

The Role of First Language (L1) in the Second Language (L2) Classroom: The case of
Jordanian Public Schools

by

Mu'ath Algazo

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Applied Linguistics and Discourse Studies

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

© 2018, Mu'ath Algazo

Abstract

This exploratory sequential mixed methods study (Creswell, 2015) sheds light on the role of first language (L1) in the second language (L2) classroom. The study, conducted in four public schools in Jordan where Arabic is the L1 of both teachers and students, and English is taught as a foreign language, explored Jordanian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' (N=7) attitudes toward using Arabic (L1) to teach English (L2) and the perceived functions and/or negative ramifications of such use. It additionally investigated 104 Grades 10 and 11 students' beliefs regarding their teachers' use of L1 in the L2 classroom. Data was collected through two rounds of interviews (pre-observation and post-observation), questionnaires, and seven class-observations. The study found that EFL teachers were highly aware of the importance of minimizing the amount of L1 use, which was influenced by the type of lesson and the proficiency level of students. The study suggests that teachers used L1 to achieve six different functions in the L2 classroom which they believed could enhance L2 teaching and learning, (i.e., translation, metalinguistic use, overcoming some teaching challenges, giving instructions, motivation, and avoiding some words in L2 that sound taboo in L1), but they also believed that L1 overuse may limit L2 development, and it may also have negative affective ramifications. The students' beliefs regarding their teachers' reasons for using the L1 in the classroom were in line with the teachers'. The findings of this study paint a clear picture of the L2 teaching reality in foreign contexts and suggest that policy makers should consider changing L2 teaching policies which do not, at present, welcome any role for L1 in the L2 classroom.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this work to my parents, Abdullah Alghazo and Mariam Alghazo for their love, support and encouragement. They worked very hard to get me where I am today so it is more their success than mine.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks and gratitude to my supervisor Professor Janna Fox, for her great help during all stages of preparing and writing the thesis. Her guidance, and valuable comments helped bring this work into light. Beside my supervisor, I would like to thank my thesis committee members: Dr. Jaffer Sheyholislami (chair of defence), Dr. David Wood (internal examiner), and Dr. Randy Appel (external examiner) for their kindness, helpful suggestions, and insightful comments. Special thanks are also extended to all the students and teachers who participated in the study and facilitated the process of data collection.

I would also like to express my appreciation to my cousin Dr. Sharif Alghazo for his generous time in proof reading, critical comments, and suggestions during the thesis work. He always provided me with help and support during my MA program. I would like to express my special thanks to him for being a great soul. My Sincere appreciation also goes to my cousin Dr. Manal Alghazo for her helpful comments and supportive suggestions that directed me to improve the work. In addition, I would like to extend my thanks to my colleague Christina Dore for her enriching notes she gave to improve this thesis.

I would also like to thank my brother Dr. Mohammad and my sister Mai for their encouragement and support. I am also very thankful to my wife Malak for her patience, love, and encouragement on every step of the way. Thanks are also extended to my father in law Trurki Swaie and my mother in law Aisha Swaie for their love and

encouragement. Additionally, to my brother in law Ali, and sisters in law Noor, Farah, and Areen for their support and encouragement.

Finally, special thanks are extended to my little daughter Salma, for being the source of hope and motivation, her smiles encouraged me to efficiently overcome the difficulties encountered in my pursuit of the MA degree.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Dedication.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Tables.....	vii
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Overview of the Jordanian Educational System.....	3
1.3 Aims of the Study.....	4
1.4 Significance of the Study.....	5
1.5 Research Questions.....	5
1.6 Organization of the Study.....	6
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	7
2.1 Historical Overview of Language Teaching Approaches.....	7
2.2 Theories of Second Language Acquisition (SLA).....	10
2.3 Current Views on L1 Use in L2 Classrooms.....	12
2.4 Teacher Attitudes Toward L1 Use.....	16
2.5 Student Attitudes Toward L1 Use.....	18
2.6 Functions of L1 Use.....	19
2.7 Negative Ramifications of L1 Use.....	26
2.8 Amount of L1 Use.....	28
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	31
3.1 Research Design.....	31
3.2 Setting.....	32
3.3 Participants.....	32
3.4 Data Collection.....	34
3.5 Data Analysis.....	39
Chapter Four: Findings and Discussion.....	40
4.1 Teacher Attitudes Toward L1 Use (Research Question 1).....	40
4.2 Functions of L1 Use (Research Question 2).....	48
4.3 Negative Ramifications of L1 Overuse (Research Question 3).....	71
4.4 Functions of L1 Use According to Students (Research Question 4).....	74
Chapter Five: Conclusion.....	79
5.1 Summary of Findings.....	79
5.2 Limitations.....	81
5.3 Implications.....	83

5.4	Directions for Further Research	84
	References	85
Appendix A	Student Questionnaire	95
Appendix B	Pre-observation Interview Questions	96
Appendix C	Sample of the initial coding of the first researcher	97
Appendix D	Sample of the initial coding of the second researcher.....	98
Appendix E	Certification of Institutional Ethics Clearance	99
Appendix F	The Jordanian Education Directorate Approval (Arabic)	100
Appendix G	Teacher consent form	101
Appendix H	Student consent form.....	103

List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Demographic information of teacher-participants (n=7)</i>	33
Table 2. <i>Demographic information of student-participants (n =104)</i>	34
Table 3. <i>Dates of interviews and class observations</i>	35
Table 4. <i>Interview duration, observed classes, and schools</i>	36
Table 5. <i>Value of questionnaire options</i>	37
Table 6. <i>Sources for questionnaire items</i>	38
Table 7. <i>Functions of L1 use according to teachers</i>	49
Table 8. <i>Functions of teacher L1 use according to students (n=104)</i>	75

Chapter One: Introduction

The issue of first language (L1) use in the second language (L2) classroom has long attracted my attention as a result of my long experience both learning and teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in both Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Throughout my learning experience in Jordan, I used my L1 (Arabic) as a means of learning English as an L2 at both school and university. After I graduated with a BA in English language and literature, and later with an MA in Applied Linguistics, I was hired to teach EFL in Saudi Arabia, where I continued to use my L1 in the classroom. My experiences raised the question of why teachers and students revert to their L1s when they learn/teach an additional language, and whether the use of L1 in L2 classrooms is valuable or detrimental to learning. The present Master's thesis work is informed by this curiosity. In this work, I aim to better understand the functions and potential ramifications of using L1 in an L2 classroom according to EFL teachers and students in Jordanian public schools. I use the term "functions" here to refer to the purposes or reasons for using the L1, as per the literature which will be reviewed in later sections of this and the following chapter.

1.1 Background

The study of L1 use in the L2 classroom has captured the attention of researchers for many years (see, for example, Anton & DiCamilla, 1999; Artemeva, 1995; Atkinson, 1987; Auerbach, 1993; Butzkamm, 2003; Cook, 2001; Cummins, 2007; Duff & Polio, 1990; Macaro, 2009; Polio & Duff, 1994; Rolin-Ianziti & Varshney, 2008; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin 2000; Turnbull, 2001). Researchers have looked at the issue from a variety of different perspectives and in different contexts. These studies

will be discussed further in the following section. However, little work has been conducted in foreign contexts where teachers and students rely on their L1 in order to teach or learn L2s. Hence, and based on my personal experiences, Jordan was selected as a venue to explore English as a foreign language teachers and students' use and views on the role of L1 (Arabic) in the L2 (English) classroom. In addition, to the best of my knowledge, there exist no studies which examine this issue in Jordan.

A review of literature about L2 teaching methods which have prevailed during the past century and a half shows that some methods have been in favour of using L1 in L2 teaching, while other approaches have banned it completely (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The Grammar-Translation Method, for example, advocated for the use of L1 as a tool to enhance L2 teaching and learning, during which the L1 was to be the primary medium of instruction within the classroom. Most interactions between the teacher and students were conducted in the L1, and students' success depended profoundly on their ability to translate from the L2 into their L1 (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). This method dominated L2 teaching for many years, up until the end of the 19th century. Although the effectiveness of the method is highly debated, many teachers in a number of countries, particularly within foreign language contexts, still practice the Grammar-Translation Method in their classrooms (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

In the late 19th century, opposition to the Grammar-Translation Method developed in different locales; linguists such as Henry Sweet in England, Wilhelm Viëtor in Germany, and others across Europe, shared the belief that the L1 should be avoided in L2 classrooms (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). As a result, the prevailing perception among teachers and policy makers changed gradually to hold that the use of L1 in L2 classes is

to be avoided entirely (Corcoran, 2008). Furthermore, the predominance of the Direct Method and later the Audio-Lingual Method contributed to the idea of excluding the L1 from the L2 classroom (Corcoran, 2008).

In more recent times, prevailing perceptions about the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom have changed once again. Many applied linguistics researchers (see, for example, Al Masaeed, 2016; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Bateman, 2008; Bruen & Kelly 2014; Butzkamm, 1998; De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002; Schweers, 1999; Sharma, 2006; Storch & Aldosari, 2010) have observed the functionality and positive results of using the L1 in L2 classrooms. For example, Al Kharma and Hajjaj (1989), Kovacic and Kirinic (2011), and Mohebbi and Alavi (2014) studied EFL contexts and found that L1 use had several important functions in L2 classrooms, including, for example, explaining new vocabulary words and grammar points, clarifying difficult concepts or ideas, and giving instructions that could enhance the L2 teaching and learning process.

Based on the observations of many scholars and researchers, in addition to my own experience of learning and teaching EFL, I conducted an empirical study in Jordan where, to my best knowledge, there exist no studies that explore EFL teachers' and students' perspectives about the functions and the potential benefits and/or ramifications of using the L1 (Arabic) in the L2 (English) classroom.

1.2 Overview of the Jordanian Educational System

Jordan is a country in the Middle East measuring approximately 60,000 square miles in size. With over 9.5 million residents, roughly 6.6 million are Jordanian citizens,

and around 30% of those citizens are students (Al Jabery & Zumberg, 2008; Jordanian General Statistics Department, 2015). The Jordanian constitution grants the right of free public education to all Jordanian citizens; in other words, public education services are available to all Jordanians without any discrimination based on sex, religion, or any other reason (Al Jabery & Zumberg, 2008).

The educational system in Jordan consists of basic and secondary schools. Basic school includes Grades 1 to 10 (ages six to 16), and is free and compulsory for all Jordanian students. Secondary school consists of Grades 11 and 12 (ages 16 to 18), and is also free to Jordanians in the public school system, but it is not compulsory (Al Jabery & Zumberg, 2008).

Finally, it should be noted that Arabic is the official language in Jordan and English is a core subject taught in all public and private schools from Grades 1 through 12. However, students have almost no place to practice English outside of the classroom, since Arabic is used as the common tongue throughout the country.

1.3 Aims of the Study

This Master's thesis aims to contribute to ongoing applied linguistics research about L1 use in L2 classrooms. Specifically, it explores Jordanian public school EFL teachers' attitudes toward using Arabic (L1) to teach English (L2) and the perceived functions and/or negative ramifications of doing so. This study additionally considers students' beliefs regarding teachers' use of L1 in the L2 classroom.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Little research has investigated this phenomenon in the Jordanian context; thus, this work may help raise awareness among EFL teachers and education policy makers in Jordan and in the wider EFL context of the role of L1 in the L2 classroom. This goal is especially desirable given the widely held perception among the L2 teaching policy makers in EFL contexts that the use of L1 in English classes is to be avoided entirely. Littlewood and Yu (2011) noted that “[a]t the level of national policy, the monolingual principle has been embodied in the guidelines of many countries” (p. 66). Consequently, this study will address the validity of this principle.

1.5 Research Questions

The primary research questions driving this inquiry are:

- 1 What are Jordanian EFL teachers’ attitudes toward L1 usage in the L2 classroom?
- 2 What do teachers consider to be the main functions of L1 usage in the L2 classroom?
- 3 What do teachers consider to be possible negative ramifications of L1 overuse in the L2 classroom?
- 4 What are the main functions of the teachers’ use of L1 in the L2 classroom according to Jordanian EFL students?

1.6 Organization of the Study

This thesis is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 has introduced the rationale, aims, and research questions guiding this study. Chapter 2 reviews previous research regarding the use of L1 in L2 classrooms, which informs the present study. Chapter 3 describes the research methodology, including a description of the setting and participants, the instruments and procedures used for qualitative and quantitative data collection, and the methods employed to analyze the data. Chapter 4 presents and discusses the results of the study. Chapter 5 summarizes the findings, outlines the limitations of the study and possible pedagogical implications, and proposes directions for future studies.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

The use of L1 in L2 classrooms has long been beset by controversy (Sharma, 2006; Storch, & Wigglesworth, 2003), where studies either fully support the idea or vehemently oppose it, both sides with their own justifications. Such arguments among applied linguists and second language acquisition (SLA) researchers have produced an immense body of research, which has contributed to the development of L2 teaching and learning methods. This chapter reviews previous research that has been conducted on this issue in both second language (SL) and foreign language (FL) contexts.

2.1 Historical Overview of Language Teaching Approaches

At the end of 19th century, the pamphlets, books, and articles of writers such as Henry Sweet, Otto Jespersen, and many others, provided the foundation for the pedagogical reforms of their era, later known as the Reform Movement in language teaching (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The Reform Movement generated many new assumptions about language teaching that were later adopted into a wide array of language teaching approaches. Among these was the proposition that “spoken language is more basic than written, explicit discussion of grammar should be avoided, and language should be practiced as a whole, rather than as separated parts” (Cook, 2001, p. 404). The emergence and success of the Direct Method, for example, that focused on the exclusive use of the L2, contributed to making more prevalence the belief that L1 use in L2 teaching is ineffective and should be avoided. Indeed, since then almost all significant academic works on language teaching (e.g., Chambers, 1991; Duff & Polio, 1990; Krashen, 1982; Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Long, 1983; MacDonald, 1993) have assumed

that an L2 is best taught and learned when use of the students' L1 is avoided during class time.

In the early 20th century, the abandonment of the Grammar-Translation Method and the adoption of the Direct Method for teaching L2s deepened the growing bias against L1 usage for L2 learning (Corcoran, 2008). Like several other L2 teaching methods, the Direct Method pointed to research on child language acquisition as justification for opposing the use of L1 in L2 teaching and learning (Cook, 2001). Specifically, the approach was based on the theory that “second language learning mirrored first language acquisition, in which a child acquires his or her L1 with no prior language to refer back to” (Kaushik, 2013, p. 7). Since the advent of the Direct Method that followed the rules of L1 acquisition, monolingual instruction has become typical for teaching L2s and thus ousted the Grammar-Translation Method as the predominant language teaching approach (Corcoran, 2008).

For the first half of 20th century, there were almost no arguments against the superiority of the Direct Method's core principle that L2s are learned best through the sole use of the target language. Thus, those principles deeply influenced monolingual L2 teaching methods up to the present day (Corcoran, 2008). For example, Audiolingualism, which was a popular approach to teaching L2s in 1950s and 1960s, continued to support the exclusion of L1s in L2 learning (Lado, 1964). The Audiolingual approach remained widespread around the world until the 1970s when Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) started to gain a following. CLT and more recent approaches, such as Task-Based Instruction, do not explicitly oppose L1 usage in L2 classrooms, but do call for minimizing any use of L1s as much as possible. As Cook (2001) pointed out:

Recent methods do not so much forbid the L1 as ignore its existence altogether. Communicative language teaching and task-based learning methods have no necessary relationship with the L1, yet . . . the only times the L1 is mentioned is when advice is given on how to minimize its use. The main theoretical treatments of task-based learning do not, for example, have any locatable mentions of the classroom use of the L1 . . . Most descriptions of methods portray the ideal classroom as having as little of the L1 as possible, essentially by omitting reference to it. (p. 404)

In recent times, many researchers (see, for example, Butzkamm, 2003; Cook, 2001; Cummins, 2007) have argued against ignoring or excluding L1 usage, and advocated for consideration of the potential benefits of including L1s in L2 instruction. Cook (2001), for example, argued that the comparison between child language acquisition and adult L2 learning is inappropriate since L2 learners have “more mature minds, greater social development, a large short-term memory capacity, and other differences from L1-only young children” (p. 406). In addition, he claimed that, “[t]he argument for avoiding the L1 based on L1 acquisition is not in itself convincing. It seems tantamount to suggesting that, since babies do not play golf, we should not teach golf to adults” (p. 406). In other words, L1 acquisition is not comparable to L2 learning.

Furthermore, the presumed pedagogical superiority of separating languages from one another during the learning process has been questioned and disproved by many scholars (Corcoran, 2008). Atkinson, (1987) claimed that, "although the mother tongue is not a suitable basis for a methodology, it has, at all levels, a variety of roles to play which are at present, consistently undervalued" (p. 247). Consequently, avoiding the use of L1s in a monolingual classroom setting is tantamount to ignoring an important resource which may be invaluable to increasing teaching efficiency.

In sum, the prevalent pedagogical approaches to second language instruction since the decline in dominance of the Grammar-Translation Method have all tended to exclude L1 usage from the classroom. Although recent methods do not overtly reject L1 use, there are still conflicting views among researchers (e.g., under the banner of the Communicative Method and Task-based approaches) that suggest that the best way to acquire or learn L2s is without the intervention of students' L1.

