of L1 was not statistically significant (p>.05). In other words, teachers' educational degrees did not affect their use of L1.

Teachers' Preferred Practices Regarding the Use of L1 in ELT Classrooms

The second section of the questionnaire consisted of 15 checkbox statements. These 15 statements were categorised into six groups regarding their contents. Teachers were asked to mark the statements that best indicated their practices regarding L1 use in the classroom. The responses of the teachers are presented as "yes" in this section, and percentages of each statement as well as the associated category are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Teachers' Preferred Practices Regarding the Use of L1 in Language Classes

In my language classes, I use L1 :	Yes (%)
GIVING AND CLARIFYING INFORMATION	**48.8**
1. While giving information about the class content.	46.6
2. While clarifying an exercise.	56.3
3. While clarifying an example.	48.3
4. While defining an unknown word.	65.5
7. in the presentation session.	27.6
SCAFFOLDING STUDENTS	**31.6**
5. While helping students to answer comprehension questions.	39.7
6. When the students ask questions in their native language.	33.3
8. When the students do pair/group works, and I walk around them.	21.8
DOING LANGUAGE SKILLS RELATED ACTIVITIES	**27.6**
9. in the pre-sessions (such as pre-reading, pre-writing, etc.)	35.1
10. in the post-session (such as post-listening, post-reading etc.)	20.1
GIVING INSTRUCTIONS IN A TEST	**28.4**
11. While giving written instructions in a test that I conduct for my class.	27.0
12. While giving oral instructions in a test that I conduct for my class.	29.9
GIVING FEEDBACK	**25.3**
13. While giving oral feedback.	32.8
14. While giving written feedback.	17.8
GIVING METALINGUISTIC INFORMATION	**75.3**
15. While drawing students' attention to the similarities and differences between Turkish and English whenever appropriate (e.g. word structure, sentence structure, word meaning, etc.).	75.3

As seen in Table 11, all teachers preferred to use L1 (Turkish) in certain circumstances in the classroom; however, the percentages differed for different situations. When the percentages associated with teachers' responses were analysed, it was discovered that teachers mainly preferred to use Turkish in the following situations, listed here in decreasing order of preference:

1. Giving metalinguistic information

2. Giving and clarifying information

3. Scaffolding students

4. Giving instructions in a test

5. Doing language skills-related activities

6. Giving feedback

In Table 11, statement 15 has the highest percentage of positive replies. That is, a considerable number of teachers (75.3%) used Turkish while giving metalinguistic information by drawing students' attention to similarities and differences between Turkish and English whenever appropriate in terms of word structure, sentence structure, and word meaning in language classes. It was seen that although teachers were unclear in the first part of the questionnaire about whether comparisons between Turkish and English were beneficial to students' language acquisition or confused the students, in this section, the majority of teachers stated that they utilised Turkish for this purpose.

As shown in Table 11, nearly half (48.8%) of the teachers responded that they used Turkish to give and clarify information. That is, following "giving metalinguistic information", nearly half of the teachers preferred to use Turkish while giving and clarifying information about class content and clarifying examples, exercises, or unknown words. In this category, it was seen that most of the teachers (65.5%) used Turkish, especially while defining unknown words. On the other hand, only 27.6% of the teachers seemed to use Turkish in presentation sessions. That is, the majority of teachers did not prefer to use Turkish as the language of instruction.

According to Table 11, only 25.3% of the teachers used Turkish to give written or oral feedback, which showed that teachers did not prefer to use Turkish for feedback.

To conclude, the results of the questionnaire administered to 174 English teachers to investigate their views on the use of L1 in ELT classrooms have been reported here. These results were presented quantitatively by using descriptive and inferential statistics. EFL teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 in general, their attitudes regarding the use of L1 in terms of its contributions to learners' language learning processes, and their attitudes regarding the use of L1 in terms of affective dimensions of language learning have been presented. These attitudes were compared in terms of teachers' length of teaching experience, the departments they graduated from, and their educational degrees to determine whether those variables affected their attitudes regarding the use of Turkish in the classroom. Additionally, the teachers' preferences regarding the use of L1 have also been reported. The findings of the semi-structured interviews are presented in the following section.

Findings from the Analysis of the Interviews

This section presents the analyses of the qualitative data gathered from semi-structured interviews carried out with 20 English teachers regarding their views on the

use of L1 (Turkish) in ELT classrooms. Seven open-ended questions were asked to obtain a more in-depth understanding of the teachers' perspectives on Turkish usage in ELT classrooms and to triangulate and clarify inconclusive questionnaire results. Four themes emerged from the EFL teachers' answers to the interview questions through content analysis:

1. Overall views of EFL teachers on using Turkish in class

2. Factors considered when using Turkish or only English

3. Reasons for using English

4. Reasons for using Turkish in teaching the target language

The findings are reported here in line with these themes and supported by relevant excerpts from the responses of the participants.

Overall Views of EFL Teachers on Using Turkish in Class

The primary objective of this research was to learn EFL teachers' opinions on using L1 in the classroom. The analysis of the responses revealed that English teachers needed to use Turkish "when necessary" and in "a limited amount" depending on the "students' proficiency level" and "the difficulty of the subject", as illustrated in excerpts 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Excerpt 1

"Turkish can be used when necessary" (P4, P8, P14, P17).

Excerpt 2

"Teachers should adjust the dosage of Turkish according to the level of learners" (P2, P4, P8, P14).

Excerpt 3

"It is okay for the teacher to use Turkish to some extent" (P2, P4, P5).

Excerpt 4

"Turkish can be used to clarify difficult subjects" (P4, P5).

The participants also highlighted that Turkish should not be overused since the excessive use of Turkish could negatively affect language skills, the structuring of sentences, and motivation for learning the target language, as seen in the following excerpts.

Excerpt 5

"When you use Turkish unnecessarily, it negatively affects students' pronunciation, communication, speaking, and listening" (P1, *sic*).

Excerpt 6

"If we use the mother tongue too much, students can think in Turkish while constructing sentences in English, which will create ambiguity in the sentences" (P16).

Excerpt 7

"If we switch to Turkish frequently, the student's motivation towards the target language may decrease" (P4).

The findings from the questionnaire on the use of Turkish were inconclusive. Although half of the participants thought that switching to Turkish had a negative effect on students' language learning progress, the majority agreed that Turkish should be treated as a source in the classroom. The interview analysis on this topic supported the questionnaire results and provided more details since the EFL teachers had different opinions. That is, they did not have a complete objection to the use of Turkish. They pointed out that Turkish should be used in small amounts and when needed depending on the students' proficiency levels and the type of the subject; otherwise, excessive exposure to it may hinder the process of language learning.

Factors Considered When Using Turkish or Only English

The EFL teachers were asked about the use of only English in the interviews to understand their views on the use of Turkish in the classroom better. The interview analysis revealed that even though all the teachers supported the use of English as much as possible, they were opposed to using only English in the classroom, as illustrated in excerpt 8:

Excerpt 8

"We should use the target language during the classes as much as possible, but not only the target language. There are some moments when we need the mother tongue, too" (P3, P10, P13).

The teachers commented on the factors they considered while deciding to use only English or Turkish in the classroom. The analysis of the responses in this part revealed four factors: student-related, teacher-related, context-related, and curriculum/policy-related.

Concerning student-related factors, the students' English proficiency levels, ages, and readiness were the essential criteria to be considered while deciding whether to use only English or not, as illustrated by participants in excerpts 9, 10, and 11:

Excerpt 9

"Using only English in the classroom during the lesson is very risky, because I have to take into consideration students' demands and students' proficiency level" (P6, P17).

Excerpt 10

"I deeply believe in the fact that using only English in the classroom is determined by some factors, such as the age of the students" (P17, *sic*).

Excerpt 11

"I believe that the student's readiness level should be sufficient to speak only English" (P18).

