



The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning™

2022

Volume 12/Issue 1

Article 3

A Comparative Study of the Attitudes of EFL Student and Practicing Teachers towards First Language Use

Gülten Koşar, Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Turkey,
gulten.kosar@mku.edu.tr

Recommended Citations:

APA

Koşar, G. (2022). A comparative study of the attitudes of EFL student and practicing teachers towards first language use. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 12(1), 28-43.

MLA

Gülten Koşar. "A comparative study of the attitudes of EFL student and practicing teachers towards first language use." *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning* 12.1 (2022): 28-43.

The JLTL is freely available online at www.jltl.org, with neither subscription nor membership required.

Contributors are invited to review the Submission page and manuscript templates at www.jltl.org/Submitonline

As an online journal, the JLTL adopts a green-policy journal. Please print out and copy responsibly.





The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 2022(1), pp.28-43

A Comparative Study of the Attitudes of EFL Student and Practicing Teachers towards First Language Use

Gülten Koşar¹

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received, June 05, 2021

Revisions completed December 26, 2021

Published January 1, 2022

Key Words:

English Language Teaching and Learning

EFL Practicing teachers

First Language Use

School Experience

ABSTRACT

Answers have been sought to the question of whether using first language in English lessons holds a facilitative power over or is a major hindrance to learning it. This comparative case study aims at filling the gap in the literature in comparing and contrasting EFL practicing teachers and EFL student teachers' attitudes to the use of first language, and if school experience impinges impact on EFL student teachers' attitudes towards incorporating it into English language teaching. The inductive content analysis of the data collected by pre-semi-structured interviews and post-semi-structured interviews demonstrated the school experience did not produce substantial changes in EFL student teachers' attitudes towards first language use. Additionally, whilst strong parallels existed between the attitudes of both sides concerning first language use, notable discrepancies as to the emphasis placed by them upon extraneous factors to elucidate the reasons lying behind its use appeared.

© Association of Applied Linguistics. All rights reserved

The literature is rich in investigating the use of first language (L1) in target language (TL) learning (Carroll & Morales, 2016; Levine, 2003; Osborne, 2020; Storch & Aldosari, 2010, Thompson & Harrison, 2014; Tian & Macaro, 2012; Varshney & Ianziti, 2006; Wach & Monroy, 2019; Wang & Kirkpatrick, 2012; Wang, 2019), and what is yielded in the vast array of explorations indicates no consensus has been reached upon the effectiveness of using L1 in TL teaching and learning to date. While incorporating students' L1 into TL teaching is deemed to be a medium stimulating TL learning in a number of researches, in others, it is not presented as an agent having the potential for enhancing it.

¹ Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Turkey, gulten.kosar@mku.edu.tr

Practicing and student teachers' conceptions of L1 use in TL learning and teaching could considerably vary from each other. The diversification in approaches towards using L1 is not only evident among the ones belonging to different parties, but also comes out as a result of looking into one party's perceptions of the topic of concern. To illustrate, whereas some practicing teachers do not favor the use of L1 in TL teaching (e.g., Chimumbutane, 2013), others state their strong beliefs in the beneficial effect of L1 use on it (e.g., Gallagher & Colohan, 2017; Giannikas, 2011; He, 2012; Lee, 2018; Lin, 2012; Segi, 2011). Since EFL teachers' beliefs regarding how effective teaching could be conducted bring about a profound effect upon their classroom teaching practices (e.g., Farrell & Yang, 2017; Gallant et al., 2014), their beliefs with respect to the use of L1 in EFL teaching and learning are highly likely to impact on the amount of L1 they use and/or permit their students to use in lessons. Along with the influence wielded by EFL practicing teachers' (EFLPTs) beliefs and attitudes about L1 use over English lessons, EFL student teachers' (EFLSTs) beliefs concerning the integration of L1 into English lessons could project their future instructional practices pertinent to L1 use, and their experiences of the school experience (SE) may produce changes in their attitudes towards the use of L1.

The review of relevant literature uncovers the scarcity in the research into comparing and contrasting EFLPTs and EFLSTs' attitudes towards using L1 in EFL classrooms, and whether or not the SE brings about any shifts in EFLSTs' attitudes to it. This study, hence, is likely to contribute substantially to the body of knowledge of the under-researched topics stated in the preceding sentence. Additionally, the findings presented in this research could help gain detailed insights into EFLPTs and EFLSTs' reasons behind their use of L1 in lessons.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. L1 Use from the Perspective of Students

Existing studies on uncovering students' perceptions in regard to the use of their L1 in TL learning have reported contradictory results. For example, the research by Neokleous (2017) demonstrated the support of students for L1 use in EFL classrooms while the study done by Tian and Hennebry (2016) to explore students' perceptions regarding their teachers' language use in teaching lexical items yielded the students appreciated their teachers' use of both L1 and TL accentuating that the amount of TL used by their teachers should be tailored according to their level of proficiency in it.

A new study conducted by Brevik and Rindal (2020) investigated students' perceptions of the language/s used in English classes and showed that the teacher was the one determining which languages would be used, and the participants viewed their teachers' use of L1 as useful. In the same vein, the college students participating in the research by Kim et al. (2017) expressed their beliefs in the facilitative effect of the use of L1 in English-medium instruction classes on learning. In contrast to that study, the college students in the study by Macaro et al. (2018) did not favor instructors' use of L1 to explain concepts, rather, stated that they would appreciate the effort put by them in explaining concepts in the TL. In the same vein, in the research by Crichton (2009), the study participants favored their teachers' use of TL in lessons, which encouraged their TL production, and the researcher suggested that students could learn TL on the condition that the teacher continuously spoke it in lessons. Similar to the college students in the study by Macaro et al. (2018), the young learners taking part in the research by Lee (2012) did not appreciate the exclusive use of L1.

