

Student Teachers' Opinions On Mentor Teachers' Use Of Native Language

Meliha R. ŞİMŞEK¹

Abstract: Although there have been attempts for a bilingual method that makes active use of codeswitching in the foreign language class, exclusive use of the target language remains an undisputed practice from primary to tertiary education around the world. For this reason, a survey consisting of three closed-ended and four open-ended questions was administered to 30 student teachers (Department of Foreign Language Education, METU) in order to investigate their perspectives on mentor teachers' use of native language (L1) and codeswitching in the EFL class. It was found that there is L1-dominance in the practicum classes and the students' low level of English is the major excuse for the randomness of L1 use, whereas its sparing uses concentrate on managerial and clarification purposes. While two-thirds of the student teachers supported the use of L1 and reported varied benefits of codeswitching, the rest rejected it under the influence of monolingualism.

Keywords: codeswitching, L1-dominance, monolingualism

Özet – Öğretmen Adaylarının Yönder Öğretmenlerin Anadil Kullanımına İlişkin Görüşleri. Yabancı dil sınıfında dil değiştirmeden etkin olarak yararlanan ikidilli bir yöntem için girişimlerde bulunulduysa da yalnızca erek dilin kullanımı tartışmasız bir uygulama olarak varlığını ilköğretimden yükseköğretime tüm dünyada sürdürmektedir. Bu nedenle, üç kapalı ve dört açık-uçlu sorudan oluşan bir anket 30 öğretmen adayına (Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, ODTÜ) yönder öğretmenlerinin anadil kullanımına ve yabancı dil sınıfında dil değiştirmeye ilişkin görüşlerini araştırmak için verilmiştir. Uygulama sınıflarında anadilin baskın olduğu, anadilin rastgele kullanımına başlıca gerekçe olarak öğrencilerin düşük İngilizce düzeylerinin gösterildiği, anadilin amaçlı kullanımlarının ise yönetsel ve açıklama odaklı olduğu saptanmıştır. Öğretmen adaylarının üçte ikisi anadil kullanımını destekleyip dil değiştirmenin çeşitli yararlarını belirtirken geri kalanı tekdilliliğin etkisiyle karşısındadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: dil değiştirme, anadil baskınlığı, tekdillilik

Introduction

The use of the mother tongue (L1) in the EFL class (English as a foreign language) has stirred perhaps the liveliest debate in the history of foreign language teaching methods. In Prodromou's (2001; as cited in Gabrielatos, 2001: 33) opinion, it "has been a skeleton in the cupboard" that "we just haven't wanted to talk about", whereas Gabrielatos (2001: 33) regards it as "a bone of contention for over two centuries". A closer look into the development of language teaching methods indicates that excepting the Grammar-Translation method, almost all the language teaching methods "since the Reform Movement of the 1880s, whether the audiolingual and audiovisual methods, the communicative method, or the Silent Way, have insisted that teaching techniques should not rely on the L1" (Cook, 1999: 201). Most of the mainstream ELT methods adopt "exclusive use of the target language [L2], which Macaro refers to as the virtual position", as they "see no pedagogical or communicative value in the first language at all" (Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009: 3). The proponents of the virtual position consider L1 acquisition and L2 learning as identical processes, and the presence of the comprehensible L2 input is enough for the mastery of a foreign language (Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009). As a result, many educators believe that the learner's first language mustn't come into contact with the target language for the sake of effective language teaching and learning (Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009).

However, in Klapper's (1998: 24) view, the identification of L2 learning with monolingual L1 acquisition is deeply mistaken, and denying learners access to their mother tongue is not only unhelpful, but in fact "harmful", and "negligent" "for a teacher to ignore the obvious classroom resource of a common L1". That's why, he (1998: 25) urged to "move away from the misconceived dogmatism of the direct method to a methodology which acknowledges the crucial role of L1 for the developing FL [foreign language] learner". This call has been answered by the following methods that make active use of translation and codeswitching in the foreign language class: C. J. Dodson's "the Bilingual Method" (Butzkamm, 2000), Eric Hawkins' "Reciprocal Language Teaching" (Cook, 1989), Rodolpho Jacobson's "The New Concurrent Method" (Cook, 2001), and Robert Weschler's "the Functional-Translation

¹ Meliha R. Şimşek, Öğr. Gör. Dr., Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Ankara, e-posta: malliday@gmail.com

Method" (Weschler, 1997). Nevertheless, these bilingual methods have not gained wide currency in ELT methodology, and in spite of the growing body of research against it, "the virtual position still enjoys significant support", "whether in primary, secondary or higher education, whether in Canada, the United States, Europe or Asia" because "these results have not yet filtered through to educators in communicative and immersion classrooms" (Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009: 8). In addition to the efforts aimed at designing a bilingual method, other ELT authorities have also provided such lists of the areas in which L1 can be used in the foreign language class: lead-ins, eliciting language, giving instructions, checking comprehension, teaching grammar explicitly, maintaining discipline, discussing crosscultural issues, building rapport, translating unknown vocabulary, making clarifications, explaining errors, making crosslinguistic comparisons (Atkinson, 1993; Polio & Duff, 1994; Gill, 2005; Macaro, 2005; Meyer, 2008). Still, "among many communicative foreign language and immersion instructors, there is a blind acceptance of the notion that exclusive target language is the best practice", and thus "any kind of meaningful dialogue about this hegemony, about the realism or desirability of the position or about the potential usefulness of the first language for learners" cannot be built (Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009: 4).

Atkinson (1987: 241) also points out that "in teacher training very little attention is given to the use of the native language" by referring back to the lack of information related to "the potential of its use" in introductory TEFL courses such as Haycraft (1978) and Hubbard et al. (1983), who "ignore it entirely"; Harmer (1983), who "makes four passing references to it", and Gower and Walters (1983), who caution against its overuse. "This gap in methodological literature is presumably partly responsible for the uneasiness which many teachers, experienced and inexperienced, feel about using or permitting the use of the students' native language in the classroom" (Atkinson, 1987: 241). For this reason, the purpose of this study is to investigate the opinions of student teachers on the use of mother tongue by mentor teachers in the practicum school, as well as their own attitudes towards L1 use as prospective teachers of English. It is considered that the reflections of the student teachers on what is actually happening in the real classrooms and the expression of their personal stance towards the issue of codeswitching may have important implications for teacher training programs, in which the English-only policy is propagated. Having studied at a university, where the medium of instruction is English regardless of faculty, and being trained in the methodology classes of the department, where the exclusive use of the target language is imposed, these student teachers' preconceptions about codeswitching are especially important because unlike "novices learning other professions, such as those of lawyers or doctors", "student teachers arrive for their training courses having spent thousands of hours as schoolchildren observing and evaluating professionals in action" – a phenomenon termed as "the apprenticeship of observation" (Borg, 2004: 274).

Method

Participants

The participants in this study were nine male and 21 female student teachers, all senior students (n=30) at the Department of Foreign Language Education (Middle East Technical University). To ensure the anonymity of the participants, each student teacher was assigned "a case number", "instead of using respondents' real names to identify their data" in the present study (Ciambone, 2004: 18).

Data Collection

In order to examine their opinions on the amount and style of the mother tongue use by the mentor teachers at the practicum school, and also to determine their stance towards L1 use as prospective teachers of English, the student teachers were administered a survey developed by the researcher. The survey consisted of seven questions: three central and four subquestions. The three central questions were closed-ended, requiring the participants to make a choice, whereas the four subquestions were open-ended, requiring them to comment on their specific choices:

1. Please estimate how much time your mentor teacher spends using Turkish in the EFL class.
a. over 80% b. 60-80% c. about 50% d. 20-40% e. less than 20%.
2. Does your mentor teacher use Turkish randomly or sparingly? a. If randomly, why do you think your mentor teacher always resorts to using Turkish in the EFL class? b. If sparingly, in what circumstances does your mentor teacher prefer to use Turkish in the EFL class?
3. Do you support the use of Turkish in the EFL classes? a. If yes, in what areas do you think the use of the students' mother tongue can prove useful? b. If no, what drawbacks do you think the use of mother tongue may have in the EFL class?

In the first question, the percentages of time spent on native language use were derived from Crawford's five-point scale (2004: 9). After being reviewed by ELT specialists and measurement experts, the questions were revised on the basis of their evaluations with the purpose of increasing the validity of the survey.

Procedure

The data examined in this study were collected during the course, entitled "Practice Teaching" in the spring semester of the 2010-2011 academic year. The departmental goal of the course is to enable student teachers to consolidate the skills necessary for teaching English as a foreign language through observation and teaching practice under the supervision of mentor teachers at practicum schools and also to critically analyze the previously acquired teaching knowledge through reading, research and in-class activities (Undergraduate Program Course Descriptions). The course, instructed by the researcher, required the student teachers to do selected readings and tasks from Ur's (2006) "A Course in Language Teaching Trainee Book", to participate in classroom discussions, and to write reflective reports. That's why, the participants responded to the survey questions at the end of the ten-week period. During the practicum, they visited an anatolian vocational high school serving 856 students with 89 teachers, and observed five mentor teachers (with at least five years of experience) for six hours a week in Ankara.