Participants also reported that if the English proficiency levels of the students were low, the use of only English might lead to demotivation and anxiety, as illustrated in excerpts 12 and 13:

Excerpt 12

"If the students' language level is insufficient, speaking only English will cause the majority of students to lose interest in the lesson and develop a negative attitude towards English" (P14).

Excerpt 13

"If the students' level is low, speaking only English will create anxiety in the students" (P13).

The teacher-related factors that the interviewed participants described as influencing their decisions to use only English or Turkish in the classroom were teachers' proficiency in English and their experiences. The participants reported that if teachers had a low level of proficiency, they might avoid using only English. The following excerpt is an example of this:

Excerpt 14

"It depends on the teachers' proficiency to speak only English or not. If the teachers do not trust their proficiency to handle the situations in the classroom, they do not prefer only English" (P1, P17).

Regarding teachers' experience, the participants asserted that English teachers whose perspectives were influenced by the methodology courses offered in BA programs often tended to use only English in class after beginning their teaching careers. However, when they used that method, they faced some problems, as reflected by excerpt 15:

Excerpt 15

"We have always been taught to use only English in the classroom as the ideal way in English language education. However, based on my experience, I ran into some problems when I tried this" (P5, P16).

The analysis of the responses revealed that several participants also pointed out various context-related factors based on the school that needed to be taken into account when deciding on only English or Turkish usage. The school type and the conditions of the schools were claimed to be influential in the usage of only English, as understood from the following excerpt:

Excerpt 16

"I think the use of only English in the classroom may differ in terms of the school we work at" (P9, P16).

Regarding curriculum/policy-related factors, the participants reported that the curriculum intensity and official exams were influential criteria for using only English or Turkish. The following participants' comments are examples of this:

Excerpt 17

"In the 7th and 8th grades, with students who are preparing for the official high school exam, since there are many grammar rules I need to explain and many subjects that I need to complete before the exam, I cannot manage to speak only English" (P18).

Excerpt 18

"In the Turkish education system, it is somehow impossible to use only English in the classroom because many factors make EFL teachers use students' L1 besides English" (P2, *sic*).

The findings of the questionnaire regarding whether teachers should only use English in the classroom were also uncertain; the teachers were divided on this issue. The questionnaire findings were addressed in the interviews in order to clarify the topic better and acquire a more in-depth grasp of teachers' opinions. The comments from the participants offered additional details regarding the topic and the interview analysis showed that the teachers agreed on using English as much as possible but opposed using only English, which depended on various factors to be considered.

Reasons for Using English

In the interviews, the teachers were asked about the connection between their use of English and their professional image to understand the reasons behind their use of

English. Analysis of the interview data revealed that some teachers thought that English teachers use only English in the classroom to protect their professional image, while others disagreed. Those participants who disagreed reported that the reason behind their use of English was to expose their students to the target language, as illustrated by the following excerpt:

Excerpt 19

"I am afraid I have to disagree with the fact that the teachers are using only English to protect their image. They use English to expose the students to language" (P4, P17).

Some other participants held similar views and noted that if English teachers used English sufficiently during the lessons, they did not need to speak only English to protect their image, as illustrated in excerpt 20:

Excerpt 20

"I disagree that the teachers use only English to protect their image. If they make sufficient use of English during the lessons, they do not care about what others think" (P17, P20, P15).

The remaining participants believed that English teachers sometimes use only English in the classroom to protect their professional image. These participants commented on some societal assumptions, such as "the best English teacher is the one who speaks only English in the classroom" and "English teachers should speak only English in the classroom", which may cause English teachers to sometimes use only English to protect their professional image, as illustrated in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 21

"The teacher who speaks only English is seen as the best English teacher among people; as a result, teachers sometimes use only English to protect their professional image in this regard" (P5, P8).

Excerpt 22

"Even when the teachers do not know the English meaning of a word, it is often perceived as if they are not proficient in English. So, English teachers sometimes use only English to protect their professional image" (P5, P8).

Similarly, another prevalent assumption that the participants reported was the belief that English teachers are not able to speak English well, and this caused both the general public and students to "test" teachers sometimes in this regard; consequently,

teachers may use only English to protect their image, as explained in excerpts 23 and 24:

Excerpt 23

"There is a widespread conception that English teachers cannot communicate in English, so English teachers sometimes use only English to show off" (P13).

Excerpt 24

 "Students sometimes press the teachers to irritate them in the sense of their English competency, and the teachers can exhibit such a reaction to this attitude of the students" (P7, P5).

The findings of the questionnaire revealed that even though half of the participants believed that teachers should not use only English in the classroom, most teachers thought that if the teachers used Turkish in the classroom, the students might have doubts about their English proficiency. As a result, to gain more detailed insight, interviewees were asked whether or not they believed that English teachers use only English in the classroom to protect their professional image. The interview findings supported the questionnaire results since the analysis indicated that apart from the goal of exposure to the target language, there were various common perceptions among society and students regarding the instruction of English and English teachers that caused participants to respond in this way in the questionnaire.

Reasons for Using Turkish in Teaching the Target Language

Interview analysis on the use of Turkish indicated that there were some specific reasons for the EFL teachers' use of L1. As illustrated in the following excerpts, the EFL teachers used Turkish when teaching idioms and complex grammatical structures, explaining instructions, lowering the affective filters of students, fostering motivation, and engaging in student-teacher interactions, as illustrated in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 25

 "When teaching some idioms…for example, 'it is raining cats and dogs'. Turkish can be used for such phrases" (P1, *sic*).

Excerpt 26

"Speaking Turkish is especially effective in teaching complex grammatical structures in lessons" (P13).

Excerpt 27

"It can be used when explaining instructions" (P3, P13).

Excerpt 28

"We speak Turkish to put the anxious students at ease" (P3, P2).

Excerpt 29

"Turkish fosters a positive relationship between the teacher and students" (P2, P3, P5).

Excerpt 30

"Turkish motivates students in the lesson" (P3, P13, P5).

The teachers also claimed that they used L1 to compare English and Turkish, especially with older students familiar with Turkish grammar and the abstract parts of the language. However, with younger learners, they did not utilise Turkish in comparisons as they thought that it would be confusing for them, as illustrated by the following excerpt:

Excerpt 31

"Turkish should be treated as a source, especially…when comparing the two languages for older learners who have more metalinguistic awareness and a better grasp of most of the structures of Turkish than young learners" (P2, P13).

The analysis of the teachers' responses also revealed that Turkish could be used for comparisons while teaching similar aspects of the language, as illustrated in excerpt 32:

Excerpt 32

"I think Turkish is helpful if we are comparing similar aspects. However, I think it is harmful if the different aspects of languages are compared" (P7, P19).

According to the questionnaire findings, the use of Turkish was thought to be detrimental to students' language learning processes by half of the teachers. However, the majority of the teachers also believed that Turkish should be used as a source in the classroom. In order to delve more deeply into the teachers' views, they were asked to comment on the occasions they believed could justify using Turkish. Interview analysis provided details on this issue, as teachers' responses revealed explicit areas where Turkish could contribute to the teaching of the target language. Furthermore, the findings of the questionnaire regarding making comparisons between Turkish and English to ease learning were also inconclusive as such comparisons were seen as both facilitating and confusing for language learning. The analysis of the interview data indicated that teachers did not use Turkish for comparisons with young learners or for different aspects of the languages since they believed that it would be confusing in

these contexts; however, they used Turkish in comparisons when teaching older students and when comparing similar aspects of the languages.

In summary, in this section, interview findings regarding the use of Turkish in ELT classrooms have been reported. Specific details and additional information were obtained through these findings on the usage of Turkish and concerning the inconclusive findings from the questionnaire. In the following chapter, the findings are addressed in relation to the pertinent body of literature in accordance with the study questions.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter discusses the current study's findings concerning the research questions specified in the first chapter. It also establishes a link between the findings of this research and other similar studies in the literature. In addition, conclusions are drawn in light of the limitations of the study and suggestions for further investigation are made.

