

VIEWS OF NOVICE PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS TOWARDS THE USE OF L1 IN THE EFL CLASSROOM

Kenan Çetin¹ and Nurdan Özbek-Gürbüz²

¹Bartın University, Bartın, Turkey,

²Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey



Abstract

This study aimed to explore the views of pre-service teachers (freshman students) at English Language Teaching program at a state university in Turkey towards the use of L1 (mother tongue) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms while also investigating their actual use of L1 during an extracurricular teaching event. It also aims to find out if there is a relationship between participants' educational background in language learning, their views towards use of L1 and their actual use of L1. This study employed a qualitative approach by collecting data through semi-structured interviews and these interviews were supported with field notes taken by the researcher. The findings showed that ELT students mostly favored the use of L2 (target language) in the classroom and stated that it must be used as much as possible; however, some participants also stated that L1 could be used depending on the proficiency of students. The analysis of the interviews showed that there was no relationship between the participants' actual use of L1 and their educational background for the participants. Finally, the study suggests some implications towards the ELT curriculum in line with the findings.

Keywords: English as a foreign language, use of L1, Turkish pre-service students

Article history:

Received: 30 May 2022

Reviewed: 05 September 2022

Accepted: 06 September 2022

Published: 20 December 2022

Contributor roles

Conceptualization; Investigation; Data curation; Formal Analysis;

Writing - original draft: K.Ç. (lead);

Resources; Methodology; Supervision; Validation; Writing - review & editing; Visualization: N.Ö-G. (lead)

Copyright © 2022 Kenan Çetin and Nurdan Özbek-Gürbüz



This open access article is published and distributed under a [CC BY-NC 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. Permissions beyond the scope of this license may be available at kenancetin@bartin.edu.tr. If you want to use the work commercially, you must first get the authors' permission.

Citation: Kenan, Ç. and Özbek-Gürbüz, N. (2022). Views of Novice Pre-Service Teachers Towards the Use of L1 in the EFL Classroom. *English Studies at NBU*, 8(2), 271-288. <https://doi.org/10.33919/esnbu.22.2.7>

Kenan Çetin is a research assistant at Bartın University and a Ph. D. student of ELT at Middle East Technical University. His areas of interest are pre-service language teacher education and use of technology in language teaching and learning.

E-mail: kenancetin@mail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4311-406X>

Nurdan Özbek-Gürbüz is an Associate Professor at the Department of English Language Teaching, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. She holds a BA and an MA in English Language Teaching from Gazi University and Middle East Technical University respectively, and a PhD from the Department of English Studies at University of Nottingham, UK. Her areas of interest include Spoken Discourse, Conversational English, English Language Teacher Education, Teaching Speaking, Assessment of Speaking Skill, English as an International Language and Intercultural Communication.

E-mail: nurdano@metu.edu.tr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1685-4644>

There have been contradicting views regarding the ways English should be taught throughout the history of English language teaching. One of the main controversies in this regard is the use of mother tongue in foreign language classrooms. Some researchers argue that thinking in L2 is the best way to develop proficiency and it is a common belief that the more input students receive, the more they will benefit from being exposed to the target language (Gass, 2017; Gass, Mackey, & Pica, 1998; Halliwell & Jones, 1991; Krashen et al., 1984; Krashen, 2008).

The controversy on use of L1 in EFL classrooms still goes on and it attracts scholars in the field of language teaching. A growing number of recent publications on the use of L1 in EFL classrooms show that abandoning L1 entirely is not favorable; however, there is a limitation to its use (Al-amir, 2017; Almohaimed & Almurshed, 2018; Alshehri, 2017; Debreli & Oyman, 2016; Diaz & Perez, 2016; Galali & Cinkara, 2017; Köylü, 2018; Sali, 2014; Taşçı & Ataç, 2020; Taşkın, 2011; Timuçin & Baytar, 2014; Tetiurka, 2016; Turnbull, 2018; Yavuz, 2012). Although use of L1 has been examined in EFL classrooms, most studies in the literature looked at the views of students or teachers. Only a limited number of studies examined the views of pre-service teachers and none of these studies were conducted in Turkish context. This study aims to explore the views of pre-service teachers (freshman students) at the program of English Language Teaching at a state university in Turkey towards the use of L1 in EFL classrooms. Their actual use of L1 was also taken into consideration with observations by one of the researchers of this study at an extracurricular teaching event organized together by their university and a middle school in a city located in Black Sea Region in Turkey. Another aim of the study is to find out if there is a relationship between educational background, views towards use of L1 and actual use of L1 among the participants. Guided with these aims, this study sought to look for answers to the following research questions:

1. What are the views of pre-service teachers who had their first teaching experience during an extracurricular event towards the use of native language (L1) in the classroom?
2. Do the pre-service teachers use L1 in their teaching? If so, for what reasons do they use L1?
3. Is there a relationship between their educational background, their views towards use of L1, and their actual use of L1?

One important aspect of the study is that it examines the first teaching experience of pre-service teachers. As some researchers suggest, first-time teaching is a critical instance in a prospective teacher's life and it is a time period when they first encounter the most intense emotions caused by a mismatch of reality and expectations (Gaede, 1978; Meanwell & Kleiner, 2014). It is not illogical to expect prospective teachers to teach in a way that contradicts their beliefs or views. This study contributes to the debate on the use of L1 in EFL classrooms by examining the novice pre-service teachers' first time teaching experience and gathering their views on the use of L1 during their experience. Moreover, since the participants of the study are at their first year of education, their view on the use of L1 can be significant in comparing the views of prospective teachers, in-service teachers, or instructors.

Background

Auerbach (1993) claims that the monolingual view towards teaching a language dates back to 19th century when political views affected language teaching policies which caused a decline of bilingual education. Phillipson (1992) states that monolingual tenet defends that English should be taught in the medium of L2 entirely and English should be the only language permitted in the classroom. In such a tenet, use of mother tongue is seen as the absolute last resort and should only be use in extreme situations. The ban of mother tongue means that L1 is seen as a hinderance in monolingual tenet. The monolingual tenet is criticized for imposing content and ideology of English since it rejects the experience of other languages which also means excluding a person's most substantial experience (Phillipson, 1992).

On contrary to monolingual tenet, some scholars argue that the potential of the use of L1 needs further exploration, and it may be used for eliciting language, checking comprehension, or even giving instructions at early levels (Atkinson, 1987; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Schweers, 1999). Building on Atkinson's work, Schweers (1999) suggests a list of uses for L1 in EFL classrooms (Figure 1).

In addition to Schweer's suggested list, Auerbach (1993) also lists some other uses for L1 in educational process such as "negotiation of the syllabus and the lesson; record keeping; classroom management; scene setting; language analysis; presentation of rules governing grammar, phonology, morphology, and spelling; discussion of cross-cultural

issues; instructions or prompts; explanations of errors; and assessment of comprehension” (p. 21). Zakaria (2013) also lists similar uses of L1 such as “helping establishing security, conveying meaning of words, checking for comprehension, and explaining grammatical rules” (p. 373).

1. Eliciting language <i>“How do you say ‘X’ in English?”</i>
2. Checking comprehension <i>“How do you say, ‘I’ve been waiting for then minutes’ in Spanish?” (Also used for comprehension of a reading or listening text.)</i>
3. Giving complex instructions to basic levels
4. Co-operating in groups <i>Learners compare and correct answers to exercises or tasks in the L1. Students at times can explain new points better than the teacher.</i>
5. Explaining classroom methodology at basic levels
6. Using translation to highlight a recently taught language item
7. Checking for sense <i>If students write or say something in the L2 that does not make sense, have them try to translate it into the L1 to realize their error.</i>
8. Testing <i>Translation items can be useful in testing mastery of forms and meanings.</i>
9. Developing circumlocution strategies <i>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.</i>

Figure 1

Suggested Uses for the L1 in the EFL Classroom (Schweers, 1999, p. 7)

