



## Exploring the Influence of Teachers' Experience on the Responses about L1 use in L2 Teaching

Muhammad Ahsan<sup>\*</sup>Noshaba Younus<sup>†</sup>Muhammad Naeem<sup>‡</sup>

**Abstract:** *The focus of the current research was to explore the influence of teachers' experience on the responses about L1 use in L2 teaching. To investigate an evident and contemplative comprehension of this topic or subject matter, the available research targeted the 156 teachers who were practising teaching English at graduation level in different public sector colleges and universities of the Southern Punjab, Pakistan. The data collection source applied for the study was a questionnaire. Data were examined using SPSS (statistical package for social sciences) 23 version. Data was examined with the help of different data analysis techniques such as descriptive analysis, analysis of variance (ANOVA), T-Test and Cronbach's alpha. The outcome of the immediate study showed that the teachers displayed a highly positive sense about the use of native language in the foreign language classroom. Most of the teachers adopted using L1 in certain occurrences for solid reasons, such as while teaching grammar and its usage in the target language classroom. Foreign language teachers were extremely inspired to use L1 while teaching short questions and summaries, letter writing and paraphrasing the text in different classes of graduation.*

**Key Words:** Teacher, Experience, College, University, Teaching, Grammar

### Introduction

The national, native language or mother tongue all are called the First Language (L1) of a person, and all these terms are used as alternatives to each other. In this background, [Stern \(1983\)](#) magnifies the range of the term and reveals that these expressions may apply either to the language acquired first in early life or to a language that was learnt later but has come to be the dominating one. This idea was heightened and supported by [Kangas \(1981\)](#) when she states 'L1 as the language one reflects in, the language one dreams in, and the language one computes in'. She categorizes characteristics of the first language into four wide-ranging types. Firstly, 'The Origin' (the language learnt first) secondly, 'The Competence' (the language known best) thirdly, 'The Function' (the language used most) and fourthly, 'The Attitude' (the language one identifies with, and also is identified by other people as a native speaker of). Native language is the language that someone

achieves in premature years and which generally becomes his natural instrument of thought and communication ([Lanvers, Ursula & Hamers, Josine & Blanc, Michael, 2001](#)). For this study's sake, the above-mentioned terms will be used to describe the language acquired first at home or institution in youth and still ruling and functioning as a national language. A large number of language teachers showed a huge number of startups and circles where the use of L1 may yield useable results in L2 teaching. In this regard, [Auerbach \(1993\)](#) suggests the following conceivable areas and situations for using L1: negotiation of the syllabus and the lesson, record keeping, management of the classroom, presentation of the rules governing grammar, phonology, morphology, and discussion of cross-cultural issues, instructions, explanation of errors and assessment of comprehension.

<sup>\*</sup> Lecturer, Department of English, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan, Punjab, Pakistan.

Email: [mahsan@gudgk.edu.pk](mailto:mahsan@gudgk.edu.pk)

<sup>†</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of English, Riphah International University, Faisalabad Campus, Punjab, Pakistan.

<sup>‡</sup> Department of English, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan, Punjab, Pakistan

Teachers often use L1 in degree-level classes to:

- a) Give instructions
- b) Describe meanings of words
- c) Explain complex ideas and terms
- d) Explicate complex grammar points and their usage ([Tang, 2002](#)).

A considerable number of teachers discover that the use of L1 delivers more time to exercise L2 because understanding is achieved much faster. The basic point with teacher use of L1 is that it can be used for explanation purposes after an endeavour has been made to communicate ideas in L2, and students still seem to be perplexed. The idea is that L1 helps a more supportive and accelerating role in the L2 classroom ([Tang, 2002](#)).

### Background of the Study

A variety of arguments have been given about the use of the first Language in EFL classrooms by the researchers. According to [Chavez \(2003\)](#), several researchers and language practitioners desire L1 not to occur at all in foreign language classroom settings. In the same way, [Elridge \(1996\)](#) says that the use of mother tongue in English language classroom produces short-term benefits to the foreign language learner, but with the jeopardy of hampering long-term acquisition. Maximizing the use of L2 and minimizing the use of L1 is necessary, and it provides necessary exposure for second language acquisition, affirm [Duff and Polio \(1990\)](#). [Cook \(2008\)](#), on the other side, asserts that native language should be avoided in foreign language classrooms because it doesn't happen in first language acquisition, and the two languages should be kept separate in mind. She goes with the idea that when children acquire the first language, they do not have another language to rely on. So, second language students should learn the L2 in the similar way they acquired their first language; without referring to an extra language. The second statement of Cook urges keeping the two languages divided. It means, to learn a second language proficiently, students should use it independently from the L1. [Spada and Lighbrown \(1999\)](#), however, think that second language learning is not regarded as separate from the first language and has interactions with it.