The first aim of this study was to determine the general attitudes of EFL teachers regarding the use of L1. The findings revealed that EFL teachers in state schools in Siirt held favourable attitudes about the use of L1, provided that it was used appropriately and in a balanced way based on the students' competency levels and the complexity of the subject. For language learning, these EFL teachers in state schools in Siirt underlined that exposure to English input was essential, and they favoured its greatest possible use; however, they were opposed to using the target language exclusively because the majority of them considered that it might be difficult for students, necessitating the use of L1 in addition. It can be said that this result is in line with the balanced approach proposed by scholars such as Harmer (2001) and Nation (2003). This result also corroborates the viewpoints advanced by various researchers. According to Cook (2001), if L1 is used prudently and treated as a resource rather than a handicap, it could open new doors for teachers and students. Similarly, according to Atkinson (1987), Harbord (1992), and Scrivener (2005), if L1 is used appropriately, it can affect L2 learning positively (as cited in Hanakova & Metruk, 2017). Moreover, careful use of L1 in ELT classrooms was highlighted in the studies conducted by Solhi and Büyükyazı (2011), Yavuz (2012), Köylü (2018), and Acar (2020).

The findings also revealed that EFL teachers in state schools highlighted specific factors that were critical in determining whether to utilise only English or Turkish in the classroom. The first factor mentioned by the participants in this study was related to the students' characteristics, such as their level of proficiency and age. It might be said that the students in state primary, secondary, and high schools have different proficiency levels, ages, and grades; even in the same school, while some classrooms may have students with low-level competencies, some may include those with high proficiency levels. As a result, teachers of English pay attention to such qualities of their students so that they do not demotivate them or foster negative views of the English language. Similar factors were also highlighted in the study of Mahmutoğlu and Kıcır (2013); they concluded that it is critical in EFL courses to take students'

levels, ages, and cultural backgrounds into account; otherwise, the students may become bored with language learning and stop showing interest.

The teachers' language competency and experiences were the second set of factors that influenced their decisions about whether only English would be used in the classroom. This might be because teachers eligible to teach in Turkish state schools are not all graduates of ELT programs. In order to work as English teachers in state schools, they are all required to take a general test (the KPSS), which is solely an evaluation of their theoretical knowledge and consists of questions with multiple-choice answers. The positions they are given at schools are determined by their scores on that test (Öztürk & Aydın, 2019); thus, there are no employment criteria that evaluate whether or not their oral fluency and abilities are sufficient for teaching the language communicatively. Therefore, it may be necessary to speak L1 in the classroom due to the teacher's poor level of language ability. Hlas (2016, as cited in Shin et al., 2019) also highlighted this factor, claiming that teachers' insufficient L2 skills can result in the teachers' L1 use. Concerning teachers' experiences, the findings revealed that the teachers had been taught and encouraged to use the communicative approach and avoid using L1; however, they discovered that this approach was difficult after they were assigned to state schools, leading them to use L1. An explanation for this might be the large class sizes and presence of students with various proficiency levels in state schools in Turkey. This finding supports the research conducted by Li (1998), which revealed that although EFL teachers are trained to employ the communicative language teaching method, many teachers are unable to adapt the practices of that technique to their EFL settings due to factors such as large classes and the low proficiency of their students (as cited in Al-wossabi, 2016).

Aside from teachers' experiences, it was discovered that contextual factors such as school type also influenced their use of only English or Turkish. It can be said that as English teachers are educated to teach students of all age groups in Turkey in general (Öztürk & Aydın, 2019) and in Siirt, they need to change their teaching styles and their use of L1 according to school types, such as primary, secondary, and high schools, and even different types of high schools.

The high school entrance exam for the 8th grade and the curriculum's intensity were also among the factors that influenced teachers' decisions about the use of only English or Turkish in classrooms. An explanation for this may be that the preparation for these exams does not necessitate the communicative side of the language as they are written

exams that include multiple-choice answers based on reading, grammar, and vocabulary knowledge (Öztürk & Aydın, 2019). Consequently, in preparation for these tests, EFL teachers teach their students intense exam content via traditional methods such as grammar and translation, including the analysis of sentence structures, word meanings, and translations of reading passages for comprehension (Işık, 2008). As a result, instead of English, they need to resort to Turkish more often. The factors pointed out by EFL teachers in state schools in Siirt were similar to what Shin et al. (2019) found. According to Shin et al. (2019), students' proficiency levels and ages, teachers' proficiency and experience, time constraints, curricula, policies, institution types, and university entrance exams all have roles in language choices.

This study's findings on teachers' use of only English to defend their professional image indicated that teachers' frequent and excessive use of Turkish led students to question the teachers' English. As a result, it can be said that English teachers should use English and Turkish sufficiently and appropriately in the classroom in order to avoid having to deal with challenges related to maintaining their professional reputation. It is also possible to say that this is further evidence that EFL teachers in state schools are averse to the excessive usage of L1. Another crucial finding in this regard was that some assumption and ideas within society about English teachers' proficiency and instruction of English may prompt students to question teachers' language competencies while speaking Turkish. It is possible that the basis for these thoughts and views stem from the dominating English-only policy and anti-L1 methodology of the 20th century and from the tenets of the Makere Report, in which it is said that "English is best taught monolingually" and that an "ideal teacher of English is a native speaker" since, as Phillipson (1992, as cited in Auerbach, 1993, p. 4) argues, these tenets were recognised as fact and constituted the cornerstones of optimal language teaching, the impact of which can still be seen everywhere English is taught.

Another aim of this study was to determine EFL teachers' views on the use of L1 for the sake of the students' language learning processes. The results indicated that the EFL teachers believed that overusing L1 would negatively affect language learning processes in terms of linguistic abilities, including hearing, pronouncing, and speaking the language. On the other hand, most English teachers supported the application of Turkish as a source while teaching abstract vocabulary such as idioms or dealing with misunderstandings and confusion, and particularly for making complex grammatical topics and instructions easier for students to understand. It can be inferred that EFL

teachers in state schools in Siirt value using L1 as a methodological tool in specific areas to promote students' language learning processes as long as it is not used excessively. This result seems to support the viewpoint of Nation (2003), who suggests that, like other tools, L1 should be viewed as a valuable instrument and utilised when necessary but not excessively. On the other hand, these findings contradict the hypothesis of Lado (1957, as cited in Lightbown & Spada, 2013) that L1 negatively influences L2 acquisition. The results also coincide with the findings of Butzkamm (2003) and Mahmutoğlu and Kıcır (2013), emphasising L1 as a tool for overcoming misunderstandings and its facilitative effect in clarifying meaning and building learners' confidence.

Another related finding of the present study was that most EFL teachers disagreed that the use of only English provides faster learning of the target language. This finding might be a further indication that EFL teachers do not favour using English exclusively in the classroom and believe that using L1 enhances L2 acquisition. This finding does not support the argument proposed by Auerbach (1993) that "the more students are exposed to English, the more quickly they will learn" (p. 5), or that of Ellis (2008, as cited in Almoayidi, 2018), who suggests that the more exposure students have to L2, the faster they will learn.

The findings regarding the facilitative role of using Turkish to make comparisons between English and Turkish revealed that comparing the same linguistic elements of the languages with older students had the potential to simplify the process of learning the target language. That is, for older students who can grasp the similarities and differences between languages and are familiar with many aspects of Turkish grammar, the use of Turkish for comparisons between the language elements of Turkish and English can benefit the language learning process. It can be said that EFL teachers in state schools have a good understanding of the instances in which using L1 can either help or hinder the language learning process in that they do not use L1 with all types of students or for all linguistics elements. This result parallels the conclusions drawn by Yavuz (2012), who argues that "the richness of a learner's L1 knowledge and experience is unquestionably an accessible source for L2 learning" (p. 4343). Furthermore, it is aligned with the research conducted by Harper and Jong (2004), who propose that L1 might be a handy tool while teaching older students as they already have linguistic and cognitive systems, and ignoring this source would be a mistake. Aside from the students' proficiency levels, the present findings revealed that if

comparisons are made for similar linguistics elements, it may facilitate target language learning. This finding is consistent with the contrastive analysis hypothesis presented by Lado (1957), which asserts that highlighting the similarities between languages may assist learners in viewing L1 as a tool rather than a hindrance.