The body of literature on use of L1 shows that the matter was examined mostly by gathering students’ and teachers’ views. Almohaimeed and Almurshed (2018) found out that although most students refrained from the use of L1 in classroom, some still thought it could be used for understanding difficult vocabulary or grammar points. Galali and Cinkara (2017) examined the views of students towards the use of L1 and found out that they viewed L1 as a tool which could be used in finding out the meanings of unknown words or understanding grammar points. Debreli and Oyman (2016) found out that students who had a low proficiency background in English tended to prefer the use of L1 and participants mostly demanded that new vocabulary items or complex grammar

points are explained in L1. Köylü (2018) investigated language instructors' use of L1 and reported that most (85%) participants rarely used L1 and some often used L1 (15%) for socializing, translating vocabulary, or clarifying language points. In his study, Kılıçkaya (2006) reported that most instructors at Turkish universities favored Turkish-medium instruction. Marsakawati (2017) also examined instructors' views and reported that instructors used L1 to provide clarification, build rapport, save time and establish the discipline in the classroom. Diaz and Perez (2016) argue that teachers use L1 for explaining the meaning of a word or a sentence, teaching and eliciting grammar rules and for classroom management purposes. Al-Amir (2017) reported that many teachers agreed on the use of L1 for the explanation of administrative information, discussing assignments, quizzes, tests, and giving instruction. Alsheshri (2017) found out that teachers thought that use of L1 should be limited to functions such as explaining vocabulary, clarifying meaning or building relationships with students. Taşçı and Ataç (2020) reported that teachers used L1 for functions such as "translation, classroom management, checking understanding, eliciting, drawing attention giving feedback, grammar instruction" (p.655). Yavuz (2012) stated that teachers reported that they used L1 when they wanted to increase students' interest or self-confidence in class. Sali (2014) investigated English teachers' use of L1 in classes and she found out that the teachers used L1 "to communicate the content of the lesson or to regulate classroom interactions and proceedings efficiently" (p. 316). Timuçin and Baytar (2014) investigated students' and teachers' use of L1 in classrooms, and they observed that teachers mostly used L1 by means of translation, for the purposes of checking understanding and giving directions. Taşkın (2011) also investigated both teachers' and students' views on use of L1 and found out that although teachers had negative perception towards the use of L1 in classrooms, they used it as a last resort in order to present grammar or vocabulary, check comprehension or drawing attention, and students had positive views on the use of L1 in their classroom.

In addition to students' and teachers' views, some research also included pre-service teachers' views on using L1 in EFL classrooms. Turnbull (2018) maintains that pre-service teachers' views towards the use of L1 is limited to translation and explanation. Tetiurka (2016) found out that most pre-service teachers held the view that L1 could be used to explain grammar, translate vocabulary or explain difficult tasks.

Method

Design of the Study

The present study employed a qualitative approach by following the principles of a case study design in order to explore the views of pre-service teachers towards the use of L1 in EFL classrooms. Yin (2018) states that case studies help in understanding a contemporary phenomenon (a case) in depth and the contextual conditions that are relevant to the case. Since the study focused on a case and aimed to gather participants' views and their use of L1, case study was an appropriate mode of inquiry. As with any other similar study, this case study focuses on a small sample in a specific setting.

Research Context

The participants of this study were all freshman students enrolled at English Language Teaching bachelor's program at a state university located in Black Sea Region in Turkey. The data for this case study came from field notes and observations taken during an extracurricular event titled "Speak English Event". The event was organized with the aim to increase middle school students' (sixth graders) motivation and willingness to learn English by meeting pre-service teachers who prepared English teaching activities for the day.

Each pre-service teacher carried out an activity as a group leader and activity leader. The role of group leader was for assisting students and helping them understand the instructions. Group leader role was for carrying out the activity by giving instructions. The activities at the event included a warm up activity (Guessing game; daily routines), an ice breaker (Ball in the air), a main activity titled 'Superwriters', and a wrap-up activity (Run to the board), and each participant was the leader of at least one activity and leader of at least one group.

Participants

Eight ELT students at A state university in Turkey participated in the interviews. The ages of the participants vary from 18 to 20; moreover, five of them are female and three of them are male. All the participants are in their first year of education at a state university in Turkey.

Table 1

Participants' Demographic Features

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Age	18	18	18	24	22	19	18	18
Gender	F	F	M	M	F	F	M	F

All eight participants enrolled in English Language Teaching program by obtaining adequate score from university placement exam which includes an English proficiency exam conducted by Measuring, Selection and Placement Center (ÖSYM in Turkish). All participants in the study also passed a proficiency exam conducted by the school of foreign languages at the university and they obtained a score above B2 level of English.