Instructors and learners are normally prohibited from using their mother tongue in second language classroom activities. A reason proposed by [Cook \(2005\)](#) for this is that teachers

need to recognize that the second language/L2 user is a particular kind of person in their own right with their own knowledge of the first language/L1 and the L2, rather than a monolingual with an added L2. If language teachers think of this as a starting point and base their teaching on it, then they had better realize the minds and needs of L2 learners. But here, the question arises that what about the use of L1 in L2 classroom. [Qi \(1998\)](#), to make this situation clear, views that the use of mother tongue seems to be a natural and cognitive behaviour in a bilingual mind engaging in second language assignment. [Wells \(1998\)](#) also admits that the mother tongue can play a vital role in the shared performance of tasks in L2, and consequently, in the creation of opportunities for learning L2. For example, if students are working in groups, they do not have to continuously speak English; they can use their mother tongue. With this activity, they can get control over L2 difficulties and attain effective communication with each other. [Anton and DiCamilla \(1999\)](#), in this situation, suppose that the use of L1/first language seems not only as a tool to generate content but, more clearly, as a means to construct a social and cognitive space in which learners are able to provide themselves with help throughout the assignment. In the line of collaborative performance, in a study that focused on the use of L1 made by 22 pairs of grade 8 French immersion students completing either a dictogloss or a jigsaw, the use of L1 during collaborative tasks took place for three most important reasons-increasing efficiency, facilitating interpersonal interactions and focusing attention, maintain [Turnbull and Arnett \(2002\)](#) students were able to make accomplishment in their tasks more effectively and easily as a result of using L1. Turnbull and Arnett added that by having mother tongue/L1 as the main source in the EFL classroom, teachers could facilitate learners' learning process.

[Turnbull \(2001\)](#) proposes that "the use of L1 and L2 should be seen as balancing". Teachers concern themselves not only with the teaching of English as a second language but also with ensuring the existence of a strong climate for promoting L1 development, pleads [Kouritzin \(2000\)](#). Along with Kouritzin, Levine (2003) also supports maximum use of target language/L2 while at the same time granting to L1 pedagogically sound functions. Resultantly a

number of researchers seem to agree that dealing with L1 as a source for L2 classroom may open up many ways for using it successfully. For example, [Cole \(1998\)](#) admits that an instructor may spend a lot of time trying to explain the meaning of an item in English/L2, while simply translating the item using mother tongue/L1 may save time and suffering. [Nation \(2003\)](#) also advocates and supports the use of L1 whenever the meaning to be conveyed in the target language is beyond students' capabilities and considers that a small amount of L1 discussion can help to overcome some of the barriers. Teachers who use their mother tongue in their EFL classrooms may have preferences for when to use students' L1 in the classroom. Teachers generally prefer to use L1 when they want to maintain students' attention, curiosity, or involvement, states [Carless \(2008\)](#). It is described by [Macaro \(2001\)](#) that instructor use learners' L1 for providing the meaning of lexical items and to help and to reinforce understanding of the L2/second language. Besides teachers' preferences for using L1, there are many classroom activities in which L1 can be proficiently introduced. For example, it is suggested by [Edstrom \(2006\)](#) that students' L1 can be used for classroom management, grammar instruction, and to reimburse for lack of comprehension. "L1 can be used in conversation tasks, discussion of intensive reading, and preparation for writing", suggests Nation (2003). Turnbull (2001), in addition, managed a study in which four French teachers' use of English (L1) and French (L2) was tape-recorded for eight weeks. The instructors' speech was then coded by dividing the teachers' talk into different categories. Turnbull states that giving classroom organizational instructions, teaching grammar, teaching background to new tasks or assignments, and disciplining was best done in L1. Additionally, [Cook \(2005\)](#) implies that L1 can be used as a way of conveying L2 meaning as a shortcut for explaining tests, tasks, as a way of explaining grammar and for practising L2 uses such as code-switching. It is viewed by [Cook \(2005\)](#) that using mother tongue in these situations or circumstances saves time for teachers and students. Furthermore, it helps learners' understanding of the materials presented in the L2/target language. Using mother tongue in these situations also gives teachers and students helpful ways in which the first language can be used in second language teaching and learning situations. On the other hand, it is discouraged by Duff and

Polio (1990) the use of L1/native tongue by teachers to make explanations clear.