Another goal of this study was to determine EFL teachers' perspectives on the use of L1 regarding the affective elements of language learning. According to the findings, these EFL teachers believed that appropriate use of L1 in the classroom might positively impact affective aspects of language learning such as motivation, anxiety, and teacher-student relationships. That is, the EFL teachers prioritised using English in the classroom; however, they did not favour usage of only the target language or Turkish since they believed that the exclusive use of either language would demotivate students and the use of only English could make students anxious in the classroom, as well, resulting in distance between teachers and students. In other words, if Turkish is used constantly in the classroom, students will not need to learn the target language, which aligns with the viewpoint of MacDonald (1993), who claims that excessive dependence on L1 might demotivate learners and reduce their desire to improve their comprehension of L2. It may be inferred that EFL teachers in state schools believe that a reasonable level of L1 usage may benefit students' motivation to learn English. Köylü (2018) reached a similar conclusion, pointing out that a moderate degree of code-switching in the classroom seemed to influence students' motivation positively. Similarly, these findings suggest that the appropriate use of L1 could be practical in terms of lowering students' anxiety since the use of only English can make students anxious in terms of incomprehension of the course content and being forced to speak in English. It is possible that students fear failure in the exams, and if they do not understand contents taught while using only English, it causes anxiety. The explanation for the anxiety of being forced to speak in English might be students' low proficiency levels and lack of opportunities for oral practice outside the classroom. Students in Siirt might not have chances to practise English outside of the classroom environment since Siirt is not a touristic place and people in Siirt do not use English as a means of communication; as a result, students may feel coerced when teachers speak only English in the classroom. Therefore, participants believed that the use of L1 would make students feel at ease, which shows that EFL teachers also use L1 as a psychological tool for language teaching. This result is consistent with the findings of Scott and Fuente (2008), who assert that using only the target language has a

detrimental impact on learners since it places a high cognitive burden on them. In a similar vein, Littlewood and Yu (2009) and Burden (2000, as cited in Hanakova & Metruk, 2017) claimed that taking away the support of L1 completely and putting students in an environment where they feel alienated and powerless causes frustration for them. For that reason, Harbord (1992) claims that L1 could lessen L2 production barriers and affective blockages, hence generating language and discourse methods tailored to particular circumstances. The finding is also in line with those of Al-Hinai (2011, as cited in Mahmutoğlu and Kıcır, 2013) and Yavuz (2012); in their studies, they concluded that appropriate L1 usage breaks down psychological barriers, alleviates student anxiety, and fosters a more relaxed learning atmosphere for both learners and teachers.

When gaps between teachers and students were considered, the EFL teachers believed that the careful use of Turkish might promote interactions between teachers and students. This suggests that EFL teachers favour L1 as a means of creating sociality between teachers and students, which positively contributes to the classroom environment. This is consistent with the arguments of several scholars. Harmer (2007), Pachler and Field (2013), and Mahmutoğlu and Kıcır (2013) argue that using L1 facilitates essential interactions between teachers and students, allows for discussions about learning, and improves the classroom's social climate. The same issue was explored in the study by Greggio and Gil (2007) and they concluded that L1 usage promoted interaction between learners and teachers, thus facilitating foreign language learning.

An additional objective of this study was to determine whether or not the variables of the length of time that EFL teachers have been working in this profession, the university departments from which they graduated, and the educational degrees they hold influence their usage of L1. The findings revealed that teachers' years of experience did not affect their use of L1 in ELT classrooms. This result might have been obtained because of the context of the study as EFL teachers in state schools have to apply a standard curriculum and use the textbooks produced by the MoNE. Furthermore, the official placement tests that students take for entry into high schools and universities require teachers to prepare the students to pass those specific exams, which contributes to situations in which teachers have to use similar methods and materials in the language teaching process. This result does not support the findings of

Schweers (1999), who discovered in his study that teachers with the greatest length of experience used L1 most in teaching language.

The effect of the departments of these EFL teachers on their attitudes regarding the use of L1 was also investigated. The findings revealed that the departments from which the teachers graduated were not influential on their use of L1 in general or their views on the contributions of L1 to the language learning process. However, for the affective dimensions of language learning, there was a significant difference: teachers from English language teaching departments had different views of this issue compared to those who graduated from other departments. This may be attributed to the programs of these departments in Turkey. The ELT program aims to increase pre-service teachers' proficiency in reading, listening, writing, and speaking in the foreign language and train them with the knowledge, attitudes, and abilities essential for teaching a foreign language based on theory and practice for four years (Öztürk & Aydın, 2019). That is, teacher candidates take courses on subject matter such as linguistics and literature and the methodology of language teaching as well as general education courses to teach English to students of all ages in primary, secondary, and high schools (Karakaş, 2012). In addition, with the teaching practicum included in the final year of the program, teacher candidates observe students and teach lessons in a real classroom environment at schools with the assistance of a mentor. This way, teacher candidates put theory into practice and apply what they have learned throughout the ELT program (Öztürk & Aydın, 2019). The goal of other departments' programs, on the other hand, is not to train students to teach language, so the graduates of these departments need to take a pedagogic formation program for a year in order to obtain a certificate to become a teacher. This short pedagogical formation program completed by the graduates of other departments might not be sufficient as ELT programs provide training in all aspects of teaching a foreign language. Consequently, graduates of ELT programs might have more understanding and knowledge about the aspects of teaching the language than teachers from other departments do, which might lead those teachers to teach in the way that they were taught in language instruction. In this regard, Bailey et al. (1996, as cited in Freeman, 2010) state that throughout their own educations, prospective teachers spend countless hours in instruction, which shapes their unconscious opinions about how education needs to be conducted; thus, if these beliefs are not addressed in teacher education programs, teachers may continue to teach in the manner in which they themselves were trained. This finding supports the conclusion of Paker and Karaaç

(2015) that teachers' attitudes regarding the use of L1 in ELT classrooms vary significantly as they come from different educational backgrounds.

Additionally, the teachers' attitudes were analysed to see whether or not their educational degrees influenced their usage of L1. The findings revealed that the educational degrees (BA, MA/PhD) of these EFL teachers in state schools did not affect their use of L1 in the classroom. This could be explained by the factors of the setting in which EFL teachers work. As mentioned before, teachers with different educational degrees face similar situations in state schools that affect their language instruction. That is, state school teachers must follow a standard curriculum and use the textbooks prepared by the MoNE. Although teachers are expected to teach the language communicatively, the official exams for high school and university placement make that difficult because they include multiple-choice questions. The findings on this issue also revealed that although the differences between the mean results for teachers with bachelor's degrees and those from other departments were not statistically significant, the mean value obtained for teachers with BA degrees was higher than that for MA/PhD degrees in terms of the use of L1 in general. This might be because, after graduation, teachers with BA degrees begin working at state schools after passing the KPSS and might not have the opportunity to participate in continuing education programs such as postgraduate education or in-service training. However, since the teachers with MA/PhD degrees had continued their education, it is likely that they had more current and extensive knowledge and awareness regarding the use of L1 in teaching the target language. In this regard, Alhas (2006, as cited in Vural & Başaran, 2021) claims that postgraduate education provides teachers with a more comprehensive understanding of the subject matter, helps them develop their teaching abilities to a higher standard, and gives more in-depth professional knowledge.