Data Collection Instruments

The views of the participants were gathered by semi-structured interviews which were administered at the end of the event. The interviews included questions aiming to gather the participants' views towards the use of L1 in language teaching, as well as some reflective questions towards their actual of L1 at the event. Moreover, data regarding their actual use of L1 was also obtained through researcher's notes during the teaching event.

Adams (2015) states that semi-structured interviews employ “a blend of closed and open-ended questions, often accompanied by follow-up why or how questions”, and “the dialogue can meander around the topics on the agenda” (p. 493). The type of instrument implemented in this research was semi-structured due to the fact that this study aimed to gather beliefs and opinions of the participants towards the use of L1, and while doing so, it is important to direct structured questions and then build on the inquiries during the interview with the help of follow-up questions. Interview questions were built by taking into consideration the relevant information gathered from the review of literature (Klasinc, 2018). The interview questions were sent to experts in the field of education and language teaching.

Table 2

Data Collection Matrix

Objective	Data Collection Instrument
To explore the views of the participants towards the use of L1 in EFL classrooms and a possible link towards their background and their use of L1	Semi-Structured Interviews Questions in the interview are based on the findings of the studies in the literature (Appendix 1)

To observe and report actual frequency and reason of use of L1 in teaching	Observation Chart
	The chart includes 3 categories: specific time of the use of L1, the utterance, and context

Observations by one of the researchers of this study were also used as supporting information for the questions in the interviews. The first author of this study was present at the event and recorded any use of L1 with information such as time of the use of L1, the utterance (the specific word that the participant used), and context (reason of the use).

Data Analysis

The analysis regarding the interviews included transcribing the recordings of the interview and focusing on the emerging related codes with the help of the questions structured beforehand, as well as the new ideas which occurred during the interviews. The codes of the analysis were organized in MAXQDA 2018 software.

Findings

Three major themes emerged from the analysis of the transcripts of interviews. The first major theme '*Personal background in language education*' included participants' responses regarding their history with learning English. The second major theme '*Views towards the use of L1*' which included their preferences towards L1 or L2 also included a sub-section for *L1 as a teaching tool*. The third theme '*Use of L1 by the Participants*' included the participants views and insights regarding when they actually used L1. The third major theme and included their views in regard to why they, or teachers use L1 in the classroom.

Table 3

Personal Background in Language Education

Themes	Codes	f	Participants
Attitudes towards learning English	Always liked English as a course and as a language, had no trouble learning it	6	H, F, E, B, A, C
	Gradually liked and improved English	1	G
	Almost always bad at English, until recently	1	D
Teacher's use of L1 in the past	Almost always	4	B, C, D, H
	Mostly L1 but sometimes L2	2	A, G
	Exceptional: extracurricular or temporary instances of L2 instruction in language education	2	E, F

Since personal background in language education of the participants were examined in relation to their views towards the use L1 and their actual use. The analysis of the transcripts also included their responses about personal educational background of language. Specifically, the medium of instruction their teachers used in the past and their motivation levels towards learning English were included in the results.

Almost all participants showed positive attitude towards learning English; while some always liked English, others gradually started liking it with age. One exception was that a participant (D) recently started liking English after studying in Prep classes (English preparatory programs before starting their university education) for a year and decided to study English Language Teaching after graduating from another B. A. program. Half the participants (B, C, D, H) stated that their teachers almost always used L1 in the classroom in the past. Only two participants (A & G) reported partial use of L2 in the classroom. One participant (E) reported that she had attended to a private language course where English was the medium of instruction. Another participant (F) stayed in Australia for three years.

Table 4

Views towards the Use of L1

Themes	Level	f	Notes	Participants
General views and preferences	Moderate	6	Participants defend the use of L2 and state that it should be prioritized; however, they also believe L1 can be used depending on proficiency	B, C, D, E, F, G, H
	Exceptional	1	Different than other views, participant holds a more flexible view towards the use of L1.	A

When asked about their preferences, the participants generally favored the use L2; they stated that L2 must be prioritized in the classroom; however, upon further questioning about their views in various settings, some participants stated that L1 could be used in some situations. The categorization of this theme showed that most participants constantly defended the use of L2 and argued that L1 can be used with low-proficient students to a limited extend. One participant (A) held a more flexible view stating that L1 may be used when needed such as introducing new grammar structures that does not exist in students' native language, as some of the excerpts demonstrated:

