CrossMark | Cite Us

Exploring the Influence of Teachers' and Students' Mother Tongue on the Use of National Language in L2 Teaching/Learning

Muhammad Ahsan * | Muhammad Saeed Nasir † | Tahira Asgher ‡

Abstract: *The purpose of the current study was to explore the influence of teachers' and students' mother tongue on the use of national language in L2 teaching and learning. For a comprehensive understanding of the issue, the study focused on 156 teachers and the 577 students who were teaching and learning English at graduation level in different public sector colleges and universities of Southern Punjab. Two questionnaires were used for data collection. The data were analyzed through SPSS (statistical package for social sciences). Data were analyzed using descriptive analysis, Analysis of variance (ANOVA), T-Test and Cronbach's alpha. The results of the study indicated that the teachers who have Saraiki as their mother tongue have a high inclination toward the use of it in their classroom setting due to the socio-cultural factor such as their multilingual aptitude and their emotional attachment with their mother tongue.*

Key Words: First Language, Second Language, National Language, Motivation, Education

Introduction

One of the main theoretical issues that have dominated the field of second language learning for decades is the use of L1 when teaching/learning L2. This issue has been divisive, and a number of contrasting and supporting arguments have been raised. "Don't ban mother tongue use but encourage attempts to use the target language" (Willis, 1996). This is one of the supporting views that call for reviewing the role of L1 in L2 classrooms. This voice supports many other researchers' voices that support re-establish the role of L1 in L2 classrooms after its use has been proscribed for many years. The only use of English in English language classrooms has been an issue of considerable discussion. Several students and teachers are calling for reviewing the role of students' and teachers' first language (L1) in L2

classrooms where students and teachers most likely share the same L1. The use of student's mother tongue is a debatable topic in English language teaching/learning. Use or not to use L1 has been argued since the realization of the Direct Method of teaching English in the 20th century. This approach has a significant effect on the way English is taught until today. However, the prohibition of L1 started to be questioned by numerous researchers and calls for real pedagogical rationalization. At one end of the scale are those who consider the importance of L1 use in the target language classroom, and on the other end are those who vindicate its proscription. Regardless of L1 being proscribed in L2 settings, teachers might occasionally use it, which directs to differences in their teaching method and

* Lecturer, Department of English, Ghazi University Dera Ghazi Khan, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: mahsan@gudgk.edu.pk

† Lecturer, Department of English, Emerson University Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.

‡ Assistant Professor, Department of English Linguistics, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.

Global Educational Studies Review

GESR

approach. This lack of an approach that unifies and deals with the use of L1 is leaving teachers bewildered about the contexts in which L1 may be constructive for teaching/ learning. As a result, it is central to address the question of using L1 in L2 classrooms in order to evade confusion in teaching/learning approaches and to make sure L1 is not used greatly. In Pakistan, English language teachers are greatly confused about when to use students' L1 in the L2 classroom. They lack a comprehensive approach that provides them with how, when, and why to use L1 in the English language classroom.

As it has been argued that the success of L2 acquisition heavily relies on keeping it separate from the first language (Cook, 2008), others (Brown, 2000, Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003) have witnessed that students' first language plays a primary role in second language learning as well as in its use. Turnbull (2001) argues that the "use of L1 and L2 should be seen as harmonizing, depending on the characteristics and stages of the language learning process". The efficacy of students' first language has been suggested in the literature as a tool to facilitate the early stages of L2 learning and knowledge. For instance, Nation (2003) argues that using L1 in L2 atmosphere "can have incredibly positive effects on teaching/ learning". Yet Cook (2001) argues that L1 is not something to be utilized in teaching but to be set aside. In this line of action, Cook believes that L1 shouldn't be used at any time in L2 classrooms. Although Turnbull (2001) encourages the use of L1, he argues that its disproportionate use has negative impacts on students; and teachers' L2 learning and fears that allowing teachers to use L1 in l2 classrooms "will lead to an overuse of the L1 by many teachers. The fact that some part of the literature encourages the use of L1 in L2 classrooms while some part of the literature discourages its use as it is confusing to teachers and students. As a result, teachers are not utterly aware of whether they should use their students' L1 or not. Within this context, the current research commences with an attempt to find out the influence of teachers' and students' mother tongue on the use of national language in L2 teaching/learning.