2.2 Theories of Second Language Acquisition (SLA)

The quest to understand how languages are learned has led to a number of theories. SLA as a general concept was defined by Ellis (1997) as “the systematic study of how people acquire a second language ... inside or outside of a classroom” (p. 3). Meanwhile, theories of language learning have been defined as “those principles of learning which center around the role of the learner or student” (Van Beek, 2016, p. 12). The following theories show the varying views of researchers regarding the best way to acquire or learn an additional language.

2.2.1 Input Hypothesis

Krashen (1982, 1985) argues that *learning* occurs through studying the rules and patterns of languages that enable learners to apply the knowledge consciously, whereas language *acquisition* occurs through comprehensible input, which is the language that is comprehended by learners (Krashen, 1982, 1985). The Input Hypothesis posits that understanding a message or receiving comprehensible input is the only viable way of acquiring an L2 (Krashen, 1982, 1985). In other words, learners can learn or acquire additional languages through comprehensible exposure to the L2 in question. Krashen introduces the hypothesis using the metaphor of $i+1$; wherein i represents the level of

language that the learners have already acquired and *I* represents an element that is slightly beyond their control, i.e., that has not yet been acquired (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). According to this hypothesis, hearing and understanding in the L2 are essential first steps to acquisition, and production comes later. This theory therefore reinforces the idea of ignoring the L1 in L2 classrooms in favor of maximum exposure to the L2 only (Kaushik, 2013) – albeit at a comprehensible level.

2.2.2 Interaction Hypothesis

Long (1983) agrees with Krashen that comprehensible input plays a key role in the process of SLA, but highlights the question of *how* input can be made comprehensible (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). In response, Long's (1983) Interaction Hypothesis states that learners acquire language via the negotiation of meaning that occurs in interaction. He argues that interaction –e.g., conversation between students and teachers– is the key to acquiring an L2. In 1996, Long revised his hypothesis to focus on cognitive factors such as noticing and corrective feedback in communication (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). Long considers the success of SLA to be dependent on the amount of exposure to the desired L2; by extension, the use of L1 in L2 contexts is implicitly discouraged because it decreases the amount of exposure to the L2 in question.

2.2.3 Output Hypothesis

Swain's (1985) Output Hypothesis claims that L2 learners must be pushed to produce language that is understandable to the interlocutor in order to develop and improve L2 skills. The output can be spoken or written language (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). Swain asserts that actually producing the target language helps learners to notice gaps in their linguistic knowledge, and that the need to produce comprehensible output

motivates learners to improve and develop their L2 knowledge. Based on this, L2 learning begins when learners venture to produce comprehensible L2 output and notice gaps in their linguistic knowledge that limit further comprehensible output. In other words, L2 learning depends profoundly on the ability of the learner to produce the L2.

Swain in other studies (e.g., Johnson & Swain, 1994; Swain & Lapkin, 2000) stated that the L1 may have a valuable role in the L2 classroom. For example, Swain and Lapkin (2000) claimed that “judicious use of the L1 can indeed support L2 learning and use” (p. 268). Patently, it seems that the Output hypothesis does value the role of L1 in L2 learning since L1 may assist L2 students to produce the L2 output particularly that L1 may serve as a lubricant of the L2 conversation (Butzkamm, 1998).

2.3 Current Views on L1 Use in L2 Classrooms

In recent decades, the issue of whether the L1 should be used in the L2 classroom has continued to be a matter of discussion among applied linguists. Arguments generally fall under one of three different perspectives: the virtual, maximal, or optimal position. Macaro (2001) summarized these perspectives as follows:

- 1) *Virtual position*: The L1 has no place in the L2 classroom, for there are no benefits to using an L1 in L2 contexts. Thus, as long as the teacher is sufficiently qualified, the L1 should be excluded from the L2 class.
- 2) *Maximal position*: The L1 has no place in the L2 classroom. However, because of the imperfect teaching conditions of a typical educational environment, teachers may need to depend on the L1 as a teaching resource to

overcome some teaching challenges (e.g., large class size or limited assigned time). Therefore, L1 use may be allowed, even needed, at times.

- 3) *Optimal position*: The L1 is valuable and beneficial in the L2 context since it may enhance some aspects of L2 learning (e.g., increasing student comprehension of a grammar point).

In sum, the virtual position sees the L1 as detrimental and to be avoided entirely in L2 classrooms, whereas the maximal position opposes L1 usage except in contexts where its use can ease a challenging teaching situation. The optimal position, in contrast, considers the use of L1s a consistently valuable resource for L2 learning.

In recent years, numerous studies (e.g., Al Masaeed, 2016; Anton & DiCamilla, 1999; Artemeva, 1995; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Bruen & Kelly 2014; Cook, 2001; De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Edstrom, 2006; Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989; Kim & Elder, 2005; Kim & Petraki, 2009; Kovacic & Kirinic, 2011; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Macaro, 2009; Polio & Duff, 1994; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002) have held either a maximal or an optimal position, claiming that L1s may play a positive role in the L2 classroom. For example, Antón and DiCamilla (1999) found that the L1 can play a crucial role in overcoming students' L2 task problems by creating a social and cognitive space in which students can help each other through the tasks at hand. Interaction in the students' L1 can perform the functions of "construction of scaffolded help, establishment of intersubjectivity, and use of private speech" (Antón & DiCamilla, 1999, p. 245) and thus enable learners to complete meaning-based L2 language tasks. Hence, L1 can be an effective learning tool in pair or group work;

students can revert to it to achieve the goals of particular L2 tasks and to help each other overcome learning challenges (Storch & Aldosari, 2010).

Polio and Duff (1994) conducted one of the earliest studies to shed light on L2 teachers' in-class linguistic behaviours. They investigated when teachers tend to use their students' L1 rather than the target L2, and identified the functions of that usage. The study found that teachers and students' use of their shared L1 in the L2 classroom enhanced the L2 teaching and learning process. For example, the study suggested that the L1 was used in the L2 classes in order to provide translations for unknown L2 vocabulary items which may help students to better understand the lesson.

Taking a different approach to teacher perspectives on L2 usage, Cook (2001) found that teachers were aware of the need to expose learners to the L2 as much as possible, and so implied that any L1 in the L2 classroom is essentially detrimental and should be excluded. In other words, teachers feel guilty for using L1 in L2 classes. Therefore, Cook called for licensing L1 use in the L2 classroom, in order to give teachers absolution from the guilty feelings which they experience when they revert to their L1.

On the other hand, Turnbull (2001) considered Cook's (2001) call to license L2 teachers' use of L1 in the classroom to be both vague and dangerous, since this would only encourage L2 teachers to maximize L1 usage over that of the L2. Turnbull believed that teachers should be aware that L2 classrooms are, for the most part, the only place where students will encounter the L2. L1 overuse deprives learners of the immersion experience in the L2 and may be counterproductive to students' development.

At the same time, Turnbull (2001) acknowledged that there can be benefits to L2 teachers using the L1, and supported the judicious and principled use of L1. He claimed:

We do not need to license teachers to use the L1; many do so in any case. I believe that official guidelines that encourage teachers to use the [target language, or TL] create positive pressures for teachers, encouraging them to speak as much TL as possible. In addition to official guidelines, teacher educators must help teacher candidates and practising teachers make principled decisions about the judicious use of the L1, while maximizing their TL use. (p. 537)

Although the idea of using the L1 during instruction is gaining traction among applied linguists, some continue to maintain a virtual position toward L1 usage, i.e., L1 has little or no place in the L2 classroom. One claim is that using the L1 may have detrimental effects on the quantity of students' exposure to comprehensible L2 input by increasing exposure to the L1 and thus minimizing exposure to the L2 (Al-Masaeed, 2016). This question of exposure is relevant to their position that L2 learning adults follow the same path as children do in L1 learning –that the L2 will be acquired unconsciously rather than learned consciously (De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009). This argument stems from the belief in naturalistic approaches to language teaching in which plentiful immersion and exposure to the target language are the most successful ingredients for learning an additional language (De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009). Moreover, relying on L1 to teach L2 is perceived to be a sign of insufficient training on the part of teachers, since non-native L2 teachers may encounter pressure from learners not to constantly or exclusively use the L2 in the classroom (Harbord, 1992; McMillan & Rivers, 2011).

To sum up, many of the above mentioned studies (e.g., Al Masaeed, 2016; Anton & DiCamilla, 1999; Artemeva, 1995; Bruen & Kelly 2014; Cook, 2001; De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002) perceive a positive role for L1 use in the L2 classroom and –directly or indirectly– call for removing the nineteenth-century view that ignores any positive role for an L1 in language instruction. It is on account of the Great Reform that the role accorded to the L1 by teachers in L2 classes has been decidedly secondary (Butzkamm, 2003). The view of those scholars who support L1 use in L2 classes is that there is a need to explore the benefits of L1 usage as a cognitive tool for L2 development and for overcoming L2 learning challenges.

2.4 Teacher Attitudes Toward L1 Use

In addition to Cook's (2001) study about teacher guilt, several studies have explored L2 teachers' perceptions regarding the use of L1 in the L2 classroom, specifically in EFL contexts (e.g., Al Nofaie, 2010; Al Shammari, 2011; Bruen & Kelly 2014; Copland & Neokleous, 2010; De La Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Kovacic & Kirinic, 2011; Kim & Petraki, 2009; Macaro, 1997; Mohebbi & Alavi, 2014; Polio & Duff, 1994; Sharma, 2006; Tang, 2002). These studies, conducted in various foreign language contexts, have largely found that L2 teachers generally support L1 use in the classroom. Schweers (1999), for example, reported that all of the study's teachers fully supported using their L1 (Spanish) in their L2 (English) classrooms. Kovacic and Kirinic (2011) likewise found that 80% of teachers in their study preferred to use their L1 (Croatian) in the L2 (English) classroom. Similar findings were reported by both Sharma (2006) and Tang (2002).

Al-Nofaie (2010) examined L2 teachers' attitudes toward in-class use of L1. The case study was conducted at a female intermediate school in Saudi Arabia where Arabic was the L1 of both teachers and students, and English was taught as a foreign language. The main finding of the study was that teachers' attitudes toward using Arabic in the English classroom were positive because certain situations require L1 interventions, such as clarifying the meaning of difficult L2 vocabulary items. Al-Shamari (2011) conducted a similar study to investigate teachers' attitudes toward the use of L1 (Arabic) in the L2 (English) classrooms of two Saudi technical colleges. Al-Shamari's study found that teachers supported the balanced and judicious use of L1 in the L2 classroom, believing that it made the learning process more effective.

Teachers' positive attitudes toward the role of L1 in the L2 classroom may come from their positive experiences using the L1 in their L2 teaching. Several studies (see, for example, De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Kim & Petraki, 2009; McMillan & Rivers, 2011) have suggested that teacher L1 usage may enhance L2 learning by serving vital in-class cognitive, communicative, and social functions. Teachers may also find that using the L1 in their classes has practical benefits, including making more efficient use of class time for example, by minimizing misunderstandings when conveying task instructions. Consequently, L1 may be perceived as a necessity for an L2 lesson to unfold smoothly. Copland & Neokleous (2010), for example, reported that even one of their participants who was "the strongest advocate of an L2 only policy, allowed her students to use the L1 frequently" (p. 276). This example may reflect that a positive attitude toward L1 use can exist even among teachers claiming a monolingual approach.

2.5 Student Attitudes Toward L1 Use

Several studies (e.g., Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Kim & Petraki, 2009; Schweers, 1999; Storch & Aldosari, 2010; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003) have explored students' perceptions and views regarding the use of their L1, particularly amongst themselves in pair and group work. Many of these studies concluded that the L1 can serve as a useful cognitive tool for achieving learning tasks. Storch and Wigglesworth's (2003) study noted that students support L1 use in their L2 learning, particularly when they do not have the required metalanguage in the L2. Using their L1 enabled them to achieve a number of immediate goals, such as providing each other with word definitions and explanations of grammar points. Using their L1 was thus perceived as conducive to their studies by helping them to negotiate and provide justifications for grammatical choices more quickly and more clearly. The same study also found that even students who did not use their L1 in their L2 learning felt that using an L1 could be useful, because it can enable L2 learners to discuss the prompt and structure of activities in greater depth and complete tasks with greater ease. Moreover, Kim and Petraki (2009) reported that L2 students in Korea believed that L1 played a supportive role in the classroom, and that it was very useful for learning the target L2. Duff and Polio (1990) found that students were satisfied with their teachers' amount of L1 use, even when the amount of L1 use as a percentage of classroom time was very high.

Furthermore, many studies (see, for example, Al Shammari, 2011; Schweers, 1999; Sharma, 2006; Tang, 2002) have come to the same conclusion that students feel favourably toward L1 use in the L2 classroom. Schweers (1999) reported that nearly 90% of students participating in his study believed that their L1 (Spanish) should have a role

in their L2 (English) classroom. Tang (2002) had similar results: 70% students in the study supported the use of their L1 (Chinese) in their L2 (English) classes. Kovacic and Kirinic (2011) came to the same conclusion as Tang, with 68% of students in their study stating that their L1 (Croatian) should be used in their L2 (English) classes. Al Shammari (2011) and Sharma (2006) reported similar findings in the contexts of EFL.

On the other hand, Nazary (2008) showed different results. Nazary conducted a study in the EFL context of Iran with 85 students who were selected based on their L2 proficiency according to three categories: elementary, intermediate, and advanced level. The study used a questionnaire and found that EFL Iranian university students in all levels were reluctant to use their L1 in the L2 classroom on account of the fact that such usage would reduce their exposure to the L2.

The studies discussed in this section show that while there are two perspectives on using L1 in the L2 classroom, L2 students tend to support balanced and judicious in-class use of L1 for the reason that it may help them overcome certain learning challenges. Still, at least one study found that some students reject the idea for the reason that they believe that in-class use of their L1 might reduce their exposure to the target L2. Additional studies would allow further exploration of students' perceptions toward using L1 in L2 classrooms.

2.6 Functions of L1 Use

Proponents of L1 use in the L2 classroom hold that a reasonable use of L1 can support a number of functions. To reiterate, in the context of this work, “functions” refers to the purposes or reasons for switching to an L1 in an L2 classroom. Several studies (see, for example, De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Kim & Elder, 2005; Polio & Duff,

1994; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002; Swain & Lapkin 2000) have focused on identifying possible functions of L1 use and how they serve (or not) the L2 teaching and learning process. Of these, some studies (e.g., De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002) explored the functions that teachers achieved by reverting to the L1, while others (e.g., Storch & Aldosari, 2010; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003) investigated the functions that were achieved by students.

Overall, studies vary in terms of the number and type of functions examined and identified. For example, Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002) proposed that there are three main functions of L1 usage for teachers, whereas De la Campa and Nassaji (2009) identified 14 such categories. The same was evident in studies that focused on L2 learners' functions for L1 use: Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) reported four main functions achieved by L2 learners, while Storch and Aldosari (2010) identified five. These differences in findings are presumably related to differences in settings, participants, students' proficiency level, instruments for data collection, methods of data analysis, and other circumstances. Nevertheless, the studies' authors are in consensus in concluding that using the L1 in L2 classrooms undoubtedly serves many different functions. The following two sections will provide examples of the respective functions of teachers' and students' use of L1 in the classroom.

2.6.1 Teachers' functions of L1 use

Cummins (2007) argued that it is necessary to rethink exclusive reliance on monolingual instruction in L2 classrooms, for the reason that providing space for L1 use may be beneficial to L2 students' learning. Auerbach (1993) also pointed out, "when the native language is used, practitioners, researchers, and learners consistently report

positive results" (p. 18). Indeed, when they revert to their L1, L2 teachers may achieve different functions that may assist them in overcoming a variety of teaching challenges. A study by Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002), for example, involved four teachers teaching French as a foreign language to students at Queensland University in Australia. Two teachers were native French speakers and two were native English speakers. Close to seven hours of recordings of teachers' talk in five classes were analyzed. The analysis showed that three main purposes and a number of sub-purposes were achieved when teachers use the L1 of their students. The first function, *translation*, referred to translating L2 items from the lesson or instructions into the students' L1. The second function, *metalinguistic use*, was expressed through comments, such as talking about L2 forms or culture, and through contrasting L1 and L2 forms and cultural practices. The third function, *communicative uses*, included switching to the L1 from the L2 to communicate more effectively with students for certain purposes –for example, class management (e.g., giving task instructions to students or planning exams or activities); reacting to students' requests (e.g., responding to questions about the L2); or expressing their state of mind (e.g., telling jokes) (Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002, p. 410). Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie's study provides an adept explanation of several main functions or purposes that are achieved by using the L1 of students in the L2 classroom.