If everything is going well, it (medium of instruction) should be English. If nobody understands anything in the class, then Turkish might have a place. (Participant F)

It (medium of instruction) should be English but students who were here today were at A1 level, some adjustments can be made for them. (Participant H)

Table 5

Views towards the Use of L1 as a Teaching Tool

L1 As a teaching tool when...	f	Notes	Participants
teaching grammar and vocabulary	3	Despite the general view favoring the use of L2, participants state that L1 can be used in specific cases	E, C, A
giving instructions	4	These participants hold the view that L1 may be used to a limited extend depending on proficiency level	A, B, E, F
having classroom interactions	4	Participants think that L1 can be used for having small talks warm-up discussions before class or discussing a homework or project in detail	E, C, F, G,

There was a general tendency in the views of the participants towards the use of L2 as the medium of instruction in the classroom; they held a general view that grammar and vocabulary could be taught by using L2 in classroom, and it could be better if L1 was not used as some of the excerpts showed (it is important to note here that all excerpts from the interviews were translated from Turkish to English by the researchers):

I think then (when a new grammar structure is introduced) flashcards can be used, it is better if L1 is not used. (Participant F)

There were also participants who stated that L1 could be used in specific cases. For teaching grammar and vocabulary, one participant (A) stated that grammar should be introduced in Turkish first, then reinforced again in English; and that she *saw no problem* in the use of L1 for teaching vocabulary either while also she would be found of the use of L2. Moreover, one participant (C) defended the use of L2 for teaching vocabulary but was unsure about teaching grammar in L2 and finally stated that L1 could be used for teaching grammar, as excerpts demonstrated:

Perhaps revision can be made in English, but the structure can be introduced in Turkish first. (Participant A)

I think for that (teaching vocabulary) English should be used and they should deduct the meaning from former words they used, the teacher should not say the meaning in Turkish but in English... ..for grammar it is a little harder, then Turkish may be used. (Participant C)

The participants generally thought that L1 could be used when things got too complicated. They (A, B, E, F) stated that L1 could be used in the classroom depending on the type of instruction. If the activity involved simple actions such as dancing or clapping, using L2 could be appropriate; however, when the instruction involved more abstract concepts or explanations L1 came into play. The others (D, C), on the other hand, stated that using L2 could not make a difference when students did not understand an instruction before a teaching activity, or that (G) students could eventually understand instructions in L2 with peer assistance in the classroom.

Turkish can be used but I would like to give an example from my teacher at language school, he used to do it in English, and when we could not understand, he used to show it on the board or give an example. (Participant E)

Participants F and E stated that teacher could make use of L1 while making revisions or having small talks or warm-up discussions before the class or discussing details of an assignment or a project; but only when the students in the classroom showed signs of confusion or had a hard time understanding. One participant (C) held the view that L1 could be used as a tool to *ease into the use L2*; in other words, a language teacher could use L1 at first, and then gradually increase the use of L2. Others, on the other hand, saw no use in L1 for this matter (D, H). While some participants favored L2 for classroom management, others (A, F, G, H) stated that L1 could be used for establishing order in the classroom (preventing misbehavior) and giving positive reinforcement or correcting students' mistakes (A).

Table 6

Use of L1 by the Participants

Students used L1 during...	f	Notes	As...	Participants
main activity (<i>writing a story and acting it out</i>)	5	Participants admit using L1 to assist the students	group leader	A, G, D, E, H,
icebreaker (<i>throwing a ball and the one catching it asks a question</i>)	1	Participants admit using L1 in their instructions	Activity leader	F

Participants' use of L1 was observed during the event; moreover, their reported use of L1 was also analyzed through the transcripts of the interviews. The two data collection methods showed similar results; there was no discrepancy between reported use of L1 and observed use of L1. Both sources of data confirmed that most participants did not use L1 during the event as activity leaders when they gave instructions, monitored and concluded the activities.

Almost all participants admitted using L1 during activities that they participated as *group leaders* when they assisted the 6th grade students in completing the activities. Participant A used L1 as *last resort* in an attempt to encourage the students several times to get an answer to a question asked by the activity leader (another participant) during the main writing activity in which students gathered in tables in groups of 5 and with one prospective EFL teacher, and wrote a story of daily routines together about a fictional character they created and finally acted the story out. Participant A also stated that the whole activity could have failed without the use of L1. Participant E also admitted using L1 in order to save the flow. Participant D also reported use of L1 for the same reason.