2.2. Student Teachers' Conceptions of the Use of TL and the Relationship between Experiential Learning Model of Development and the Probable Changes in Them after the SE

Examining student teachers' perceptions of the use of TL in the teaching of it have been determined as the topic of a plethora of research in the literature. Having the stated purpose, the comparative case study undertaken by Aberdeen (2018) revealed the considerable commonality between native and non-native pre-service teachers' perceptions concerning being against the exclusive use of TL in TL classes, yet also demonstrated their predisposition for using TL to fulfill diverse functions in lessons. Similarly, the study by Macaro (2001) showed that student teachers resorted to L1 as providing procedural explanations as to activities and classroom management, but also indicated that they predominantly used TL in classes. However, the EFLSTs in Barak and Yinon's study (2005) advocated the use of students' L1 rather than the TL putting forward the advantages to be gained in making things clear for all students, managing classroom and enhancing student engagement in communicative activities.

There could occur changes in student teachers' conceptions of the use of L1 in TL teaching in the pre-service teacher education program as a result of what they learn in the offered courses. For example, the changes taking place in student teachers' attitudes towards using L1 subsequent to doing practicum were explored in a study by Bateman (2008), the results of which indicated the movement from supporting the use of TL to incorporating L1 into TL teaching. That variation in EFLSTs' attitudes to L1 use was considered to stem from their lack of self-confidence, discipline issues, the wish for establishing a good rapport with students, lack of time, and lack of knowledge about how to achieve the goal of maximizing the use of TL. In addition, the influence of pre-service teacher education on EFLSTs' viewpoints on the use of L1 in English lessons was depicted in the research by Miri et al. (2017) because the EFLSTs started to hold positive views on using L1 as a consequence of the coursework they completed.

According to experiential learning model of development (Kolb, 2015), there exists three disparate levels of adaptation: performance, learning and development. Kolb (2015) expounds how adaptation in the three levels occurs in the succeeding statements:

In the acquisition phase of development, adaptation takes the form of performance governed by a simple registrative consciousness. In the specialization phase of development, adaptation occurs via a learning process governed by a consciousness that is increasingly interpretative. The integrative phase of development marks the achievement of a holistic developmental adaptive process governed by a consciousness that is integrative in its structure. (p. 211)

EFLSTs commence their academic education in the English language teaching program with their existing mental structure of the effect of L1 use on English language teaching and learning, which is prone to evolve by reason of the coursework they take and their field experiences in the program. In view of the three levels of adaptation in the experiential learning model of development, EFLSTs engage in real teaching in the SE at the level of performance, which is likely to reflect their attitudes towards the use of L1. The level of learning in the SE includes both having a first-hand experience of L1 use in the lesson/s they teach and their observations on their mentors' teaching practices bearing traces of L1 use, and at the last level of experiential learning model of development, the level of development, EFLSTs reflect on the effect of the integration of L1 use into English lessons on English language teaching and learning in the light of their lived experiences of the use of L1, which might impinge on their practices in L1 use in the future.

2.3. Practicing Teachers' Perceptions of Incorporating L1 into TL Teaching

Practicing teachers' beliefs and instructional practices in using L1 in TL classes, and the rationale behind employing it have been the topic of several studies heretofore. Examinations on their practices in the use of L1 demonstrate that their personal history of language learning, the extent to which TL is used

in the society, and the level of significance attached to it have a lot to do with the amount of their L1 use in TL classes (Kim & Elder, 2008). Moreover, Kibler and Roman's (2013) study suggested school principals as crucial factors impinging upon teachers' perceptions of incorporating students' L1 into language lessons, which needs to be taken into consideration for even if the teacher believes that L1 should be used to enhance student comprehension and learning, the rules set by the institution for which they work might not allow them to do so. Further, creating a safe learning environment is presented in the literature as an advantage provided by using L1 (Leeming, 2011), which can promote student participation in TL classes. For instance, the study by Campa and Nassaji (2009) yielded that the experienced participating teacher used L1 in German L2 language classes with an eye to creating a comfortable and supportive learning environment whereby students could engage more in lessons whereas the novice one used L1 to facilitate L2 learning. For this reason, it could be stipulated that teachers' year of teaching experience might be a factor affecting their attitude towards L1 use and for what purposes they incorporate it into their classroom practices. Similar to the findings in Campa and Nassaji's (2009) research, the research undertaken by Bruen and Kelly (2017) reported that the study participants who were foreign language lecturers in a higher education institution stated that using a shared L1 in lessons alleviated anxiety among students and prevented cognitive overload.

The research by Qian et al. (2009) yielded that the EFLPTs used L1 in an effort to encourage classroom interaction, manage the classroom, and promote the relationship between them and students. Another finding demonstrated in that study was that teachers' use of L1 decreased markedly in compliance with students' level of proficiency, that is to say, the higher level of proficiency the students had, the less L1 the teachers used. In line with Quin et al.'s (2009) research, the kindergarten teacher teaching Spanish learners of English in the study by Oliveria et al. (2016) used Spanish specifically for giving instructions, elucidating key concepts, checking comprehension, classroom management and enhancing student learning. Spanish teachers of English in the research carried out by Ramos (2005) advocated the use of Spanish to support Spanish learners' English language learning by providing explanations in Spanish. In the same vein, the EFLPTs in the study by Samar and Moradkhani (2014) highlighted that they employed L1 due to a number of reasons, the most important of which was enabling student comprehension.

The participants in Vaish's (2012) study had divergent views on using L1 in that though they supported the use of TL, they also posited that L1 use could be an invaluable tool in TL learning. The study done by Lourie (2010) also revealed differing practices of teachers of young learners in using L1, attributed to participants' varying pedagogical views and their presumptions about the objectives of young learners' program. Carried out to explore a teacher and adult language learners' L1 use, the research by Ma (2019) indicated that L1 was employed by the teacher to pose questions and to establish social relationship with students, whilst adult learners used L1 to ask and answer questions and to provide peer support.