De la Campa and Nassaji (2009) also aimed to examine the functions of using L1 by L2 teacher, but in a Canadian university setting with two instructors of German as a foreign language. One instructor had 20 years of German teaching experience in Canada, and the other only four weeks. Both participants were native German speakers and fluent in English, while most of the students were native English speakers and studying German

as a foreign language. Data consisted of transcriptions of audio-recordings from samples of the instructors' L2 classes over the course of a 12-week semester. The transcriptions were analyzed using the coding scheme developed by Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002). Modifications were made to the original scheme, resulting in a total of 14 main functional categories:

- 1) *Translation*: to translate items from the L2 to the L1;
- 2) *Contrast*: to compare the forms and cultural terms of the L1 and L2;
- 3) *Evaluation*: to talk about students' contributions;
- 4) *Activity instruction*: to explain or provide instruction regarding class activities;
- 5) *Activity objective*: to describe the objectives of class activities;
- 6) *Elicitation of student contribution*: to elicit student contributions;
- 7) *Personal comment*: to express the instructors' personal comments or views about some event or point;
- 8) *Comprehension check*: to check students' comprehension;
- 9) *Class equipment*: to talk about anything concerning classroom equipment, such as the projector;
- 10) *Administrative issues*: to explain administrative issues, such as announcing an exam;
- 11) *Repetition of student L1 utterances*: to repeat something said by a student in the L1;
- 12) *Reaction to student question*: to respond to students' questions;
- 13) *Humour*: to make a joke in order to elicit laughter from students; and

14) *Instructors as bilingual*: to overcome learning challenges or problems.

Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie's (2002) study revealed that instructors employed the L1 for various pedagogical and social functions meant to facilitate L2 learning by helping students to better understand L2 instructions and by creating a supportive and enjoyable environment in the classroom. Building on this, De la Campa and Nassaji (2009) noted that the novice teacher in their study relied on the students' L1 as a means to help their students more often than the experienced teacher. The novice teacher's lack of experience may explain this conclusion, as an experienced teacher may have a better sense of the appropriate time to revert to translation in order to overcome a particular problem, whereas a novice teacher may not have this skill and thus depend more frequently on translation as a means of facilitating the learning process.

2.6.2 Students' functions of L1 use

Current communicative language teaching approaches to the L2 classroom encourage the use of small group work, such as pair work, as an effective method of increasing the opportunities for learners to be exposed to the L2 (Storch & Aldosari, 2010). However, it has been noted that many L2 teachers do not favour group work since students may actually use their L1 throughout group tasks without any effective control (Storch & Aldosari, 2010). At the same time, as mentioned earlier, using the L1 can help students to overcome learning difficulties. Lucas and Katz (1994), for example, observed that pairing L2 students who share an L1 allowed more fluent partners to help their less fluent partners.

This section will look more closely at two studies, Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) and Storch and Aldosari (2010), that focused on the functions that are achieved by students when they use the L1 amongst themselves during pair or group work.

Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) studied the functions that are served by students using their L1 in pair work. In the study, twenty-four university students were split into 12 pairs; six pairs shared the same L1, while the other six did not. The pairs were asked to complete two tasks: a text reconstruction task, and a short joint composition task. The learners' talk was audiotaped while they were working on their tasks. Data analysis of the same-L1 pairs revealed four main functions were achieved through the use of the L1 during the tasks: *task management* in which students communicated in the L1 in order to discuss how the task should be completed and structured; *task clarification* in which the students used the L1 to discuss the meaning of the task instructions; *vocabulary and meaning* in which students reverted to their L1 in order to discuss lexical choices and the definitions of some words; and *grammar* in which deliberations were held regarding grammar points. In follow-up interviews, the same-L1 students showed an awareness that using the L1 enabled them to discuss the structure of the tasks in greater depth, which helped them to complete them more easily and quickly. The study concluded that L1 usage can be a beneficial means of facilitating the L2 learning process during group work and allowing L1 use in the L2 classroom can provide learners with a significant cognitive tool for L2 learning (Artemeva, 1995).

A second study by Storch, this time with colleague Aldosari (Storch & Aldosari, 2010), shed further light on the functions of L1 use by L2 students. The study was conducted at a University College in Saudi Arabia in which Arabic was the L1 and

English was being taught as a foreign language. Thirty-six first-year university students participated in the study. The participants were placed in three groups according to their proficiency level: six pairs comprised of two students from the high proficiency group (H-H); six pairs comprised of one high proficiency student with a lower proficiency partner (H-L); and six pairs comprised of two lower proficiency students (L-L). All groups were asked to complete three tasks –jigsaw, composition, and text editing– over a period of three weeks. All of the pairs’ conversations were audio-recorded.

The findings showed that using L1 (Arabic) during the completion of the task served the five following functions:

- 1) *Task management*: Students used their L1 to clarify instructions, choose a topic for the tasks, and discuss issues related to managing the task, such as directing or negotiating the writing activity;
- 2) *Discussing and generating ideas*: During the composition task especially, students used their L1 for the sake of generating or commenting on ideas;
- 3) *Grammar deliberation*: Students reverted to their L1 to discuss L2 grammatical points and text structure;
- 4) *Vocabulary deliberation*: Students deliberated in their L1 on the meaning of words or sentences in the L2; and
- 5) *Mechanics deliberation*: Students used their L1 to discuss punctuation and L2 spelling and pronunciation.

The findings also showed that the amount of L1 usage was influenced by the type of task. For instance, task management demanded more use of the L1 than did other tasks, while deliberation mechanics demanded the least. As well, students reported being

aware of the importance of using the L2 as much as possible; therefore, they attempted to keep the amount of L1 use modest during pair work. Storch and Aldosari (2010) concluded that the students' L1 played an important role in helping them to overcome a variety of difficulties associated with the assigned tasks. Students reverted to their L1 when they felt it would be a more effective tool for completing the task, but were conscious of the need to use as much L2 as possible.

As evidenced in the above sections, there are some differences between the functions of L1 use by teachers and L1 use by students. In both cases, however, L1 plays a vital role in the L2 classroom by enhancing L2 teaching and making the learning process itself more fruitful.

2.7 Negative Ramifications of L1 Use

Despite the recognized advantages of using students' first language in L2 classrooms, there is nonetheless evidence of "dangers associated with *overuse* [emphasis added] of the L1" (Bruen & Kelly, 2014, p. 11). The primary "danger" is that overuse of L1 in the L2 classroom may negatively influence the L2 learning process by depriving students of L2 input (Turnbull, 2001). There are, however, other perceived dangers. Atkinson (1987), for example, suggested that L1 overuse can cause students to become dependent on their L1 and feel that reaching a full understanding of aspects of the target language cannot happen without translation. More specifically, L1 overuse can lead to: a poor understanding of equivalences and pragmatic features due to inaccurate translation; inadvertent over reliance on their L1 as a matter of course, despite their ability to use the L2; and failure to realize the importance of exclusively using the target language in some activities.

Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney (2008) also investigated the issue of excessive L1 use in L2 classrooms from the perspective of beginner French students in an Australian university. The research found that students feel L1 usage poses some concerns regarding overuse, among them that it minimizes students' opportunities for exposure to the target language and increases their L1 dependence. Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney emphasized, "excessive use of the L1 may lead to a cognitive dependence on L1, which, combined with a lack of attention to the TL [target language], is regarded as a hindrance to language learning" (p. 260). Furthermore, they concluded that minimizing the amount of in-class L1 use increases exposure time to the L2, which can help students to learn the L2 in a more natural manner and also direct their attention to the target language without relying too heavily on their L1.

As previously mentioned, one cause of heavy reliance on L1 by some L2 teachers might be a lack of teaching experience, as noted by De la Campa and Nassaji (2009). Another cause, suggested by Duff and Polio (1990), is that over reliance is attributed to a lack of awareness regarding proper L1 use in the L2 classroom. Raising awareness about L1 use (and overuse) among L2 teachers is thus important because they may not otherwise realize when or why they make use of the L1 (Polio & Duff, 1994). A third rationale is that teachers use the L1 excessively because of the benefits that arise from the practice. Harbord (1992), who believed that L1 could enhance L2 teaching, warned that L1 should not be considered as "a device to be used to save time for more useful activities, nor to make life easier for the teacher of the students" (p. 355).

These and other reasons, which surely vary from one context to another, may drive both L2 teachers and students to rely heavily on their L1 during class time.

However, research which has been conducted on the issue of excessive L1 use has confirmed that such overuse definitely influences L2 learning, and may play a negative role in L2 classrooms. Therefore, L2 teachers and students must be aware of the extent to which their L1 is given a place in the classroom.

2.8 Amount of L1 Use

As the previous sections have described, several studies (see, for example, De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Duff & Polio, 1990; Storch & Aldosari, 2010) have been conducted with the aim of understanding how much L1 use in the L2 classroom is acceptable (i.e., positive or neutral effects), and how much is overuse (i.e., negative effects). Of these studies, some focused on students' typical L1 use amongst themselves during pair or group work (Storch & Aldosari, 2010), while other studies shed light on teachers' L1 usage (De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Duff & Polio, 1990).

The amount of L1 used among learners was shown to vary depending on the type of the task at hand and on the proficiency of the learners (Storch & Aldosari 2010; Storch & Wigglesworth 2003). Storch and Aldosari (2010) found that the average number of L1 words used by students who worked in pairs, calculated as a percentage of total words used, was only 7%: lower proficiency students used L1 words 12% of the time, whereas higher proficiency students used L1 words 5% of the time. The authors noted that, regardless of proficiency, learners consciously avoided using their L1 as much as possible and tried to minimize the use of L1 while working on group tasks. Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) similarly reported that students used modest amounts of L1 during their group work; in interviews, students stated that they fully realized that they had to use the target language as much as possible. Therefore, learners' stated avoidance of L1

suggests that learners' use of their L1 may occur when they encounter L2 learning challenges –i.e., L1 use may arise in response to a need to complete the L2 task at hand.

In terms of the amount of L1 used by teachers, prescriptions vary. Turnbull (2001) proposed that teachers who use the L2 less than 25% of the time in class may be relying too heavily on the L1 and depriving their students of valuable L2 input. Shapson, Durward, and Kaufman (1978), meanwhile, considered 75% of class time in the L2 and 25% in the L1 to be an acceptable ratio. Calman and Daniel (1998), however, were significantly more demanding: 95% of class time in the L2 is the level acceptable to school boards.

Taking a descriptive approach, Duff and Polio (1990) observed 13 different L2 classes at the university level at the University of California, where English is the L1 and the L2s were different foreign languages such as French, Hebrew, Japanese, etc. The study found that L2 use by teachers varied from 10-100%: six teachers used the L2 over 90% of the time during classes, while the other seven teachers relied more frequently on the L1. The amount of L1 varied in accordance with the proficiency level of the class and the experience of the teachers, echoing De la Campa and Nassaji's (2009) finding that novice teachers use greater amounts of L1 than experienced teachers.

In conclusion, there is no consensus among applied linguists on the ideal or appropriate amount or acceptable level of student and teacher L1 use in the L2 classroom. They have, however, identified numerous factors that may play crucial roles in influencing the use of L1 in L2 classrooms, including teaching policies, teacher experience, and type of activity or task, and students' proficiency level. With respect to students' proficiency level, several studies (De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Kharma &

Hajjaj, 1989; Kim & Petraki, 2009) elaborated on the impact of students' L2 proficiency on L1 use in L2 classrooms. For example, De la Campa and Nassaji (2009) reported that students' low proficiency in German (L2) was an important factor that prompted teachers use English (L1) in their classes. Duff and Polio (1990) likewise noted that using the learners' L1 in the L2 classroom occurred even among the native speaker teachers of the target language. Consequently, this suggests that students' proficiency level may be an influential factor for the amount of L1 use in the L2 classroom. However, a lack of L2 proficiency on the teacher's part may lead to L1 overuse, which is certainly to be rejected in the L2 classroom.

Chapter Three: Methodology

This chapter focuses on the methodology of the current study. First, it explains the mixed-method research design (Creswell, 2015). Then, it describes the setting of the study. Finally, it presents a profile of the study's participants, followed by a discussion of data collection methods and analysis.

3.1 Research Design

This mixed-methods study was conducted using a qualitative-dominant (QUALITATIVE + quantitative) exploratory sequential design (Creswell, 2015). Specifically, qualitative data collection and analysis was followed by quantitative data collection and analysis, where the quantitative findings were used to triangulate qualitative findings and increase their reliability (Creswell, 2014). Qualitative data was collected from two rounds of interviews with seven EFL teachers, (pre-observation interview and post-observation interview). The researcher also observed one 45-minute class per teacher. Each observation was followed by a post-observation interview that expanded on the researcher's field notes taken during the class. Quantitative data was derived from a questionnaire comprised of 10 questions that was distributed to the students of the teachers who were interviewed. The questions explored students' beliefs about their teachers' reasons (i.e., functions) for L1 use in their L2 classroom.

3.2 Setting¹

The study was conducted in four public schools (Schools A, B, C, and D) from late April to early May 2017 in one governorate in the northern part of Jordan. I chose this location because I have access to these schools through personal contacts who work in the Educational Directorate and at schools of the area. In addition, I know based on my previous experience as a student there that English language teachers and students in these schools often rely on Arabic (L1) as a teaching and learning tool. Grades 10 and 11 were selected for class observation and distribution of the questionnaire, though it should be noted that the initial plan of the study included students of Grades 11 and 12, for these grades represent the secondary stage in the schooling-system of Jordan. However, the Grade 12 students had finished classes by the time the study was conducted because they had taken the national exam (Tawjihi) in June. Consequently, the plan was changed to include students of Grade 10 instead of Grade 12.

3.3 Participants

When I arrived in Jordan, I met with an English language supervisor in the Education Directorate of the governorate in which the study was conducted. The supervisor nominated 10 English language teachers to participate in my study based on their qualifications and experience level, the grades that they teach, and their proficiency in English (i.e., they must be able to express their ideas clearly in English). I contacted the teachers by telephone to invite them to participate; seven EFL teachers from the four

1. Based on information from the Jordanian Ministry of Education (MOE), in the governorate where the study was conducted there were 119 public schools operating in the academic year of 2015/2016. In addition, the total number of English language teachers in the governorate schools was 314 in the academic year 2016/2017; 124 of the teachers were male and 190 were female (English supervisor in the Education Directorate, personal communication, April 20, 2017).

schools volunteered to participate in the study. Table 1 summarizes their demographic information. All names are pseudonyms.

Table 1. *Demographic information of teacher-participants (n=7)*

<i>Name</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>School</i>	<i>Teaching experience (years)</i>	<i>Academic qualifications</i>
1- Mark	Male	A	22	MA English Methodology BA English language & Literature
2- Megan	Female	A	23	Higher Diploma in technology and communication BA English language and literature
3- Tala	Female	A	12	Higher Diploma in technology and communication BA English language and literature
4- Sophia	Female	B	15	BA English language & literature
5- Zeina	Female	B	6	BA English language & literature
6- Adam	Male	C	14	Higher Diploma in English Methodology BA English language and literature
7- Hannah	Female	D	20	Higher Diploma in technology and communication BA English language and literature

All teacher-participants had at least a university degree in English language and literature, a program that is offered at most Jordanian universities. Graduates of this program are qualified to work as English language teachers at schools in Jordan and other Arab countries. Some participants had further qualifications, such as diplomas or Master's degrees. Their teaching experience of teachers ranged from six to twenty-three years. Of the seven teachers, Mark, Megan, and Tala taught in the same school (School A); Sophia and Zeina taught at the same school (School B); and Adam and Hannah were from different schools (Schools C and D, respectively).

The second group of participants comprised 104 students in Grades 10 and 11 at the time of the study. The students' ages ranged from 16 to 18 years old. All of them had studied English as a foreign language for 10 or 11 years. Table 2 displays the demographic information of the student-participants. It should be noted that in Jordan schools are divided by gender; in the case of this study, only two participating teachers were male, which limited the number of male student participants as a result.

Table 2. *Demographic information of student-participants (n =104)*

	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>
Grade 10	0	56
Grade 11	23	25

3.4 Data Collection

The study employed three principal methods of data collection: interviews, class observations, and a questionnaire. Briefly, data collection began, as shown in Table 3, with individual pre-observation interviews in which I asked each participant 10 questions in order to explore their attitudes toward the phenomenon of using L1 in L2 classrooms.

After the interview, I scheduled and conducted one class observation with each participant in order to observe the teachers' practices in the class environment. At the end of each class observation, I distributed a questionnaire to the students of the class to obtain their views on L1 use in the L2 class. Finally, based on the class observations I developed questions for the post-observation interviews, which aimed to elicit reasons which motivated teachers to revert to the L1. These steps are further described in the sections that follow.

Table 3. *Dates of interviews and class observations*

<i>Pseudonym</i>	<i>Date of pre- observation interview</i>	<i>Date of class observation</i>	<i>Date of post- observation interview</i>
1- Mark	April 25	May 4	May 4
2- Megan	April 25	April 26	April 26
3- Tala	April 25	May 10	May 10
4- Sophia	April 27	May 2	May 2
5- Zeina	April 27	May 2	May 3
6- Adam	May 3	May 3	May 3
7- Hannah	May 9	May 9	May 9

3.4.1 Interviews

A total of two individual interviews were conducted with each teacher in a quiet place within each teacher's respective school. First, a semi-structured pre-observation interview was conducted during which I posed the participant questions about their attitudes toward using L1 in their L2 classes. This interview also inquired about the

perceived main functions and/or negative ramifications of using L1 in the EFL. The questions for the pre-observation interview (see Appendix B) were modified from the interview questions of Al Sharaeai (2012).

Following each teacher’s class observation, I conducted a second semi-structured interview. The questions for the post-observation interview were developed from my notes taken during the class observation. Questions aimed to elicit the teacher’s reasons for reverting to the L1 in class and also to identify the functions which were achieved in the English class by reverting to the L1.