Data Analysis

The qualitative data derived from the responses to the open-ended questions were analyzed by using the descriptive analysis method. According to Yıldırım and Şimşek's (2011: 224) model, descriptive analysis was performed on the qualitative data in four steps: i. firstly, a framework for descriptive analysis was designed on the basis of the research questions and the conceptual structure of the study, and the themes were identified for the subsequent classification of the data; ii. secondly, the data organized according to the thematic framework were read, combined in a meaningful and logical way, and the irrelevant data were omitted; iii. thirdly, the previously-organized data were defined and supported by using direct quotations from the responses of the participants; and iv. the findings identified were finally explained, related and interpreted in the fourth stage. Yıldırım and Şimşek (2011) states that reliability can be increased, bias can be decreased and comparison between categories can be undertaken if qualitative data are quantified through the use of percentages and frequencies. For this reason, each participant was assigned a case number and listed from 1 to 30. Then, seven major themes (perceived amount of L1 use by mentor teachers, style of mentor teachers' L1 use, reasons for mentor teachers' random use of L1, purposes of mentor teachers' sparing use of L1, student teachers' preferences on L1 use, reasons for L1 use and reasons against L1 use in the EFL class) were entered into an Excel spreadsheet. After that, the sentences that reflected the participants' opinions were pasted under the sub-themes. During this process, no corrections were made in the responses of the student teachers in order to keep the original language of the qualitative data intact. To ensure validity, the participants were invited to confirm the researcher's findings and the tentative results were refined in the light of their reactions (Silverman & Marvasti, 2008; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). In addition to respondent validation (member checks), all parts of the data were analyzed and repeatedly inspected, while deviant cases were actively sought out in comprehensive data treatment (Silverman & Marvasti, 2008). Ultimately, the frequencies and percentages were calculated for each category by using Excel, as in Akşit's example (1998, as cited in Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011: 248-249). Using appropriate tabulations was the last method used to improve the quality of data analysis, offering "a means to survey the whole corpus of data ordinarily lost in intensive, qualitative research" (Silverman & Marvasti, 2008: 70).

Findings

The participants were first asked to estimate the percentage of time spent by mentor teachers on L1 use. Like Crawford's (2004: 9) scale, there were five options: "over 80%, 60-80%, about 50%, 20-40%, less than 20%", and the results of the student teachers' (STs) perceived amount of L1 use by their mentor teachers (MTs) are presented below.

Table 1. *STs' Comments on the Perceived Amount of Mentor Teachers' L1 Use*

<i>Perceived Amount of Mentor Teachers' L1 Use</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Over 80%	10	33.3
60-80%	10	33.3
About 50%	1	3.3
20-40%	3	10
Less than 20%	6	20
TOTAL	30	100

According to Table 1, 10 out of 30 STs (33.3%) indicated that mentor teachers use over 80% of time Turkish in the class, while another 10 (33.3%) pointed out that their L1 use takes up 60-80% of the class time. These two groups together make up 67% of STs that feature a high amount of L1 use by MTs in the EFL class. Now that the amount of L1 use by MTs is considered as more than 60% of time, limiting target language use to 40% or less of the time, these classes in the practicum school can be defined as "L1-dominant" in Crawford's (2004: 9) terms. There is only one participant (3.3%) that estimated MTs' L1 use as about 50%, implying a balanced interplay of both the target language and the students' mother tongue. Along with three STs (10%), attributing a 20-40% of time to MTs' amount of L1 use, six STs (20%) perceived MTs' amount of L1 use as less than 20% of time. They together form 30% of all the participants that feature a low amount of L1 use by MTs in the EFL class.

Table 2. *STs' Comments on the Style of Mentor Teachers' L1 Use*

<i>Style of Mentor Teachers' L1 Use</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
He uses Turkish randomly in the class.	19	63
He uses Turkish sparingly in the class.	11	37
TOTAL	30	100

Secondly, STs were asked if their mentor teachers use L1 "randomly" or "sparingly". These two terms concern the binary opposition in their manner of native language use: the former refers to a situation in which language alternation has become "a routine" and L1 is adopted as "the *main* language of the classroom", while the latter refers to "selective and limited use of the L1" "at times when there are enormous advantages in using it" (Atkinson, 1993: v). Table 2 shows STs' ideas on their style of L1 use.

According to Table 2, 63% of STs believe their MTs use the mother tongue with no particular aim in mind. For example, ST8 responded: "I think my mentor teacher uses Turkish randomly. She doesn't have any specific aim in using Turkish, because she always speaks in Turkish". On the other hand, 37% of STs indicated that their MTs resort to L1 use purposefully. Unlike ST8, who ascribed the randomness of MT's L1 use to its high frequency, ST12 remarked that the mentor teacher spares the use of Turkish for other purposes than lesson delivery, by saying: "He uses Turkish sparingly. If the thing he is trying to tell is related to the lesson (grammar subject, vocabulary, comprehension of a text), he prefers to use English".

Table 3. *STs' Comments on the Reasons for Mentor Teachers' Random Use of L1*

<i>Reasons for Mentor Teachers' Random Use of L1</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Students' level of English is too low to understand an English-only lesson.	16	53
Teachers don't have the teaching knowledge to teach through English.	7	23
Teachers don't make an effort to teach through English.	5	17
Students lose interest as they are used to being taught in Turkish.	2	7
TOTAL	30	100

Respondents gave multiple answers.

In response to the follow-up question, "If randomly, why do you think your mentor teacher always resorts to using Turkish in the EFL class?", 19 STs provided 30 comments. The most frequently stated reason for MTs' random use of L1 is the students' low level of English (53%), as in ST1's response: "Because the proficiency level of the students is a bit low. The students have difficulty in understanding what the teacher is saying when she speaks in English....so the teacher translates what she says into Turkish". Secondly, seven STs (23%) indicated that their MTs lack the knowledge of teaching techniques and strategies to teach the target language without making use of the native language. For instance, ST10 criticised the mentor teacher's choice over the traditional language teaching methods by saying: "My

mentor teacher always uses Turkish in the class. She only uses English in certain situations,...she mainly adopts Grammar-Translation method in the classes, which leads to ineffective learning”.

Also, ST5’s remark on the mentor teacher’s concern about the study of grammar calls to mind the Grammar-Translation method: “Her main reason is that they can’t understand, they can’t learn the grammar point, if she uses English....As the teacher tries to teach just grammar, they miss lots of things”. Similarly, ST29 also pointed out that English is reduced to an ordinary school subject on the curriculum – that students need to know about – instead of being treated as the language of communication in the foreign language class by saying: “...the most important aspect why the mentor teacher uses Turkish randomly is that the aim of the lessons does not include anything for the sake of language learning; in other words, they do not study English for the sake of communication”.

Five STs (17%) associated MTs’ random use of L1 with their lack of endeavour to teach through English, as in ST9’s and ST28’s comments respectively: “She uses Turkish randomly. I think, she uses it just because explaining everything in Turkish is easier or it is the easy way which is not tiring and which is not time-consuming” (ST9), and “He wants to give the meaning by using the easiest way which is mother tongue. He doesn’t spend any effort to explain it in English first or giving comprehensible input” (ST28). Only two STs (7%) made reference to the students’ previous learning experience. For instance, ST10 commented: “The reason why the teacher resorts to using Turkish is that students are used to being taught in Turkish. Although she tries to speak and encourage them to speak English, they don’t pay attention. They usually wait for the Turkish explanation”.

In response to the follow-up question, “If sparingly, in what circumstances does your mentor teacher prefer to use Turkish in the EFL class?”, 11 STs provided 21 comments in Table 4 below.

Table 4. STs’ Comments on the Purposes of Mentor Teachers’ Sparing Use of L1

Purposes of Mentor Teachers’ Sparing Use of L1	f	%
Teachers use Turkish in order to discipline the class.	8	38
Teachers use Turkish in order to make clarifications.	6	28
Teachers use Turkish in order to give instructions.	3	14
Teachers use Turkish in order to teach vocabulary.	2	10
Teachers use Turkish in order to teach grammar.	1	5
Teachers use Turkish in order to give feedback.	1	5
TOTAL	21	100

Respondents gave multiple answers.

According to Table 4, 38% of them mentioned the sparing use of L1 for bringing order to the class and reminding students of the school’s regulations. For example, ST17 commented: “She uses it sparingly and deliberately. As far as I observed, she uses Turkish when she wants to warn students about being silent or listening to her carefully”, and ST22 responded: “She also uses Turkish when she wants to mention the school rules and dressing (ties, skirts etc.)”. ST23 also remarked on the mentor teacher’s use of Turkish for self-expression while managing disruptive behaviour: “He uses Turkish sparingly, because he chooses it when he needs to express his feelings like anger....when he loses control of the class, he starts using Turkish to take everything under control”. On the other hand, six STs (28%) stated that their MTs use Turkish in order to make clarifications. ST22 and ST40 suggested that their MTs feel obliged to use Turkish only when students do not show any sign of understanding: “Lastly, when she is convinced that nobody in the class understands anything, she explains the topic in Turkish” (ST22), and “when she sees that none of the students got the main idea of the lesson, she switches to Turkish only for few minutes” (ST40).