The perceptions of student and practicing teachers about monolingual approach was explored in Lee's (2016) research in which it was reported that EFLPTs, contrary to EFLSTs, opposed more to TL-only policy, and teachers' level of proficiency in English and their teaching experience did not have a significant effect on their beliefs concerning L1 use in English language learning. The available literature appears to be in need of more research in examining the differences and similarities in EFLSTs and EFLPTs' attitudes towards using L1 in EFL teaching, and the effect of the SE on EFLSTs' attitudes to L1 use. Therefore, the research questions guiding the present study are:

- 1- What are the differences, if any, in EFLSTs' attitudes towards the use of L1 in EFL classrooms they adopted before starting and after completing their SEs?
- 2- What are the differences and similarities in EFLSTs and EFLPTs' attitudes towards using L1 in EFL classrooms?

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

One of the two purposes of this comparative case study is figuring out the similarities and differences between EFLSTs' and EFLPTs' attitudes towards using L1 in EFL classrooms, because as is stated by Beck et al. (2004), "the major aim of comparative research is to identify similarities and differences between social entities" (p. 152). At the outset of this study, pre-semi-structured interviews (PRSSIs) were conducted with the participating EFLSTs about their views on using students' L1 in English lessons. Then, the participants began their SEs in their placement school, the selection of which was made by the Provincial Directorate for National Education. The placement school is a state secondary school, which delivers education for grades 5-8. While 3 hours of English lessons are offered to grades 5 and 6, it is 4 hours for grades 7 and 8. The changes that took place in the English language curriculum of primary and secondary schools (Ministry of National Education [MNE], 2013) highlighted the need for not teaching English as a subject, yet teaching it through using communicative approach so that students can use it as a means of engaging in and carrying out communication; therefore, the language to be used in the classroom is recommended to be principally English (Ministry of National Education [MNE], 2018).

Throughout the SE, the EFLSTs observed EFLPTs' (mentors) classroom practices, learned about the organization of school, and practiced teaching English, which are also specified as course requirements (MNE, 2012). Subsequent to the completion of the SE, post-semi-structured interviews (POSSIs) were carried out with the EFLSTs and a semi-structured interview was held with the EFLPTs.

3.2. Participants

3.2.1. EFLPTs

Five EFLPTs mentoring the EFLSTs in the SE accepted to participate in the study following the information provided to them on the purpose of the study. To maintain anonymity and confidentiality, EFLPTs' names will not be mentioned in the study. Demographic information about the EFLPTs is displayed in Table 1 below.

Table 1
Demographic Information

EFLPT	Age	Gender	Year of Teaching Experience	The Grades Being Taught
EFLPT 1	27	Female	4	Grades 5, 6, 7 and 8
EFLPT 2	33	Female	11	Grades 6, 7 and 8
EFLPT 3	42	Female	15	Grades 5, 6 and 7
EFLPT 4	30	Male	7	Grades 5, 7 and 8
EFLPT 5	34	Male	12	Grades 6, 7 and 8

As can be seen in Table 1, three of the EFLPTs were female and two were male. Their ages ranged from 27 to 42. The EFLPT with the most experience in the profession had been teaching for 15 years whereas the one with the least experience had been teaching for four years when this study was conducted. EFLPT 1 was teaching grades 5, 6, 7, and 8, EFLPT 2 was teaching grades 6, 7, and 8, EFLPT 3 was teaching grades 5, 6, and 7, EFLPT 4 was teaching grades 5, 7, and 8, and EFLPT 5 was teaching grades 6, 7, and 8 as the study was undertaken. Each EFLPT mentored three EFLSTs.

3.2.2. EFLSTs

15 senior EFLSTs studying at a state university in Turkey took part in the study. The explanations about the aim of the study were given to them, and their consent to participate in the study was obtained. One of the EFLSTs was male while the others were female. The average age of the participants was 22.7. All the student teachers taught English during the SE though the total number of lessons they taught varied, depending on their EFLPTs' approaches towards allowing EFLSTs to teach, because it is worth to note that it is not mandatory for EFLSTs to teach in the SE. All the participants taught English more than once, one of which was observed by their university supervisor.

3.3. Data Collection Tools and Analysis

3.3.1. PRSSIs and POSSIs with the EFLSTs

Two semi-structured interviews were carried out with the EFLSTs, one before they began to go the placement school and one after the completion of the SE. In the PRSSI, a question was raised so as to learn about EFLSTs' attitudes towards L1 use in English lessons and the reasons behind them. The ultimate purpose of the POSSI was to find out if any shifts in their attitudes to using L1 occurred as a result of what they experienced in the placement school in regard to English language teaching. The questions posed in the POSSIs involved what dis/advantages of using L1 in English lessons considering the lessons taught by the EFLPTs and they observed were, and whether or not any change/s had occurred in their attitudes towards employing students' L1.

The PRSSIs and POSSIs were transcribed verbatim, and inductive content analysis was conducted to analyze the data. The interview data were read by two coders repeatedly before starting the coding process. Thereafter, the data were coded. Afterwards, the coders compared and contrasted the codes they generated and reread the transcriptions and codes for several times to resolve the discrepancies and to come to an agreement on them. Subsequently, the coders developed themes from the codes. The themes belonging to the PRSSIs and POSSIs will be compared and contrasted to each other with a view to investigating the effect of the SE on the attitudes of the EFLSTs' towards using L1 in EFL classes.

3.4. Semi-Structured Interview with the EFLPTs

Semi-structured interviews were carried out with the EFLPTs prior to the completion of the SE. They were asked if or not they used L1 in lessons, what reasons they would suggest to elucidate their use of L1, and whether or not their attitudes towards the use of L1 would have been different if they had taught English in a different context. All the interviews were transcribed verbatim and the same process of the analysis of the transcribed interviews as the one run for the interviews with the EFLSTs was gone through. The findings obtained from the analysis of the interviews with the EFLPTs will be compared to those from the EFLSTs.