In this study, the preferred ways in which EFL teachers employed L1 were also discovered. The findings revealed that English teachers preferred to use Turkish for different situations. Most often, they preferred to use Turkish while giving metalinguistic information by directing the students' focus towards the differences and parallels between Turkish and English in terms of structures and the meanings of words and sentences, taking the proficiency levels and ages of students into account. This could be the result of the EFL teachers' personal language learning experiences as Hobbs et al. (2010) argue that "teachers of foreign languages interpret teaching philosophies and methods through the lens of their own learning cultures and give rise

to a wide range of possible interpretations of approaches such as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) based on their individual beliefs on education and instruction" (p. 46). The EFL teachers participating in this study were non-native English teachers, and throughout their own language learning educations, they might have been taught word and sentence structures traditionally by analysing the elements of languages and translating words; consequently, they might employ L1 mainly for these purposes. In addition, as the official placement exams include multiple-choice questions that require analysis and comprehension of linguistic elements, teachers might prefer to use L1 mainly for that purpose. This usage of L1 is in line with the findings obtained by Grim (2010), who concluded that teachers employed L1 for providing metalinguistic explanations, eliciting empathy, and clarifying instructions with translations.

The second most preferred L1 practice was giving and clarifying information about the content covered in class, unclear words, examples, and exercises. The findings also revealed that these EFL teachers used L1 the least in presentation sessions within this category. It can be inferred that EFL teachers in state schools do not prefer L1 as the language of teaching but use it when the content is above the level of students' comprehension, which is also proof that EFL teachers prefer English as the language of teaching when possible because they value exposure to the target language. Scholars such as Atkinson (1987, as cited in Yavuz, 2012) suggest that L1 can be used to elicit language, check comprehension, and give complex instructions. Additionally, Piasecka (1988, as cited in Auerbach, 1993, p. 9) claims that L1 could be used to present rules governing grammar, give complex instructions or prompts, and conduct assessments of comprehension. In Şenel's (2010) study, it was found that teachers regularly used L1 to clarify the meaning of difficult language items, measure comprehension, and explain the meaning of new vocabulary.

Using L1 for scaffolding in the process of assisting students with comprehension problems while students engage in pair or group work and the teacher walks around the classroom was the third preferred usage of L1 by the EFL teachers in this study. This might result from the prevalence of online education due to the COVID-19 pandemic, when courses were online, which was not as appropriate for conducting pair/group work activities; as a result, teachers might not have used L1 for this purpose.

Doing language skills-related activities and providing feedback were the two least preferred situations in which Turkish was used, which might have resulted from online

education during the COVID-19 pandemic, which was challenging in terms of conducting speaking, listening, and writing activities.

In brief, the participants of this study preferred to use Turkish primarily for:

1. Providing metalinguistic information whenever appropriate, depending on the students' levels; and
2. Giving and clarifying information in terms of the content of the lesson, complex instructions, and grammar points or unknown vocabulary.

Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

This study was designed to obtain the viewpoints of EFL teachers at state schools in Siirt, Turkey. Several implications can be drawn from the findings of this study for program/curriculum designers and teacher educators at the university level regarding the use of L1.

While creating curricula, the designers can provide explicit directions and clear rules for teachers regarding the pedagogical and methodological use of Turkish in English lessons based on the students' proficiency levels to obtain the maximum advantage of L1 usage.

Similarly, teacher educators can provide concrete guidance and real-life examples to teacher candidates on the appropriate use of L1 so that they can use L1 in the moments when L1 can best serve as an effective pedagogical and methodological tool.

Aside from these implications, this study has also produced several recommendations for future research. First, this study focused primarily on English teachers' views on the use of Turkish, the variables that affected the teachers' attitudes, and their preferences on using Turkish in ELT classrooms in state schools in Siirt, Turkey. Future research could be conducted by investigating both teachers' and students' perspectives to provide a more comprehensive picture of the use of L1 and to see differences and similarities in perspectives on this topic among different kinds of participants.

Second, the current study used questionnaires and interviews as data collection instruments. In future research, observations recorded on video can also be used to see English teachers' real usage of Turkish and compare whether they reflect their views in their teaching.

Furthermore, this study has investigated English teachers' views in relation to their years of experience, the departments from which they graduated, and their educational degrees. Although the results indicated that the teachers had similar views on the use of L1 in the context of these variables, more research with larger populations could be conducted on the same variables, and particularly the variables of teachers' years of experience and the departments from which they graduated, to obtain a broader understanding of the issue since the present study included a small number of participants.

Finally, in this study, as the teachers focused mainly on the school type, grade level, and proficiency levels of students while expressing their views on the use of Turkish, in future research, the school types of primary, secondary, and high school could be applied as variables in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the use of Turkish in ELT courses.

Limitations of the Study

The current research has several limitations. First, it was conducted on a limited basis; 174 English teachers at state schools in Siirt completed the questionnaire and 20 of those teachers were interviewed. As a result, the findings do not represent all state schools in Turkey and cannot be generalised.

Furthermore, considering the time period in which this study was conducted, the data were gathered during lockdowns proclaimed in response to the COVID-19 pandemic; as a result, observations could not be performed as an additional data collection tool, which could have yielded more detailed information on English teachers' attitudes and preferences regarding the use of Turkish.

Moreover, because of the COVID-19 pandemic and online education, it was not easy to reach teachers with different educational levels and departments. As a result, the interviews were mostly conducted with teachers with BA degrees and graduates of English language teaching departments.

Finally, students were excluded from this study because of the limitations imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic; as a result, only teachers' views were obtained. If students at various levels are included and their views are compared with those of teachers, a more in-depth understanding of the use of L1 will be possible.

While recognising these limitations, this study can still be deemed significant in its own right for various reasons. First, the participants of this study were all non-native English teachers working at different state schools in Siirt, Turkey, and the views of these teachers on different elements of the use of L1 were studied. Second, the teachers' views were explored using questionnaires and interviews while considering multiple variables. Therefore, the findings of this study may suggest insights for researchers who investigate the use of L1 in different contexts.

REFERENCES

Acar, S. C. (2020). A comparative study on the perceptions of EFL teachers on the use of mother tongue. *Innovational Research in ELT, 1*(1), 34-44. https://doi.org/10.29329/irelt.2020.311.4

Almoyidi, K.A. (2018). The effectiveness of using L1 in Second Language Classrooms:A controversial issue. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 8*(4), 375-379.

Al-wossabi, S. (2016). Speaking in the target language: Issues and considerations. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *7*(5), 886. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0705.08

Ayaz, A. D., Ozkardas, S., & Ozturan, T. (2019). Challenges of English language teaching in high schools in Turkey and possible suggestions to overcome them. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 41–55. https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.543778

Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quaterly, 27*(1), 1-18. https://ncela.ed.gov/files/rcd/BE019020/Reexamining_English_Only.pdf

Balnaves, M., & Caputi, P. (2001). *Introduction to quantitative research methods: An investigative approach*. Sage Publications.

Brooks, F. B., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskyan approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 77(2), 262-274. https://faculty.weber.edu/tmathews/SLI/Readings/Brooks%20&%20Donato%20199 4.pd

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. https://is.muni.cz/th/dvasg/12675926/Sample_VIII.pdf

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

Butzkamm, W., & Caldwell, J. A. (2010). 86. the bilingual reform. A paradigm shift in foreign language teaching. *English and American Studies in German*, *2009*(2010), 152–154. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783484431225.152

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*(3), 402–423. http://www.viviancook.uk/Writings/Papers/L1inClass.htm

Cook, V., & Singleton, D. M. (2014). *Key topics in Second language acquisition*. Multilingual Matters.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*es (3rd ed.). Sage Publications. http://www.drbrambedkarcollege.ac.in/sites/default/files/research-design-ceil.pdf

Croker, R., & Heigham, J. (2009). Interviews. In *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A practical introduction*, 182-192. Palgrave Macmillan. https://toaz.info/doc-viewer

Çelik, S. (2008). Opening the door: An examination of mother tongue use in foreign language classrooms [Yabancı dil sınıflarında ana dil kullanımının incelenmesi]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education), 34*, 75-85. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/87543

Dendrinos, B. (2006): Mediation in communication, language teaching and Testing. National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.

Dörnyei, Z. (2019). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.