Historical Perspective of the Study

The 16th century has witnessed that Latin was commonly used in Europe as the language of commerce, religion and education. The focal point was mainly on teaching grammar rather than on communication; consequently, translation was the main source of teaching. For the comprehensive understanding of grammar, students were endowed with lists of words to translate sentences. This teaching method was named the Grammar-Translation Method (Byram, 2000). In the mid of the 19th century, foreign language teaching received more consideration and developed a lot, particularly through some renowned persons such as Marcel (1793-1896), Prendergast (1806- 1886) and Gouin (1831-1896). Their period was known later as the Pre-Reform Movement (Howatt, 2004). They considered this concept as the similarity between first language acquisition by children and second language learning by adults. Alternatively, first language acquisition was the replica for learning a second language. For that reason, translation was thought of as the foundation of confusion and was substituted by pictures and gestures. The end of the 19th was characterized by the appearance of the Reform Movement, whose endeavour was to develop some new language teaching principles (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). The use of L1 in teaching a foreign language grew to be a controversial matter among reformers. Some of them viewed that integrating two languages would not help students to reach fluency; consequently, learners should use their mental capabilities to comprehend the meaning of the new language. Contrary to it, other reformers high lightened the importance of L1, especially when introducing unfamiliar items (Howatt, 2004). The demand for new teaching methods amplified. One of the pioneers who advocated the exclusion of L1 was J.S. Blackie (Hawkins, 1981). He advocated his philosophy of learning words through the association directly with objects and thinking in L1 should be proscribed. This innovative method was identified as the Direct Method. The principle behind this method was that learners acquire their L2 directly in the same way as children acquire their L1 (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). The fact is that this method was an addition to Gouin and his contemporaries' Natural View towards Language Learning (Brown, 2001). Soon after it, another method named the Audio-lingual Method

emerged, and this method also emphasized the proscription of the use of L1. This method viewed the target language and native language as two diverse systems that should not be connected, so merely L2 should be used (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Brooks (1964) stated a variety of characteristics of this method. For example, Learners had to learn through repetition and memorizing; for this reason, listening and speaking were introduced prior to reading and writing. In addition, learning should take place without referring to L1. The idea that L2 should be expanded with no reference to L1 is known as language compartmentalization, and the interpretation behind this principle is to avoid L1 interference (Cook, 2001). Numerous language theorists and researchers have put their focus on L2. Krashen (1981), for example, maintained that intelligible input provides opportunities for unintentional and implicit learning, which guides to attaining language competence. In this regard, the dominance of L2 may point out prohibiting L1 in the classroom (Macaro, 1997). In response to this argument, Swain (2000) broadens this concept to incorporate output as an issue leading to language competence. She highlighted the significance of engaging learners in shared dialogues in which learners construct language. This production helps learners to observe and assess their progress. Although the role of L1 in social communication is not discussed by Swain (2000), it appears that L2 output is the utmost result of the concept of interaction. Classroom communication in L2 has been encouraged to offer learners a naturally communicative atmosphere (Cook, 2001). In accordance with preceding thoughts, Halliwell and Jones (1991) assert that using L2 as a practical and normal means of communication is promising. To attain success in learning L2, learners should be optimistic about taking risks in practising equally speaking and understanding in L2. According to Halliwell and Jones (1991), the reason is that learners can realize the message even when they do not know the accurate meaning of words or structures; this viewpoints to that learners do not require comprehending all the words they hear as long as they are able to understand the message. Correspondingly, Macdonald (1993) considers that the centre of attention on L2 can improve communication and stimulate both conscious and unconscious learning. It also generates confident learners and challenges them to communicate with others through their restricted language. Macdonald's suggestion to teachers is, "If you get stuck in the middle of a lesson, strive to communicate your message through other ways, such as mime or demonstration" (Macdonald, 1993). This directs to the question: What if miming and demonstrations do not work for some reason? Methods and opinions which are discussed preceding call for avoiding L1 rely on two most important weak suppositions, as recognized by Cook (2001). The first proposition is the resemblance between L1 and L2 learning processes, and the second supposition is that learning L1 and L2 is a separate procedure. Both the suppositions are talked about methodically in the subsequent part.