The total time of the interviews was approximately two hours and 10 minutes, in which each pre-observation interview lasted an average of 12 minutes, whereas the post-observation interviews lasted an average of six minutes. Table 4 shows the duration of the pre- and post-observation interviews, the grade of the class that was observed for each participant, and the participants’ schools.

Table 4. *Interview duration, observed classes, and schools*

<i>Pseudonym</i>	<i>Pre- observation interview duration (minutes)</i>	<i>Post-observation interview duration (minutes)</i>	<i>Grade</i>	<i>School</i>
1-Mark	12:25	7:24	11	A
2-Megan	15:40	6:10	11	A
3-Tala	6:42	4:06	10	A
4-Sophia	14:00	5:12	10	B
5-Zeina	12:06	8:10	11	B
6-Adam	14:06	4:16	11	C
7-Hannah	11:10	6:56	10	D

3.4.2 Class observations

I observed one 45-minute Grade 10 or 11 class taught by each of the seven teacher-participants. The intention was to examine the degree of match (or mismatch) between teachers' stated beliefs and their actual teaching practices. The class observation also aimed to explore the functions and benefits of L1 use in the practical environment.

3.4.3 Questionnaire

A Likert-type scale questionnaire was used to gather insights from the students. The questionnaire included statements to which students were asked to respond by ticking the option that best described their perception. The options ranged from *never*, which indicated that the participant strongly disagreed with a statement, to *always* which indicated that the participant strongly agreed. The first three options (i.e., Always, Usually, Often) were considered indicative of the participant's agreement to the statement whereas the other three options (Occasionally, Rarely, Never) were regarded as indicative of their disagreement. Each answer in the questionnaire was given a value which would help to understand the mean value of each item in the questionnaire. Table 5 shows the value of each option in the questionnaire.

Table 5. *Value of questionnaire options*

<i>Option</i>	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Usually	Always
<i>Value</i>	0	1	2	3	4	5

A questionnaire was distributed to the students of the teacher-participants at the end of each class observation. The questionnaire included 10 questions in two sections (see Appendix A): the first section included two items about participants' gender and

total years spent learning English, and the second section included eight items about functions that may be achieved when teachers use L1 in class. These eight items aimed to explore students' beliefs about the functions of teachers' use of L1 in their L2 classrooms. The items of the questionnaire were adapted or modified from the questionnaires of previous studies. Table 6 shows the source of each question posed in the questionnaire:

Table 6. *Sources for questionnaire items*

<i>“My English language teachers use Arabic in the English language class to:”</i>	<i>Source</i>
Explain complex grammar points	Sharma (2006)
Help define some new vocabulary items	Sharma (2006)
Explain difficult concepts or ideas	Sharma (2006)
Give instructions	Sharma (2006)
Praise the students	Mohebbi and Alavi (2014)
Translate the reading texts	Lucas and Katz (1994)
Maintain discipline in the class	Mohebbi and Alavi (2014)
Explain the similarities and differences between Arabic and English in terms of grammar or structure or pronunciation.	Al-Nofaie (2010)

3.5 Data Analysis

Pre- and post-observation interviews were audio-recorded using a digital voice recorder and transcribed. The data was then coded for emergent themes according to Charmaz (2014), who defined coding as “naming segments of data with a label that simultaneously categories, summarizes, and accounts for each piece of data” (p. 111). Charmaz (2014) identified two stages in coding for emerging themes: first, *initial coding*, during which the researcher stays closely focused on the data, looking for themes in segments and jotting down words that reflect the recorded actions; and second, *focused coding*, during which the researcher looks for “the most significant and/or frequent earlier codes to sift through large amounts of data” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 138).

I conducted initial coding and focused coding in order to elicit the emergent themes from the interviews’ data. Furthermore, to improve reliability, a second researcher familiar with the issues considered in the thesis independently coded three of the transcripts in full. When we compared our codes, the correspondence in our initial coding was 57 heads out of 70 codes, or approximately 82% agreement (see Appendices C & D), which is considered a satisfactory level of consistency according to Bachman (1990).

Class observation data comprised notes that were taken in class regarding teachers’ practices and students’ behaviours in L1 use. Post-observation interview questions were developed based on these notes.

Quantitative data gathered from the questionnaire survey was analyzed using SPSS, a statistical software package. Every item in the questionnaire form was tabulated as a percentage, mean value, and standard deviation (SD) value in order to understand the meaning of the data gathered.

Chapter Four: Findings and Discussion

In the following sub-sections, the findings are presented, interpreted, and discussed in relation to mainstream literature on L1 use in L2 classes. The findings revealed a number of L1 functions based on EFL teachers and students' perceptions, as well as two negative ramifications of L1 overuse in the L2 classroom. Before presenting the findings, it may be useful to restate the research questions here.

- 1) What are Jordanian EFL teachers' attitudes toward L1 usage in the L2 classroom?
- 2) What do teachers consider to be the main functions of L1 usage in the L2 classroom?
- 3) What do teachers consider to be possible negative ramifications of L1 overuse in the L2 classroom?
- 4) What are the main functions of the teachers' use of L1 in the L2 classroom according to Jordanian EFL students?

4.1 Teacher Attitudes Toward L1 Use (Research Question 1)

Two main findings related to teachers' attitudes toward awareness and time spent using the L1. These will be expanded and discussed below.

4.1.1 Awareness of L1 use

Based on interviews and observations of teachers' practices in the classes, all participants manifested an awareness of the importance of minimizing L1 use as much as possible in their classes in order to increase students' exposure to the L2. For example,

Adam stated “students should practice English in the class because they do not have other places to do that.” Hannah also claimed: “Arabic use should be limited to specific situations and teachers should encourage students to use English as much as they can.” In addition, Mark stated:

As I mentioned before, we teach English as a foreign language so the amount of exposure to the language is too little. Students only have the opportunity to practice English inside the classroom. So, they do not have any opportunities outside the classroom so ... I mainly use English but as I told you here and there it is essential to use Arabic.

Observation notes further showed that the use of L1 in five of the participating classes was minimal. The other two teachers used a good deal of L1 in their classes, but they justified that use by appealing to the fact that they had grammar lessons to give, which needed more L1 use than other types of lessons. This finding clashes somewhat with Polio and Duff’s (1994) observation that L2 teachers may not be aware of how L1 and L2 are being used in their classes. The present study found that participants were in fact highly aware of their L1/L2 use, and overwhelmingly held that it is important to minimize the amount of L1 use and increase L2 use in the classroom.

The participants’ apparently high awareness and full intention to minimize L1 use in their classes and increase the amount of L2 use may be attributed to two main factors: firstly, all teachers had considerable experience teaching English at the public school level (their experience varied from 6-23 years). This may have enabled them to realize that L1 should only be used for specific purposes in an L2 classroom, while the main focus ought to be on practicing the L2. For example, Zeina, who had the least

teaching experience (6 years) among the participants, claimed that “I am an English language teacher; I come to this school to teach the English language. I just use Arabic to help my students to understand the English language lessons.” In addition, during the class observation, her L1 use was quite limited (approximately 10%). The influence of teaching experience on teacher cognition development in terms of practices is widely reported in the literature. For example, De la Campa and Nassaji (2009) observed that an experienced participant who had more than 20 years of teaching experience used fewer L1 words in the L2 class than a novice participant who had only four weeks of teaching experience.

Secondly, a high awareness of the importance of minimizing L1 use may come from the teaching policies in Jordan that ban using L1 in L2 classrooms. For example, when the researcher asked Hannah if she breaks with policy guidelines when she uses Arabic in her English class, she said: “Yes. If my supervisor comes to observe my class and finds me using Arabic in teaching English, this will be a negative point on my record.” In addition, she stated “In the English Teacher’s Manual, teachers should not translate anything into Arabic unless as the final option.” What Hannah said gives the impression that Jordanian EFL teachers are aware of the principles of the Jordanian teaching policies, which do not, apparently, welcome L1 use during L2 instruction. Littlewood and Yu (2011) observed that the L2 teaching policy in many countries prefer monolingual approaches in the L2 classes. Duff and Polio (1990) likewise suggested that teaching policies regarding L1 use in L2 classrooms may influence L1 use by L2 teachers.

In spite of the teachers' high awareness of the need to minimize the amount of in-class L1 use as much as possible, they still considered the L1 to be a beneficial teaching tool. In other words, they believed that using the L1 in some situations and for specific purposes could enhance the L2 teaching and learning process. Therefore, they support a judicious and principled use of L1. For example, Zeina pointed out "it [L1] is beneficial sometimes, but I don't support using it all the time". Mark also stated that:

You know we are after our students in order to understand. The ultimate goal is that they use the English language. When I find it difficult for them to understand any situation, why not? We can use Arabic in order to make the big picture clearer for them, but as I said we are always afraid of the overuse of Arabic.

It is obvious here that the teachers are aware of the importance of using the L2 in an L2 class, yet they continue to use the L1. A possible explanation is that they pay more attention to achieving the ultimate goal of the class than to following the teaching policy. In other words, because they are the actual practitioners in the educational field they can therefore decide what a suitable method is for achieving the goals or overcome learning challenges in their particular class. For example, Hannah said, "if you have no other choices to make the idea clear for your students but Arabic, I think you should use it." Similarly, Mark stated, "in some situations, I find it is difficult to convey the message I want to my students so I find myself obliged to use my mother tongue." These observations point to the benefits of L1 use for teachers in the real world, even though they also realize the importance of maximizing L2 use as much as they can.

Khurma and Hajjaji (1989) argued that excluding L1 from L2 classrooms in some educational environments, such as public schools where teachers are not native speakers of the target language, or other classroom realities, is often challenging (e.g., due to class size or limited time for the assigned material). In these cases, avoiding L1 use simply does not work because “[one needs a way of] bridging information gaps when those cannot be [addressed] in the second language” (p. 231). Hence, although adherents of the *maximal position* described in Chapter 2 believe that L1 may have no value in the L2 classroom, they still think that because of imperfect teaching conditions in the educational environments, teachers may need to revert to the use of L1 as a teaching recourse to overcome teaching challenges (Macaro, 2001).

In sum, this study found that EFL teachers are aware of their L1 use in the L2 classroom and that they believe that L1 use may enhance the L2 teaching and learning process. Overall, the teachers support a balanced and principled use of L1 in some situations in order to overcome some classroom barriers, despite L1 use being forbidden according to educational policy.

4.1.2 Amount of L1 use

This study has also found that teachers believe that the appropriate amount of L1 usage depends on two variables: 1) the type of lesson and 2) the students’ proficiency level.

4.1.2.1 Type of lesson

The interviewed teachers suggested that the type of lesson influences the amount of L1 use in the class. They think that some lessons, such as grammar, need more L1 support than others. For example, Zeina stated:

Reading lessons need less Arabic while grammar lessons need more Arabic. Different types of lessons need different amount of Arabic. Speaking lessons do not need Arabic. Students must ask and answer questions in English only while reading lessons need some Arabic but not the same amount as in grammar.

The suggestion was that lessons in which the teacher has both the role of providing explanations and is also the main source of information (e.g., grammar lessons) need more L1 use than lessons in which the teacher has less of a role as the main source of information (e.g., listening and speaking lessons). This is because the former type of lesson requires the teachers to explain and provide rules, give examples and details, conduct comparisons between the L1 and L2, and so on. In such cases, the students have only the role of listening or asking for greater clarification. Thus, teachers giving these kinds of lessons need to use all available means or teaching resources in order to ensure that the lesson is comprehensible to the students. Consequently, teachers may find L1 to be a beneficial teaching tool that helps them to achieve their teaching goals or overcome challenges, e.g., students' misunderstanding. The same conditions prevail during reading lessons, during which teachers strive to ensure that their students understand the texts, comprehend new words and key concepts. Thus even during reading lessons, teachers may provide some clarifications by translating or giving L1 equivalents for some words and concepts.

On the other hand, lessons such as listening require students to listen carefully to L2 conversations or activities in order to improve their listening skills without any intervention from the teacher. Teachers, in such cases, may have only the role of managing the class or tasks underway. Similarly, during speaking lessons, which require

students to speak the L2 as much as possible, teachers may use only the L2 for the entire time. For example, when the researcher asked Hannah if L1 can have a place in speaking and listening classes, she said, “No, speaking and listening lessons should be taught in English.” Unfortunately, none of the participants’ speaking or listening classes were observed, and so it is impossible to know to what extent their practices match their beliefs in classroom.

Bateman (2008) and Duff and Polio (1990) noted that lesson content is a variable that can influence L1 use in the L2 classroom. Similarly, teachers in the present study may need to use more L1 in some types of lessons according to their roles or teaching goals.

4.1.2.2 Student's proficiency level

With respect to the second feature affecting L1 use, student proficiency level, teachers may believe that low proficiency students need greater amounts of L1 use during class-time than those with higher levels of proficiency. For example, Zeina pointed out:

Using Arabic in the English language classes depends sometimes on the students’ level in English language. When the students are weak, you have to use Arabic to explain English as a subject because they are not going to understand a single word if you speak English all the time.

Hannah also claimed:

I think the level or the stage that you are teaching determines if or not to use Arabic in the class. For example, if you are teaching secondary stage, it is rarely to use Arabic but if you are teaching the basics [elementary] stages, I think you will need to use Arabic sometimes.

It is apparent that teachers believe that low proficiency students need more L1 usage than higher-level students and that the L1 may be a valuable teaching resource for

increasing these students' comprehension of the L2. Moreover, classrooms usually include students of different proficiency levels, and so teachers may find that using more L1 with students of low-level proficiency may decrease the proficiency gap between the students in their L2 classroom. This was clear in Megan's view when she said:

We always have, in our classes, good students, weak students and excellent students. You have to deal with each of them separately from his colleagues. For example, if I ask a question, some students will be able to give full answer, full meaning in English. Others will give half of the answer in English and may continue answering in Arabic sometimes. I have to deal with each student separately from the other.

Zeina shared the same belief in her pre-observation interview when she proposed, "When the students are weak, you have to use Arabic to explain English." In her class observation, Zeina gave her students the Arabic meanings of some English words. In the post-observation interview, she said:

[The Arabic meanings were given] because not all the students can understand the meaning of these words in English. Some can understand them in English without a need to use Arabic while the other [low-level proficiency students] cannot understand them in English only and they need Arabic to help them to understand better.

Megan and Zeina claimed that using L1 enabled them to deal with low proficiency students by increasing the students' comprehension of the L2 lessons' contents to a level equal to that of their higher-level proficiency classmates, without needlessly wasting time or effort.

In the literature on L1 use in the L2 classroom, many studies have found that the students' level of proficiency has an effect on L1 use. Communication between teachers and students using the L1 may create a more relaxed atmosphere in the L2 class (Bruen &

Kelly, 2014), particularly by encouraging lower-level proficiency students to engage in the class. Moreover, switching to the L1 may play a positive role in reducing the language and culture shock within the L2 classroom (Auerbach, 1993; Brooks-Lewis, 2009). Consequently, L2 students, particularly those with low-level proficiency, become more comfortable and relaxed whereas they may otherwise feel anxious in a monolingual teaching environment (Levine, 2003).

Several more studies have pointed to proficiency level influencing L1 use in L2 classrooms. For example, De la Campa and Nassaji (2009) found that students' low level of German (L2) skills was a major factor in why the participating instructors chose to use English (L1) in their classes. Moreover, Kharma and Hajjaj (1989) noted that the teachers of beginners' classes support L1 use more than teachers of higher-level courses. These authors suggested that the L1 use "decreases with the increase of the students' knowledge of the language being taught" (p. 228). Kim and Petraki (2009), meanwhile, found that teachers and students give a significant role to L1 use more in the beginning stages of language apprehension, less in intermediate stages, and much less at advanced levels.

4.2 Functions of L1 Use (Research Question 2)

This question aimed to identify the main functions of L1 use in the L2 classroom based on the teachers' beliefs and practices. In the pre-interviews, all of the teachers suggested some functions of using L1 in the L2 classroom; these were then compared with their practices in the classroom. The conclusion is that all participants reverted to L1 in their L2 classes in order to achieve different functions and purposes. Specifically, the functions were as follows: translation, metalinguistic use, overcoming some teaching challenges, giving instructions, motivation, and avoiding some words in L2 that sound

taboo in L1. These are expanded in the following sections. Table 7 shows the teachers that discussed or demonstrated each L1 function.

Table 7. *Functions of L1 use according to teachers*

<i>Function</i>	<i>Teacher</i>
1. Translation	All participants
2. Metalinguistic use	All participants
3. Overcome teaching challenges	Mark, Tala, Zeina
4. Give Instructions	Hannah, Zeina
5. Motivation	All participants
6. Avoid taboo words	Megan

4.2.1 Translation

Translation occurs when a teacher translates L2 items, such as words, phrases or proverbs, into the L1. Translation may enable students to understand the meaning of said items and learn them better. Malakoff and Hakuta (1991) observed, “translation provides an easy avenue to enhance linguistic awareness and pride in bilingualism” (p. 163).