According to Table 4, 14% of STs, who described their MTs’ L1 use as “sparing”, cited instances of L1 use for giving instructions. ST18 commented: “He gives importance to avoid Turkish. He only uses Turkish when he explains some issues as how the students will present their presentations”. As for the teaching of vocabulary, 10% of STs indicated that their MTs made use of Turkish equivalents while teaching the meaning of unknown words, as in ST24’s comments: “Also, she has to use Turkish while she is explaining unknown words” (ST24). Only ST2 referred to the use of Turkish for explaining grammar (5%): “She prefers to use Turkish while she is trying to give a grammatical explanation”. It is just ST24 that acknowledged the use of Turkish for giving feedback: “The teacher prefers to use Turkish especially when he makes suggestions for their presentations” (5%).

STs’ responses to the third question, “Do you support the use of Turkish in the EFL classes?”, are tabulated below.

Table 5. *STs' Comments on L1 Use in the EFL Class*

<i>STs' Choice over L1 Use</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
I support the use of Turkish in the EFL class.	20	67
I don't support the use of Turkish in the EFL class.	10	33
TOTAL	30	100

According to Table 5, 20 out of 30 STs are in favour of L1 use in the EFL classes. 10 STs are, on the other hand, against the use of the mother tongue in the foreign language class. A further analysis of Pro-L1 responses revealed that 12 out of 20 STs (60%) are sensitive to the selective and judicious use of the mother tongue in the EFL classes. The fact that STs are aware of the use of the target language as the medium of instruction is evidenced by the following responses of ST8 and ST9:

- *I think the use of Turkish in EFL classes is necessity in Turkey, but Turkish should be used as rare as possible....There isn't any certain degree in using Turkish or English in the class. However, I think it is certain that the teacher should try hard to use English as much as possible in the class....I support that the second language (English) should be used as much as possible, but we cannot totally avoid from the mother tongue (ST8).*
- *I support the use of Turkish in the classroom, when it is necessary. It shouldn't be randomly. On the other hand, I prefer the use of the target language for the most of the lesson. I mean we shouldn't be so strict....The target language should be used and encouraged but we should be able to switch to Turkish if necessary (ST9).*

In reply to the follow-up question, "If yes, in what areas do you think the use of the students' mother tongue can prove useful?", 20 Pro-L1 STs provided 49 comments as to what benefits L1 use can offer in the EFL class in Table 6. 35% of Pro-L1 STs indicated that L1 use can be useful in enhancing the understanding of students, especially those with limited English proficiency. For instance, ST8 argued against the idea of an English-only lesson at the cost of students' comprehension: "Always using English is great for students' language development, but if they have enough knowledge and skill in English. When their level is too low and they don't understand, the teacher should use Turkish in these circumstances". ST17 noted the indispensability of L1 use, too: "Till starting this internship program and observing a real class environment, I used to object to the use of mother tongue, but seeing it is sometimes inevitable, if we want to teach English effectively, especially with the students whose level is low".

Table-6: *STs' Comments on the Reasons for L1 Use in the EFL Class*

<i>Reasons for L1 Use in the EFL class</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
L1 use facilitates comprehension especially at lower levels.	17	35
L1 equivalents facilitate the teaching of vocabulary.	6	12.2
L1 explanations facilitate the teaching of grammar.	6	12.2
It is easier to give instructions by using L1.	5	10.2
L1 use creates a more conducive atmosphere to L2 learning by removing negative feelings like anxiety, fear and alienation.	4	8.2
L1 use can be time-saving.	3	6.1
It is more effective to discipline the class by using L1.	2	4.1
L1 use promotes cultural learning through crosslinguistic comparisons.	2	4.1
Because L2 learning is different from L1 acquisition, students need to form links between L1 and L2.	2	4.1
It is more efficient to give feedback by using L1.	1	2
L1 use can add a fun element to the class and makes L2 learning more enjoyable.	1	2
TOTAL	49	100

Respondents gave multiple answers.

As for the use of Turkish in the teaching of vocabulary, six STs (12.2%) agreed that providing the L1 equivalent can ease the students' understanding of the meaning, especially in the case of abstract lexical items and when exemplifying and paraphrasing in L2 do not work: "...If the students don't understand

from example sentences, explanations, there is no need to force them....Telling they [unknown words] mean 'zıt anlam, kavram, yasadışı' etc. in Turkish will make our job easier and facilitate their understanding" (ST9). With lower levels, "insisting on using English" – monolingual glossing – can become "a torture" because "...while explaining a word, sometimes students got so confused" in ST11's words. According to Table 6, another six STs (12.2%) indicated that L1 use can prove useful in the teaching of grammar. ST24 made special mention of the use of Turkish in areas of difficulty – where L1 and L2 grammar do not overlap: "It would be useful when students don't understand some grammar points which have no common characteristic in Turkish. I can give present perfect as an example. Because students can understand some points in Turkish easily".

Table 6 shows that there are five STs (10.2%) who believe in the efficiency of giving instructions in the native language. For instance, ST2 commented: "...giving explanation or direction (while explaining how to do) requires usage of native language, considering the level of students", and ST17 responded: "I think mother tongue is particularly necessary while giving complicated instructions". With regard to the affective benefits of L1 use in the EFL class, four of 20 Pro-L1 STs (8.2%) argued that psychological barriers to L2 learning can be overcome by the use of Turkish, thus providing a more relaxed atmosphere, where L2 input can be received more readily by students. For instance, ST27 wrote: "I observed such situations as insistent use of English made students confused and discouraged. For instance, students do not understand the instructions and they can't do the activities and they got panicked". In addition, ST14 drew attention to the risk of learning impotence: "No use of L1, on the other hand, can discourage students from learning the language", while ST23 stressed the practicality of L1 use when the feeling of alienation is aroused: "Teachers should switch his/her language when students get lost".

As for the time-efficiency of L1 use in the EFL classroom, three STs (6.1%) postulated two different reasons. ST8 and ST25 stated that the language teacher needs to resort to the students' native language when their comprehension comes to a halt. For instance, ST8, who believes that "Using Turkish % 0 is really great in theory, but in practice, the realities are different", responded: "They may have big problems in understanding and the teacher may waste too much time on explaining. In these situations, the mother tongue should be used for them to comprehend some points and for the teacher to use time effectively". On the other hand, ST20, more concerned about curriculum pacing, noted that L1 use can be time-saving especially in beginner level classes: "Although I do not want to use Turkish in the class as a prospective teacher, it will be difficult as we have a very heavy curriculum and we do not have much time. Especially with beginners, it would be more difficult".

It is evident from Table 6 that only two STs (4.1%) believe in the effectiveness of L1 use for maintaining classroom discipline. ST26 commented: "Moreover, when the students get bored, code-switching would play a major role in having students listen to the teacher, stop talking", while ST30 stressed the importance of establishing a classroom code of conduct by using the mother tongue: "Also, at the beginning of the term, the teacher should give classroom rules and principles in the mother-tongue. In my opinion, this will lead better classroom management". Another two STs (4.1%) focused on the use of the mother tongue for making comparisons between the native and the target culture. For instance, ST2 argued: "...teaching cultural elements requires a usage of native language considering the level of students", and ST26 commented: "I think use of both English and Turkish in the classroom can be useful. While the lesson is going on, there might be some topics related to the culture of the students".

It can also be seen from Table 6 that two other STs (4.1%) consider L1 acquisition and L2 learning as distinct processes and believe in the necessity of the formation of crosslinguistic links. To quote ST7, "we cannot teach a student a language which she even doesn't know the basics, without using her/his mother language, I don't think it will be efficient", and ST8 responded: "I believe that learning second language is different from learning first language. Therefore, students may build connections between the first and the second language to get what is taught".

The two least-cited reasons for L1 use relate to giving feedback and adding the fun factor to L2 learning (2% each). In relation to giving feedback by using Turkish, ST13 commented: "Moreover, the teacher should give homework in mother tongue for this level of students. In addition, feedback should be given in Turkish. They should understand correctly in what situations they should improve themselves". As to how the foreign language class could be made fun by L1 use, ST9 recommended: "To make the lesson more enjoyable, to make something clear, we can give an example or we can make a joke in Turkish. Then we can switch to English, because learning a language without speaking will be deficient".

Table-7: STs' Comments on the Reasons against L1 Use in the EFL Class

Reasons Against L1 Use in the EFL class	f	%
Students should be exposed to comprehensible input in order to acquire L2 in the same way as L1.	9	36
Recourse to L1 steals from the time of L2 use unless comprehensible input and low affective filter are at stake in beginner level classes.	5	20
Students won't bother to process L2 input if L1 is used in the EFL class.	5	20
Students cannot form good language habits if L1 is used in the EFL class.	3	12
Audiovisuals, demonstration and nonverbal cues can equally cater for the expression of meaning.	3	12
TOTAL	25	100

Respondents gave multiple answers.