When asked about why they used L1, the participants gave various responses. Many used L1 for organizational purposes; for role distribution in group works since the 6th graders did not understand what to do. Additionally, one participant (C) thought that the students might have been shy and retain themselves from speaking even if they could.

They could not distribute roles on their own, there needed to be a leader in the group, I helped, and I needed to do that in Turkish since they did not comprehend.
(Participant D)

One participant (F) used L1 as an activity leader (instructor of the activity) when she asked one of the students to ask a question in an icebreaking activity; when the student froze, she tried again, and eventually she uttered "Bana soru sorun" which means "Ask me a question" in Turkish. When asked about the incident, the participant stated that after not getting a response for a while, she had to sustain the flow of the activity and used L1 as a *last resort*. There was no other instances of L1 use for the participant. Other participants did not use L1 as the activity leaders. Participant H stated that although she did not use L1 she felt often that the 6th graders did not understand the instructions, that is when others came to help as group leaders. She thought that if the group leaders were

not there to help, she would *give up* and *give in* to the use of L1. Participant G stated that he did not use L1, thought the 6th graders *picked up enough hints* from the instructions he gave in L2. He insisted on using L2 during his activity as the leader even when the flow of the activity was under threat after the students struggled to guess a word since he held the view that in order to motivate the 6th graders in learning English, one must make use of L2 as much as possible. Participant D also felt the need to use L1 but he *held himself back* and expected the students to observe or warn each other in order to catch up. Participant A did not use L1 in activities as the leader, either. She felt that since the activity was more *practice-based* (guessing game with actions) students already figured out what to do.

The participants were also asked if they would use L1 if they were not observed in the future (A, D, G) if it was needed or when they had a difficulty in communicating. In addition to their use of L1, the participants were also asked about why a language teacher might use L1 in EFL classrooms, their responses mostly (B, F, H) hovered around the view of '*being drawn into using it*'; meaning that one may not usually prefer to use it, but feel as though they have to since they have the responsibility to follow an agenda, prepare their students for exams.

I would use English if I was a teacher on my own, but if I saw that they did not understand, I would turn back to Turkish. (Participant A)

Discussion

In light of the analysis of transcripts of the interviews, it was determined that the students generally held the view that L2 should be used as much as possible, and some participants stated that L1 could also be used in teaching grammar and vocabulary, giving instructions or having classroom interactions (Table 5). Similarly, Solhi and Büyükyazı (2011) claim that teachers mostly use L1 to explain new or difficult grammar structures. In further examination of the findings, it was also determined that most participants used L1 during the main activity as *group leaders* when they assisted the 6th grade students in completing the activities (Table 6). One student also used L1 while giving instruction as an *activity leader* (when she gave instructions, monitored and concluded the activities).

It was clearly stated both by the participants and supported by the observations of the researcher that the participants of the interviews generally preferred L2 as the

medium of instruction but made use of L1 as a last resort. Although participants stated that L1 could be used in classroom, none of the participants prioritized the use of L1; in fact, most held the view that it is best if L2 was the medium of instruction. Upon further examination, the fact that Participant F used L1 during the icebreaker but did not use L1 during the main activity (see Table 4) indicated that she might have used L1 by mistake without a particular purpose. The fact that most participants used L1 during the writing activity could mean that the use of L1 might show difference among receptive and productive skill-based activities.

Some participants stated that L1 could be used for lower-proficiency classrooms. This finding was in alignment with the findings of Solhi and Büyükyazı (2011) who reported that teachers often use L1 depending on the learner's language levels. Similarly, Zakaria (2013) also stated that L1 is used for explaining grammatical rules. This finding was also supported by Cole (1998) who argues that L1 is most useful at beginning and low levels. Cole also claims that teachers can make use of L1 by comparing the main grammatical characteristics of the two languages, which is in alignment of the finding of this study which determined that the participants viewed L1 as a teaching tool in certain situations. There were mixed views regarding the use of L1 in classroom management; half the participants favored L1 and the other half favored L2. Literature shows that L1 can be used as a tool to manage a classroom (Auerbach, 1993; Marsakawati, 2017; Zakaria, 2013).