4. Findings

The results on EFLSTs' attitudes towards L1 use both before and following the SE will be given in the following lines so that an answer can be obtained to the first research question of if or not any changes in their attitudes to using L1 took place after the SE.

4.1. Findings with respect to EFLSTs' Attitudes towards L1 Use in EFL Classrooms before Commencing the SE

The findings gathered from the PRSSIs revealed that while 8 participants had positive attitudes towards using L1 in EFL classes, the remaining opposed its use prior to the outset of the SE. Table 2 below illustrates the findings yielded by the data gathered through conducting PRSSIs.

Table 2.
Findings Obtained from the PRSSIs

Theme	Code	Example
Facilitating English language learning	Improves understanding	<i>I believe that the use of L1 can help our students understand what is taught. The teacher can use visual aids or her gestures and mimics, but still the student may not understand. Then, she must use L1.</i>
	A means to scaffold low-achieving students	<i>I think I should use L1 when I teach low proficient students.</i>
Adverse effects on students' speaking skills	EFLSTs' prior schooling experiences	<i>My English teachers taught me English in Turkish and because of that I am not good at speaking in English.</i>
	Realities of EFL settings	<i>EFL learners cannot find opportunities to practice speaking English outside school. Therefore, I guess English teachers have to expose their students to English as much as they can in the classroom.</i>
	Being a good model for students	<i>If English teachers speak Turkish in the lesson, students will not try to speak English because they mimic their teachers.</i>

The EFLSTs supporting the use of L1 in the PRSSIs highlighted that they did not advocate predominantly using L1 in English lessons, but it could be resorted to as a medium when there was no other way to ensure that students understood. Below is the theme that developed from the responses of EFLSTs advocating the use of L1, which is displayed in Table 2.

4.2. Facilitating English language learning

The common ground on which the EFLSTs holding a positive attitude towards incorporating L1 into teaching met was its facilitative effect on learning English. They stated that providing nothing done by the teacher such as attempting to explain a pattern by simplifying the language she had used, using visual aids and body language worked, she could resort to students' L1. The point accentuated by the EFLSTs was that insisting on using English despite the fact that students did not understand what was conveyed by the teacher did not make sense to them because the primary role of the teacher was to assist English language learning process for students, which could be rendered by using L1. The supporters of the use of L1 also

stated that for low-level learners of English, its use could empower students in their journey to becoming an independent user of English.

4.3. Adverse Effects on Students' Speaking Skills

The content analysis of the responses of the opponents of L1 use produced the theme adverse effects on students' speaking skills, which could be seen in Table 2 alongside the codes and examples of them. Seven EFLSTs in the PRSSIs expressed their negative attitudes towards using L1 by referring to their prior English language learning experiences. They stated that as English language teacher candidates, their current level of proficiency in speaking was insufficient, and it had been worse when they began their studies at the department, which they believed resulted from the fact that they had been taught English by teachers who had used their L1 almost 100% in lessons. They emphasized that students had a tendency to mimic their teachers, and although they might have to struggle with understanding a teacher speaking exclusively English, they would get used to it. Additionally, they emphasized that students should be exposed to English as much as possible particularly in EFL learning settings.

I do not believe that students learn English better from a teacher using their mother tongue in lessons. If it was so, I would have learnt English well till my graduation from high school. If the teacher uses students' L1 in lessons, they will use their mother tongue, too. In such classes, English is used for just greeting at the beginning of lessons, T: "Good morning class", Ss: "Good morning teacher", T: How are you today? ", Ss: "Fine, thanks, and you?", T: "Thank you, sit down". Students should be exposed to English more, and encouraged to speak in English to learn English. (EFLST 12- POSSI)

4.4. Findings Regarding the Changes in EFLSTs' Attitudes towards L1 Use After the Completion of the SE

Table 3
The Findings Obtained from the POSSIs

Theme	Code	Example
Changes in favor of the use of L1	Necessary for ensuring student learning	<i>Before the start of the SE, I had thought that L1 should not be used in the teaching of English, but now I have changed my mind. In the SE, I have seen that students understand better if the teacher speaks in English.</i>
	Required for less proficient students	<i>The SE has taught me that less proficient students are in need of teachers using L1.</i>
Change in favor of the use of English	Possibility of teaching English in English	<i>At the beginning of the SE, I had believed that we could not teach English by just speaking English, but after observing lessons in which students learned English from the teacher who spoke English, I have started to believe that teachers can teach English in English.</i>
	Teachers' willingness to teach English in English	<i>If teachers want to teach English in English, they can succeed it.</i>

Following the completion of the SE, the participants, in the POSSI, were asked if any changes had occurred in their attitudes towards using L1 in English lessons. Three of the participants stated the shift in their attitudes. Two of them started to support L1 use and stated that they had realized using solely English in lessons did not promote student learning in real classes, specifically less proficient students' learning, producing the theme *changes in favor of the use of L1* depicted in Table 3. The statements by one of the two EFLSTs epitomize those of the other.

Before starting to go to the placement school, I had thought that L1 shouldn't be used in English lessons because my past English teachers had used to use L1 from the beginnings to the ends of lessons, and because of that, I had difficulties in making simple sentences in English in my first year at the department. But after teaching real students, I saw that I had to use L1 not to get stuck in lessons and to be able to complete them. (EFLST 9-POSSI)

The other EFLST expressing changes in her attitude towards the use of L1 maintained that her experiences in the SE led her to commence to believe that English should be the only language to be used in English lessons, producing the theme *change in favor of the use of English* as can be seen in Table 3. Before the SE, using only English in lessons had not sounded plausible to her, but after teaching lessons in English, she stated in the POSSI that English could and should be taught via speaking in English. In addition, to elucidate her new point of view better, she highlighted the central role of the teacher in the language/s used in lessons by arguing that if the teacher really wanted to teach English in English, she could do so without attempting to find valid excuses for not using it.