In reply to the follow-up question, "If no, what drawbacks do you think the use of the mother tongue may have in the EFL classes?", 10 Anti-L1 STs provided 25 comments as to why the use of the students' native language should be avoided in the foreign language class in Table 7. 36% of the Anti-L1 participants believe that in order for the students to acquire a second language, they need to receive as much comprehensible input as possible. For example, ST10 responded: "A foreign language should be learned as the way we learn the native language. Since this idea is not adopted by our education system, students gradually become those we do not approve...students should always be exposed to target language", and ST29 commented: "I strongly believe that even though the students do not understand the utterances in English, they pretty well learn it unconsciously".

This view is reminiscent of Stephen Krashen's input hypothesis. At the same time, it is not context-sensitive in terms of his acquisition-learning hypothesis, since learners are here in an EFL setting, where English is not spoken outside the classroom. On the other hand, ST18 and ST28 are conscious of the context and believe teachers should avail every opportunity to provide L2 input in the EFL class: "English should be more widely used than Turkish, because the class environment is the only area which the students will get enough input in English. Their acquisition of structures and meaning could be achieved by enough English input" (ST18), and "If we spend this already limited time in mother tongue, it will not lead to an accomplishment for our students. I support the idea of Krashen's [Krashen's]. To create an atmosphere to make them acquire the language we must speak always in English" (ST28).

According to Table 7, 20% of Anti-L1 STs believe that time not spent on L2 input is time not well-spent and L1 use can only be excused in beginner level classes when it helps learners to understand the input and overcome language anxiety. Although ST6 first asserted that he was in favour of an English-only approach, he went on to explain that such adherence to the monolingual approach might prove inhumane in the case of beginners: "...such a philosophy might be hard to realize with beginners. In my practicum school, such approaches would be very harsh on students. To help them get proficient in English, it's a necessity to start off with what they already know and can relate to". In the same way, ST22 noted the importance of making crosslinguistic comparisons for beginners: "I do not support the use of Turkish in EFL classes except in beginner levels. Beginners should get the main idea of the target language linking it with their mother tongue. After this link is drawn, there is no need for native language". Having the same concern, ST16 stated that beginners would be discouraged from participation if the teacher insisted on an English-only class: "Because some students are shy and they refuse to speak in English...If they feel comfortable, they learn much more efficiently. So, by using Turkish when necessary the teacher should help students participate in the lesson". ST18 remarked on the affective benefits of L1 use as well: "I would prefer using Turkish more in beginner levels than advanced levels...using Turkish a little could reduce the anxiety and make the students get used to a new language".

Along with the reduction in L2 time, the risk of excessive dependency on mother tongue is another equally-weighted reason against L1 use in the EFL classes. Again, 20% of Anti-L1 STs fear learners will not be motivated enough to process the target language if they can easily fall back on their mother tongue. Below are listed the selected comments of ST5, ST18 and ST29 in respective order:

- ...If we use both Turkish and English, students will not listen to us while we are using English. Because they know that after we finished explaining in English, we will use Turkish. They will wait for the turn of English. So, the use of English will not be efficient. Students will not learn efficiently (ST5).

- ...I won't resort to Turkish any time my students have difficulty in understanding the lesson. My students could find it challenging to understand English, but unless they try, they will not manage to develop their English (ST18).
- ...In addition, the flexibility to switch to native language makes the students feel that there is always one way out when they are stuck in terms of understanding. This flexibility lowers down the motivation to use the target language everytime and in every circumstance (ST29).

In the same vein, 12% of Anti-L1 STs believe that L1 use is a barrier to the formation of good language habits, because students will be deprived of the opportunities for language practice with the teacher if he uses L1 in the class. For instance, ST5 made mention of teacher's modelling for the development speaking skills: "If we use Turkish in our classes, our students will know lots of things about English language, but they will not be able to speak fluently. We should use only English in the class", while ST12 observed that L1 use by the teacher might be counter-effective, doing more harm than good: "I always appreciate the efforts to stick to the target language in EFL classes. Otherwise, a habit of using mother tongue would occur where the students have trouble expressing themselves in English". ST10's comment, on the other hand, calls to mind the prohibition of L1 use in the Audio-Lingual Method: "Normally, English teachers should avoid the use of Turkish as much as possible. In this way, students will adopt this habit of speaking and listening in English in classes".

As for the conveyance of meaning, another three Anti-L1 participants (12%) argued that audiovisuals, demonstration and nonverbal cues are much better tools than L1 use. For example, ST1 responded: "The teachers could support their speech with gestures and mimics for the students to understand. And the teacher may do and show what they want from the students and then want them to do the same thing", and ST28 also commented: "We can use audio-visual aids to render the speech comprehensible but I don't think using mother tongue is the solution for an effective language learning".

Discussion

The initial finding of this study reveals that the foreign language classes in the practicum school can be defined as "L1-dominant" due to the high amount of L1 use by the mentor teachers, whose target language use was estimated by 67% of the participants to be "40% or less of the time", in Crawford's (2004: 9) terms. In this respect, this result is similar to Kim and Elder's (2005) study, where four of the seven teachers used the target language under 50% of the time (ranging between 23-46%). However, there is no consensus in the educational literature as to how much L1 use is present in the foreign language class: Duff and Polio (1990) found out a wide range of variability in the amount of target language use by native-speaker teachers of thirteen different languages (from 10% to 100%) with a mean of 67.9%, whereas Macaro (2001) calculated a relatively low amount of L1 use by six student teachers with a mean of 4.8%.

One conclusion that could be drawn from this diversity of data is that the native language of the students cannot be totally banished from the foreign language class, and will continue to exist in different amounts. The problem is whether the mother tongue is put to good use or "abused", as Prodromou (2002: 5) pointed out the students' native language "has been used surreptitiously and haphazardly and, as a result, it may not have been used to good effect. Its potential as a resource has been cramped and distorted by the guilt and prohibitions that have accompanied its use".

The second finding indicates that more than half of the participants agreed on the randomness of MTs' codeswitching. Similarly, Meij and Zhao (2010: 405) studied the views of teachers and students on the frequency of teacher codeswitching in English major courses in Chinese universities and found that the students correctly perceived it as "being more frequent and longer in duration" than the teachers did as their codeswitching behaviour was in fact "seven times more prevalent" and also "10 times more time consuming" than the teachers supposed.

When asked why MTs use the mother tongue randomly in the class, 53% of the participants related it to the students' lack of understanding due to their low level of English, and 7% of them blamed it on the students' loss of interest due to their previous learning experience. In Kang's (2008) case study of a nonnative EFL teacher at a Korean elementary school, the students' inability to comprehend the teacher's L2 input and their disinterest in an English-only lesson again ranked high among the teacher's reasons for the exclusive use of L1 despite the TETE (Teaching English Through English) policy in Korea. The students' previous experience and level are, too, among the factors that determine the exact proportions of L1 and L2, according to Atkinson (1993), who recommends to reduce the amount of L1 use at higher levels and to increase the amount of L2 use gradually if the students are used to having classes mainly in L1. In the case of the practicum classes, these two student-related reasons serve as a pretext for the

exclusive use of L1 and create a chicken-egg dilemma, because “If English is not the *main* language used in the classroom, the learners are not going to learn very much English” (Atkinson, 1993: 12). Now that “perfect teaching and learning conditions do not exist”, “teachers have to resort to the L1”, which has no pedagogical value in it, in terms of Macaro’s (2001: 535) Maximal Position.

The participants also observed two teacher-related reasons for the randomness of L1 use by MTs in these classes: the lack of teaching knowledge and endeavour to teach through English. Polio and Duff (1994) also point out that teachers’ codeswitching stem from their lack of necessary experience and strategies to rephrase and modify their speech. Similarly, when Lai (1996) analyzed the data from the journals and classroom discourse of four pre-service teacher trainees in Hong Kong, she found that their use of ineffective strategies necessitated L1 use, and reasoned that not the language of instruction but the teaching method needs to be adjusted. As for the latter problem, Lai (1996)’s participants, too, found using L1 easier and more efficient even if they were aware of the importance of teaching in English. In this regard, the exploitation of L1 use as a survival strategy by teachers can be resembled to “a crutch” that can help to “get by in a lesson” but also “a recognition of weakness” (Prodromou, 2002: 5).

As for the purposes of MTs’ sparing use of L1, disciplining the class, making clarifications and giving instructions attained the top three positions, while teaching vocabulary, explaining grammar and giving feedback were after them. It can be concluded that the sparing uses of L1 by MTs concentrate on mainly managerial (disciplining the class and giving instructions) and clarification purposes, as in the case of Barak and Yinon (2005)’s study, where they explored the perspectives of 14 Arab and Jewish EFL student teachers towards L1 use via an inductive analysis of their reflective essays on their taught and recorded lessons.