None of the participants held the view that L1 should be the medium of instruction considering the fact that almost all of them had English teachers who almost always used L1 in the classrooms in the past. This finding shows that there was no relationship between the participants' use of L1 and their educational background since most of them had teachers who used Turkish most of the time in the classroom. Participants who were taught English as a medium of instruction (Participant F stayed in Australia for 3 years, and Participant E attended a language school with English as a medium of instruction; see Table 3) held the view that L1 could be used in EFL classroom, and they actually used L1 during activities. These findings eliminate the possibility of a relationship between these participants' use of L1 and their educational background. However, the fact that most participants viewed L1 as a tool to be used in EFL classrooms and they actually used L1

as group leaders in activities indicate that there might be a relationship between their views and actions which is expected and natural.

Conclusion

This study aimed to explore the views of pre-service teachers at the program of English Language Teaching at a state university in Turkey towards the use of L1 (mother tongue) in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms. It also aimed to find out if there was a relationship between participants' educational background, their views towards use of L1 and their actual use of L1 among the participants. With a qualitative approach, data were through semi-structured interviews with ELT students and field notes taken by the researcher. The findings illustrated that participants in this study mostly favored the use of L2 (target language) in the classroom. The participants also stated that L2 should be used as much as possible; however, some participants also stated that L1 could have a place in the classroom depending on the proficiency. Moreover, the analyses of the interviews showed that there was no relationship between the participants' actual use of L1 and their educational background.

As with any case study, the sample size of this research was limited to a small number of participants. One limitation was that the views of eight participants guided the study in reaching conclusions. Since the results of this study is unique to the case studied in this research, it can be expected that other studies can present different results, and for this reason it can be suggested that further research can be conducted in order to find out views of pre-service teachers towards the use of L1. Another limitation was that the participants had their first teaching experience in a controlled and observed setting and their actual use of L1 may have differed without observation.

The mixed views between and within the responses indicates that the medium of instruction is of significance in EFL classrooms, and also a significant topic for ELT students, which is why this study suggests that this topic should be incorporated further into the curriculum of the ELT departments. In Turkey, pre-service teachers of English language usually have their first teaching experience in the fourth (last) year. Another pedagogical implementation of this study is that ELT students are introduced to practical teaching experiences earlier during their teacher education programs. This may be done gradually. In other words, the students may participate in supervised teaching which requires collaboration between universities and state schools in Turkey.

References

- Adams, W. (2015). Conducting semi-structured interviews. In J. S. Wholey, H. P. Hatry, & K. Newcomer, K. E. (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation (4th edition)* (pp. 492-505). Jossey-Bass.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119171386.ch19>
- Al-Amir, B. A. H. (2017). Saudi female teachers' perceptions of the use of L1 in EFL classrooms. *English Language Teaching*, 10(6), 12-20.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n6p12>
- Almohaimed, S. M., & M Almurshed, H. (2018). Foreign language learners' attitudes and perceptions of L1 use in L2 classroom. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(4), 433-446.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3308322>
- Alshehri, E. (2017). Using learners' first language in EFL classrooms. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(1), 20-33. <https://doi.org/10.22492/ijll.3.1.02>
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586949>
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241-247. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/41.4.241>
- Bayraktaroğlu, S. (2019) *Teaching students in English is damaging their education*.
<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/opinion/teaching-students-english-damaging-their-education>
- Castrillon Diaz, L. S., & Bernal Perez, M. C. (2016). Teachers' beliefs on the use of mother tongue in English lessons in a bilingual school (*Doctoral dissertation, Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios*).
- Cole, S. (1998). The use of L1 in communicative English classrooms. *The Language Teacher*, 22, 11-14. <https://lozyko.ga/476343-media.pdf>
- Debreli, E., & Oyman, N. (2016). Students' preferences on the use of mother tongue in English as a foreign language classrooms: is it the time to re-examine English-only policies?. *English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 148-162.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n1p148>
- Edstrom, A. (2006). L1 use in the L2 classroom: one teacher's self-evaluation. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(2), 275-292.
<https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.63.2.275>
- Gaede, O. F. (1978). Reality shock: A problem among first-year teachers. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 51(9), 405-409.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.1978.9957085>
- Gass, S. M. (2017). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner (2nd edition)*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315173252>