4.5. EFLSTs' Views on the Advantages of Disadvantages of Using L1 after the SE

The participants were asked about the advantages and disadvantages of the use of L1 in the POSSIs, and they were kindly requested to visualize the lessons taught by the EFLPTs. The EFLSTs stated that their mentors taught English in students' L1, but in one or two classes in which students' level of English proficiency was higher the EFLPTs used English to a small extent. Six of the EFLSTs mentioned no advantage of using L1 in English while the remaining EFLSTs stated both advantages and disadvantages of L1 use. Table 4 demonstrates the advantages and disadvantages of employing L1 they observed in the lessons taught by their mentors.

Table 4.

Observed Advantages and Disadvantages of L1 Use

Advantages of L1 use	Disadvantages of L1 use
Facilitating grammar teaching	Speaking is not developed.
Smooth flow of lessons	Poor pronunciation skill
Facilitating vocabulary teaching	Stimulating thinking in L1
Establishing comfortable & safe learning environment	Students' lack of awareness of the fact that a different language is being learnt.
	Attrition of teachers' speaking skill
	Limited input in English
	Not promoting permanent learning

Table 4 illustrates that facilitating grammar and vocabulary teaching, creating a comfortable and safe learning environment, and enabling smooth flow of lessons are among the advantages of using L1. The observed disadvantages of resorting to L1 subsume a number of issues: students' speaking and pronunciation skills are not improved, thinking in English is not encouraged, students are not aware of the fact that they are learning a new language, teachers' proficiency in speaking skill decreases, students are not adequately exposed to English, and lasting learning is not fostered.

4.6. Findings as to EFLPTs' Attitudes Towards the Use of L1

The analysis of the data obtained from the semi-structured interviews conducted with the EFLPTs revealed that all of them used L1 in lessons, congruent with the EFLSTs' statements about the use of L1 by their mentors. Four of EFLPTs highlighted in the interview that in spite of the fact they employed it in lessons, they believed that students' L1 should not be used; on the contrary, English should be the only medium of instruction to teach English. The other EFLPT noted in the interview that she did use L1 in English lessons because she believed that a foreign language could be taught by virtue of using it. The EFLPTs were asked in the interviews to explicate why they used students' L1. Succeeding lines involve the theme that was developed from the content analysis of practicing teachers' responses and the explanations as to it.

4.6.1. Contextual Factors determine the use of L1 in EFL classrooms

The EFLPTs stated that though they wanted to teach English by using English, due to the factors pertaining to the context including students' low-level of proficiency, the burden placed upon them by high-stakes tests and overcrowded classrooms, they had to use it. They pointed out in the interview students getting education in the placement school came from low socioeconomic background, which, according to them, adversely influenced students' interest in learning English. The participants also mentioned the content of high school entrance test as one of the reasons behind using L1 in lessons. In that exam, multiple choice questions assessing students' knowledge of grammar and vocabulary are asked to test their knowledge of English. Therefore, the EFLPTs claimed that they used L1 to teach grammar and vocabulary to students, which, they believed, could help them get higher scores on the English test. They also indicated that parents and the administration were expecting students to get high scores on the test, another significant factor in using L1 in lessons. Teaching crowded classrooms was postulated by the EFLPTs as a strong reason for using L1 in English lessons. They stressed that teaching roughly 35 students in the same classroom made it stringent to speak merely English in lessons because all students did not understand what was meant by them when they spoke English. The response of one of the EFLPTs to the question of why they used L1 in lessons, presented in the extract below, exemplifies other EFLPTs' responses to the same question.

I use L1 in my lessons. Of course, the ideal way of teaching English is using English to teach it. I know that as an English teacher I should expose my students to English. But we have lots of problems. For example, our students have low socioeconomic status and they are not interested in English. They will take high-school entrance test and the questions are multiple-choice questions that test grammar and vocabulary knowledge, and speaking skill is not assessed. Because of this, we focus on teaching grammar and vocabulary through using L1. Parents also care about students' performance on the test. (EFLPT-2)

4.6.2. For what Purposes the EFLPTs use L1

In the semi-structured interview, a question was posed in an effort to find out for what purposes the EFLPTs used L1 in lessons. Their responses led to the development of the below-mentioned themes.

4.6.3. Assuring student comprehension

The EFLPTs stated that unless they had used L1 in lessons, students would have got into difficulties in understanding what was covered in lessons. Students' low-level of proficiency was asserted by all the

EFLPTs as the reason for their use of L1, and thus, it was believed to be the means of promoting English language learning process for students. They also maintained that teaching grammar and vocabulary in English was hardly possible considering students' level of proficiency in English, and insisting on pursuing English-only policy would produce nothing positive but result in waste of time.

Teaching English grammar in English is like a dream in my context. I would really like to teach in English, but how can I do it? Students don't understand and my aim is making my students understand. (EFLPT-3)

4.6.4. Encouraging student participation

The second theme emerging from the analysis is linked with the probability of increasing student participation. All the EFLPTs stated that students participated in lessons more so long as L1 was used, yet when they conducted their teaching in English, since students did not understand them, they participated less. Another point made by the practicing teachers was related to nagging the anxiety students felt over the likelihood of being ridiculed by peers and/or the teacher when they did not understand the teacher speaking in English and/or made a mistake as they spoke it. Hence, they highlighted because creating a safe learning environment was one of the primary and bounden duties of a teacher, using L1 was a medium for providing a comfortable and stimulating learning environment to students.

4.7. Findings regarding the Similarities and Differences between EFLSTs and EFLPTs' Attitudes towards the Use of L1

The attitudes of EFLPTs and those of EFLSTs, as were revealed in the POSSIs and the semi-structured interviews, towards L1 use are compared and contrasted to each other to identify the similarities and differences between them, which are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5.