Thirdly, when the participants were asked if they – as prospective teachers – support the use of the mother tongue in the EFL class, 67% of the participants (20 out of 30 STs) were found to be in favour of it, and most importantly, 60% of these Pro-L1 participants (12 out of 20 STs) expressed their sensitivity to the selective and judicious use of L1 in the EFL class. Similarly, in McMillan and Rivers’ (2011: 1) study, which “documents the attitudinal survey of 29 native-English speaker teachers at a Japanese university”, it was found that 20 out of 29 English teachers were in favour of L1 use by the teacher and 22 out of 29 English teachers supported the idea that selective L1 use is compatible with CLT (Communicative Language Teaching).

The extensive literature on the desirability of L1 use by teachers in different educational contexts also indicates that though showing varying degrees of agreement, foreign language teachers support the use of the mother tongue. The highest level of support was expressed by teachers of English at the University of Puerto Rico in Schweers’ (1999) study (100%), while, in similar studies, L1 use was supported by: i. 72% of 20 teachers in a Beijing university (Tang, 2002), ii. 80% of five instructors at Adama Teachers College in Ethiopia (Beressa, 2003), iii. 80% of 100 tertiary teachers from five universities in Indonesia (Zacharias, 2004), iv. 68% of 25 college level teachers in Japan (Shimizu, 2006), and v. 70% of 10 high school teachers in Turkey (Şevik, 2007). For this reason, it can be concluded that the exclusive use of L2 in the foreign language class, which “is not a recent practice introduced alongside communicative methodology”, but “has been the bedrock of classroom teaching for over a hundred years”, has recently turned out to be “a broken myth”, as teachers have recognized various uses of the mother tongue in communicative teaching (Howatt, as cited in Burden, 2000: 139; Barak & Yinon, 2005: 98).

In order to gain more insight into their beliefs about the uses of the mother tongue, these 20 Pro-L1 participants were asked to comment on the potential areas in which L1 might prove useful. The results are in line with the recurring themes in the literature, but again with differing degrees of agreement in each category. The use of the mother tongue to facilitate students’ comprehension was advocated by 35% of the participants; which also received the support of 39% of the Chinese teachers in Tang’s (2002) study. However, 70% of the Turkish teachers in Şevik’s (2007) study, 68% of the Japanese teachers in Shimizu’s (2006)’s study, and 57.14% of the Ethiopian instructors in Beressa’s (2003) study believe that L1 use greatly aids comprehension.

As for the teaching of vocabulary, 12% of the Pro-L1 participants were in favour of L1 use. This finding is almost the same as Schweers’ (1999) finding of 12.6%, but the least amount of support in this area was provided by 7.69% of the instructors in Beressa’s (2003) study, whereas it is in Zacharias’ (2004) study that 62% of the participants approved the use of the mother in teaching new words. The amount of support provided by the participants of Tang (2002), Shimizu (2006), Şevik (2007) can be listed in respective order: %39, %24 and %20. The use of L1 in the teaching of grammar was equally cited by 12% of the Pro-L1 participants. However, it is in Şevik’s (2007) study that the use of the mother tongue in teaching complex grammar rules received the highest amount of support by the teachers (80%). The

amount of support in Tang's (2002), Zacharias' (2004) and Shimizu's (2006) studies range between 39% and 64% in the area of grammar instruction.

L1 use was found useful in the area of giving instructions by 10% of the Pro-L1 participants, to which Zacharias' (2004) result is the closest with the support of 11% of the teachers. Even a lower amount of support for giving instructions by using the mother tongue is present in Tang's (2002) study: only 6% of the teachers. On the other hand, Shimizu's (2006) and Şevik's (2007) results amount to 28% and 20% respectively. Like 7.3% of the teachers in Schweers' (1999) study, who supported the use of L1 for helping students feel more comfortable and confident, 8% of the Pro-L1 participants in this study believe that L1 use can create a more conducive atmosphere to learning by removing the negative feelings of anxiety, fear and alienation. This use of L1 receives the support of 32% of the teachers in Shimizu's (2006) study and 28.57% of the instructors in Beressa's (2003) study. While 6.1% of the student teachers in this study believe in the time-efficiency of the mother tongue use in the EFL class, this is raised to: 14.29% of the instructors in Beressa's (2003), 28% of the teachers in Tang's (2002), 40% in Şevik's (2007), and to 48% in Shimizu's (2006) studies.

The use of the mother tongue in disciplining the class was approved by 4% of the Pro-L1 participants in this study, and similarly, only 7.69% of Beressa's (2003) instructors argued for L1 use in maintaining classroom discipline. This is raised to 20% of the teachers in Şevik's (2007) study, even though Schweers (1999), Tang (2002), Zacharias (2004) and Shimizu (2006) made no mention of it. The highest amount of support for the use of L1 in disciplining the class is, however, provided by 55.8% of the 52 Chinese teachers of English in Yao's (2011) study. While another 4% of the Pro-L1 participants advocated the use of L1 for promoting cultural learning, it is only in Yao (2011)'s study that 76.9% of the teachers reported to better illustrate the cultural points in texts by using L1. With regard to forming crosslinguistic links, again 4% of the Pro-L1 participants believe in the necessity of L1 use; and 2.5% of Schweers' (1999) teachers, likewise, approved the mother tongue use in explaining the relationship between English and Spanish. In Beressa's (2003) study, however, 15.38% of the instructors believe in the necessity of making comparisons between the target language (English) and the native language (Oromo).

The least-cited uses of L1 in the EFL class concern giving feedback and adding a fun element to the class, each amounting to only 2% of the Pro-L1 student teachers. As for L1 use in giving feedback, this finding is below Zacharias' (2004) result of 11%. But in the use of L1 jokes for fun in the class, it approximates Beressa's (2003) result of 7.69%; though being way below Şevik's (2007) result of 20%. Schweers (1999) and Shimizu (2006) documented similar amounts of support for the use of the L1 jokes in the EFL class: 15%-16%, while the highest result is acquired in Yao's (2011) study, where 69.3% of the teachers reported to switch into Chinese to tell a joke in order to enliven the class.

In the light of these findings, two immediate conclusions can be drawn here: i. whether there is a native-speaker or a non-native teacher in the foreign language class, codeswitching is a natural phenomenon in the monolingual classes and the amount of teachers' L1 use varies across different educational contexts; and ii. teachers almost uniformly agree that a judicious and selective use of the mother tongue can prove useful in varied areas of language teaching ranging from the facilitation of comprehension to class management.

The discussion henceforth will, therefore, focus on the drawbacks of L1 use as perceived by the 10 Anti-L1 participants in this study. 36% of them disapproved the use of the mother tongue in the EFL class, because they believe students can learn a foreign language in the same way as a native-speaker acquires it by being exposed to comprehensible input. Similarly, Ford (2009: 71) interviewed 10 native-speaker teachers from various universities of Tokyo about their principles and practices of L1 use and found that nine of the 10 interviewees supported an English-only approach, as it is "their responsibility to provide students with plenty of rich comprehensible input". In Leung (2010: 7, 18)'s study with 20 non-native teachers from two secondary schools in Hong Kong, one of the teachers' reasons against L1 use is "maximal L2 exposure", because they argue "the development of students' L2 proficiency is proportional to the amount of L2 input they receive", "although the students may have difficulty understanding at the beginning". Aware of this difficulty, 20% of Anti-L1 STs in this study sanctioned the use of L1 in beginner level classes only when it helps learners to understand the input and overcome language anxiety. Otherwise, they believe that time not spent on L2 input is time not well-spent. Likewise, 80% of Leung's (2010: 22) teachers indicated that "using L1 reduces students' exposure to L2", while "a 100% English-only proponent" teacher in Ford (2009: 71)'s study "emphasized the need for maximizing students' time spent hearing the L2 as they had so little opportunity to do so otherwise in a typical FL setting".

Yet, Krashen's input hypothesis that "people acquire language best by understanding input that is slightly beyond their current level of competence" (Richards & Rodgers, 2002: 182) is challenged by Macaro's (2005: 66) hypothesis that "large amounts of input do not necessarily lead to take-up of the

language by the learner". In fact, "there is no evidence pointing in the direction of higher achieving learners (or faster learners) feeling more at ease with L2 exclusivity" (Macaro, 2005: 70). Therefore, instead of the total avoidance of L1 use in the EFL class, teachers can provide "an enhanced form of input that is more salient for the learner, more easily processed, and consequently results in a greater understanding of the TL" (Turnbull & Arnett, 2002: 205-206).

In addition to the reduction of L2 time, the risk of overreliance on L1 use also aroused concern among 20% of Anti-L1 participants, who believe learners will feel too much at ease to take the trouble to process the input in the target language. In the same way, Ford's (2009: 70) teachers state that "if learners know that the teacher will use the L1, then they stop concentrating so much on processing information in L2, knowing that they will get an explanation or instruction clarified in Japanese", which will restrict their opportunities for L2 practice.