Learners, on the other side, also tend to use their mother tongue in the classroom even when their teachers do not. Research conducted by [Storch and Wigglesworth \(2003\)](#) was carried out mainly in a foreign language and immersion classroom, in which students share the same L1. Twenty four ESL university-level students contributed to the study. The students also shared an analogous educational background and were all at intermediate ESL proficiency level. The main purpose of the study was to find out whether ESL learners would use their first language to carry out multifarious tasks and if they did what cognitive functions mother tongue use would provide. They plead that learners made use of their L1 mainly for task management and task clarification. It is affirmed by Storch and Wigglesworth that most of the time, students find it easier and helpful to use their native language as it aids them to justify and discuss difficult topics or tasks in the classroom. Moreover, it is declared by Turnbull and Arnett (2002) that students may sometimes need their teachers to use their first language because they could not learn if they could not understand their teacher. [Cook \(2001\)](#) states that teachers, as a result, use their L1/first language to build up interlinked L1 and L2 knowledge in the students' minds..., to provide a shortcut for giving instructions and explanations..., to continue learning tasks through collaborative dialogue with fellow students and to develop L2 activities such as code-switching for later real-life use. The aim of this research was to analyze the effect of teachers' experience on the responses about L1 use in L2 teaching at degree level and to measure the teachers' attitude (experience-wise) towards the use of L1 in the L2 atmosphere.

## Research Questions

- i. Is there any effect of teachers' experience on the responses about L1 use in L2 teaching?
- ii. What sort of attitude teachers employ on the use of L1 in the EFL classroom?

## Methods and Materials

Since the purpose of the existing study was to find out the influence of teachers' experience on the responses about L1 use in teaching L2 language classroom. For this objective, the researcher used

a questionnaire as the main tool. According to [Beale \(2002\)](#), research methodology should comprise of a description of research participants, sampling plan, target institutions, data collection instruments and procedures. Therefore, the data collection procedure was bi-fold: qualitative and quantitative. The qualitative part investigated teachers' beliefs and opinions as to why they agree or disagree with L1 use, in detail and the quantitative tool explored their experience on the responses about L1 use in teaching L2 generally. A mixed-method type was the best possible way for this purpose to answer all of the questions in this study. The opted site of this study was government universities and colleges located in the home division of the researcher and two other divisions like Bahawalpur and Multan, so it would be much uncomplicated to make a good link with the selected respondents.

Since to answer the queries of the present study, both qualitative and quantitative research methods were utilized, and they would have a

questionnaire. With the intention to determine the subjects' judgment of the use of native language in their target language classes, the researcher made a teachers' questionnaire that was the last data collection technique used in the present study. The researcher developed a questionnaire from the studies by [Elmetwally \(2012\)](#), [Al-jadidi, Husna Suleiman S \(2009\)](#), [Maniruzzaman \(2003\)](#) and [Rahman \(2006\)](#) as models with little change on the grounds of the researcher's personal teaching experience of seven years and these few alterations and changes were also supported by [Johnson \(1992\)](#) who noted that 'what makes a high-quality questionnaire is building on theory and earlier research; building on preceding work not only assists in improving the quality of tools but allows researchers to share the findings of similar studies to one another. The ended form of the questionnaires was the result of my own readings in the literature, joint with my own demonstrations and apprehension of the subject.

### Teachers' Responses Analysis

**Table 1.** Reliability of the Scale = .935

Scale Category	Reliability
Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.821
Impact of L1 Use on L2 Pedagogy	0.806
Reasoning of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.743
Situation & Atmosphere of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.778
Contribution of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.807

**Table 2.** Showing Frequency of Teachers' Responses on Five Categories of Scale

Scale Categories	No. of Teachers	Mean	SD	Frequency
Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.10	0.61	Medium
Impact of L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.32	0.45	Medium
Reasoning of L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.37	0.64	Medium
Situation and atmosphere of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.27	0.43	Medium
Contribution of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.44	0.51	Medium

Table 2 showing all five scale categories in the current study were used as medium-range. The most favoured category described was the contribution of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.44, SD=0.51), the reasoning of L1 use in L2 pedagogy

(M=3.37, SD=0.64), the effect of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.32, SD=0.45), situation and setting of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.27, SD=0.43) and perception & belief of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.10, SD=0.61).