Erarslan, A. (2018). Strengths and weaknesses of Primary School English language teaching programs in Turkey: Issues regarding program components. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 325–347. https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.464194

Erdoğan, S. (2015). Use of L1 in EFL classes and teachers' and learners' opinions on the issue (A case study in a Turkish state primary school). Master thesis, Ufuk University, Ankara. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Freeman, D. A. (2010). *Teacher learning in language teaching*. Cambridge Univ. Press.

George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference. 17.0 update (10th ed.).

Greegio, 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), 371-379.

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. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, *45*(3), 271–308. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444812000067

Hobbs, V., Matsuo, A., & Payne, M. (2010). Code-switching in Japanese language classrooms: An exploratory investigation of native vs. non-native speaker teacher practice. *Linguistics and Education, 21*(1), 44–59. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2009.12.004

Hanakova, M., & Metruk, R. (2017). The use of L1 in the process of teaching English. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods, 7*(8), 208-216.

Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, *46*(4), 350–355.https://www.scribd.com/document/154724166/John-Harbord-1992-the-use-of-the-mother-tongue-in-the-classroom-pdf

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching: with DVD. 4th ed. Pearson*: Longman

Harper, C., & Jong, E. (2004). Misconceptions about teaching English-language learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *48*(2), 152–162. https://doi.org/10.1598/jaal.48.2.6

Hui, Y. (2010). The role of L1 transfer on L2 and pedagogical implications. *Canadian Social Science, 6*(3), 97-103.
https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/236293787.pdf

Işık, A. (2008). Yabancı dil eğitimimizdeki yanlışlar nereden kaynaklanıyor? [Where the mıstakes are orıgınated ın our foreıgn language teachıng] *Journal of Language and Linguistics,*4(2), 15-26.

Johnson, R. B., &, Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: a research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14-26.

Kalaycı, Ş. (2018). SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri. 9. Baskı, Dinamik Akademi, Ankara.

Karakaş, A. (2012). Evaluation of the English Language Teacher Education Program in Turkey. *ELT Weekly*, 4(15).

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. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/114544

Kırkgöz, Y. (2007). English Language Teaching in Turkish: Policy changes and their implementations. *RELC Journal 38*(2), 216-228.
https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0033688207079696

Koçoğlu, Z., & Gaba. M. (2015). The use of L1 in the EFL classroom. *Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 4*(6), 48-62.
https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/420182

Köylü, Z. (2018). The use of L1 in the tertiary L2 classroom: Code-switching factors, functions, and attitudes in Turkey. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching. 16*, 271-289.

Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon.

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., & Spada, N. M. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2009). First language and target language in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Language Teaching*, *44*(1), 64–77. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444809990310

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

Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. *Educational Linguistics*, 63–84. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-24565-0_5

Madriñan, M.S. (2014). The use of first language in the second-language classroom: A support for second language acquisition. *Gist: Education and Learning Research Journal*, 50-66. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1062663.pdf

Mahmutoğlu, H., & Kıcır, Z. (2013). The use of mother tongue in EFL classrooms. *EUL Journal of Social Sciences 4*(1), 49-72.

Mart, Ç. T. (2013). The facilitating role of L1 in ESL classes. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 3*(1), 9-14.

McDonald, C. (1993). *Using the target language.* Mary Glasgow.

Meyer, H. (2008). The pedagogical implications of L1 use in the L2 classroom. *Maebashi Kyoai Gakuen College Ronsyu, 8*, 147-159. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.522.8833&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Miles, R. (2004). Evaluating the Use of L1 in the English language Classroom. School of Humanities. Centre for English Language Studies Department of English. University of Birmingham. https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/mateflteslddissertations/milesdiss.pdf

Namaghi, S. O., & Norouzi, S. (2015). First language use in teaching a foreign language: Theoretical perspectives and empirical findings. *US-China Foreign Language,13*(9), 615-622.

http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/55f27daf13e83.pdf

Nation, P. (2003). The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning. *Asian EFL Journal, 5*(2), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.26686/wgtn.12560333

Nazary, M. (2008). The role of L1 in L2 acquisition: Attitudes of Iranian university students. *Novitas-ROYAL, 2*(2), 138-153. https://app.trdizin.gov.tr/publication/paper/detail/T0RrME16QXc

Öztürk, G., & Aydın, B. (2019). English language teacher education in Turkey: Why do we fail and what policy reforms are needed? *Anadolu Journal Of Educational Sciences International*, 181–213. https://doi.org/10.18039/ajesi.520842

Pablo, I., Lengeling, M. M., Zenil, B. R., Crawford, T., & Goodwin, D. (2011). Students and teachers' reasons for using the first language within the foreign language classroom (French and English) in Central Mexico. *PROFILE, 13*(2), 113-129. http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/prf/v13n2/v13n2a09.pdf

Pachler, N., & Field, K. (2013).*Learning to Teach Modern Foreign Languages in the Secondary School: A companion to school experince* (2nd. ed.). Routledge.

Paker, T., & Karaağaç, Ö. (2015). The use and functions of mother tongue in EFL classes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 199*, 111-119.

Prodromou, L. (2002). From mother tongue to other tongue. https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/mother-tongue-other-tongue

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

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

Saville-Troike, M. (2012). *Introducing second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Schweers, C. W. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 37*(2), 6-13.

http://okt.kmf.uz.ua/atc/oktat-atc/MELT/Readings_III 5/Schweers_19999.pdf

Scott, V., & Fuente, d. l. M. (2008). What's the problem? L2 learners' use of the L1 during consciousness-raising, form-focused tasks. *The Modern Language Journal*, *92*(1), 100–113. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00689.x

Shin, J.-Y., Dixon, L. Q., & Choi, Y. (2019). An updated review on use of L1 in foreign language classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *41*(5), 406–419. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1684928

Solhi, M., & Büyükyazı, M. (2011). The use of first language in the EFL classroom: a facilitating or debilitating device? *In Proceedings of the 1st international conference on foreign language teaching and applied linguistics, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina*, 860-866.

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.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics.* (6th ed.). Pearson/Education

Taşkın, A. (2011). Perceptions on Using L1 in Language Classrooms: A Case Study in a Turkish Private University. Middle East Technical University, Turkey.

Thompson, G. (2006). Teacher and student first language and target language use in the foreign language classroom: A qualitative and quantitative study of language choice. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences, 67*(4), 1316.

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

Tunçay, B. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards and practices of L1 use in EFL classroom (Unpublished master's thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey. http://repository.bilkent.edu.tr/handle/11693/15654

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

Voicu, C. G. (2012). Overusing mother tongue in English language teaching. *International Journal of Communication Research*, *2*(3), 212-218. https://www.ijcr.eu/articole/84_30_IJCR%203-2012.pdf

Vural, Ö., & Başaran, M. (2021). The reasons for teachers' preference for Master's degree. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *13*(1), 589–613.

Wong, M. H. R. (2010). The effectiveness of using English as the sole medium of instruction in English classes: Student responses and improved English proficiency. *Porta Linguarum*, *13*, 119-130.

Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*, 89-100. https://acamh.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x

Yavuz, F. (2012). The attitudes of English teachers about the use of L1 in the teaching of L2. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46*, 4339-4344.

Yphantides, J. (2009). Student use of Japanese in the EFL classroom. *Accents Asia 3*(2), 1-26.