These concerns are not in vain, considering the perceived amount and randomness of L1 use by the mentor teachers in this study. Crawford (2004: 5, 10) also investigated "language teachers' attitudes to and use of the target language" in Australia, and found that many of the respondents had "reservations about the desirability of L2 use or even actively oppose it", as well as claiming to use the target language "quite sparingly across a teaching cycle". Thus, she (2004: 11) suggested that "even after several years in a language program, many students potentially experience very little interaction with their teacher in the target language". Conscious of these repercussions of limited exposure on students' language development, 12% of Anti-L1 participants in this study advocate that L1 use must be avoided in order for the students to form good language habits, as it robs them of the opportunities for language practice with the teacher in classroom interaction. However, in Macaro's two studies with pre-service and experienced teachers (Macaro, 2001 and Macaro & Mutton, 2002; as cited in Macaro, 2005: 71-72), "no significant increase in the students' use of L2 was detected if the teacher used the L2 exclusively or almost exclusively". On the contrary, he (2005: 72) suggests that "expert codeswitching" has "no negative impact on the quantity of students' L2 production", but rather may promote it.

Their last reason against L1 use relates to the expression of the meaning in the EFL class: three Anti-L1 participants regard audiovisuals, demonstration and nonverbal cues as much better tools than L1 use. Likewise, in Leung's (2010: 18-19) study, teachers showed preference for contextualization, illustration and "self-explanatory visuals such as pictures and video clips" over resort to L1 use. However, there is ample evidence in the literature that a direct translation of the target language word might prove more effective in the expression of meaning than the implicit techniques like contextualizing, paraphrasing, antonyms, synonyms, glossing and visuals in vocabulary instruction (Prince, 1996; Lotto & De Groot, 1998; Ramachandran & Rahim, 2004; Bacherman, 2007).

An overview of these findings suggest that although two-thirds of the student teachers in this study recognize the importance of L1 use in the foreign language class and advise caution in the amount of L1 use, one-third of them reject codeswitching under the influence of these three claims of the Monolingual Approach: i. "the learning of an L2 should model the learning of an L1 (through maximum exposure to the L2)"; ii. "successful learning involves the separation and distinction of L1 and L2"; iii. "students should be shown the importance of the L2 through its continual use" (Cook, 2001, as cited in Miles, 2004: 10).

Conclusion

Like 80% of Beressa's (2003) instructors, 100% of the student teachers in this study were not trained for using the mother tongue purposefully in the foreign language classroom. Rather, they seemed to adopt "the communicative teaching style", which has "little systematic recognition of the possibilities available to the learner through the first language" (Cook, 2001: 216). After observing that L1 use is dominant and random in the foreign language classes of a state high school in Ankara, they were divided on the issue of L1 use in the EFL classes, especially in the case of weak students: while the majority of the participants were in favour of judicious and selective use of the mother tongue for varied pedagogic purposes, the rest of them were against it, as they assume "it is [their] job to recreate in [their] classrooms the natural conditions of acquisition present in the external environment" – this Larsen-Freeman (2003: 20) calls "the reflex fallacy", and redefines the task of the language teacher as "to improve upon natural acquisition", "not emulate it".

The conflict between theory and practice is not particular to the participants in this study, though. In Barak and Yinon's (2005: 101) study, too, "the issue of promoting communication and encouraging active participation in the foreign language is solidly entrenched in student teachers' understandings of their roles", but Arab and Jewish student teachers still "made intrinsic connections between strategies for promoting communication, pupil participation, and the use of L1". Similarly, in Meij and Zhao's (2010: 396, 406) study, all the participants "perceive and experience the classroom as a compound bilingual space

in which there is and should be room for L2 as well as L1”, although “the tacit policy of universities is to favor the immersion mode”. As a result, “during training, prospective teachers may thus learn that they are expected not to use the L1 in their lessons. In their own classrooms, teachers have tended to react differently” as Meij and Zhao (2010: 406) put it.

Whether they are of Turkish, Arabic, Jewish or Chinese origin, the student teachers are faced with this discrepancy between the English-only policy and the practice of L1 use by the teachers. This is attributed to “the homogeneous character of EFL teacher education” in Barak and Yinon’s (2005: 107) politically correct language, whereas Holliday (1994: 3) associates it with “the unilateral professionalism”, which is “ethnocentric, failing to appreciate the social backgrounds of others, using international English language education to feed its own expansionism”. This linguistic imperialism involves, on the one hand, foreign curriculum developers or teachers “trying to effect appropriate English language teaching with students who are foreign to them”, and on the other hand, native teachers and curriculum developers “trying to make sense of methodologies developed in Britain, North America or Australasia for ‘ideal’ teaching-learning situations, which are very different from their own” (Holliday, 1994: 11). The question of “what is the optimum classroom situation?” or “how far received classroom methodologies are the most appropriate?” (Holliday, 1994: 11) can then be posed for the issue of L1 use in the foreign language classroom.

Now that “SLA research provides no principled reasons for avoiding the L1 in the classroom” “...other than allowing the students to hear as much second language as possible”, “[twenty-first-century teaching] will have to look elsewhere for its rationale, if [it] is to continue to accept the ban on the first language imposed by the late nineteenth century” (Cook, 2001: 155, 157). Therefore, it is naive for the local teachers to submit to the imposed ideal of an English-only class by the mainstream ELT methods and to banish such a vital resource from the foreign language class. In contrast, the local educators must take the initiative in deciding what is right for the particular country, as Cook (2001: 165) put it: “Whether an idea or approach in language teaching is useful does not intrinsically depend on which country it comes from. Its merits have to be accepted or rejected by the experts on the situation”; i.e. by “the teachers and students who live and work there”.

The fact that the target language is the *main* language of the classroom is irrefutable, but whether it should be the *only* language in the classroom should be questioned, because “avoiding examination or conversation about the role of the learners’ first language can only be counterproductive to the ultimate goals of communicative second and foreign language programs” (Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2009: 183). There is in fact a more immediate question: “how can L1 use be systematized to realize its full potential as a resource in the foreign language class?”. There is ample evidence that “teachers and students, alike, codeswitch even when rules or policy ban them from doing so”, and “far from being necessarily due to laziness or inattention to detail, there are sound pedagogical reasons for this” (Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2009: 183).

For the above reasons, teacher training programs must come to grips with the issue of codeswitching in methodology and practice teaching classes so that novice teachers can be equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills for the optimal use of the mother tongue in the foreign language class. “Optimal first language use” may be a fuzzy term, as “researchers still disagree about how and whether optimal first language use can be defined” (Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2009: 186). But if future research fills the gap in the methodological literature on “the features of classroom activities and materials that promote optimal codeswitching so that the first language does not become a crutch for both teachers and students” (Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2009: 185), then both pre-service and in-service teachers will be freed from the feelings of guilt and frustration, and they will make informed decisions about the timing of their codeswitching behaviour. The provision for training programs in codeswitching is also highlighted in Adendorff (1996, as cited in Meij & Zhao, 2010), Cook (2001, as cited in Meij & Zhao, 2010) and Macaro (2001). In this way, “our strategic objective will continue to be maximum interaction in the target language”, but “the role of the mother tongue will be to enrich the quality and the quantity of that interaction in the classroom, not to restrict or impoverish it (Prodromou, 2002: 5).

References

- Atkinson, D. (1987). The Mother Tongue in the Classroom: A Neglected Source?. *ELT Journal*, 41 (4), 241-247. Retrieved December 27, 2011 from: <<http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/content/41/4/241.full.pdf+html>>
 Atkinson, D. (1993). *Teaching Monolingual Classes*. Essex: Longman Group UK Limited.