**Table 3.** Frequency and Percentage of the Participants Teaching Experience of L2 (N=156)

Experience	Frequency	Percentage
0-4	53	34.5
5-10	62	39.3

Experience	Frequency	Percentage
11-20	25	15.9
21-Above	16	10.2
Total	156	100

Table 3 displays the next variable picked for the available study, and this was the frequency and percentage of the participants' teaching experience. The whole population was divided into four different categories in this variable, i.e. from 0 to 4 years, 5 to 10 years, 11 to 20 years and 21 and above years teaching experience. In the first category, 53 participants were incorporated that

stipulated 34.5% of 156. In the second category, 62 teachers participated, and this was 39.3% of the total population. The third category indicated a 15.9% response of 25 respondents, which is also the third-rate response in the table. In the last category, 16 participants took part, which was 10.2% of the total sample.

**Table 4.** Showing Analysis of Variance ANOVA of Teachers' Experience with five Categories

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Perception	Between Groups	425.327	3	141.776	1.125	.341
	Within Groups	19149.678	152	125.985		
	Total	19575.005	155			
Impact	Between Groups	1015.807	3	338.602	2.589	.055
	Within Groups	19878.255	152	130.778		
	Total	20894.061	155			
Reasoning	Between Groups	300.174	3	100.058	2.589	.126
	Within Groups	7851.296	152	51.653		
	Total	8151.470	155			
Situation & Atmosphere	Between Groups	314.158	3	104.719	1.582	.196
	Within Groups	10061.496	152	66.194		
	Total	10375.654	155			
Contribution	Between Groups	135.742	3	45.247	1.051	.372
	Within Groups	6542.794	152	43.045		
	Total	6678.536	155			

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 4 denotes the analysis of variance (ANOVA) of teachers' experience in terms of the main five scale categories. It discloses the results of the ANOVA with relation to participants (teachers) of the present study. The interaction of teachers' experience with the first sub-category tells a statistically non-significant correlation of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 with F= 1.125 and P=.341, the second sub-category reveals statistically near to significant correlation of the

influence of L1 use in L2 with F= 2.589 and P=.055, but the reasoning of L1 use in L2 with F=2.589 and P=.126 showed statistically non-significant. Likewise, the fourth sub-category, atmosphere and situation of L1 use in L2 with F=1.582 and P=.196, showed statistically non-significant. Similarly, the fifth sub-category, which is the contribution of L1 use in L2 with F= 1.051 and P=.372, showed statistically non-significant.

**Table 5.** LSD

Dependent Variable	(i) experience	(j) experience	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	p
Impact	0A	5-10	2.86214	2.13935	.183
		11-20	-3.95540	2.77464	.156
		Others	-2.78600	3.26208	.394
	5-10	0A	-2.86214	2.13935	.183
		11-20	-6.81754*	2.70933	.013
		Others	-5.64814	3.20670	.080



Dependent Variable	(i) experience	(J)experience	Mean Difference (I-	Std. Error	p
Reasoning	11-20	0-4	3.95540	2.77464	.156
		5-10	6.81754*	2.70933	.013
		Others	1.16940	3.66125	.750
	0-4	5-10	2.24568	1.34451	.097
		11-20	-1.26206	1.74377	.470
		Others	-.68841	2.05010	.737
	5-10	0^1	-2.24568	1.34451	.097
		11-20	-3.50774*	1.70272	.041
		Others	-2.93409	2.01530	.147
	11-20	0^1	1.26206	1.74377	.470
		5-10	3.50774*	1.70272	.041
		Others	.57365	2.30097	.803
Situation &. Atmosphere	0-4	5-10	.88594	1.52203	.561
		11-20	-3.13429	1.97401	.114
		Others	-1.45536	2.32079	.532
	5-10	0^1	-.88594	1.52203	.561
		11-20	-4.02023*	1.92754	.039
		Others	-2.34130	2.28140	.306
	11-20	0 A	3.13429	1.97401	.114
		5-10	4.02023*	1.92754	.039
		Others	1.67893	2.60478	.520
	Others	0 A	1.45536	2.32079	.532
		5-10	2.34130	2.28140	.306
		11-20	-1.67893	2.60478	.520