Teachers’ reliance on the L1 for translation purposes was evident during class observations. During the post-observation interviews, teachers justified translating in some classroom situations, saying that translation assisted them in making the teaching process more fruitful. Teachers indicated that translation assisted them in a number of ways. Firstly, *explaining the meanings of words*: Teachers suggested that translation

assisted them in order to explain the meaning of words, which may increase students' comprehension and facilitate the learning of L2 words. However, teachers did not translate all of the words or concepts which they encountered in class; they realized that translation should not be used randomly, but rather that it should be used to overcome particular challenges. For example, Hannah claimed:

In the English Teacher's Manual, teachers should not translate anything into Arabic unless as the final option. If students need to know the meaning of a word, they have to go to the glossary where they can find the English meaning of it.

Based on the interviews and class-observations, teachers may be aware of the fact that the act of translating the meaning of words must be done purposefully in four scenarios: 1) new words, 2) abstract or difficult concepts, 3) proverbs, and 4) words that may have more than one equivalent in L1 which may provoke misunderstandings among the students.

With respect to translating new words, Mark said, "I use it [L1] in different situations... For example, when I want to explain or teach them new words". In his class, he asked students to give him the Arabic meaning of some English words, and he justified that practice in the post-observation interview: "You know that it is a new unit and they are new vocabulary words for my students so I wanted to make sure that they understand the meanings of these words." Hannah also gave an Arabic translation for the English word "features" in her class, saying that the word was new:

Because this was a new word for them. I thought that it would be easier for my students to understand this new word if I told them its' Arabic meaning. I think English teachers need to use Arabic sometimes when teaching new vocabulary.

Teachers may have a tendency to point to links between the L2 and L1 because they are aware or have come to realize from experience that the two languages are not yet clearly separated within the L2 learners' minds (Cook, 2001). In other words, learners' will tend to make links between the L1 and L2 in order to learn the L2 because "the two languages are closely linked in the mind" (Cook, 2001, p. 414). Students might memorize and understand the meanings of new L2 words much better if they recognize the L1 meanings of these words. The teachers' conscious efforts to establish connections between L1 and L2 were clear in Sophia's statement: "We should not forget the idea that when you want to explain grammar or anything new for students in the second language, you should relate it to their first language."

Many researchers have observed the practice of explaining the meaning of new L2 words during classroom time in different contexts. For example, Sharma (2006) found that 42% of participating teachers used their L1 in order to define new L2 vocabulary items. A similar finding was reported by Al-Shammari, (2011), Kharma and Hajjaj (1989), Mohebbi and Alavi (2014), and Shweers (1999).

A second reason teachers use translation is to *explain the meaning of abstract or difficult concepts*. It is commonplace that teachers encounter concepts that are not easy to explain using only the target L2; thus, teachers may find translation to be a good means of explaining the meanings of these concepts to their students. For example, Mark stated that some abstract concepts such as "hope" may be difficult to be explained to students through the L2:

When I want to explain or teach them ... abstract words for example. It is not enough to use English sometimes. So, I try to use Arabic to give them a clear idea. For example, if I want to teach the word *hope*, it is easier for me to say to my students *hope* means *الامل* [*Alamal*]. In this case, I shorten, I save my time and I can shift into English automatically.

Using translation as a means of explaining the meaning of abstract or difficult concepts may come as a result of particular teaching challenges, such as time limitations. Such concepts can take time to explain; therefore, teachers may find that translation may be an effective way to save the class time by enabling students to understand the meaning quickly through their L1.

The use of translation in order to teach difficult concepts is widespread among both L2 teachers and students, particularly in foreign language contexts. For example, Al Shammari (2011) conducted a study in Saudi Arabia and reported that 51% of teachers used the L1 in order to teach difficult concepts. Similar findings have been reported by Kharma and Hajjaj (1989), Sharma (2006), and Shweers (1999).

A third rationale for using translation is *translating proverbs*, which are different from simple phrases or words because they convey hidden meanings. Proverbs are one form of formulaic language manifestations (Wood, 2015), which is simply defined as a multi-word structure (i.e., three words or more) carrying a specific meaning (Appel & Trofimovich, 2017) or more technically as “an umbrella term used to describe fixed and semifixed expressions of various lengths” (Appel & Wood, 2016, p. 56). Translating these chunks of words (i.e., proverbs) may be very important and necessary in the L2 classroom to make sure that learners have understood the accurate meaning of these expressions. The ideas contained in proverbs typically have equivalents in other

languages, and so giving an equivalent proverb in the L1 can be effective, more so than translating it word-for-word from the L2 to the L1. Mark, for example, reverted to Arabic in order to give his students the equivalent of the English proverb “too many cooks spoil the broth.” He explained to his students that there is an equivalent proverb in Arabic culture: *كثرة الطباخين تفسد الطبخه* “Kuthret Altbakheen Tufssed Altabkhah” Giving students the L1 proverb enabled them to understand the English proverb, and was intended to help them to recognize and acquire the translation skill of needing to explain the overall idea of such a saying, not understand each individual word’s meaning which could lead them astray. Mark further suggested that translating proverbs may motivate students:

If they understand the proverb in Arabic, they become more motivated and they want to know more and more about the lesson. They want to discover what is next, what is going on. That is why I wanted to translate it in to Arabic.

During Mark’s class observation, students were smiling and laughing when Mark translated the aforementioned proverb into Arabic. The students were happy to know that this English proverb has an Arabic equivalent and meaning. Recognizing the meaning of the proverbs attracted the students’ attention to the class, and this may be the reason that inspired Mark to translate the English proverb into Arabic.

Translation was also used for *words that may gloss more than one equivalent in the L1*. In other words, teachers may encounter L2 words that have more than one meaning in the students’ L1. In such cases, some teachers give the required meaning for the particular lesson at hand, without paying attention to the fact that this L2 word may have a different meaning in another L1 context, whereas other teachers try to clarify all

potential L1 meanings of the same L2 word. This study found two examples where teachers used translation to clarify the meanings of words and show how the meaning may vary from one sentence to another. The first example was in Mark's class, during which he had to explain the meaning of English word *raw*. The English word *raw* glosses two different meanings in Arabic: it may gloss as "نيء" *Naie* ' which refers to uncooked meat, or it may gloss as "خام" *Kham*, which means not processed, as in "raw material". Mark was aware that if he just translated the meaning required for the particular lesson underway, i.e., as "raw food", his students would not realize that there was another meaning of *raw*.

The second example was in Megan's class, during which she had to explain the English word *treated*. Megan explained to her students that *treated* may have either of two meanings in English. First, it may mean how one deals with others or how others deal with oneself, as in "He treats his dog poorly". Second, it may have the sense implied when one is sick or wounded and needs medical (or other) attention, as in, "Her pneumonia needs to be treated immediately". She explained that the first meaning glosses as "عومل" *Aumelah*, while the second meaning glosses as "عولج" *Aulejah*. Although only the first meaning was required for that particular lesson, Megan explained to her students that the word *treated* has different meanings in English and that each meaning glosses a different word in Arabic.

Megan and Mark were the only teachers who paid such attention to the different connotations of English words in Arabic. Megan and Mark also had the most teaching experiences (23 and 22 years respectively) among the participants and they taught in one of the pioneering schools (A) in the area. Consequently, long teaching experience as well

as the reputation of the school may qualify them to be aware more than others of the importance of explaining how some English words may have many different Arabic meanings.

A final application of translation was for *teaching students translation skills*.

Teaching students the strategies needed for proper translation was an evident factor in the teachers' practices when they gave their students the L1 equivalents for L2 words or sentences, or asked their students to translate some words or sentences which they encountered during the L2 class. Cook (2009) argued that the "practice of translation is an end in itself for many students rather than simply a means to greater proficiency in the target language" (p. 115). Although teachers' translation practices with respect to explaining the meaning of L2 words and sentences may include indirect training in translation skills, this study found that teachers were aware of this function: from time to time they translated, or ask their students to translate, words or sentences in order to enable their students to practice their translation skills. For example, Sophia was mindful to teach her students translation strategy. She claimed that translation practices in the class enable the students to acquire translation skills and the ability to translate correctly. During class, she asked her students about the Arabic translation for "The red castle", and she justified that:

I usually try to relate what they learn in English to Arabic. I teach how to translate from English to Arabic and vice versa...I want them to understand that when they translate they translate the idea or the meaning not the sentence or the phrase as it is.

In addition, she may have realized that translation practice teaches her students to change their belief that every L2 word has an exact equivalent in their L1. Cook (2009)

has argued that one of virtues of translation is that it enables L2 students to overcome the problem of literal translation, which is often based on the belief that every word in the L2 has an exact equivalent in the L1, or vice versa. Hence, translation practice may have more to it than the simple role of facilitating the apprehension of L2 meanings; it may also enable the students to acquire translation skills that maybe help correct misaligned beliefs about languages being equivalent.

4.2.2 Metalinguistic use

Metalinguistic use is a second function of L1 use according to the data.

Metalinguistic use occurs when teachers switch from speaking in the L2 to talking about the L2 in the students' L1 (Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002). This occurs for four main reasons. The first is to *explain grammar*. The use of L1 in order to teach L2 grammar is widespread among L2 teachers, particularly in foreign language contexts. For example, Hannah suggested, "Some language aspects also need to be explained in your first language like grammar and vocabulary." Based on the interviews, it was clear that all participants in the study were convinced that using L1 to teach L2 grammar is a beneficial practice. Adam and Sophia taught grammar lessons during their classroom observations, while the other five participants taught reading lessons. The five teachers who taught reading lessons made limited use of L1 (approximately 10 %) whereas Adam and Sophie's L1 use was extensive (approximately 50%). When the researcher asked Adam and Sophia about their L1 use in the L2 classroom, Adam said he used "about 50% in grammar, 20% in reading." Sophia answered, "Not more than 20%. This could be in teaching all aspects of language but not grammar."

This large amount of L1 use during the L2 grammar classes reflects the belief that L1 use during grammar lessons comes as a result of “the difficulty of making the grammar point comprehensible through the L2” (Edstrom, 2006, p. 285). Because grammar lessons require ample effort on the part of teachers to explain grammar points and make them comprehensible, teachers may find that using the L1 for, for instance, conducting comparisons between L1 and L2 grammar rules, increases their students’ comprehension. Sophia, for example, pointed out:

Grammar is something abstract and it is related to the language itself. So, if I explain it in English, it would be difficult for them to take it. Therefore, I explained it in Arabic firstly so they could understand the rule then they can practice using the rule in English.

Teaching experience may be the main factor behind teachers’ belief that L1 use may assist them to overcome the difficulty of teacher L2 grammar lessons. For example, Sophia stated, “From my experience in teaching English language for 15 years, I find that it [L1 use] is an effective way in teaching grammar but not in other skills.” She later added, “I have tried to use English only in grammar lessons but I found that it is not effective at all.” Sophia believes, based on her teaching experience (15 years), that L1 use is very important in an L2 grammar class, and she also believed that the monolingual approach is not effective at all in the same context. Apparently, teachers may touch on the benefits of L1 use in grammar lessons; e.g., increasing their students’ comprehension, clarifying the grammatical points and concepts, and speeding-up explanations in order to finish the assigned material. Thus, they become advocates for the view that L2 grammar is better explained in L1, and “are not enthusiastic about carrying out grammar explanation in the L2” (Cook, 2001, p.415).

Assalahi (2013), for example, noted that L1, in EFL context, is seen among L2 teachers as a strategy to facilitate L2 grammar learning. Moreover, Kharma and Hajjaj (1989) found that 66% of their teacher-participants believed that L1 should be used in order to explain L2 grammar. Similar findings were reported by Al-Shammari, (2011), Bateman, (2008), Mohebbi and Alavi, (2014), and Sharma (2006).

A second reason for using the L1 to explain L2 points is for *teaching L2 pronunciation*. Teachers may teach L2 pronunciation by referring to sounds from L1 for the sake of comparing the linguistic systems. In Tala's class, it was noted that she reverted to Arabic in order to explain how the English word "therapeutic" was pronounced. In the post-observation interview, she said: "Sometimes I use alternative Arabic sounds to help my students to pronounce words correctly. They connect the pronunciation with Arabic sounds so they cannot forget that, because they connect it with similar sounds in Arabic." Then, when asked if she believes that Arabic is a good method to fix the students' pronunciation, she said "Yes, by connecting it with similar sound in Arabic." Based on Tala's practice and belief, using L1 to teach L2 pronunciation may represent the teachers' lifeline for overcoming challenges to instructing students in pronunciation, because L2 teachers are not usually native to the language which they teach, particularly in foreign language contexts. Moreover, students may find L1 to be a good technique for learning L2 sounds because they try to imitate or make links between L1 and L2 sounds, as Tala proposed.

Several previous studies in both ESL and EFL contexts (e.g., Alghazo, 2013; Burgess & Spencer, 2000; Foote, Holtby & Derwing, 2011) have reported that teaching L2 pronunciation may be the most difficult skill that teachers contend with in L2 classes,

and that teachers feel insecure when they teach L2 pronunciation. In the EFL context of Jordan, Alghazo (2013), for example, reported a lack of confidence and training on the part of L2 teachers in pronunciation instruction, particularly in teaching the prosodic aspects of English (i.e., rhythm and intonation). In the ESL context of Canada, Foote, Holtby and Derwing (2011), for example, found that L1 may play a key role in increasing teachers' confidence teaching L2 pronunciation, for the reason that non-native English speaking teachers may themselves have poor pronunciation abilities, which is likely to be a source of confusion. In the afore-mentioned study of Foote, Holtby and Derwing (2011), it was found that 35 participants out of 99 believed that pronunciation instruction would be more effective if the teacher shared the same L1 as the students. In EFL contexts, however, no studies were found to report teachers' preferences as to the use of L1 in L2 pronunciation instruction.

Furthermore, students themselves may favour using their L1 while learning L2 pronunciation, because L2 sounds may be challenging for them. For example, Alghazo (2015) conducted a study in Saudi Arabia with Arabic students learning English as a foreign language and reported that nearly 90% of participating L2 students in his study preferred that their L1 be used in L2 pronunciation classes.

A third reason that the L1 may be used for metalinguistic purposes is for *teaching L2 punctuation*. Teachers may revert to their L1 in order to teach punctuation by discussing any similarities and/or differences in the use of punctuation marks that may exist between the two languages. In the present study, Adam was the only teacher who indicated in the pre-observation interview that he relied on Arabic in order to teach students about English punctuation. However, none of the participants taught punctuation in the classes

which were observed and so it is unclear the extent to which teachers actually made use of the L1 for this purpose.

A final reason for using the L1 to talk about the L2 is when *talking about cultural similarities and differences*. In the L2 class, teachers often discuss the L2 culture. Three of the present study's teacher-participants indicated in the pre-interviews that they may revert to Arabic in order to explain some cultural aspects in both languages. However, in the class-observation, the researcher only noted one example, in Megan's class. Megan was one of the participants who claimed that she relied on Arabic in order to talk about English culture, as she says, "to show the differences in cultures or the similarities". In Megan's class, the reading text was from "Oliver Twist" the famous novel written by the English writer, Charles Dickens. Megan talked about the novel and the author, and then asked her students if they were able to give an example of an Arabic writer. Her students answered Najeeb Mahfouz. Megan then talked about Najeb Mahfouz –that he received a Nobel Prize and has written many great works, and so on– all in Arabic. In her post-observation interview, she justified this approach:

I think that our students should appreciate our Arabic writers and they must always remember that as we have English writers who write in a certain style, unique style in English language, we similarly have writers in Arabic language ... that helps the students to understand the English culture also.

Megan believed that giving an example from the Arabic context would improve her students' understanding of the culture surrounding English via a comparison of the students' culture and English culture. She held that a comparison would increase her students' comprehension of such abstract concepts as the place of famous writer in a culture. When students know that Charles Dickens holds in the

English context the same place as Najeb Mahfouz in the Arabic context, they can understand the concepts and significance of writers and literature.

Previous studies in different contexts (see, for example, Bateman, 2008; Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989; Mohebbi & Alavi, 2014; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002) have similarly noted that teachers may use their L1 in order to explain some aspects of L2 cultures. Using the L1 may play an important role in facilitating the understanding of some aspects or issues regarding the differences or similarities of L1 and L2 cultures because “L2 learners are more flexible in their ways of thinking and are less governed by cultural stereotypes” (Cook, 2001, p. 407). In context of this study, using the L1 in order to explain the similarities and differences between the L1 and L2 cultures may increase the students’ comprehension of L2.

4.2.3 Overcoming teaching challenges

Teachers may encounter a variety of challenges in the L2 classroom that provoke them to revert to their L1 as a solution. The present study found that the L1 enables L2 teachers to overcome two main challenges. The first is a *lack of knowledge on the part of teachers*. For example, L2 lessons may include technical concepts or topics about which teachers do not have sufficient knowledge; in such cases, the L1 may enable teachers to explain these L2 items with more confidence. Mark suggested that using L1 assists teachers in teaching certain topics that are difficult to understand:

Last week I was teaching the students a scientific text about volcanoes, the lava, and the magma which is difficult for me and my students. So, when I used Arabic, I asked my colleagues who teach science to give me some information about this topic and they gave it to me in Arabic because they know Arabic better than English. I tried to convey my experience and the information I got from my colleagues to my students.

Mark's experience was echoed by Tala, who also claimed that some types of lessons, such as reading lessons on scientific topics, demanded L1 use in order to overcome the difficulty of such topics. She said, "I usually use Arabic... in teaching science topics."