- Barak, L. & Yinon, H. (2005). Different But Similar: Student Teachers' Perspectives on the Use of L1 in Arab and Jewish EFL Classroom Settings. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 18 (1), 91-113. Retrieved June 16, 2011, from: <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07908310508668735>>
- Bacherman, D. M. (2007). The Use of Students' First Language in Second-Language Learning in a Computer-Based Environment. Doctoral Dissertation, Walden University. Retrieved November 9, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT 3240051).
- Beressa, K. (2003). Using L1 In The Efl Classroom: The Case Of The Oromo Language With Particular Reference To Adama Teachers College. M.A. Thesis. Addis Ababa University. Retrieved June 20, 2011, from: <http://etd.aau.edu.et/dspace/handle/123456789/671?mode=full&submit_simple>Show+full+item+record>
- Borg, M. (2004). The Apprenticeship of Observation. *ELT Journal*, 58 (3), 274-276. Retrieved December 11, 2011, from: <<http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/content/58/3/274.full.pdf+html>>
- Burden, P. (2000). The Use of 'Only English' in a Learner-Centered University Classroom in Japan. *RELC Journal*, 31 (1), 139-149. Retrieved December 29, 2008, from: <<http://rel.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/31/1/139>>
- Butzkamm, W. (2000). Bilingual Method. In Michael Byram (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*, (pp. 84-87). New York: Routledge. Retrieved August 10, 2011, from: <http://www.fremdsprachendidaktik.rwth-aachen.de/Ww/b2000_bilingual.html>
- Ciambrone, D. (2004). Anonymity. In M.S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman & T. F. Liao (Eds.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods* (pp. 18-19). California: SAGE Publications.
- Cook, V. (1989). Reciprocal Language Teaching: Another Alternative. *Modern English Teacher*, 16 (3/4), 48-53. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from: <<http://homepage.ntlworld.com/vivian.c/Writings/Papers/ReciprocalLT.htm>>
- Cook, V. (1999). Going Beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33 (2), 185-209. Retrieved December 29, 2009, from: <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3587717>>
- Cook, V. (2001). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold.
- Crawford, J. (2004). Language Choices in the Foreign Language Classroom: Target Language or the Learners' First Language? *RELC Journal*, 35 (1), 5-20. Retrieved December 21, 2008, from: <<http://rel.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/35/1/5>>
- 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. Retrieved May 10, 2010, from: <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/328119>>
- Ford, K. (2009). Principles and Practices of L1/L2 Use in the Japanese University EFL Classroom. *JALT Journal*, 31 (1), 63-80. Retrieved August 4, 2011, from: <http://jalt-publications.org/files/pdf-article/art3_5.pdf>
- Gabrielatos, C. (2001). L1 Use in ELT: Not a Skeleton, But a Bone of Contention. *Bridges*, 6, 33-35. Retrieved December 31, 2009, from: <<http://www.gabrielatos.com/L1UseInELT-Bridges.pdf>>
- Gill, S. (2005). The L1 in the L2 Classroom. *HLT Magazine*, 7 (5). Retrieved August 8, 2011, from: <<http://www.hltmag.co.uk/sep05/mart03.htm>>
- Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kang, D-M. (2008). The Classroom Language Use of a Korean Elementary School EFL Teacher: Another Look at TETE. *System*, 36 (2), 214-226. Retrieved June 20, 2010, from: <<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6VCH-4S9RDCF-1/2/17da48cfc451c3acb91ab790fa8f3086>>
- 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. Retrieved March 30, 2009, from: <<http://ltr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/9/4/355>>
- Klapper, J. (1998). Language Learning at School and University: the Great Grammar Debate Continues (II). *Language Learning Journal*, 18 (1), 22-28. Retrieved August 7, 2011, from: <<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all?content=10.1080/09571739885200211>>
- Lai, M. (1996). Using the L1 Sensibly in English Language Classrooms. *Journal of Primary Education*, 6 (1&2), 91-99. Retrieved November 25, 2009, from: <<http://sunzi1.lib.hku.hk/hkjo/view/48/4800045.pdf>>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching Language: From Grammar to Grammaticing*. Boston: Heinle.

- Leung, C. P. (2010). English Language Teachers' Beliefs and Attitudes in the Pedagogic Use of Cantonese in English Classes in Hong Kong Secondary Schools. B.Ed. Dissertation. Retrieved July 12, 2011, from: <<http://hub.hku.hk/bitstream/10722/123915/1/ft.pdf>>
- Lotto L. & De Groot, A. M. B. (1998). Effects of Learning Method and Word Type on Acquiring Vocabulary in an Unfamiliar Language. *Language Learning Journal*, 48 (1), 31-69. Abstract. Retrieved August 1, 2011, from: <<http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsid=2458654>>
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing Student Teachers' Codeswitching in Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85 (4), 531-548. Retrieved September 25, 2009, from: <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1193074>>
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 Classroom: a Communication and Learning Strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-Native Teachers, Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession* (pp. 63-84). New York: Springer.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing Qualitative Research Fifth Edition*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- McMillan, B. & Rivers, D. (2011). The Practice of Policy: Teacher Attitudes Toward "English-Only". *System*, 39(2), 251-263. Retrieved 30 July, 2011, from: <<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X11000510>>
- Meij, H. V. D. & Zhao, X. (2010). Codeswitching in English Courses in Chinese Universities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94 (3), 396-411. Retrieved June 20, 2011, from: <<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01090.x/full>>
- Meyer, H. (2008). The Pedagogical Implications of L1 Use in the L2 Classroom. *Maebashi Kyoai Gakuen College Research Bulletin*, 8, 147-160. Retrieved May 24, 2009, from: <<http://www.kyoai.ac.jp/college/ronshuu/no-08/meyer1.pdf>>
- Miles, R. (2004). *Evaluating the Use of L1 in the English Language Classroom*. M.A. Thesis, University of Birmingham. Retrieved April 26, 2008, from: <<http://www.birminghamdev1.bham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/matefltes/dissertations/Milesdiss.pdf>>
- 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. Retrieved October 29, 2009, from: <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/330110>>
- Prince, P. (1996). Second Language Vocabulary Learning: The Role of Context versus Translations as a Function of Proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80, 478-493. Retrieved March 8, 2010, from: <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/329727>>
- Prodromou, L. (2002). The Liberating Role of the Mother Tongue. In S. Deler & M. Rinvolucri (Eds), *Using the Mother Tongue*. London: English Teaching Professional Delta Publishing.
- Ramachandran, S. D. & Rahim, H. A. (2004). Meaning Recall and Retention: The Impact of the Translation Method on Elementary Level Learners' Vocabulary Learning. *RELC Journal*, 35 (2), 161-178. Retrieved June 20, 2009, from: <<http://rel.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/35/2/161>>
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2002). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schweers, C. W. (1999). Using the L1 in the L2 Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 37 (2). Retrieved May 25, 2008, from: <<http://eca.state.gov/forum/vols/vol37/no2/p6.htm>>
- Shimizu, M. (2006). Monolingual or Bilingual Policy in the Classroom. *Maebashi Kyoai Gakuen College Research Bulletin*, 6, 75-89. Retrieved August 20, 2009, from: <<http://www.kyoai.ac.jp/college/ronshuu/no-06/shimizu.pdf>>
- Silverman, D. & Marvasti, A. (2008). *Doing Qualitative Research: A Comprehensive Guide*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Şevik, M. (2007). The Place of Mother Tongue in Foreign Language Classes. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 40 (1), 99-199. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from: <<http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/40/152/1105.pdf>>
- Tang, J. (2002). Using L1 in the English Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 40 (1), 36-43. Retrieved December 21, 2008, from: <<http://draft.eca.state.gov/forum/vols/vol40/no1/p36.htm#top>>
- Turnbull, M. & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' Uses of the Target and First Languages in Second and Foreign Language Classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204-218. Retrieved May 30, 2010, from: <<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=135905>>
- Turnbull, M. & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2009). *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Ur, P. (2006). *A Course in Language Teaching Practice and Theory Trainee Book*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Undergraduate Program Course Descriptions (2011). In *METU FLE*. Retrieved June 2, 2011, from: <<http://www.fle.metu.edu.tr/ugp.htm>>
- Weschler, R. (1997). Uses of Japanese (L1) in the English Classroom: Introducing the Functional-Translation Method. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 3 (11). Retrieved March 20, 2008, from: <<http://iteslj.org/Articles/Weschler-UsingL1.html>>
- Yao, M. (2011). On Attitudes to Teachers' Code-Switching in EFL Classes. *World Journal of English Language*, 1 (1), 19-28. Retrieved August 3, 2011, from: <<http://www.sciedu.ca/journal/index.php/wjel/article/view/199>>
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2004). Teachers' Beliefs About the Use of the Students' Mother Tongue: a Survey of Tertiary English Teachers in Indonesia. *EA Journal*, 22 (1), 44-52. Retrieved May 9, 2009, from: <http://www.englishaustralia.com.au/index.cgi?E=hcatfuncs&PT=sl&X=getdoc&Lev1=pub_jnl22-1&Lev2=EAJ_22-1zac>

Genişletilmiş Özet

İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği sınıflarda anadil kullanımı belki de yabancı dil öğretim yöntemleri tarihindeki en canlı tartışmayı başlatmıştır. Dil öğretim yöntemleri incelendiğinde, Dilbilgisi-Çeviri Yöntemi dışında neredeyse bütün yöntemlerin “1880’lerdeki Reform Hareketi’nden bu yana ister işitsel-dilsel ve işitsel-görsel yöntemler olsun ister iletişimsel ya da Sessiz Yöntem olsun” öğretim tekniklerinin anadile dayanmaması gerektiğinde direttiği görülmektedir (Cook, 1999: 201). Ancak ikinci dil öğreniminin tekdilli anadil edinimi ile özdeşleştirilmesi yanlıştır ve öğrencilerin anadillerine erişimini engellemek yararsız olduğu gibi “bir öğretmen için sınıfın aşikar bir kaynağı olarak ortak bir anadili görmezden gelmek” “zararlı” ve “ihmkar” bir davranıştır (Klapper, 1998: 24). Her ne kadar yabancı dil sınıfında çeviri ve dil değiştirmeden etkin olarak yararlanan ikidilli yöntemler geliştirildiyse de geniş bir kabul görmediklerinden yalnızca erek dilin kullanımı tartışmasız bir uygulama olarak varlığını ilköğretimden yükseköğretime tüm dünyada sürdürmektedir.