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 5 shows ANOVA (LSD) findings that describe the variation between independent and dependent variables. In the major category, the effect of L1 use in L2 teaching (experience-wise), the sub-category 0-4 years divulges an inversely proportional correlation of 11-20 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience). This scale category indicates a statistically non-significant correlation between the two categories, i.e. 11-20 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience), and this correlation is at the level of 0.156 and 0.394, respectively. But the sub-category 0-4 years also shows a directly proportional correlation with the 5-10 years category, which is also a statistically non-significant correlation at the level of .183. In the similar sub-category, 5-10 years category shows an inverse correlation with 0-4 years, 11-20 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience) and the two categories, i.e. 0-4 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience) have statistically non-significant correlation at the level of 0.183 and 0.080 respectively. The sub-category 5-10 years discloses the most significant correlation statistically with the 11-20 years category at the level of 0.013. The same sub-category 11-20 years indicates a directly

proportional correlation with 0-4 years, 5-10 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience). The two sub-categories, i.e. 0-4 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience), have statistically non-significant correlation at the level of 0.156 and 0.750, respectively.

The reasoning of L1 use in the L2 teaching category (experience-wise) the sub-category 0-4 years reveals an inversely proportional correlation of 11-20 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience). This scale category indicates a statistically non-significant connection between the two categories, i.e. 11-20 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience), and this correlation is at the level of 0.470 and 0.737, respectively. But the sub-category 0-4 years indicates a directly proportional correlation with the 5-10 years category, which is also a statistically non-significant correlation at the level of .097. In the similar sub-category, 5-10 years category shows an inverse correlation with 0-4 years, 11-20 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience) and the two categories, i.e. 0-4 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience) have statistically non-significant

correlation at the level of 0.097 and 0.147 respectively. The sub-category 5-10 years indicates a statistically most significant correlation with the 11-20 years category at the level of 0.041. The similar sub-category 11-20 years indicates a directly proportional correlation with 0-4 years, 5-10 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience). The two sub-categories, i.e. 0-4 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience), have statistically non-significant correlation at the level of 0.470 and 0.803, respectively. The sub-category 5-10 years reveals the most significant correlation statistically with the 11-20 years category at the level of 0.041.

The atmosphere and situation of L1 use in the L2 teaching category (experience-wise) the sub-category 0-4 years shows inversely proportional correlation of 11-20 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience). This scale category indicates a statistically non-significant correlation between the two categories, i.e. 11-20 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience), and this correlation is at the level of 0.114 and 0.532, respectively. But the sub-category 0-4 years also exhibits a directly proportional correlation with the 5-10 years category, which is also a statistically non-significant correlation at the level of .0561. In the same sub-category, 5-10 years category denotes inverse correlation with 0-4 years, 11-20 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience) and the two categories, i.e. 0-4 years and others (21 or above years of teaching

experience) have statistically non-significant correlation at the level of 0.561 and 0.306 respectively. The sub-category 5-10 years shows the most significant correlation statistically with the 11-20 years category at the level of 0.039. The sub-category 11-20 years shows a directly proportional correlation with 0-4 years, 5-10 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience). The two sub-categories, i.e. 0-4 years and others (21 or above years of teaching experience), have statistically non-significant correlation at the level of 0.114 and 0.520, respectively. The sub-category 11-20 years indicates a statistically most significant correlation with the 5-10 years category at the level of 0.039.

In the atmosphere and situation of native language use in the foreign language teaching category (experience-wise), the sub-category 'others' (21 or above years of teaching experience) stipulates an inversely proportional correlation of 11-20 years. This scale category indicates a statistically non-significant correlation between the two categories, i.e. others (21 or above years of teaching experience) and 11-20 years, and this correlation is at the level of 0.520. But the sub-category 'others' (21 or above years of teaching experience) also shows correlation with 0-4 years and 5-10 years categories which are also statistically non-significant correlation at the level of .0532 and 0.306 respectively.

**Table 6.** Showing Analysis of Variance ANOVA of Teachers' Experience with most Significant Categories

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Q3	Between Groups	21.304	3	7.101	3.362	.020
	Within Groups	321.023	152	2.112		
	Total	342.327	155			
Q15	Between Groups	24.158	3	8.053	4.491	.005
	Within Groups	272.527	152	1.793		
	Total	296.686	155			
Q16	Between Groups	13.772	3	4.591	2.778	.043
	Within Groups	251.222	152	1.653		
	Total	264.994	155			
Q17	Between Groups	20.766	3	6.922	3.618	.015
	Within Groups	290.843	152	1.913		
	Total	311.609	155			

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 6 reveals the analysis of variance (ANOVA) of teachers' experience with the most significant categories. The present table demonstrates findings of the ANOVA with relation to the respondents of the study, the interaction of (teachers') experience with the sub-categories of the main scale category reveals statistically most significant correlation of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 'I believe that L1 should be used to

discuss tests, quizzes, and other assignments appropriately' with  $F= 3.362$  and  $P=.020$ , It is preferable to use L1 in tests, for example, in translating questions with  $F=4.491$  and  $P=.005$ , 'I prefer to use mother tongue in dividing the class into groups' with  $F=2.778$  and  $P=.043$  and item #17 also showed the most significant correlation 'I prefer to use mother tongue in clarifying some new words to my class' with  $F= 3.618$  and  $P=.015$ .