The Limitation of the Theory of Banning L1 use in L2 Classroom

A good number of the people who are against the use of L1 are of the view that language learning by adults is parallel to language attainment by children, and the cause is that both L1 kids and L2 learners do not contain any prior comprehension regarding the new language. Yet, one drawback with this view is that it does not care about the differences which have been recognized between learning L1 and L2 (Cook, 2001). In this regard, Bley-Vroman (1990) offers a comprehensive justification of five fundamental distinctions between L1 achievement by kids and L2 learning by young learners. Initially, children's intrinsic aptitude to get their L1 fades away in adults. Secondly, young learners mostly depend on their L1 while learning L2, contrasting to kids who do not have preceding knowledge of their mother language. Thirdly, unlike children, young learners' exposure to L2 is not satisfactory because language input is restrained to being in a learning atmosphere and situation such as schools. Furthermore, kids are facilitated by some social factors at the same time as motivation and personal situations that adults not have. In conclusion, in spite of learners' difficulties when learning, they perform, of course, have more mature cognitive abilities. Bley- Vroman (1990) puts an argument that these variations between young L2 learners and offspring may possibly give an explanation why young L2 learners frequently cannot attain fluency. In the same way, Macaro (1997) indicates some more learning differences between L1 children and L2 learners. Macron affirms that the learning of L2 by the young

learners combines both conscious and unconscious processes for the reason that mature L2 learners can apply highly developed techniques when learning L2. Although L2 learners may find it hard to construct all the new language sounds properly and achieve oral competence, they are more capable of expressing themselves by applying non-verbal communicative approaches. Lastly, as an L1 child is usually corrected by his/her parents in a natural situation, whereas L2 learners get their response from their teachers in L2 classrooms, and it is also likely that they may feel uncomfortable and hesitant to produce L2 in front of their fellows. Bearing in mind the children who learn L2, it could be hard to assume that their L2 learning is parallel to their L1 achievement. It has also been supposed that kids can learn L2 better than adults. This conviction is correlated with the Critical Period Hypothesis, which declares that effective L2 learning takes place before the teenage years (Cameron, 2001). On the other hand, studies are required to support this assumption (Cameron, 2001). The resemblance between L1 and L2 learning amongst children has been challenged in research conducted by Kim Y. Y. (1997), which established that kids utilize different mental activities as they use diverse parts of the brain to make active and bring to mind the new language. Furthermore, to Kim Y. Y. (1997) research, it has been initiated that applying first language learning strategies to L2 learning may not lead to accomplishment, so children are required to pay consideration when learning a different language (Cameron, 2001).

One more negative aspect of the perception and belief of prohibition of L1, as acknowledged by Cook (2001), is that it considers learning L1 and L2 as two separate processes, as surrounded in the Audio-lingual Method. This outlook may point out that language learning is coordinate; consequently, the composite type of learning is abandoned (Cook, 2001). In the1950's, two types of bilingualism were acknowledged: coordinate bilingualism, which separated L1 from L2 and compound bilingualism, which related L1 and L2 (Stern, 1992). As a result of this distinction, two types of learning strategies have been proposed: the intra-lingual and intra-cultural strategies that focus on using L2 only and the cross-lingual and cross-cultural strategies that permit using L1 in L2 learning (Stern, 1992). On the contrary, Stern (1992) stated that L1 is measured as a facilitator for

learning L2. In other words, comparing the two languages may, in fact, assist learning procedures. On the subject of the relationship between the two languages, certain empirical studies have established that the Contrastive Analysis Approach, which is built on drawing learners' consideration to similarities and differences between L1 and L2 and could facilitate learning L2 (e.g. Kupferberg, 1999; Ghabanchi and Vosooghi, 2006). But, as Stern (1992) suggests, the aim beyond learning L2 determines which kind of the preceding strategies a learner can follow. If that means it is developing and increasing communicative skills, intra-lingual approaches will be used. Similarly, if the translation is the aim, cross-lingual strategies will be followed. Because the division of the first language and L2 has been made in an endeavour to avoid L1 interference, it was established that L1 transfer could develop language teaching (Cook, 2001). Consequently, the arguments for discouraging L1 in L2 classrooms, point out above, have not provided strong data for avoiding L1, nor have clear reasons for banning L1 been acknowledged (Macaro, 2001). As a result, a number of teaching methods and approaches encouraging the exercise of L1 as an accommodating teaching and learning tool have materialized. The rationale of this research is to analyze the influence of teachers' mother tongue on the use of national language in L2 teaching and to explore the impact of students' mother tongue on the use of national language in L2 learning.