Similarities and Differences Between EFLPTs' and EFLSTs' Attitudes Towards the Use of L1

Similarities	Differences
Promoting grammar and vocabulary teaching	While all the EFLPTs believed that they needed to use L1 due to contextual factors, six EFLSTs believed only English should be used no matter how distorting the contextual factors were.
Empowers less proficient students	Some of the EFLSTs placed the emphasis on teacher factor, whereas the EFLPTs put the emphasis on external factors to explain L1 use.
Lowers students' level of anxiety	

As demonstrated in Table 5, both the EFLPTs and EFLSTs believed that the use of L1 stimulates grammar and vocabulary teaching, encourages students with low level of proficiency in English and reduces the level of anxiety among language learners. Table 5 also illustrates that the EFLPTs claimed that contextual factors, in other words external factors, forced them to use students' L1, however, some EFLSTs laid the emphasis on the internal factor, the teacher, in resorting to L1. Moreover, whilst the EFLPTs legitimized their use of L1 in lessons by grounding their explanations on the context, the EFLSTs who did not appreciate L1 use accentuated that no excuse could be accepted to justify using it.

5. Discussion

The findings indicated that a drastic change did not take place, after the completion of the SE, in the EFLSTs' attitudes towards L1 use. Only three EFLSTs verbalized the occurrence of shifts in their attitudes towards employing it. One of them expressed that, after the SE, she started to think that L1 should not be used in English lessons while the other two EFLSTs articulated that their experiences in the SE got them to acknowledge that L1 was scaffolding students in their language learning process. Contrary to these two participants' conceptions, the other EFLST stated after the completion of the SE that regardless of the teaching context, an English teacher should follow TL-only policy, indicating that what is induced from the same context is likely to differ from student teacher to student teacher. In the study by Bateman (2008), however, a shift in more student teachers' beliefs of L1 use was demonstrated. More student teachers started to hold positive attitudes towards using L1, and contrary to the findings in this study, the changes in student teachers' beliefs were attributed to factors like discipline problems and the deficiency in their knowledge of how to accomplish the goals of extending the use of TL. In this study, the participating EFLSTs stating changes in their attitudes put forward students' proficiency level as a factor impinging on the changes, because even though they had believed that there was no need for the use of L1 before the SE, they started to believe that it endorsed low proficient students' English language learning.

One of the advantages of the use of L1 observed by the EFLSTs was providing a safe and comfortable learning environment to students, which is in agreement with a number studies in the literature (Bruen & Kelly, 2017; Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Leeming, 2011). Promoting grammar and vocabulary teaching was another observed advantage of using L1 in lessons, and also, in the PRSSIs, the EFLSTs supporting the use of L1 stated that student comprehension could be enhanced by virtue making things clear for students. The EFLSTs who did not advocate the use of L1 to teach English emphasized in the PRSSIs that they were also taught by English teachers having used L1 to teach English, which resulted in learning neither grammar nor vocabulary. In line with the views of the EFLSTs supporting the use of L1, the EFLPTs had positive attitudes towards it in that, according to them, student learning could be enabled via using L1. These findings appear to parallel the results in several researches in the relevant literature (Carroll & Morales, 2016; Kim et al., Oliveria et al., 2016; Ramos, 2005; Samar & Moradkhani, 2014; Vaish, 2012). The last observed advantage of the use of L1 by the EFLSTs is running lessons smoothly in the way they were planned. The issue upon which emphasis needs to be placed is that teaching fluidly may not necessarily be indicative of student learning, because what is believed to have been taught by teachers might not be learnt by students.

The disadvantages stated by the EFLSTs and stemming from the use of L1 include not helping students develop their speaking and pronunciation skills, which correlates with another disadvantage verbalized by them as to the effect of using L1 on deterioration in teachers' speaking skills. These disadvantages could make more sense as long as the amount of L1 used by teachers is taken into consideration. As was stated by the student teachers favoring the use of L1, it could be resorted to only if no way except for using it is left, nevertheless, in the context of this study, English lessons were offered almost 100% in L1. In such a context, while anticipating students to be able to improve their speaking skills does sound to be implausible, deterioration in teachers' speaking skill appears to be highly probable. Other disadvantages originating from the use of L1 are not leading students to think in English and insufficient or no exposure to English. Unless teachers of English use English in lessons, unsurprisingly, problems with exposing students to English and with the learning environment where students do not feel that they are learning a new language are likely to arise.

Regarding the views of the EFLPTs on the use of L1 in English lessons, four out of five had a negative attitude towards the use of L1; the context in which they taught English, nonetheless, prevented them from using English to teach it. Students' low level of proficiency in English and parental and

administrative expectations of success in the high-school entrance test involving a part assessing students' knowledge of English grammar and vocabulary were put forward by the EFLPTs as the contextual factors. Similarly, the influence of the workplace on teachers' use of L1 in TL classes was also revealed in the study by Kibler and Roman (2013), highlighting that the policy pursued by the institution on the use of L1 in TL teaching impeded teachers to transfer their perceptions of L1 use into practice. The EFLPTs in this study noted that students participated more in lessons in which L1 was used. In the same vein, in the research by Qian et al. (2009), increasing students' classroom participation was among the reasons stated by the participating EFL teachers to expound why they used L1. Consistent with the EFLPTs' perceptions of the use of L1 in this research, Aberdeen's (2018) study reported the support of teachers for using it in TL classes.

Concerning the differences and similarities between EFLSTs' and EFLPTs' attitudes towards the use of L1, obtained from the analysis of the POSSIs administered with the EFLSTs and the semi-structured interviews carried out with the EFLPTs, both the EFLPTs and the EFLSTs supporting the use of L1 believed using L1 stimulated grammar and vocabulary teaching, fostered English language learning on the part of low proficient students, and a safe and comfortable classroom environment by lowering students' level of anxiety was created. Both parties believed that teaching grammar and vocabulary was facilitated by virtue of resorting to L1 but the question of if or not students really learned grammar and vocabulary is a question still awaiting an answer for one of the disadvantages of using L1, according to the EFLSTs, was that it did not result in permanent learning. The EFLSTs might have been under the influence of their mentors using L1 in English lessons in that observing them speaking in L1 as teaching grammar and vocabulary might have led them to think that that using L1 took less time and required less effort to put into teaching them.