Zulfikar, Z. (2018). Rethinking the use of L1 in L2 classroom. *Englisia Journal, 6*(1), 43-51. http://dx.doi.org/10.22373/ej.v6i1.2514

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Ethics Committee Approval of Çağ University

T.C	
ÇAG UNIVERSITESI	
SOSYAL BILIMLER ENSTITUSU	
TEZ / ARAŞTIRMA / ANKET / ÇALIŞMA IZNI / ETIK KURULU IZINI TALEP FORMU VE ONAY TUTANAK FORMU	
OGRENCI BILGILERI	
T.C. NOSU	
ADI VE SOYADI	RAHİME ÜZÜM
OGRENCI NO	20198020
TEL. NO.	
E - MAIL ADRESLERI	
ANA BILIM DALI	İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı
HANGI AŞAMADA OLDUĞU (DERS / TEZ)	Tez
ISTEKDE BULUNDUĞU DÖNEME AIT DÖNEMLIK KAYDININ YAPILIP-YAPILMADIĞI	2020/ 2021 - GÜZ DÖNEMİ KAYDINI YENİLEDIM.
ARAŞTIRMA/ANKET/ÇALIŞMA TALEBI ILE ILGILI BILGILER	
TEZIN KONUSU	Ingilizce Oğretmenlerinin Dil Sınıflarında Anadil (Türkçe) Kullanılmasına İlişkin Fikirleri
TEZIN AMACI	Tezin amacı Ingilizce öğretmenlerinin dil sınıflarında Türkçe kullanımına ilişkin görüşlerini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır
TEZIN TURKÇE ÖZETI	Bu çalışma, Ingilizce öğretmenlerinin dil sınıflarında Türkçe kullanımına ilişkin görüşlerini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışma, 2020-2021 eğitim-öğretim yılında Siirt ili devlet okullarında görev yapan İngilizce öğretmenlerine yapılacaktır. Bu çalışmada karma yöntemli bir araştırma tasarımı kullanılacaktır. Veriler, anket ve yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme yoluyla niteliksel ve niceliksel olarak toplanacaktır. Tuncay (2014)'ten uyarlanan anket nicel verilerin toplanması için gerçekleştirilecek ve görüşme soruları araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanacaktır. Verileri SPSS (Sosyal Bilimler için İstatistik Paketi) aracılığıyla analiz etmek için tanımlayıcı ve çıkarımsal istatistikler kullanılacaktır. Görüşme vrilerini analiz etmek için görüşmeye katılanların yanıtlarından elde edilen veriler kodlanıp yorumlanacaktır.
ARAŞTIRMA YAPILACAK OLAN SEKTÖRLER/ KURUMLARIN ADLARI	Eğitim/ Siirt İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü
IZIN ALINACAK OLAN KURUMA AIT BILGILER (KURUMUN ADI-ŞUBESI/ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ - ILI - ILÇESI)	Siirt İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü - Merkez/Siirt
YAPILMAK ISTENEN ÇALIŞMANIN IZIN	Bu çalışma Siirt ili devlet okullarında görev yapan Ingilizce öğretmenlerinin derslerinde Türkçe kullanılmasına ilişkin görüşlerini araştıran bir çalışmadır.

ALINMAK İSTENEN KURUMUN HANGİ İLÇELERİNE/ HANGİ KURUMUNA/ HANGİ BÖLÜMÜNDE/ HANGİ ALANINA/ HANGİ KONULARDA/ HANGİ GRUBA/ KİMLERE/ NE UYGULANACAĞI GİBİ AYRINTILI BİLGİLER	Çalışmada kullanılacak anket çevrimiçi (online) şekilde Google Forms üzerinden İngilizce öğretmenlerine gönderilecektir. Çalışmada yapılacak olan röportaj da çevrimiçi canlı görüşme araçları üzerinden ingilizce öğretmenleriyle yapılacaktır.
UYGULANACAK OLAN ÇALIŞMAYA AİT ANKETLERİN/ ÖLÇEKLERİN BAŞLIKLARI/ HANGİ ANKETLERİN - ÖLÇELERİN UYGULANACAĞI	"Language Teachers' Attitudes, Practices and Variables That Affect their Practices in Terms of the Use of L1" adlı anket ve araştırmacı tarafından oluşturulan yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme soruları kullanılacaktır.
EKLER (ANKETLER, ÖLÇEKLER, FORMLAR, …. V.B. GİBİ EVRAKLARIN İSİMLERİYLE BİRLİKTE KAÇ ADET/SAYFA OLDUKLARINA AİT BİLGİLER İLE AYRINTILI YAZILACAKTIR)	1) Üç sayfa Language Teachers' Attitudes, Practices and Variables That Affect their Practices in Terms of the Use of L1 Anketi 2) Bir sayfa yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme formu

ÖĞRENCİNİN ADI - SOYADI: Rahime ÜZÜM	ÖĞRENCİNİN İMZASI: Enstitü Müdürlüğünde evrak aslı imzalıdır TARİH: 18/ 01/ 2021

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

1. Seçilen konu Bilim ve İş Dünyasına katkı sağlayabilecektir.

2. Anılan konu İşletme 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: Jülide İNÖZÜ	Adı - Soyadı:	Adı - Soyadı: Murat KOÇ	Adı - Soyadı: Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ
Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı:	Unvanı:Doç. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.
İmzası : Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	İmzası:	İmzası: Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	İmzası: Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır
/ / 20	/ / 20	/ / 20	/ / 20

ETİK KURULU ASIL ÜYELERİNE AİT BİLGİLER

Adı - Soyadı: Mustafa BAŞARAN	Adı - Soyadı: Yücel ERTEKİN (v. Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Sami DOĞRU)	Adı - Soyadı: Deniz Aynur GÜLER	Adı - Soyadı: Ali Engin OBA (y. Arast. Gör. Özge ÇETİNER)	Adı - Soyadı: Mustafa Tevfik ODMAN
Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.	Unvanı : Prof. Dr.	Unvanı: Prof. Dr.
İmzası : Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	İmzası : Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	İmzası : Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	İmzası : Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır	İmzası : Evrak onayı e-posta ile alınmıştır
/ / 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	Ⓧ	Çalışma yapılacak olan tez için uygulayacak olduğu Anketleri/Formları/Ölçekleri Çağ Üniversitesi Etik Kurulu Asıl Jüri Üyelerince İncelenmiş olup, 18 / 01 / 2021 - 27 / 02/ 2021 tarihleri arasında uygulanmak üzere gerekli iznin verilmesi taraflarımızca uygundur.
OY ÇOKLUĞU İLE	◯	

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.

Appendix B: Çağ University Thesis Questionnaire Application and Permission Request Letter

T.C.
ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Sayı : E-23867972-044-2100000322   18.01.2021
Konu : Rahime ÜZÜM'e Ait Tez Anket
İzni Hakkında

DAĞITIM YERLERİNE

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programında 20198020 numaralı öğrencimiz olan Rahime ÜZÜM, "İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Dil Sınıflarında Anadil (Türkçe) Kullanılmasına İlişkin Fikirleri" konulu tez çalışmasını Üniversitemiz Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi öğretim üyesi **Prof. Dr. Jülide İNÖZÜ** danışmanlığında halen yürütülmektedir. Adı geçen öğrencinin tez çalışması kapsamında Siirt İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğüne bağlı halen görev yapmakta olan İngilizce öğretmenlerine dil sınıflarında Türkçe kullanımına ilişkin görüşlerini incelemeyi kapsamak üzere kopyası Ek'lerde sunulan bir anket uygulamasını yapmayı planlamaktadır. Üniversitemiz Etik Kurulunda yer alan üyelerin kurumsal mail adreslerinden onaylar online olarak alınmış olup, gerekli iznin verilmesini arz ederim.

Prof. Dr. Ünal AY
Rektör

Ek : 3 sayfa tez etik kurul izin formu, 7 sayfa Anket, Form, Sorular, 29 sayfa dilekçe, tez önerisi,
     4 sayfa tez etik kurul izin onay e-postaları.