Research Questions

- What is the influence of teachers' mother tongue on the use of national language in L2 teaching in EFL classroom at degree level?
- What is the impact of students' mother tongue on the use of national language in L2 learning in the foreign language classroom?

Methods and Materials

The objective of the present study was to the influence of teachers' and students' mother tongue on the use of L1 in L2 teaching/learning at degree level. For this purpose, questionnaires were used as the main research tool. The research was designed to use a mixed-method type. The selected sites of this study were government

colleges and universities located in the home division of the researcher and two other divisions like Multan and Bahawalpur, so it would be considered easy to build a good connection with the respondents. One hundred fifty-six teachers and 577 college and university students participated in the current study. With a view to determining the subjects' judgment, the researcher constructed Students' and teachers' questionnaires as the last data collection technique used in this study. These two questionnaires were developed from the studies by Elmetwally (2012), Husna Suleiman Al-Jadidi (2009), Maniruzzaman (2003) and Rahman (2006)

as models with slight modification on the grounds of the researcher's personal seven years of teaching experience and these few adaptations and modifications 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 product of my own readings in the literature, joint with my own manifestations and understanding of the subject.

Students Responses Analysis

Table 1. Reliability of the Scale = .939

Scale Category	Reliability
Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.805
Impact of L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy	0..742
The reasoning of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.764
Situation & Atmosphere of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.825
Contribution of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.869

Table 2. Showing Frequency of Students' Reported on Overall Scale of L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy

	No. of students	Mean	SD
Overall scale L1 Use	577	3.47	0.71

In table 2 descriptive statistics indicated that the participants responded to a High degree of L1 use

in L2 learning but overall, near to the medium having the value (M=3.47, SD=0.71).

Table 3. Showing Frequency of Students' Reported on Five Categories of Scale

Scale Categories	No. of students	Mean	SD	Frequency of Category
Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2	577	3.44	0.51	Medium
Impact of L1 use in L2	577	3.41	0.55	High
The reasoning of L1 use in L2	577	3.39	0.54	Medium
Situation & Atmosphere of L1 use in L2	577	3.53	0.53	High
Contribution of L1 use in L2	577	3.57	0.61	High

Table 3 showing all five scale categories in the present study were used as High to medium range. The most preferred category reported was Contribution of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy (M=3.57, SD=0.61), Situations of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy

(M=3.53, SD=0.53), Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy (M=3.44, SD=0.51), Impact of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy (M=3.41 SD=0.55) and the medium Reasoning of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy (M=3.39, SD=0.54).

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage of Mother Tongue of the Students

Mother Tongue	Frequency	Percentage
Urdu	168	29.1
Punjabi	65	11.3
Saraiki	322	55.8

Mother Tongue	Frequency	Percentage
Others (Blochi, Pushto & Rangri)	22	3.8
Total	577	100.0

Table 4 displays data on the subject of frequency and percentage of the mother tongue of the students. In this category, the collected data was segregated into four sub-categories, i.e., Urdu, Punjabi, Saraiki and other languages (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri). In the first sub-category, 168 students responded to their mother tongue as Urdu, which was 29.1% of 577 participants. In the second sub-category, 65 respondents replied their mother tongue as Punjabi, and it was 11.3% of the total number. The third sub-category showed 322 participants who spoke Saraiki, which was 55.8% of the total population. The fourth sub-category was the combination of Bloch, Pashto and Rangri languages, and 22 students responded to these languages as their mother tongue, and this was 3.8% of the total selected population.