The differentiation identified between the attitudes of the EFLPTs and EFLSTs towards using L1 appears to be rooted in the emphasis placed upon the contextual factors by the EFLPTs, because six EFLSTs stated that no excuse could be invented to legitimize the use of L1 whilst the EFLPTs pointed to their workplace conditions obligating them to use L1. In addition, the EFLSTs favoring the use of L1 stated that they were against using exclusively L1 to teach English, yet viewed it as an agent to exploit when there was no way left as teaching low proficient students after having used other means such as visual aids. Furthermore, the EFLPTs brought the extraneous factors to the forefront while explaining why they used L1 in English lessons, in stark contrast to their beliefs of how English should be taught, inasmuch as they believed that English should be the medium of instruction in English language teaching, but they used L1 to teach it. It could be alleged that working as a practicing teacher makes the teacher be fraught with contextual factors, implying that today's EFLSTs might be tomorrow's EFLPTs' concerned with them. Likewise, in the study by Lee (2016), practicing teachers favored the use of L1 more than student teachers did. EFLSTs could be more enthusiastic about using English in lessons as against the enthusiasm felt by EFLPTs, firing the question of if gaining more experience in teaching makes teachers bow contextual factors more as the EFLSTs in this study seem to be influenced less by them. In addition, the PSEFLT have just been imparted knowledge about effective ways of English language teaching at different educational levels in the program, which could impact on the conceptions they hold of the use of L1 in English lessons, indicating the need for observing the EFLSTs' future teaching practices to investigate the incompatibilities, if any, between their beliefs in the use of L1 and their real instructional practices and if any changes take place in their conceptions.

6. Conclusion

Comparing and contrasting EFLSTs' and EFLPTs' views about the use of L1 in teaching English is an under-researched topic, and for this reason, the results in this study could broaden the existing body of knowledge of the topic. The findings revealed that though the attitudes of EFLPTs and EFLSTs towards the use of L1 bear striking similarities like encouraging low proficient students and reducing students' level of anxiety,

they show profound differences in the stress they laid upon its use to surmount any problem created by contextual factors. However, the present research is not free of limitations as its results are bound to the context in which it is conducted. Further research is needed to compare and contrast more EFLPTs' and EFLSTs' perceptions of and practices in the use of L1. Moreover, the number of EFLPTs should be increased to gain more information about their conceptions of the use of L1. Additionally, the research to be conducted in the future could add one more party to investigations into the use of L1, teacher educators, and attempt to examine the topic from a wider perspective.

7. Suggestions and Limitations

The findings of the present study demonstrated that the SE has the potential to lead to shifts, though not fundamentally, in EFLSTs' attitudes towards the use of L1 in lessons, which brings forward the need for seriously contemplating the effect the SE on EFLSTs' professional learning. Because EFLSTs get the chance to teach real students and observe their mentors' teaching practices in the SE, they have the opportunity for reflecting on how English language learning could be promoted by L1 use and how the effectiveness of teaching could be improved or decreased due to it. The results of the study also illustrate the significance of the context in the decisions made by the teacher on the use of L1 in English lessons. The participating EFLPTs, except one, have positive attitudes towards teaching English in English; nonetheless, extraneous factors including students' proficiency level and expectations of parents and the administration for helping students perform well on the high-stakes exam force them to teach English in L1, and two of the participating EFLSTs' took a positive attitude to the use of L1 because of a similar reason, students' low level of proficiency level in English. This fires the question of whether the attitudes of the EFLSTs would have been dissimilar if they had been placed in another school. Bearing in mind the influence of the context, the EFLSTs who started to adopt a positive attitude towards the use of L1 following their SEs might not have changed their attitudes or the EFLSTs who valued L1 use could have taken a negative attitude towards it if they had been placed in a school where English language proficiency level of students was higher. For this reason, it appears to be significant to offer a chance to EFLSTs to be able to teach students with different levels of English language proficiency via placing them in different schools. Furthermore, EFL teacher educators should devote class-time to discussing about why teachers feel the need for using L1 through drawing EFLSTs' attention to diverse scenarios in which EFLPTs believe they have no other choice but use L1 to make learning take place. By doing so, EFLSTs can formulate proposals relating to what strategies could be employed to continue to teach English in English when teachers confront problems in lessons.

Aside from the implications for pre-service EFL teacher education, the findings also carry implications for in-service teacher education. The case of the four EFLPTs believing that English should be the medium of instruction in English lessons yet teaching in L1 as a consequence of the contextual factors indicates the necessity of providing training in what can be done in order not to teach English in L1 in classes "labelled" as classes of students with low English language proficiency. In doing so, they can develop their skills in dealing with troubles leading them to use L1, which they can demonstrate in their teaching to EFLSTs as a part of their mentoring.