Dağıtım:
Gereği: Bilgi:
SİİRT İL MİLLİ EĞİTİM MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE Siirt Valiliğine

Appendix C: Permission from Siirt Provincial Directorate of National Education

for the Questionnaire and Interviews

T.C.
SİİRT VALİLİĞİ
İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü

Sayı : E-10861109-355.01-19508609

Konu : Öğrenci Rahime ÜZÜM

Tez Anket İzin Hakkında

22.01.2021

DAĞITIM YERLERİNE

İlgi : a)Mersin İli Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü' nün 18.01.2021 tarihli ve 2100000322 sayılı yazıları.

b) Valilik Makamının 21.01.2021 tarihli ve 1948817] sayılı oluru

Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İngilizce Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programında 20198020 numaralı öğrencisi olan Rahime ÜZÜM' ün **"İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Dil Sınıflarında Anadil (Türkçe) Kullanılmasına İlişkin Fikirleri"** konulu tez çalışmasını ilçenizde ve okulunuzda görev yapan İngilizce öğretmenlerine uygulanması hakkındaki Mersin ili Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğünün ilgi (a) yazı ve ekleri ile Valilik Makamının ilgi (b) izin olur' u ilişikte sunulmuştur.

Bilgi ve gereğini rica ederim.

Deniz EDİP
Vali a.
İl Milli Eğitim Müdürü

Eki: İlgi yazılar ve Valilik Oluru

Dağıtım:
Gereği;
- 6 İlçe Kaymakamlığına
(İlçe Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü)

-Merkez Resmi ve Özel İlkokul-Ortaokul
ve Lise Okul Müdürlüklerine

Bilgi;
ÇAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
(Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü)
Arıklı Karayolu Üzeri Adana-Mersin
Otoyolu 33800
Tarsus/MERSİN

T.C.
SİİRT VALİLİĞİ
İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü

Sayı : E-10861109-355.01-19488171

Konu : Öğrenci Rahime ÜZÜM
Tez Anket İzin Hakkında

21.01.2021

VALİLİK MAKAMINA
SİİRT

İlgi : Mersin İli Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü' nün 18.01.2021 tarihli ve 2100000322 sayılı yazıları.

Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İngilizce Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programında 20198020 numaralı öğrencisi olan Rahime ÜZÜM' ün **"İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Dil Sınıflarında Anadil (Türkçe) Kullanılmasına İlişkin Fikirleri"** konulu tez çalışmasını İlimiz merkez ve ilçelere bağlı okullarda görev yapan İngilizce öğretmenlerine uygulayabilmesi için; okul müdürlüklerince yapılacak bir program kapsamında ve sorumluluğunda eğitim öğretimi aksatamayacak şekilde uygulanması müdürlüğümüzce uygun görülmektedir.

Makamlarınızca da uygun görülmesi halinde olurlarınıza arz ederim.

Ahmet Mithat SARAÇOĞLU
İl Milli Eğitim Şube Müdürü

OLUR
Deniz EDİP
Vali a.
İl Milli Eğitim Müdürü

Appendix D: Questionnaire

Language Teachers' Attitudes, Practices and Variables That Affect their Practices in Terms of the Use of L1

I would like to ask you to help me by answering the following questions. This survey is conducted for my MA thesis at Çağ University. This is not a test, so there is no "right" or "wrong" answer. The result will be kept strictly confidential. I am interested in your personal opinion. Please answer as honestly and thoughtfully as possible since only such answers will lead to the success of this research.

Thank you very much for your help.

Rahime ÜZÜM

I- BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. How long have you been teaching as an EFL teacher? Put a check mark.

0-5 _____   6-10 _____   11-15 _____   16-20 _____   20+ _____

2. Education :

BA: _____   MA: _____   PhD: _____

3. Department you graduated:

English Language Teaching: ☐

English Language and Literature: ☐

American Culture and Literature: ☐

Translation and Interpretation: ☐

English Linguistics: ☐

II- ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE USE OF NATIVE LANGUAGE (TURKISH) IN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

Put a check mark on the box that best indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement. Please take into consideration your GENERAL views towards using Turkish in ELT classes, NOT a specific course or level.

Statements	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Teachers should only use the language that is being taught in their classrooms.				
2. Switching to Turkish in the classroom has negative effects on the progress of the learner language.				
3. If the teachers speak only in English, the students will be demotivated.				
4. If the teacher doesn't switch from English to Turkish, students will feel that their social identity is not respected.				
5. Using only English makes students anxious.				
6. Using only English widens the gap between the students and the teacher.				
7. Comparing English with Turkish causes confusion among the students.				
8. If the teacher uses Turkish, the students will be demotivated.				
9. Being exclusively exposed to English input does not guarantee their acquisition.				
10. Learners' native language should be treated as a resource.				
11. Code-switching is a natural part of a conversation that takes place in a multilingual context, so it is very normal to switch from English to Turkish in the classroom.				
12. Using only English is challenging for the students.				
13. Ignoring the native language of the learners is also ignoring their culture.				
14. Using Turkish sometimes to express themselves better in the class is a humanistic need of the students which should be respected.				
15. If the teachers use Turkish in the classroom, students have doubts about teachers' English proficiency.				
16. If the teachers use both English and Turkish for giving instructions, students will wait for Turkish translation and do not pay attention to English.				
17. Using only English helps students learn the language faster.				
18. Ignoring the native language of the students and using the target language exclusively is a kind of linguistic imperialism.				
19. Comparing English with Turkish facilitates language acquisition.				

III- PRACTICE IN TERMS OF THE USE OF NATIVE LANGUAGE (TURKISH) IN LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS

Put a check mark on the boxes that best indicate your use of Turkish in the classroom.

In my language classes I use L1 :	
1. While giving information about the class content.	
2. While clarifying an exercise.	
3. While clarifying an example.	
4. While defining an unknown word.	
5. While helping students to answer comprehension questions.	
6. When the students ask questions in their native language.	
7. in the presentation session.	
8. When the students do pair/group works and I walk around them.	
9. in the pre-sessions (such as pre-reading, pre-writing etc.)	
10. in the post session (such as post listening, post reading etc.)	
11. While giving written instructions in a test that I conduct for my class.	
12. While giving oral instructions in a test that I conduct for my class.	
13. While giving oral feedback.	
14. While giving written feedback.	
15. While drawing students' attention to the similarities and differences between Turkish and English whenever appropriate (e.g. word structure, sentence structure, word meaning etc.).	

Reference: Tunçay, B. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards and practices of L1 use in EFL classroom (Unpublished master's thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.

Appendix E: Interview Questions

EFL Teachers' Views on the Use of L1 (Turkish) in ELT classrooms

1. What do you think about the use of only English in the classroom?

2. Do you believe that teachers use only English in the classroom to protect their professional image? Why?

3. Do you think that comparing English with Turkish causes confusion among students, or does it facilitate English acquisition? Why?

4. To what extent do you think should Turkish be used in the classroom?

5. How often do you think should Turkish be used in the classroom? Why?

6. Do you think that exclusive exposure to English guarantees to learn English? Why?

7. What kind of anxieties do you think the use of only English causes in students?

Appendix F: Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY ELT MA PROGRAMME

RESEARCH TITLE: EFL Teachers' Views on the Use of L1 in ELT Classrooms

RESEARCHER NAME: Rahime ÜZÜM

TEL:

E-MAIL:

NAME OF THE PARTICIPANT:

     Thank you for your interest in participating in this research. The purpose of this study is to investigate EFL Teachers' views on the use of L1 in ELT classrooms. You are asked to participate in this study by answering interview questions related to this study. The information provided by you will be used for research purposes only. It will not be used in a manner which would allow identification of your individual responses and this consent form will be retained by the researcher. Your answers to the questions will be audio recorded. Your participation is voluntary. If you don't wish to take part, you don't have to. You may ask questions about anything you don't understand or want to know more about. If you decide that you want to participate, please sign in the space provided at the bottom of the page.

Participant's Signature:_____   Date: _____

Demographic Information

1. How long have you been teaching as an EFL teacher?

0-5 _____ 6-10_____ 11-15_____ 16-20_____ 20+_____

2. What is your education level?

BA: _____ MA: _____ PhD: _____

3. Which department did you graduate from?

English Language Teaching: _____

English Language and Literature:_____

American Culture and Literature:_____

Translation and Interpretation:_____

English Linguistics:_____