**Table 7.** Showing analysis of variance ANOVA of teacher's Experience with most: significant categories

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Q56	Between Groups	15.501	3	5.167	3.898	.010
	Within Groups	201.493	152	1.326		
	Total	216.994	155			
Q60	Between Groups	10.543	3	3.514	2.728	.046
	Within Groups	195.816	152	1.288		
	Total	206.359	155			
Q64	Between Groups	13.813	3	4.604	3.127	.028
	Within Groups	223.796	152	1.472		
	Total	237.609	155			
Q66	Between Groups	14.881	3	4.960	3.635	.014
	Within Groups	207.445	152	1.365		
	Total	222.327	155			

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 7 indicates the analysis of variance (ANOVA) of teachers' experience with the most significant categories. The available table indicates outcomes of the ANOVA with relation to the respondents of the study, the interaction of (teachers') experience with the sub-categories of the main scale category reveals statistically most significant correlation of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 'I think that students get to benefit from feedback when it's given in L1' with  $F= 3.898$  and  $P=.010$ , 'I use students' L1 to explain uneasy concepts' with  $F=2.728$  and  $P=.046$ . In the

same way, the fourth sub-category, 'the atmosphere and situation of L1 use in L2' shows the most significant correlation statistically 'I prefer to use L1 when I use to check my students' short questions, comprehension, letter writing, summaries and paraphrasing the text' with  $F= 3.127$  and  $P= .028$  and in the same sub-category the item number 66 also indicated the most significant correlation 'The use of L1 in my English class assists me for better comprehension of mutual communication in English' with  $F= 3.635$  and  $P=.014$ .

**Table 8.** Showing ANOVA result of mean comparison of Teachers' Experience wise:

Experience		Perception	Impact	Reasoning	Situation	Contribution
0-4	Mean	50.0388	66.8122	41.3933	42.5000	31.0698
	N	53	53	53	53	53
	Std. Deviation	10.02496	1.16653E1	8.06822	7.67513	5.81227
5-10	Mean	47.9677	63.9501	39.1476	41.6141	30.4113
	N	62	62	62	62	62
	Std. Deviation	12.28605	1.19192E1	6.84965	9.18563	7.60263
11-20	Mean	52.7412	70.7676	42.6554	45.6343	33.1600



Experience	Perception	Impact	Reasoning	Situation	Contribution	
N	25	25	25	25	25	
Std. Deviation	11.68937	1.01815E1	6.55537	6.57490	6.63174	
Others	Mean	50.0809	69.5982	42.0817	43.9554	31.3500
N	16	16	16	16	16	
Std. Deviation	9.78615	1.04821E1	6.18042	7.36603	3.69486	

Table 8 describes ANOVA findings of a mean comparison of teachers' experience. It explains that 11-20 years teaching experience category has maximum mean value (M=52.741) than others (21 and above years) teaching experience category (M=50.080), 0-4years teaching experience category (M=50.038) and 5-10 years teaching experience category (M=47.967) with the perception and belief of the main scale. Similarly, the impact of native language use in foreign language sub-category illustrates that 11- 20 years teaching experience category has maximum value (M=70.767) than others (21 and above years) teaching experience category (M=69.598), 0-4years teaching experience category (M=66.812) and 5-10 years teaching experience category (M=63.950). The third sub-category, which is the reasoning of L1 use in L2, indicates that 11-20 years teaching experience category has maximum mean value (M=42.655) than others (21 and above years) teaching experience category (M=42.081), 0-4 years teaching experience category (M=41.393) and 5-10 years teaching experience category (M=39.147). The atmosphere and situation of L1 use in the L2 teaching experience category, which is the fourth sub-category, indicate that 11-20 years teaching experience category has maximum mean value (M=45.634) than others (21 and above years) teaching experience category (M=43.955), 0-4years teaching experience category (M=42.500) and 5-10 years teaching experience category (M=41.614) The fifth and last sub-category which is the contribution of L1 use in L2 category which is strengthen the idea that 11-20 years teaching experience category has maximum mean value (M=33.160) than others (21 and above years) teaching experience category (M=31.350), 0-4 years teaching experience category (M=31.069) and 5-10 years teaching experience category (M=30.411).