Ayrıca öğretmen eğitiminde de anadilin kullanımına çok az ilgi gösterildiği İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretme (TEFL) kaynaklarındaki anadil kullanımının potansiyeline ilişkin bilginin eksikliğinden anlaşılmaktadır (Atkinson, 1987). İşte “yöntembilimsel alanyazındaki bu açık deneyimli ve deneyimsiz çoğu öğretmenin sınıfta öğrencilerin anadilini kullanmaya ya da kullanımına izin vermeye duyduğu rahatsızlıktan muhtemelen kısmen sorumludur” (Atkinson, 1987: 241). Bu nedenle, bu çalışmanın amacı uygulama okulundaki yönder öğretmenlerin anadil kullanımına ilişkin öğretmen adaylarının görüşlerini ve geleceğin İngilizce öğretmeni olarak anadil kullanımına ilişkin tutumlarını araştırmaktır. Gerçek sınıflarda gerçekten ne olduğuna ilişkin izlenimlerinin ve dil değiştirmeye dönük kişisel görüşlerinin açıklanmasının Sadece-İngilizce politikasının dayatıldığı öğretmen eğitimi programları için önemli çıkarımları olabileceği düşünülmektedir.

Bu araştırmanın çalışma grubunu Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümündeki (Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi) dokuzu erkek 21’i kız toplam 30 son sınıf öğrencisi oluşturmuştur. Uygulama okulundaki yönder öğretmenlerin anadil kullanım miktarı ve biçimine ilişkin görüşlerini incelemek ve geleceğin İngilizce öğretmenleri olarak anadil kullanımı konusundaki duruşlarını belirlemek amacıyla, öğretmen adaylarına araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilmiş bir anket verilmiştir. Anket üç ana ve dört alt, toplam yedi sorudan oluşmuştur. Üç ana soru kapalı uçlu olup katılımcıların bir seçim yapmasını gerektirmekte iken dört alt soru açık uçlu olup seçimleri hakkında yorum yapmalarını gerektirmektedir.

Bu araştırmanın verileri 2010-2011 öğretim yılının bahar döneminde “Öğretmenlik Uygulaması” adlı ders süresince toplanmıştır. Katılımcılar anket sorularına 10 haftalık süreç sonunda yanıt vermiştir. Uygulama süresince Ankara’da 856 öğrencisi ve 89 öğretmeni bulunan bir anadolu meslek lisesini ziyaret etmişler ve beş yönder öğretmeni (en az beş yıllık deneyime sahip) haftada altı saat boyunca gözlemlenmişlerdir.

Açık uçlu sorulara verilen yanıtlardan elde edilen nitel veriler betimsel analiz yöntemini kullanarak çözümlenmiştir. Buna göre, nitel veriler önceden belirlenen kategorilere göre özetlenip yorumlanmıştır. Bütün katılımcıların görüşleri belirli kategorilere ayrıldıktan sonra her küme için sıklık ve yüzdeleri Excel’de hesaplanmış ve son olarak da katılımcıların yanıtları arasından doğrudan alıntılar seçilmiştir. Yıldırım ve Şimşek (2011)’e göre, eğer nitel veriler sıklık ve yüzdelerin kullanımıyla nicelleştirilirse güvenilirlik artırılabilir, ön yargı azaltılabilir ve kategoriler arası karşılaştırma yapılabilir.

Araştırmanın sonucunda uygulama sınıflarında anadilin baskın olduğu, yönder öğretmenlerin anadili rastgele kullandığı ve anadilin rastgele kullanımına başlıca gerekçe olarak öğrencilerin düşük İngilizce düzeylerinin gösterildiği saptanmıştır. Anadilin rastgele kullanımına yol açan öğretmen-kaynaklı nedenler arasında ise öğretme bilgisi ve İngilizce ile öğretme çabasının eksikliği gösterilmiştir. Anadilin amaçlı kullanımları arasında ise sınıfta disiplin sağlamak, açıklama yapmak ve yönerge vermek ilk üçe girerken sözcük öğretmek, dilbilgisi anlatmak ve dönüt vermek bunları izlemiştir. Bu nedenle, yönder öğretmenlerin amaçlı kullanımlarının yönetsel ve açıklama odaklı olduğu sonucu çıkarılabilir.

Öğretmen adaylarına yabancı dil sınıfında anadilin kullanımını destekleyip desteklemedikleri sorulduğunda ise üçte ikisi desteklediğini belirtmiş ve anadili destekleyen bu grubun yüzde 60'ı ise seçici ve makul kullanım konusundaki duyarlılığını dile getirmiştir. Anadil kullanımları konusundaki görüşlerini inceleyebilmek için ise bu yirmi katılımcıdan anadilin yararlı olabileceği potansiyel alanları açıklamaları istenmiştir. Anadilin öğrencilerin anlamasını kolaylaştırdığı, sözcük ve dilbilgisi öğretiminde yararlı olabileceği görüşleri en sık belirtilirken yönerge verme, öğrencilerin kaygı, korku ve yabancılaşma gibi olumsuz duygularını giderme, zaman kazanma, disiplin sağlama, kültürel öğrenme, dillerarası bağ kurma gibi alanlardaki yararından söz edilmiştir. Öte yandan, anadilin en az değinilen yararı ise dönüt verme ve derse eğlence katma olmuştur.

Katılımcıların üçte biri ise yabancı dil sınıfında anadil kullanımına karşı çıkmıştır. Bu grubun yüzde 36'sı öğrencilerin bir yabancı dili ancak bir anadil konuşurunun anlaşılabilir girdiye maruz kalarak edindiği gibi öğrenebileceğini savunurken yüzde 20'si ise anadil kullanımına başlangıç düzeyindeki sınıflarda ancak girdiyi anlamaya ve dil kaygısını aşmaya yardım ettiğinde izin verilebileceğini belirtmiştir, çünkü erek dil girdisine harcanmayan zaman iyi kullanılmayan zamandır. Erek dil zamanından çalmanın yanı sıra, anadile bağımlılık riski ise anadil karşıtı katılımcıların yüzde 20'sinin oyunu almıştır, çünkü öğrencilerin erek dildeki girdiyi işlemek için zahmete girmeyecek kadar rahat olacağı görüşündedirler. Öte yandan, anadil karşıtı katılımcıların öngördüğü diğer iki sakınca ise dil alışkanlıkları ve öğretim teknikleriyle ilgilidir. Buna göre, anadil kullanımı öğrencilerin öğretmenleri ile sınıftaki etkileşimde pratik yapma fırsatlarını ellerinden alır ve işitsel-görseller, gösteri tekniği ile dilsel olmayan işaretler anlamı açıklamada anadil kullanımından çok daha iyi araçlardır.

Ankara'daki bir devlet okulunun yabancı dil sınıflarında anadil kullanımının baskın ve rastgele olduğunu gözlemledikten sonra öğretmen adayları anadil kullanımı konusunda ayrılığa düşmüşlerdir: çoğunluk anadilin makul ve seçici kullanımını çeşitli eğitsel amaçlardan ötürü desteklese de geri kalanı anadil kullanımını reddetmektedir, çünkü "görevlerinin dış ortamdaki edinimin doğal koşullarını sınıflarında yeniden yaratmak" olduğu görüşündeler (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 20). Bu çalışmadaki öğretmen adayları yöntembilim derslerinde yalnızca İngilizce'nin kullanıldığı bir sınıf idealiyle yetiştirildikleri ve yabancı dil sınıfında anadilin amaçlı kullanımı konusunda hiçbir eğitim almadıkları için uygulama sınıflarında tekdillilik politikasıyla yönder öğretmenlerin anadil kullanımı uygulamasının çatıştığına tanık olmuşlardır. Elbette erek dilin yabancı dil sınıfının "temel" dili olduğu yadsınamaz, ancak yabancı dil sınıfındaki "tek" dil olması gerekli mi tartışılmalıdır.

Daha ivedi bir soru ise anadil kullanımı yabancı dil sınıfında bir kaynak olarak tüm potansiyelini gerçekleştirmek için nasıl düzenlenebilir? "Hem öğretmenlerin hem öğrencilerin kurallar ve politika yasaklarken bile dil değiştirdiğine ve bunun tembellik veya ayrıntılara ilgisizlikten değil sağlam eğitsel nedenlerden ileri geldiğine" dair bol kanıt varken öğretmen eğitimi programlarının yöntembilim ve öğretmenlik uygulaması derslerinde dil değiştirme sorununu ele alması gereklidir; böylelikle yeni öğretmenlerin yabancı dil sınıfında anadilden en uygun biçimde yararlanabilmeleri için gerekli bilgi ve beceriler ile donanmaları sağlanabilir (Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009: 183).