- Gass, S. M., Mackey, A., & Pica, T. (1998). The role of input and interaction in second language acquisition introduction to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 299–307. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb01206.x>
- Galali, A., & Cinkara, E. (2017). The use of L1 in English as a foreign language classes: Insights from Iraqi tertiary level students. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(5), 54-64. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.5p.54>
- Halliwell, S., & Jones, B. (1991). *On target: Teaching in the target language*. Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.
- Johnson, J. S., & Newport, E. L. (1989). Critical period effects in second language learning: The influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second language. *Cognitive Psychology*, 21(1), 60–99. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(89\)90003-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(89)90003-0)
- Kılıçkaya, F. (2006). Instructors' attitudes towards English-medium instruction in Turkey. *Humanising Language Teaching*, 8(6). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED570169.pdf>
- Klasinc, U. (2018). *Students' and teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward the use of the mother tongue in teaching English and Spanish* (Doctoral dissertation, Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta).
- 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*, 15(2), 271-289. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341001715_The_Use_of_L1_in_the_Tertiary_L2_Classroom_Code-switching_Factors_Functions_and_Attitudes_in_Turkey
- Krashen, S. (2008). Language education: Past, present and future. *RELC Journal*, 39(2), 178-187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688208092183>
- Krashen, S. D., Terrell, T. D., Ehrman, M. E., & Herzog, M. (1984). A theoretical basis for teaching the receptive skills. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17, 261-275. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1984.tb03226.x>
- Long, M.H., & Sato, C.J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H.W. Seliger & M.H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 268-285). Newbury House.
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 Classroom: A Communication and Learning Strategy. In Llorca, E. (Eds.), *Non-Native Language Teachers. Educational Linguistics* (pp. 63–84). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-24565-0_5
- McMillan, B. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2011). The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes toward “English only”. *System*, 39(2), 251-263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.011>
- Marsakawati, N. P. E. (2017). Language choice in multilingual context: The use of L1 in the hospitality English courses. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 2(1), 263-272. <https://doi.org/10.30659/e.2.1.263-272>

- Meanwell, E., & Kleiner, S. (2014). The emotional experience of first-time teaching: Reflections from graduate instructors, 1997–2006. *Teaching Sociology*, 42(1), 17-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092055X13508377>
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System*, 42, 308–318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.021>
- Schweers Jr, C. W. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 37(2), 6-13.
- Solhi, M., & Büyükyazı, M. (2011, May). The use of first language in the EFL classroom: A facilitating or debilitating device. In A. Akbarov (Ed.), *FLTAL 2011 Proceedings* (pp. 860-866). International Burch University. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303610200_The_use_of_first_language_in_the_EFL_classroom_A_facilitating_or_debilitating_device
- Taşçı, S., & Aksu Ataç, B. (2020). L1 use in L2 teaching: the amount, functions, and perception towards the use of L1 in Turkish primary school context. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 7(2), 655-667. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1250581>
- Taşkın, A. (2011). *Perceptions on using L1 in language classrooms* [Unpublished Master's thesis]. <https://open.metu.edu.tr/bitstream/handle/11511/20564/index.pdf>
- Tetiurka, M. (2016). L1 Use in the Foreign Language Primary Classroom - Pre-service Teachers' Beliefs and Practices. In: Chodkiewicz, H., Steinbrich, P., Krzemińska-Adamek, M. (Eds.), *Working with Text and Around Text in Foreign Language Environments. Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp 259–272). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-33272-7_16
- Turnbull, B. (2018). Examining pre-service ESL teacher beliefs: Perspectives on first language use in the second language classroom. *Journal of Second Language Teaching & Research*, 6(1), 50-76. <https://pops.uclan.ac.uk/index.php/jsltr/article/view/482>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.251>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.)*. Sage.
- Zakaria, F. (2013). The role of first language in EFL Classroom. *Jurnal Ilmiah Didaktika*, 13(2), 373-383. <https://doi.org/10.22373/jid.v13i2.484>

Reviewers:

1. Anonymous
2. Anonymous

Handling Editor:

Boris Naimushin, PhD,
New Bulgarian University