### Discussions on the Findings

The answers to the research questions and the discussions on those answers are as under:

#### RQ: 01

Is there any effect of teachers' experience on the responses about L1 use in L2 teaching?

The experience of the teachers has the most important correlation with perceptions and beliefs of native language use in foreign language pedagogy. The next most remarkable correlation concerning teachers' teaching experience is with the sub-category of the impact of L1 use in L2 pedagogy. The most important correlation of teaching experience category (5-10 years) is with the sub-category of the impact of L1 use in L2 and in the same way, the same notable correlation is with the (11-20 years) teaching experience category (5-10 and 11-20 years) teaching experience categories have inversely proportional most important correlation with the reasoning of L1 use in L2. Similar teaching experience categories have a similar correlation with the atmosphere and situation of L1 use in L2. On the other side, comparison mean values of teachers' experience showed the highest compare mean value of (11-20 years) teaching experience category and the lowest was (5-10 years) teaching experience category, in case of perception and belief of L1 use in L2. Similar compare mean values were concluded in case of reasoning, situation, impact and role of L1 use in L2 sub-categories.

The questionnaire experience of the teacher was divided into four sub-categories, i.e. 0-4 years, 05-10 years, 11-20 years and others (21and above). The outcomes of the present study disclosed that the two sub-categories of teaching experience out of four categories such as 05-10 and 11-20 years) showed an important correlation with different main scale categories. It indicates that teachers who have experienced between 05 to 20 years keep the propensity to use L1 in L2 classrooms to discuss L2 grammar and its usage in a proper way. In a similar way, teachers from these two categories have the proclivity to use L1 to discuss quizzes, course policies, tests, attendance, and other assignments in an appropriate way.

## RQ: 02

What sort of attitude teachers employ on the use of L1 in the EFL classroom?

Results about teachers' opinions concerning the use of L1 in EFL pedagogy responses are in high and medium degree frequency. It clarifies that the teachers like to use L1 in the foreign language classroom. The findings of the present study showed that teachers keep highly positive feelings and opinions towards the use of L1 in EFL classroom. A similar kind of approach was offered by Burden (2001) with respect to teachers' views towards the use of L1 in L2 situation. The results of this study also bear a similarity to the research conducted by Schweers (1999) that showed that Arabic has a major and assisting role in teaching and learning English as a Foreign Language. The outcomes of this study disclosed that the teachers assumed the use of Urdu in the English classroom as necessary because of their students who had a very limited background in the English language. The results of the current study also indicated that letting teachers and their students use Urdu in EFL setting also helps them to encourage a positive attitude towards L2 learning, to lessen their classroom trauma, to help uneasy English classroom tasks and to discuss quizzes, tests and other relevant tasks in a proper way.

## Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

The findings of the current research have two inspiring interpretations. First but not least, it turns out that the teachers who contributed to the present study used too much and gave a really positive attitude towards the use of Urdu (L1) in English (L2) classroom, which is beneficial for the teachers and their teaching to some degree. Formerly, it was supposed that the use of L1 may or may not be a helping tool or a language obstacle. In general, responses to the statements described from the opted senior to junior teachers' mark that permitting native language in foreign language classrooms is useful in Pakistani context as exiling mother tongue from English class will negatively have an impact on their apprehension of foreign language. Although, the main goal should remain the use of the English Language and therefore, teachers should be aware of the maximum use of Urdu only to aid their teaching and learning activities. Additionally, it is also accounted that it is much simple for teachers to

use L1 not only as a helpful teaching technique to tackle difficult idea or circumstance but as the main medium of instruction. In an L2 classroom, this type of activity might be proved devastating both for teachers and their learners. So, it can be concluded that L2 should be the key language to be used in the foreign language classroom, from the above discussion, however, with the lean and prudent use of L1 in some situations.

## Contribution/Originality of the Study

Since this study tried to divulge the influence of teachers' experience on the responses about mother tongue use in foreign language teaching at Degree level in the Southern Punjab, its implication and contribution stemmed from the following considerations:

- The current study is significant since it displays and determines whether teachers are prepared to take and use L1 (Urdu) L2 classroom.
- Information from this research regarding L2 teachers' attitudes toward using L1 motivates the most experienced teachers in an L2 classroom.
- The current study would favour curriculum planners in designing suitable syllabi to make L2 teaching more effective in the context of Pakistan.