A teacher's lack of knowledge may be attributed to the fact that the participants are non-native speakers of the target language, as well as non-experts in a particular topic. It is thus reasonable that teachers find their native language to be a valuable teaching resource for countering a lack of knowledge regarding some topics or concepts that come up during L2 lessons. Bateman (2008) observed that the linguistic limitations of the L2 teachers who are non-native to the target language is one of the factors that stands behind over-reliance on the L1 in some situations in L2 classrooms. On the one hand, teachers' language limitations in some contexts (e.g., as above, in the teaching of scientific or technical terms) may limit L2 learning to some extent; on the other hand, this is a challenge inherent to teaching a language in a foreign context where teachers are often second language users themselves. Thus, some teacher L1 use may be a necessary part of ensuring that a language class operates smoothly.

A second challenge that use of the L1 may help mitigate is that of *checking students' understanding*: The L1 may be used as a tool to measure the extent to which students understand or follow the lesson. The first example of this comes from Mark's class, on the occasion of when he asked one of his students to translate a question. In the post-observation interview, Mark remarked that:

I asked one of the students to translate the question for me to make sure that they understand what they are going to do. Even though I am sure that most of my students understand what they are going to do next, what is required and what is not required, I sometimes become afraid that the students do not understand where they are going... When I use Arabic, I can be assured that they understand what is going on and I see their reaction. When they understand the question, they continue doing it to get the right answer.

A second example comes from the pre-observation interview with Zeina, who claimed, "I need to use it in the class to make sure that students understand what I mean and what I am talking about." Moreover, in her class, she gave her students the Arabic meanings for some words, and when the researcher asked her why she did that, she said to was "to make sure that the students understand the question which I asked."

Many researchers (e.g., Atkinson, 1987; Harbord, 1992; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie, 2002) also reported that the assessment of students' comprehension was a function of L1 use in the L2 classroom. Schweers (1999), for example, found that 10.4% of participating teachers rely on L1 in order to check for comprehension. A similar finding was reported by Tang (2002). Using the L1 in the L2 classroom for comprehension checks may be considered as a practical means to check how the students are doing in the classroom. Students, particularly low-level students, may keep silent when they do not understand, which is likely to foster further misunderstandings; using the L1 can therefore surmount L2 comprehension barriers by allowing teachers to check in with students regardless of their comfort with the L2.

4.2.4 Giving instructions

Another function of L1 use in the EFL classroom is to give students classroom instructions. This study found that teachers give the instructions via the L1 for three

primary reasons. The first reason is to *overcome limits on classroom time*. Limited class time is one of the key challenges that teachers face in their classrooms, especially in Jordan where an English class is 45 minutes long. Some teachers observed that this is not enough, such as Hannah in her pre-observation interview:

I think you will need to use Arabic sometimes, I use it to help them to get the idea or to save time as you do not have time to waste it. Time is limited for classes. If you want to keep it for the students' understanding, you will need more three classes for one lesson. So, I try to teach them the whole material.

During her classroom observation, Hannah spoke few sentences in Arabic in order to give instructions about a task. In the post-class interview, she justified that L1 use as a way to save time. Using the L1 enabled Hannah to manage the class time effectively, in this case by finishing the assigned material on time and achieving her class goals as a consequence. The L1 may be an additionally efficient teaching tool in teaching environments where the teacher faces large class sizes and limited assigned time (Cook, 2001; Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989).

Several studies (e.g., Al Shammari, 2011; Bruen & Kelly, 2014; Harbord, 1992; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989; Turnbull, 2001) have equally highlighted the fact that the L1 can be efficient in terms of the amount of time expended explaining the L2 lessons. Alshammari (2011), for example, found that 60% of EFL teachers in his study believe that the L1 helps them teach more efficiently. A similar finding was reported by Tang (2002).

The second reason that the L1 is used for giving instructions is for *showing the importance of the instructions*. This was clear in Hannah's class when she gave instructions in Arabic. In the post-observation interview, she said:

I use it [L1] to show the importance of something. For example, when I said *لأ تحاول الغش* [LA tuhawel Alkhash] *don't cheat*, I wanted to insist that they should not look at the text and they have to guess what the topic of the reading is from the title and the picture. I wanted them to learn brainstorming. So, I used Arabic to insist on this important issue.

Hannah spoke Arabic to her students in order to show them the extent of the importance of her instructions. Students may feel that a speech made in L1 is more significant than the same speech made in L2, and teachers usually realize that students take the instructions more seriously if it is given in their native language. Cook (2001) noted that L1 usage reflects the seriousness of the teachers, and communicates a real threat more than using the L2. Hence, teachers may find the L1 more efficient than the L2 in terms of showing the importance of instructions.

A third reason the L1 may be used for giving instructions is for *ensuring a full understanding of task requirements* such as how to do the task or exercise. For example, Zeina claimed:

I use it [L1] in listening lessons to tell the students what I am going to do. I give instructions in Arabic so the students can know what they are listening to and what they are supposed to do after the listening exercises.

She later added, "In listening lessons, Arabic is used for giving instructions only. However, if the instructions are simple and the students can understand them easily, I do not have to use Arabic." It is clear that even though Zeina believed that the

L1 should not be used during listening classes, she did not object to giving the necessary instructions in the L1 in order to enable her students to understand what they had to do. Several studies (see, for example, Al Shammari, 2011; Mohebbi & Alavi, 2014; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002; Sharma, 2006) have also reported that teachers may revert to the students' L1 in order to give instructions. This may go toward showing that the L1 can be beneficial in L2 classes in a variety of different contexts.

4.2.5 Motivation

Several studies (see, for example, Bateman, 2008; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002; Sharma, 2006) have observed that teachers sometimes use the L1 in L2 classrooms for the purpose of motivating students to participate and engage more fully in classroom activities. This study found that in certain situations boosting motivation was the main function of L1 use. There were two situations in which teachers felt that the L1 increased motivation: in *teacher-student interaction* and in *student-student interaction*.

In Mark's pre-observation interview, he clearly articulated how the L1 boosted student motivation in *teacher-student interaction*. He said, "they [his students] are shy because they need to be motivated, they need to be encouraged to break the ice as you know." During his class, he asked his students a question and when the students raised their hands to answer, he said, "أريد الطلاب الي ما سمعت صوتهم" [Aureed Altulab Eli ma Esma't Sutareh] *I am willing to hear new voices*. In the post-observation interview, Mark justified this, saying:

You know that one's language is the best. We all love our language. Sometimes we taste the language. For me, when I speak Arabic, it sounds better actually for me. When they hear this in Arabic, their own language, it sounds good for them. So, I want to encourage them to take part in the activity,

to motivate them. Also, using Arabic instructions let me know that the students understand the activity itself, what they are to do and this encourages them to take part in the activity.

Mark thus seems to find the L1 to be a significant prompt that encourage students to take part in class activities.

Meanwhile, Hannah believed that allowing the students to use their L1 both with her and amongst themselves (i.e., *student-student interaction*) would also increase their participation. She said:

Sometimes you have to let them [the students] speak Arabic because they will participate unless you let them use some Arabic. They will use it among them. If you do not allow them to use Arabic, you will have no more than 10 students participating in class. This will help them to feel more confident to participate in class.

It is clear from Hanna's view that allowing the students to use their L1 when responding to the teacher increases their participation in class and encourages them to become involved in the class activities. In the classes that were observed, students often used Arabic words while they were talking to their teachers in English (code-switching). For example, in Zeina's class, her students used Arabic when responding to questions. In the post-observation interview, Zeina explained why her students did that:

Because some students do not have enough vocabulary to speak in English. Also, some students do not have the confidence to answer in English. They are afraid to speak English and because this lack of confidence some of them answer in Arabic.

It is clear that Hanna and Zeina were aware that students with low levels of proficiency in the L2 were not able to give full answers using the L2, and they were

also aware that the L1 is “a necessary conversational lubricant” (Butzkamm, 1998, p. 96) for increasing the students’ motivation to participate and to engage in class. Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney (2008) argued that “code-switching to the L1 is also a teacher strategy for dealing with affective aspects of classroom interaction” (p. 252). Several additional studies (e.g., Cook, 2001; Edstrom, 2006; Sharma, 2006) have reported that L1 use is beneficial to motivating students.

Other teachers commented on L1 use in *student-student interaction*, such as in pair and group work. For example, Tala said, “When I see some of the students speak Arabic to help their partners, I ignore that.” Additionally, Sophia believed that using their L1 is beneficial to students engaged in group work:

As I told you English is not their first language, so if I forbid them from using Arabic, it would be difficult for them. They are still learning how to use the language. I think using Arabic is very beneficial for the students in group work.

During class-observations, three teachers asked their students to work on tasks as pairs and groups. In those classes in which students worked as pairs or groups, it was clear that students were using their L1 extensively amongst themselves while they worked on their tasks, and the teachers did not stop them. For example, during Mark’s class, he asked his students to work on a task as pairs. His students were mostly speaking Arabic, but Mark did not ask them to stop and switch to English. In the post-observation interview, he justified why he did not ask his students to use only English among each other:

I am after understanding. So, whatever means, whatever way my students use, I become pleased. I want the ultimate goal that they understand... You know that our students learn English as a foreign language so they are not mastering the

language very well. So, they find themselves obliged to use Arabic. So, I do not think that this affects the lesson. In contrary, I think it is a point of strength. They can understand each other, they can help each other even if they use Arabic.

The L1 may be considered a very valuable cognitive tool that enables students to help each other and overcome L2 learning challenges or task difficulties during pair or group work (Storch & Aldosari, 2010; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003). For example, Kharma and Hajjaj (1989) reported that teachers frequently allow students to use their L1 for talking with their peers in pair or group work. Teachers may thus be said to appreciate the role of L1 use in motivating their students to involve themselves in assigned pair and group work, and to work with classmates in order to finish the task, and this despite the fact that the L1 use among the students in these situation is often quite extensive.

Not all teachers subscribe to the belief that the L1 should be allowed amongst students. For example, in contrast to Sophia and Mark's relaxed attitude toward students speaking Arabic in group work, in Zeina's class, she asked the students not to speak Arabic when they started working in groups on the task that she assigned. Despite this instruction, her students continued speaking Arabic to each other. In the post-observation interview, Zeina justified why she asked her students to use English only "I wanted them to practice speaking English in the English class. They usually speak Arabic when they work in groups but I ask them to speak English." Although Zeina likely wanted her students to practice English, she may have also wanted to show the researcher that she was upholding her stance that using L1 in the class should be limited and purposeful even among students in group work.

4.2.6 Avoid taboo words

This function was noted in the pre-observation interview with Megan when she suggested that she and her students sometimes encounter some English words that sound taboo in Arabic, such as “maniac”, “unique”, and "knack". In such cases, Megan’s view is that switching to Arabic is beneficial to explain the potential misunderstanding to her students:

Megan: There are some words in English some students feel shy to use them like the word “unique” [sounds bad in Arabic], you know it has a bad meaning in Arabic, “maniac” and when they face it in a paragraph they will skip it and not read it.

Researcher: So, you tell them in Arabic not in English?

Megan: Yes, yes. They won’t [be] shy to use them again so that they will become like any other English words and to use them freely.

Based on Megan’s view, switching to the L1 may be a safe haven of sorts in which teachers can avoid situations in which students and teachers may be embarrassed because of a misunderstanding of meaning. As Megan stated, students may skip these words or prefer not to read them as a result of shyness. Hence, she reverts to the L1 to explain that words that sound bad in the L1 do not have the same meaning as in the L2. Butzkamm (1998) argued to this effect: “[even] if it was possible to banish it [L1] from the classroom, it could never be banished from the pupils’ minds” (p. 96). In other words, some L2 words will still sound taboo in the students’ L1 minds, despite the fact that they are fully aware that they are in an L2 classroom and the L2 word is not taboo in the L2. Hence, translating these words into the L1 and explaining their real meaning in the L2 might be the best remedy to dispel students’ shyness and/or misunderstanding and also

clarify that these words have different meanings than the meanings which initially cross their minds.

4.3 Negative Ramifications of L1 Overuse (Research Question 3)

As discussed in previous sections, teachers in this study perceived L1 use to serve numerous functions in the L2 classroom, functions which may ultimately enhance the L2 teaching and learning process. However, as was also discussed earlier, L1 overuse in an L2 classroom may negatively affect the teaching and learning process. One aim of this study was to explore teachers' beliefs about the negative ramifications of L1 overuse, whether real, perceived, or potential. Interview data in particular pointed to teachers being very aware of the risks of L1 overuse. Overall, the data suggested that teachers suppose that overuse can lead to two kinds of negative results: 1) limiting the L2 development process, and 2) causing a negative affective impact.

4.3.1 Limiting the L2 development process

In line with the L2-only advocates in Chapter 2's literature review, teachers in this study believed that L1 overuse could limit L2 development by minimizing the amount of exposure to the L2 and thus restricting the students' opportunities to practice it. For example, Megan pointed out, "When we use Arabic most of the time, when we allow students to use Arabic when they are in the rest all the time, this will limit their ability of using the English language." Adam shared the same view when he stated, "Using Arabic too much during the class does not help students to improve their English language." In addition, Hannah claimed that: "it [L1 overuse] will make acquiring the language slow." The teachers were clearly cognizant that L1 overuse can hinder the L2 learning process, and were aware of the fact that when students have more exposure to the L2, they learn

the L2 better (Turnbull, 2001). Several studies in the literature (e.g., Atkinson, 1987; Johnson & Swain, 1994; Turnbull, 2001) noted that L1 overuse may inhibit the L2 development since L1 may reduce the exposure to the L2.

The teachers also believed that L1 overuse may also cause students to become addicted to L1 use. In other words, students may become unable to avoid using their L1 for the sake of learning the L2 and may need to translate every L2 item in order to learn it. For example, Tala proposed, “If you use Arabic a lot in your English class, you teach your students to use unhelpful strategies by letting them depend a lot on Arabic to understand the ideas.” Hannah also stated that L1 overuse caused an “addiction” to L1 use, saying, “students would never have the opportunity to use English independently. They will always search for the Arabic language.” It has been noted in the literature that L1 overuse may make the students reliant on L1 as their main learning resource for grasping the L2. Atkinson (1987), for example, has reported that students and teachers may become addicted to L1 use, and consequently that they cannot understand L2 items without translation. Chapter 2 delved further into the literature on this position.

Furthermore, the teachers in this study believed that teaching practices in L2 classrooms may be the main predictor of any negative linguistic ramifications which may influence L2 learning. For example, Megan said:

If you speak always...if you use the Arabic language without organisation, without a purpose for using it in a certain situation, the students will follow your pattern and use Arabic whenever they want and stop using English whenever they want.

Zeina shared the same view: “If the teacher speaks Arabic all the time during the English lesson, they [students] will follow the teacher.” Hence, as Turnbull (2001) argued, Megan and Zeina were aware that “teachers should aim to use the TL [target language] as much as possible, and, by doing so, have a positive effect on learners' TL proficiency” (p. 534). Apparently, teacher-participants were aware of the dangers of L1 overuse in the L2 classroom.

4.3.2 Negative affective impact

The participating teachers also believed that L1 overuse may reinforce the shyness or lack of confidence that students may have when they use the L2 in front of others in class. This result may appear to clash with the earlier finding that motivating students is a function achieved by L1 use. In this case, though, the teachers were expressing their belief that L1 does play a positive role in increasing students' self-confidence and encouraging them to be involved in the L2 class; however, this impact may only last a short time (for the time of a single class, for example). Fear or shyness at the thought of publicly using the L2 is a deeper habit that requires longer-term practice to break. Hence, maximizing L2 use will increase the students' confidence over the long term, and allow them to use L2 freely, with less shyness or fear which may deprive students' academic and social engagement in class, a case that is claimed to significantly influence ultimate achievement (Fox, Cheng & Zumbo, 2014).

Megan expressed this belief when she said: “If I won't use English language in the classroom the students won't care to use English like me. They always feel shy and afraid of using English and making mistakes.” She later added, “There will be gaps using the language. Therefore, we have to encourage them to talk and to write, to communicate

in every possible way in English language during the English lesson.” Clearly, Megan believed that L1 overuse demotivates students over the long term, and leaves them afraid of using the L2. MacDonald (1993) came to the same conclusion that L1 overuse can ultimately demotivate students.

Mark also expressed the belief that L1 overuse may demotivate students from practicing the L2. He said:

I don't want them to overuse Arabic because I told you it is a foreign language and they should speak it. Sometimes, I feel that my students are shame of using English so I encourage them to use English and to be risk takers in order to use the language [L2].

Clearly, Mark thought that L1 overuse would affect the students' motivation to learn the L2, and so he encouraged them to use the L2 as much as possible in order to increase their confidence in their abilities. This finding is in line with several studies (e.g., Macaro, 1997; MacDonald, 1993; Turnbull, 2001) that reported that when teachers maximized use of the L2, it increased the students' motivation to learn it because the learners discovered for themselves how knowledge of the L2 benefitted them.

4.4 Functions of L1 Use According to Students (Research Question 4)

The above sections explored the findings related to teachers' beliefs and actions about L1 use (and overuse) in the L2 classroom. This section reports on the portion of the study that sought to understand how students perceived the functions of teacher L1 use.