References

- Aberdeen, H. (2018). A longitudinal comparative study of the use of target language in the MFL classroom by native and non-native student teachers. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(4), 329-342.
- Barak, L. O., & Yinon, H. (2005). Different but Similar: Student teachers' perspectives on the use of L1 in Arab and Jewish EFL classroom settings. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 18(1), 91-113.
- Bateman, B. E. (2008). Student teachers' attitudes and beliefs about using the target language in the classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(1), 11-28.
- Beck, M. S. L., Bryman, A., & Liao, T. F. (2004). *The Sage encyclopedia of social science research methods*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Brevik, L. M. & Rindal, A. U. (2020). Language use in the classroom: Balancing target language exposure with the need for other languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 54(4), 925-953.
- Bruen, J., & Kelly, N. (2017). Using a shared L1 to reduce cognitive overload and anxiety levels in the L2 classroom. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(3), 368-381.
- Campa, J. C. D. L., & Nassaji, H. (2009). The amount, purpose and reasons for using L1 in L2 classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(4), 742-759.
- Carroll, K. S., & Morales, A. N. S. (2016). Using university students' L1 as a resource: Translanguaging in a Puerto Rican ESL classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39(3-4), 248-262.
- Chimbutane, F. (2013). Codeswitching in L1 and L2 learning contexts: insights from a study of teacher beliefs and practices in Mozambican bilingual education programmes. *Language and Education*, 27(4), 314-328.
- Crichton, H. (2009). 'Value added' modern languages teaching in the classroom: an investigation into how teachers' use of classroom target language can aid pupils' communication skills. *The Language Learning Journal*, 37(1), 19-34.
- Farrell, T. S. C., & Yang, D. (2017). Exploring an EAP teacher's beliefs and practices in teaching L2 speaking: A case study. *RELC Journal*, 50(1), 104-117.
- Gallagher, F., & Colohan, G. (2017). T(w)o and fro: using the L1 as a language teaching tool in the CLIL classroom. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(4), 485-498.
- Gallant, P. B., Martin, C., McGonnell, M., & Corkum, P. (2014). Nova Scotia Teachers' ADHD Knowledge, Beliefs, and Classroom Management Practices. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 30(1), 3-21.
- Giannikas, C. N. (2011). L1 in English language learning: a research study in a Greek regional context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21(3), 319-339.
- He, A. E. (2012). Systematic use of mother tongue as learning/teaching resources in target language instruction. *Multilingual Education*, 2(1), 1-15.
- Kibler, A. K., & Roman, D. (2013). Insights into professional development for teachers of English language learners: A focus on using students' native languages in the classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36(2), 187-207.
- Kim, E. G., Kweon, S. O., & Kim, J. (2017). Korean engineering students' perceptions of English-medium instruction (EMI) and L1 use in EMI classes. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(2), 130-145.
- Kim, S. E. O., & Elder, C. (2008). Target language use in foreign language classrooms: Practices and perceptions of two native speaker teachers in New Zealand. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 21(2), 167-185.
- Kolb, D. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Pearson.
- Lee, J. H. (2012). Reassessment of English-only approach in EFL context in view of young learners' attitudes, language proficiency, and vocabulary knowledge. *Multilingual Education*, 2(5), 1-11.
- Lee, J. H. (2016). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' beliefs about the monolingual approach: differences between pre-service and in-service Korean teachers of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 37(8), 759-773.
- Lee, J. H. (2018). Exploring relationships between second language learners' attitudes towards classroom language and variables that motivate their learning. *Language Awareness*, 27(3), 243-258.
- Leeming, P. (2011). Japanese high school students' use of L1 during pair-work. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21(3), 360-382.
- Levine, G. S. (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.
- Lin, Z. (2012). Code-switching: L1-coded mediation in a kindergarten foreign language classroom. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 20(4), 365-378.

- Lourie, O. I. (2010). English only? The linguistic choices of teachers of young EFL learners. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 14(3), 351-367.
- Ma, L. P. F. (2019). Examining the functions of L1 use through teacher and student interactions in an adult migrant English classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(4), 386-401.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 531-548.
- Macaro, E., Tian, L., & Chu, L. (2018). First and second language use in English medium instruction contexts. *Language Teaching Research*, 22, 1–21.
- MNE. (2012). <http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/dosyalar/263.pdf>.
- MNE. (2018). <https://bit.ly/2ucfIXA>.
- Miri, M., Alibakhshi, G., & Alaei, M. M. (2017). Reshaping teacher cognition about L1 use through critical ELT teacher education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 14(1), 58-98.
- Neokleous, G. (2017). Closing the gap: Student attitudes toward first language use in monolingual EFL classrooms. *TESOL Journal*, 8(2), 314-341.
- Oliveria, L. C. D., Gilmetdinova, A., & Morales, C. P. (2016). The use of Spanish by a monolingual kindergarten teacher to support English language learners. *Language and Education*, 30(1), 22-42.
- Osborne, D. (2020). Codeswitching practices from “other tongues” to the “mother tongue” in the provincial Philippine classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 55, 1-10.
- Qian, X., Tian, G., & Wang, Q. (2009). Codeswitching in the primary EFL classroom in China – Two case studies. *System*, 37, 719-730.
- Ramos, F. (2005). Spanish teachers' opinions about the use of Spanish in mainstream English classrooms before and after their first year in California. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(2), 411-433.
- Samar, R. G., & Moradkhani, S. (2014). Codeswitching in the language classroom: A study of four EFL teachers' cognition. *RELC Journal*, 45(2), 151-164.
- Segi, A. R. C. (2011). Signalling L2 centrality, maintaining L1 dominance: teacher language choice in an ethnic minority primary classroom in the Lao PDR. *Language and Education*, 25(1), 19-31.
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2010). Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class. *Sage Open*, 14(4), 355-275.
- Thompson, G. L., & Harrison, K. (2014). Language use in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(2), 321-337.
- Tian, L., & Hennebry, M. (2016). Chinese learners' perceptions towards teachers' language use in lexical explanations: A comparison between Chinese-only and English-only instructions. *System*, 63, 77-88.
- Tian, L., & Macaro, E. (2012). Comparing the effect of teacher codeswitching with English-only explanations on the vocabulary acquisition of Chinese university students: A Lexical Focus-on-Form study. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(3), 367-391.
- Vaish, V. (2012). Teacher beliefs regarding bilingualism in an English medium reading program. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(1), 53-69.
- Varshney, R., & Ianziti, J. R. (2006). Student perceptions of L1 use in the foreign language classroom: help or hindrance? *Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association*, 105, 55-83.
- Wach, A., & Monroy, F. (2019). Beliefs about L1 use in teaching English: A comparative study of Polish and Spanish teacher-trainees. *Language Teaching Research*. doi.org/10.1177/1362168819830422
- Wang, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). Code choice in the Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *Multilingual Education*, 2(3), 1-18.
- Wang, D. (2019). Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: students and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 138-149.