## Limitations of the Study and Research Gaps

A number of constraints were perceived in the wake of conducting this research, and research ruptures were produced as revealed below:

- The current study was limited to survey the influence of teachers' experience on the responses about native language use in teaching English as L2 at degree level. Divergent to this in future studies, sub-campuses of the public sector universities, private universities and colleges can also be incorporated for enhanced understanding of the research problem.
- The present study was performed at public colleges/universities of Southern Punjab. Contrary to this approach, in future, this research statement can be prolonged to the other three provinces of Pakistan for the convincing perspective of the conception.

- The sample of this study consists of male and female English language teachers teaching at college and university level, but in the near future, researches on this topic

can be executed on school teachers as well so that an all-inclusive outlook and opinion of the target population can be drawn.

## References

- Al-jadidi, Husna Suleiman S. (2009). I was teaching English as a foreign language in Oman: an exploration of English Language teaching pedagogy in tertiary education. PhD thesis, Victoria University.
- Anton, M., & DiCamilla, F. J. (1999). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 233-247.
- Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL*, 4, 50-70.
- Beale, J. (2002). Is communicative language teaching a thing of the Past? *TESOL*, 37(1), 12-16. Retrieved on September, 06th, 2008 on the World Wide Web: [http://www.jasonbeal.essaypages/ clt \\_essay.html](http://www.jasonbeal.essaypages/ clt _essay.html)
- Carless, D. (2008). Student use of the mother tongue in the task-based classroom. *ELT journal* 62(4): 331-338.
- Chavez, M. (2003). The diglossic foreign-language classroom: Learner's views on L1 and L2 functions. In C. Blyth (Ed.) *The sociolinguistics of foreign-language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native, and the non-native speaker. Issues in Language Program Direction, a Series of Annual Reports* (pp. 163-208). Boston, *Thomson and Heinle*.
- Cole, S. (1998). The Use of L1 in Communicative English Classroom. *The Language Teacher*, 22(12), 11- 13.
- Cook, V. (2001). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: *Oxford University Press*.
- Cook, V. (2005). Basing teaching on the L2 user. In E. Llorca, (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 47-61). New York: *Springer*.
- Cook, V. (2008). *Second language learning and language teaching* (4th Ed.). London: *Hodder Education*.
- Duff, P., & Polio C. (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. *The Canadian Modern Language*, 63(2), 275-292.
- Elmetwally, E. E. (2012). Students' and teachers' attitudes toward the use of learners' mother tongue in English language classrooms in UAE public high schools. Unpublished Master's Thesis, The British University in Dubai, UAE.
- ElrIDGE, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 50(4), 303-311.
- Johnson, K. E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Reading Behaviour*, 24(1).
- Kangas, S. (1981). *Bilingualism or not*, Bank House, 8a Hill Road, Clevedon, Avon BS21 7HH, England.
- Kouritzin, S. G. (2000). Bringing life to research: life history research and ESL. *TESL Canada Journal*, 17(2)
- Lanvers, Ursula & Hamers, Josine & Blanc, Michael. (2001). Bilinguality and Bilingualism. *The Modern Language Review*. 96. 1172. 10.2307/3735982.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' code switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 531-548.
- Maniruzzaman, M. (2003). 'The use of mother tongue in the EFL classroom: learner's reaction.' *Harvest: Jahangirnagar Studies in Literature*, 18.
- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), pp. 1-8.
- Qi, D. S. (1998). An inquiry into language-switching in second language composing processes. *The Canadian Modern Language*, 54(3), 413-435.
- Rahman, S. (2006). *Speech Repertoires in Bangladesh: Monolingual or Multilingual, in ELT in Bangladesh: a Socio-psychological Study of Public and Private Universities in Dhaka*, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Jawaharlal Nehru University. *India*.
- Schweers, W. Jr. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 37(2), 6 - 9.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (1999). Instruction, first language influence, and developmental readiness in second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(1), 1-22.

- Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 760-770.
- Tang, J. (2002) Using L1 in the English Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 40, 36-43. <http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol40/no1/p36.pdf>
- Turnbull, M. & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' use of the target language and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204-218.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but... *The Canadian Modern Language*, 57(4), 531-540.
- Wells, G. (1998). Using L1 to master L2: A response to Antón and DiCamilla's, socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classrooms'. *The Canadian Modern Language*, 54(3), 343-353.