As mentioned earlier in Chapter three, a Likert-type scale of six options (i.e., Always, Usually, Often, Occasionally, Rarely, Never) was used to explore students' perceptions toward L1 functions achieved by their teachers. The first three options (i.e.,

Always, Usually, Often) were considered indicative of the participant's agreement to the statement whereas the other three options (Occasionally, Rarely, Never) were regarded indicative of their disagreement. The questionnaire consisted of two sections: The first section asked students about their gender and total years of learning English, and the second section included eight statements about teachers reasons for using L1. Table 8 shows the results of students' responses regarding how often they perceive teachers revert to their L1 during L2 lessons according to eight different functions.

Table 8. *Functions of teacher L1 use according to students (n=104)²*

<i>Teachers' L1 functions in the L2 classroom</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. Deviation</i>	<i>Always N (%)</i>	<i>Usually N (%)</i>	<i>Often N (%)</i>	<i>Occasionally N (%)</i>	<i>Rarely N (%)</i>	<i>Never N (%)</i>	
			<i>n</i>						
1. Explain complex grammar points	3.46	1.407	28 (26.9)	36 (34.6)	12 (11.5)	13 (12.5)	14 (13.5)	1 (1)	
2. Help define some new vocabulary items	3.60	1.258	28 (26.9)	37 (35.6)	16 (15.4)	17 (16.3)	4 (3.8)	2 (1.9)	
3. Explain difficult concepts or ideas	3.73	1.125	32 (30.8)	32 (30.8)	23 (22.1)	14 (13.5)	3 (2.9)	0	
4. Give instructions	2.96	1.520	15 (14.4)	33 (31.7)	20 (19.2)	13 (12.5)	15 (14.4)	8 (7.7)	
5. Praise the students	2.67	1.692	17 (16.3)	23 (22.1)	18 (17.3)	18 (17.3)	11 (10.6)	17 (16.3)	
6. Translate the reading texts	2.63	1.649	14 (13.5)	25 (24)	20 (19.2)	14 (13.5)	16 (15.4)	15 (14.4)	
7. Maintain discipline in the class	2.35	1.772	18 (17.3)	15 (14.4)	12 (11.5)	20 (19.2)	18 (17.3)	21 (20.2)	
8. To explain the similarities and differences between Arabic and English in terms of Grammar, structure, or pronunciation	3.19	1.488	25 (24)	27 (26)	16 (15.4)	18 (17.3)	15 (14.4)	3 (2.9)	

² The mode value of item 7 is 0 (never) while for the rest of items it is 4 (usually)

Overall, these results suggest that students' beliefs regarding their teachers' reasons for using the L1 in the classroom are in line with the teachers' own reasons (For an overview of the responses of all of the teacher-participants by function, see Table 7). The majority of students' answers were *always*, *usually*, or *often* for most items except Question 7. For Question 7, *maintain discipline in the class*, a small majority (56.7%) of students felt this was an infrequent function. This result mirrored teachers' sentiments during interviews, i.e., that they do not use their L1 in order to maintain classroom discipline. This was also supported by the class observations, in which the researcher did not observe teachers using the L1 to maintain discipline. This finding may be related to the fact that these students were in higher Grades (10 and 11), and thus require less discipline than younger classes. In addition, the schools in which the study was conducted were considered "good schools" in the area, another indication that perhaps classroom discipline is not a significant issue, in EFL classes or otherwise. School A, for example, is considered to be one of the pioneering schools of the area, and its students mostly considered "elite" (46 of 104 questionnaire participants were students at School A).

With respect to mean values, Questions 1 (3.46), 2 (3.60), 3 (3.73), and 8 (3.19) show that the tendency among participants was to give answers between *often* and *usually*. In Question 4, the mean was 2.96, which indicates that the participants' answers averaged *often*. In addition, the mode (the most common answer) of Question 4 was 4 (Usually) which indicates that the tendency of participants to agree with the statement. In the case of Questions 5 (2.67) and 6 (2.63), the mean shows that the tendency among the

participants was to answer *often*, as the mean of each item was higher than 2.5, and the mode value of each one was 4 (Usually) which confirm that the tendency of participants was to agree with the statement. For Question 7, the mean was 2.35 which indicates that the tendency among participants was to give the answer *occasionally*, as the mean is less than 2.5, and also the mode value was 0 (Never) which indicates that the tendency of participants was to disagree with the statement. Thus, the values of the means suggest that, in the case of most of the items, the majority of students agreed with their teachers' reasons for using L1 in their L2 classes. It can thus be concluded that overall students' views of the functions of L1 in the classroom are consistent with the teachers' beliefs as to the functions of using L1.

Furthermore, the distribution of standard deviation (SD) values varied between 1.125 (lowest value) and 1.772 (highest value) and increased as mean values decreased. Hence, the highest value (1.772) of the SD was in item 7 (maintain discipline in the class) in which the mean was the lowest (2.35) and the tendency among participants was to disagree with this statement, whereas the lowest value (1.125) was in item 3 (explain difficult concepts or ideas) in which the mean value of the same item was the highest (3.73) which indicates that participants agreed with the statement.

In conclusion, the results of the questionnaire suggest that students' perceptions correspond with those of their teachers in terms of the L1 functions achieved in their L2 classrooms. This finding is also supported by many related studies (see, for example, Duf & Polio, 1990; Kim & Petraki, 2009; Macaro, 1997; Storch & Aldosari, 2010; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003) that report that students have a positive impression of L1 usage during L2 class time. Schweers (1999), for example, found that almost 90% of L2

students believed that their L1 should have a role in their L2 classes. Similarly, Tang (2002) reported that 70% students support using their L1 in their L2 classroom. Similar findings were reported by Al Shammari (2011), Kovacic and Kirinic (2011), and Sharma (2006).

Chapter Five: Conclusion

This section presents a summary of the study's findings, discusses limitations of the study, provides some implications, and further directions for further research.

5.1 Summary of Findings

The first research question asked, *What are Jordanian EFL teachers' attitudes toward L1 usage in the L2 classroom?* The findings suggested that EFL teachers in Jordan were aware of the importance of minimizing L1 use in the classroom in order to further students' exposure to the L2, given that the classroom setting is almost the only place where students can actually practice their L2. Moreover, teachers supported a balanced and principled use of L1 as a means of overcoming some common classroom challenges in specific situations, depending on: 1) the type of lesson, e.g., grammar lessons may require more L1 use whereas listening and speaking lessons may not call for any L1 use; and 2) students' L2 proficiency level, insofar as beginners may need greater support in the L1 than students with higher levels of proficiency.

The second research question asked, *What do teachers consider to be the main functions of L1 usage in the L2 classroom?* There were six main functions that were achieved when teachers revert to their L1:

- 1) *Translation*, in which the teacher translated the L2 item into the L1. This function was mainly used in order to explain the meaning of new L2 words, phrases, proverbs, or words which may gloss more than one equivalent meaning in the L1 and may therefore cause confusion. In addition, teachers

sometimes translated some L2 items or asked their students to translate them in order to equip them with particular translation skills.

- 2) *Metalinguistic use*, in which teachers switched from speaking in L2 to talk about L2 in the students' L1 (Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002). This function was used in order to: explain grammar points, teach pronunciation, teach punctuation, and talk about cultural similarities and differences.
- 3) *Overcome teaching challenges*, in which teachers relied on their L1 in order to overcome challenges that they commonly encountered in L2 classes, such as lack of knowledge about a subject and checking students' understanding.
- 4) *Giving instructions*, in which teachers gave instructions in their L1. This function was used in order to overcome limited class time, show the importance of the instructions, and ensure students' full understanding of what was required for a task or activity.
- 5) *Motivation*, in which teachers used the L1 in order to motivate students to make judicious use of their L1 in the classroom and complete L2 tasks.
- 6) *Avoid words in the L2 that sound similar to taboo words in the L1*, in which teachers used the L1 to clarify potential misunderstandings that may arise as a result of L2 words sounding like L1 taboo words.

The above functions were perceived to be beneficial in the L2 classroom, as they may facilitate students' L2 learning and assist teachers in achieving their pedagogical goals. The functions of L1 use reflect a positive attitude toward L1 usage in L2 courses, a

conclusion that corresponds with previous studies (e.g., De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002).

The third research question asked, *What do teachers consider to be possible negative ramifications of L1 overuse in the L2 classroom?* This question aimed to identify teachers' views on potential negative ramifications of L1 overuse. Results suggested that teachers believed that L1 overuse may negatively influence L2 students by: 1) limiting the L2 development process such that L1 overuse minimizes the already-limited exposure time to the L2; and 2) demotivating students over the long term from overcoming shyness or fear of using the L2 in public.

Finally, the fourth research question asked, *What are the main functions of the teachers' use of L1 in the L2 classroom according to Jordanian EFL students?* This question investigated Jordanian EFL students' views regarding the main functions of L1 use by their teachers and sought to establish whether the students' beliefs were in line with their teachers' beliefs. A Likert-type scale questionnaire was used to elicit students' views on eight statements, where each statement referred to an L1 usage function. Results overwhelmingly suggested that teachers and students' beliefs regarding the functions of L1 use corresponded, including one instance of students observing their teachers do not employ the L1 for a certain function (maintain discipline in the class), a function that teachers also stated not employing.

5.2 Limitations

Despite the wealth of information gathered through the teacher interviews, class observations, and the student questionnaire, this study was limited in a number of areas

that would need to be addressed in future research. Firstly, the main findings of the study came from a limited number of participants; further exploring the beliefs of a greater number of teachers (e.g., via a questionnaire) may help to build more reliable generalizations regarding teachers' attitudes toward L1 use in the L2 classroom.

Secondly, the number of classes observed was also limited to one class per teacher, which was insufficient to examine the extent to which teachers enacted the beliefs that they shared in the pre-observation interviews. For example, several teachers suggested that listening and speaking classes do not require L1 use, but since no listening and speaking classes were observed it remains unknown how much teachers apply this stance in practice. A third limitation of this study was the use of a stand-alone questionnaire to explore the perceptions of students regarding the functions of teachers' L1 use; follow-up interviews with participating students would have resulted in deeper insights into their beliefs about the issue at hand. Fourthly, teachers have considerable teaching experience, between six and 23 years; therefore, they were likely highly aware of the role of L1 in the L2 classroom and its benefits and ramifications, which may have biased the results. Also, the teachers and schools were considered the "best" in the area where the study was conducted (e.g., School A is a pioneering school in the area and its students are considered "elite"). It is possible, then, that the results of this study are not representative of "normal" Jordanian schools and students. Lastly, the presence of researcher in the class-observations may have influenced the teachers to present themselves and their views in a way that they might consider more favourable, if unrepresentative of their usual approach.

5.3 Implications

The value of using the L1 as a teaching resource may be explicitly relayed to L2 teachers in training courses and workshops in order to equip teachers with the required skills to successfully undertake a teaching assignment. This study may help increase the awareness of L2 teachers and enable them to benefit from strategic L1 usage as another valuable teaching method when providing L2 instruction, and, at the same time, to be cognizant of how to avoid any negative ramifications stemming from L1 overuse.

The rejection of any role for L1s in L2 classrooms by L2 policy makers may create a clash between teaching policies and teaching realities (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988). The findings of this study paint a clear picture of the L2 teaching reality in foreign contexts and suggest that policy makers, particularly in foreign language contexts, correct L2 teaching policies, which do not, at present, welcome any role for L1 in the L2 classroom in many countries around the world (Littlewood & Yu, 2011). This ignorance of the positive role of L1 use in foreign contexts by teaching policy makers themselves may be because of the shortage of studies that support L1 use in foreign contexts. Hence, this study may be of value because it helps to bridge the gap between research and practice, and to explore the role of L1 in the L2 classroom, which may contribute to deeper understanding of aspects of the L2 teaching reality, particularly those of foreign contexts.

Furthermore, good research which starts from classroom may open doors for positive curriculum change (Fox, 2004), and it may also encourage policy makers to recognize teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward the role of L1 in the L2 classroom which may then assist them to take into account the importance of teachers' views. Consulting

teachers' beliefs and experiences before introducing new teaching policies, plans, or developments may make the teaching process itself more fruitful, and reduce the clash between teaching policies, which may favour the monolingual approach, and the reality of teaching, in which L1 usage is considered a valuable teaching resource.

5.4 Directions for Further Research

This research produced several conclusions that would benefit from further research. For example, the study suggested that teachers' awareness of the need to maximize L2 use and minimize L1 use in the classroom was due to teachers' extensive teaching experience (6-23 years). In other words, there may exist a relationship between teaching experience and a teacher's awareness of appropriate L1 usage in L2 classrooms, but the study did not examine this relationship. Therefore, this would make a valuable direction for further research.

Additionally, this study focused primarily on teachers, and explored only students' perceptions via a questionnaire. However, the study did not explore students' perceptions via interviews or even through further items in the same questionnaire in order to understand the meaning of their answers. Thus, it would be valuable to further research students' perceptions and to compare their beliefs with their teachers' views in order to better understand just how functionally L1 is being used in L2 classrooms, especially in foreign contexts.

References

- Alghazo, S. M. (2015). Advanced EFL learners' beliefs about pronunciation teaching. *International Education Studies*, 8(11), 63-76.
- Alghazo, S. M. (2013). *Pronunciation instruction in Jordan: Practices and beliefs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Technology Sydney (UTS), Sydney: Australia.
- Al Jabery, M., & Zumberg, M. (2008). General and special education systems in Jordan: Present and future perspectives. *International Journal of Special Education*, 23(1), 115-122.
- Al Masaeed, K. (2016). Judicious Use of L1 in L2 Arabic Speaking Practice Sessions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(4), 716-728.
- Al-Nofaie, H. (2010). The attitudes of teachers and students toward using Arabic in EFL classrooms in Saudi public schools: A case study. *ROYAL*, 4(1), 64-95.
- Al Shammari, M. (2011). The use of the mother tongue in Saudi EFL classrooms. *Journal of International Education Research*, 7(4), 95-102.
- Al Sharaeai, W. (2012). *Students' perspectives on the use of L1 in English classrooms* (MA thesis). Retrieved from <http://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/docview/1269526199?accountid=9894>. (Order No. 1531400)
- Antón, M., & DiCamilla, F. (1999). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 233-247.

- Appel, R., & Trofimovich, P. (2017). Transitional probability predicts native and non-native use of formulaic sequences. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 24-43.
- Appel, R., & Wood, D. (2016). Recurrent word combinations in EAP test-taker writing: Differences between high-and low-proficiency levels. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 13(1), 55-71.
- Artemeva, N. (1995). The adult learner as incipient bilingual: The role of L1 in the adult ESL classrooms. *Carleton Papers in Applied Language Studies*, 12, 113-136.
- Assalahi, H. M. (2013). Why Is the Grammar-translation Method Still Alive in the Arab World? Teachers' Beliefs and Its implications for EFL Teacher Education. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(4), 589.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241-247.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bateman, B. E. (2008). Student teachers' attitudes and beliefs about using the target language in the classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(1), 11-28.
- Brooks, F., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 77(2), 262-274.
- Brooks-Lewis, K. A. (2009). Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(2), 216-235.

- Bruen, J., & Kelly, N. (2014). Using a shared L1 to reduce cognitive overload and anxiety levels in the L2 classroom. *Language Learning Journal*, 1-14.
- Burgess, J., & Spencer, S. (2000). Phonology and pronunciation in integrated language teaching and teacher education. *System*, 28(2), 191-215.
- Butzkamm, W. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma. *Language Learning journal*, 28(1), 29-39.
- Butzkamm, W. (1998). Code-switching in a bilingual history lesson: The mother tongue as a conversational lubricant. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1(2), 81-99.
- Calman, R., & Daniel, I. (1998). A board's eye view of core French: The North York Board of Education. *French Second Language Education in Canada: Empirical Studies*, 281-323.
- Chambers, F. (1991). Promoting use of the target language in the classroom. *Language Learning Journal*, 4(1), 27-31.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (Second ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners. Narratives of experience*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Cook, G. (2009). Use of translation in language teaching. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha, (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Study* (pp.112-115). New York: Routledge.

- Copland, F., & Neokleous, G. (2010). L1 to teach L2: Complexities and contradictions. *ELT Journal*, 65(3), 270-280.
- Corcoran, J. N. (2008). *L1 in the L2 classroom: Framing Brazilian teacher beliefs and practices* (MA thesis). Retrieved from <http://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/docview/304397573?accountid=9894>.
- Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (Fourth ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W. (2015). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221-240.
- De la Campa, J., & Nassaji, H. (2009). The amount, purpose, and reasons for using L1 in L2 classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(4), 742-759.
- Duff, P. A., & Polio, C. G. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(2), 154-166.
- Edstrom, A. (2006). L1 use in the L2 classroom: One teacher's self-evaluation. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(2), 275-292.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foote, J. A., Holtby, A. K., & Derwing, T. M. (2012). Survey of the teaching of pronunciation in adult ESL programs in Canada, 2010. *TESL Canada Journal*, 29(1), 1-22.

- Fox, J., Cheng, L., & Zumbo, B. D. (2014). Do they make a difference? The impact of English language programs on second language students in Canadian universities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(1), 57-85
- Fox, J. (2004). Curriculum design: Does it make a difference? *Contact*, 30(2), 1-4.
- General Statistic Department of Jordan. (2015), *Jordan population statistics*, Amman. Government report. Retrieved July 20, 2017 from http://www.dos.gov.jo/dos_home_a/main/population/census2015/Analytical_reports/Paper_education.pdf
http://www.dos.gov.jo/dos_home_a/main/population/census2015/Education/Education_4.2.pdf
<http://web.dos.gov.jo/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/2015.pdf>
- Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 350-355.
- Johnson, R. K., & Swain, M. (1994). From core to content: Bridging the L2 proficiency gap in late immersion. *Language and Education*, 8(4), 211-229.
- Kaushik, V. (2013). *German for English speakers: The use of the L1 in L2 vocabulary acquisition* (MA thesis). Retrieved from <http://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/docview/1475268299?accountid=9894>.
- Kharma, N., & Hajjaj, A. (1989). Use of the mother tongue in the ESL classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 223-235.

- Kim, S. H. O., & Elder, C. (2005). Language choices and pedagogic functions in the foreign language classroom: A cross-linguistic functional analysis of teacher talk. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(4), 355-380.
- Kim, Y., & Petraki, E. (2009). Students' and teachers' use of and attitudes to L1 in the EFL classroom. *Asian EFL Journal*, 11(4), 58-89.
- Kovacic, A., & Kirinic, V. (2011). To use or not to use: first language in tertiary instruction of English as a foreign language. *1st International Conference on Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, Sarajevo.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom* (First ed.). New York: Pergamon.
- Lado, R. (1964). *Language teaching: A scientific approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (Fourth ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44(1), 64-77.

- Long, M. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126-141.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Ed.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.
- Lucas, T., & Katz, A. (1994). Reframing the debate: The roles of native languages in English-only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(3), 537-561.
- Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- 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. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the L2 classroom: Exploring “optimal” use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O’Cain (Ed.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 35–49). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- MacDonald, C. (1993). *Using the target language*. Cheltenham, UK: Mary Glasgow Publication.
- Malakoff, M., & Hakuta, K. (1991). Translation skills and metalinguistic awareness in bilinguals. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 141–166). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- McMillan, B. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2011). The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes toward "English only". *System*, 39(2), 251-263.
- Ministry of Education of Jordan (2017). *Ajloun Education Directorate*. Retrieved July 20, 2017 from <http://www.moe.gov.jo/Directorates/DirectoratesMenuDetails.aspx?MenuID=252&DirectoratesID=9>
[http://www.moe.gov.jo/Files/\(2-2-2017\)\(8-43-24%20AM\).pdf](http://www.moe.gov.jo/Files/(2-2-2017)(8-43-24%20AM).pdf)
- Mohebbi, H., & Alavi, S. M. (2014). Teachers' first language use in second language learning classroom context: A questionnaire-based study. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 7(4), 57-73.
- Nazary, M. (2008). The role of L1 in L2 acquisition: Attitudes of Iranian university students. *ROYAL*, 2(2), 138-153.
- Polio, C. G., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 313-326.
- Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge university press.
- Rolin-Ianziti, J., & Brownlie, S. (2002). Teacher use of learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58(3), 402-426.
- Rolin-Ianziti, J., & Varshney, R. (2008). Students' views regarding the use of the first language: An exploratory study in a tertiary context maximizing target language use. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 65(2), 249-273.
- Schweers Jr, C. W. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English teaching forum*, 37(2), 6-9.

- Shapson, S., Durward, M., & Kaufman, D. (1978). "Summary, Conclusions and Suggestions" Chapter from *BC French Study: An Evaluation of Elementary French Programs in British Columbia*. Burnaby: Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University.
- Sharma, K. (2006). Mother tongue use in English classroom. *Journal of NELTA*, 11(1-2), 80-87.
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2010). Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 355-375.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 760-770.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Ed.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 232-253). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 251-274.
- Tang, J. (2002). Using L1 in the English classroom. *English Teaching Forum*. 40(1), 36-43.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but.... *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(4), 531-540.
- Van Beek, Leendert G. W. (2016). *The qualities, practices, and theories held by award-winning second language college teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from

<http://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/docview/1864688816?accountid=9894>.

Wood, D. (2015). *Fundamentals of formulaic language: An introduction*. London: Bloomsbury.

Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching: Beliefs, decision-making, and classroom practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A Student Questionnaire

PART 1:

1. Sex الجنس : [] Male ذكر [] Female أنثى [] other
2. Total years of learning English:
مجموع سنوات تعلم اللغة الانجليزية

PART 2: My English language teachers use Arabic in the English language class to: معلموا اللغة الانجليزية الذين يستخدمون اللغة العربية في حصة اللغة الانجليزية لكي:							
		Always دائما %100	Usually عادة %80	Often غالبا %60	Occasionally أحيانا %40	Rarely نادرا %20	Never لا استخدم %0
1-	Explain complex grammar points لشرح بعض النقاط الصعبة في دروس قواعد اللغة الانجليزية						
2-	Help define some new vocabulary items يساعدوا الطلاب في تعريف بعض المفردات الجديده						
3-	Explain difficult concepts or ideas لتوضيح بعض المفاهيم والافكار التي تبدو صعبه						
4-	Give instructions لاعطاء بعض التعليمات						
5-	Praise the students للثناء على الطلبة وتشجيعهم على التعلم						
6-	Translate the reading texts لترجمة نصوص القراءة						
7-	Maintain discipline in the class للمحافظة على انضباط الطلاب في الحصة						
8-	To explain the similarities and differences between Arabic and English in terms of Grammar or structure or pronunciation...etc لشرح التشابهات والاختلافات بين اللغة العربية والانجليزية فيما يتعلق بالقواعد او التركيب اللغوي او اللفظ						

Appendix B Pre-observation Interview Questions

1. Do you use your Arabic in the English language class? If so, how often? Why?
2. In what types of situations do you use Arabic in the English language class?
3. How comfortable are you using Arabic in the English language class?
4. Do you prefer speaking English or Arabic in the English language class? Why?
5. For what type of lessons do you need to speak Arabic in the English language class?
6. Do you allow to your students to use Arabic in the English language class? If so, is it useful? Distracting?
7. What do you think about a teacher using Arabic to teach English?
8. What do you think about students using Arabic to learn English?
9. Where do you use English outside of the class?
10. Is there anything else you'd like to share with me about your experience using Arabic versus English in English classes?

Appendix C Sample of the initial coding of the first researcher

The First Researcher Coding 1

Pre-observation interview

Megan: April 25, 2017.

We are going to do an interview with Mrs. Megan in April 25th, 2017.

1- Muath: the first question to Mrs. Megan is where do you use English outside of the class?

Megan: in every aspect of life wherever it is a need for me especially in clinical fields I use it too much. I like to know how to deal with medicine and symptoms of diseases.

Using for internet

Muath: You mean you read in online...

Megan: Yeah yeah online or in medical magazines.

using L1 on the need or on the necessity

2- Muath: Ok. Do you use Arabic in English language class?

Megan: Sometimes yeah wherever it needs, wherever I feel it is a need here to use Arabic I use

it, yes. But mainly I focus on using the second language because it is a necessity to use it and to practise it in front of the students in order to encourage them to use the second language only and try not to use Arabic language to solve a problem or to give a full answer. If you speak always...if you use Arabic language without organisation, without a purpose for using it in a certain situation, the students will follow your pattern and use Arabic whenever they want and stop using English whenever they want. This will cause a mess in the classroom.

L1 overuse ramific

3- Muath: In what types of situations do you use Arabic in English language classroom?

Megan: Uh..sometimes it is good to show the students the similarities between Arabic and English in grammar mainly, in proverbs maybe, even in some life situations to show the differences in cultures or the similarities in cultures. This is good for the students. This will help him to choose what suits his personality in the future and in his job and what aspects or things he should be away (aware) from. In teaching the glossary, it is good to be sure that the students really gain or guess the Arabic meaning of this word in order to use it correctly and properly. So,

Benefits of L1: 1- similarities of Gr 2- explain meaning of proverb 3- show similar and difference of culture 4- teaching the meaning of word

I use Arabic in teaching meaning of the words (vocabulary).

Feeling uncomfortable to use L1

4- Muath: How comfortable are you (in) using Arabic in English language classes?

Megan: Uh. I always feel comfortable in using Arabic, it is my first language first of all and I adore it as a language. I have my interest and my writings in Arabic language. Therefore, if I gonna use it, I will use it in a very simple and easy way. But I think it is my duty to be away

Appendix D Sample of the initial coding of the second researcher

The Second Researcher Coding

Pre-observation interview
Megan: April 25, 2017.

Coded 18 pages stopped p.16
1

We are going to do an interview with Mrs. Megan in April 25th, 2017.

TLU 1-Muath: the first question to Mrs. Megan is where do you use English outside of the class?

Megan: in every aspect of life wherever it is a need for me especially in clinical fields I use it too much. I like to know how to deal with medicine and symptoms of diseases.

Muath: You mean you read in online...

Megan: Yeah yeah online or in medical magazines.

2- Muath: Ok. Do you use Arabic in English language class?

Megan: Sometimes yeah wherever it needs, wherever I feel it is a need here to use Arabic I use it, yes. But mainly I focus on using the second language because it is a necessity to use it and to practise it in front of the students in order to encourage them to use the second language only and try not to use Arabic language to solve a problem or to give a full answer. If you speak always...if you use Arabic language without organisation, without a purpose for using it in a certain situation, the students will follow your pattern and use Arabic whenever they want and stop using English whenever they want. This will cause a mess in the classroom.

L2 / ✓
L1 use
need
Rules of use

3- Muath: In what types of situations do you use Arabic in English language classroom?

Megan: Uh..sometimes it is good to show the students the similarities between Arabic and English in grammar mainly, in proverbs maybe, even in some life situations to show the differences in cultures or the similarities in cultures. This is good for the students. This will help him to choose what suits his personality in the future and in his job and what aspects or things he should be away (aware) from. In teaching the glossary, it is good to be sure that the students really gain or guess the Arabic meaning of this word in order to use it correctly and properly. So, I use Arabic in teaching meaning of the words (vocabulary).

Similar Grammar
clarity of meaning

4- Muath: How comfortable are you (in) using Arabic in English language classes?

Megan: Uh. I always feel comfortable in using Arabic, it is my first language first of all and I adore it as a language. I have my interest and my writings in Arabic language. Therefore, if I gonna use it, I will use it in a very simple and easy way. But I think it is my duty to be away

ease of use = L1

5/6

Appendix E Certification of Institutional Ethics Clearance

CERTIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ETHICS CLEARANCE

The Carleton University Research Ethics Board-A (CUREB-A) has granted ethics clearance for the research project described below and research may now proceed.

CUREB-A is constituted and operates in compliance with the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (TCPS2).

Ethics Protocol Clearance ID: Project # 106384

Project Team Members: Mr. Mu'ath Algazo (Primary Investigator)

Janna Dorothy Fox (Research Supervisor)

Project Title: Using First Language (L1) in the Second Language (L2) Classroom [Algazo Muath]

Funding Source (If applicable):

Effective: **March 20, 2017**

Expires: **March 31, 2018.**

Restrictions:

This certification is subject to the following conditions:

1. Clearance is granted only for the research and purposes described in the application.
2. Any modification to the approved research must be submitted to CUREB-A via a Change to Protocol Form. All changes must be cleared prior to the continuance of the research.
3. An Annual Status Report for the renewal of ethics clearance must be submitted and cleared by the renewal date listed above. Failure to submit the Annual Status Report will result in the closure of the file. If funding is associated, funds will be frozen.
4. A closure request must be sent to CUREB-A when the research is complete or terminated.
5. Should any participant suffer adversely from their participation in the project you are required to report the matter to CUREB-A.

Failure to conduct the research in accordance with the principles of the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans 2nd edition* and the *Carleton University Policies and Procedures for the Ethical Conduct of Research* may result in the suspension or termination of the research project.

Please contact the Research Compliance Coordinators, at ethics@carleton.ca, if you have any questions or require a clearance certificate with a signature.

CLEARED BY:

Date: March 20, 2017

Andy Adler, PhD, Chair, CUREB-A

Shelley Brown, PhD, Vice-Chair, CUREB-A

Appendix G Teacher consent form

CUREB-A Clearance #106384

Appendix C: Consent from participants.



Consent Form

Title: Using First Language (L1) in Second Language (L2) Classroom.

Date of ethics clearance: March 20th, 2017 – March 31st, 2018

Ethics Clearance for the Collection of Data Expires: To be determined by the REB.

I _____, choose to participate in a study on "Using L1 in the L2 Classroom". This study aims to identify functions and benefits of using L1 in L2 classroom. The researcher for this study is Muath Algazo. He is an MA student in the School of Linguistics and Language Studies/ Carleton University (1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1S 5B6). He is working under the supervision of Professor Janna Fox in the Applied Linguistics and Discourse Studies program at Carleton University:

236 Paterson Hall , Carleton University
Colonel By Drive, Ottawa
Ontario, Canada
K1S 5B5

This study involves pre-interview for 30 minutes followed by observing one class and post-observation interview in order to explain certain situations that were noted in the classroom. With your consent, interviews will be audio-recorded. Once the recording has been transcribed, the audio-recording will be destroyed.

While this project does not involve any foreseeable risk, care will be taken to protect your identity. This will be done by keeping all responses anonymous and allowing you to request that certain responses not be included in the final project. Moreover, the data obtained from the participants will be combined and will not be attributable.

You have the right to end your participation in the study at any point. You can withdraw by phoning or emailing the researcher or the research supervisor. If you withdraw from the study, all data collected up to the point of withdrawal will be retained for analysis.

All research data, including audio-recordings and any notes will be encrypted. Any hard copies of data (including any handwritten notes or USB keys) will be kept in a locked cabinet at Carleton University during the study period. Research data will only be accessible by the researcher and the research supervisor. Once the project is completed, all research data will be securely destroyed. Electronic data will be erased and hard copies will be shredded.

If you would like a copy of the finished research project, you are invited to contact the researcher to request an electronic copy which will be provided to you.

The ethics protocol for this project was reviewed by the Carleton University Research Ethics Board, which provided clearance to carry out the research. Should you have questions or concerns related to your involvement in this research, please contact If you have any ethical concerns with the study, please contact Dr. Andy Adler, Chair,

Carleton University Research Ethics Board-A (by phone at 613-520-2600 ext. 2517 or via email at ethics@carleton.ca).

Researcher contact information: Supervisor contact information:

Name: Muath Algazo Name: Janna Fox

Department: Applied Linguistics and Discourse Studies Department: SLALS

Carleton University Carleton University

Tel: Tel: [613-520-2600](tel:613-520-2600) x 2046

Email: muathalgazo@mail.carleton.ca

Email: jannafox@Cunet.Carleton.Ca

Do you agree to be audio-recorded: Yes No

Signature of participant Date _____

Signature of researcher Date _____

Appendix H Student consent form

CUREB-A Clearance #106384



Students' Consent Form

Title: Using L1 in L2 Classroom

Date of ethics clearance: March 20th, 2017 – March 31st, 2018

Ethics Clearance for the Collection of Data Expires: To be determined by the REB

I, _____, choose to participate in a study on “Using L1 in the L2 classroom”. This study aims to identify the functions and benefits of using L1 in the L2 classrooms. This study aims to identify functions and benefits of using L1 in L2 classroom. The researcher for this study is Muath Algazo. He is an MA student in the School of Linguistics and Language Studies/ Carleton University (1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1S 5B6). He is working under the supervision of Professor Janna Fox in the Applied Linguistics and Discourse Studies program at Carleton University:

236 Paterson Hall , Carleton University
Colonel By Drive, Ottawa
Ontario, Canada
K1S 5B5

This study involves one 10 minute survey that will take place in the classroom. You have the right to refuse to answer any of the questions. Should you feel some distress, you are encouraged to speak to the researcher who will direct you to support services.

You have the right to end your participation the survey with no penalty at any time, for any reason, up until you hand the form back to the researcher. You can withdraw by stop answering the questionnaire at any time before completing it. As the questionnaire responses are anonymous, it is not possible to withdraw after you hand it back.

All the questionnaire forms will be kept in a locked cabinet at Carleton University during the study. Research data will only be accessible by me and my supervisor. Once the project is completed, all research data will be destroyed, and the survey forms will be shredded.

If you would like a copy of the finished research project, you are invited to contact the researcher to request an electronic copy which will be provided to you as long as the safety of all participants will not be comprised by doing so.

The ethics protocol for this project was reviewed by the Carleton University Research Ethics Board, which provided clearance to carry out the research. If you have any ethical concerns with the study, please contact Dr. Andy Adler, Chair, Carleton University Research Ethics Board-A (by phone at 613-520-2600 ext. 2517 or via email at ethics@carleton.ca).

Page 1 of 2

CUREB-A Clearance #106384

Researcher contact information:

Name: Muath Algazo
Department: Applied Linguistics and Discourse Studies
Carleton University
Tel:
Email: muathalgazo@cmail.carleton.ca

Supervisor contact information:

Name: Janna Fox
Department: SLaLS
Carleton University
Tel: 613-520-2600 x 2046
Email: jannafox@cunet.carleton.ca

Do you agree to fill in a questionnaire form: ___Yes ___No

Signature of participant

Date

Signature of researcher

Date