Table 5. Showing Mean Comparison of Students' Mother Tongue with Five Categories

Mother's tongue		Perception	Impact	Reasoning	Situation	Contribution
Urdu	Mean	71.1642	43.0531	37.8457	42.2940	46.2942
	N	168	168	168	168	168
	Std. Deviation	11.12848	7.41740	6.94159	8.38439	9.05078
Punjabi	Mean	68.6343	44.2055	36.4846	40.0544	45.6923
	N	65	65	65	65	65
	Std. Deviation	16.23856	9.21539	8.67170	8.79788	10.38233
Saraiki	Mean	73.1111	44.9148	37.9332	43.2664	46.8321
	N	322	322	322	322	322
	Std. Deviation	11.25582	7.54756	7.56078	8.18538	9.63292
Others	Mean	75.6839	46.4091	39.3561	43.3776	47.5877
	N	22	22	22	22	22
	Std. Deviation	8.77578	7.69250	7.51432	7.65882	11.24798
Total	Mean	72.1380	44.3498	37.7988	42.6256	46.5759
	N	577	577	577	577	577
	Std. Deviation	11.88652	7.75399	7.51935	8.33597	9.60414

Table 5 explains the results of the mean comparison of students' mother tongue with the five sub-categories. The perception and belief of L1 use L2 sub-category indicate that other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) has maximum mean value (M=75.683) than Saraiki language category (M=73.111), Urdu language category (M=71.164) and Punjabi language category (M=68.634). Similarly, the impact of L1 use in the L2 sub-category shows that other languages (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) category has maximum value (M=46.409) than Saraiki language category (M=44.914), Punjabi language category (M=44.205) and Urdu language category (M= 43.053). The third sub-category, which is the reasoning of L1 use in L2, reveals those other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) has maximum value (M=39.356) than Saraiki language category (M=37.933), Urdu language category (M=37.845) and Punjabi language category (M=36.484). The atmosphere and situation of L1 use in L2 category which is the fourth sub-category indicate that other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) also has the maximum value (M=43.377) than Saraiki language category (M=43.266), Urdu language category (M=42.294) and Punjabi language category (M=40.054). The fifth and last sub-category, which is the 'Contribution of L1 use in L2' category, also support the idea that other languages (Bloch,

Pushto and Rangri) category carries the maximum value (M=47.587) than Saraiki language category (M= 46.832), Urdu language category (M= 46.294) and Punjabi language category (M=45.692.

Teachers Responses Analysis

Table 6. 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
The 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 7. Showing Frequency of Teachers' Reported on Overall Scale of L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy

	No. of teachers	Mean	SD
Overall scale L1 Use	156	3.30	0.53

In the table, 7 the descriptive statistics indicated that the participants responded to a Medium degree of L1 use in L2 learning (M=3.30, SD=0.53).

Table 8. Showing Analysis of Variance ANOVA of Teachers' Mother Tongue with Five Categories

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Perception	Between Groups	133.414	3	44.471	.348	.791
	Within Groups	19441.591	152	127.905		
	Total	19575.005	155			
Impact	Between Groups	879.370	3	293.123	2.226	.087
	Within Groups	20014.691	152	131.676		
	Total	20894.061	155			
Reasoning	Between Groups	562.789	3	187.596	3.758	.012
	Within Groups	7588.681	152	49.926		
	Total	8151.470	155			
Situation & Atmosphere	Between Groups	250.237	3	83.412	1.252	.293
	Within Groups	10125.417	152	66.615		
	Total	10375.654	155			
Contribution	Between Groups	344.370	3	114.790	2.755	.045
	Within Groups	6334.166	152	41.672		
	Total	6678.536	155			

Table 8 demonstrates the analysis of variance (ANOVA) of teachers' mother tongue with respect to five main scale categories. It reveals findings of the ANOVA with relation to respondents (teachers) of this study. The interaction of teachers' mother tongue with the sub-categories of the main scale category reveals a statistically non-significant correlation of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 with F= .348 and P=.791, Impact of L1 use in L2 with F=2.226 and P=.087 but Reasoning of L1 use in L2 with F=3.758 and P=.012 showed statistically highly significant. The fourth

sub-category, Situation and Atmosphere of L1 use in L2 with F=1.252 and P=.293, showed statistically non-significant. On the other hand, the fifth sub-category, which is the Contribution of L1 use in L2 with F= 2.755 and P=.045, showed statistically significance.

Table 9. Showing ANOVA Result Compare Mean Teachers' Mother Tongue Wise

		Perception	**Impact**	**Reasoning**	**Situation**	**Contribution**
Urdu	Mean	49.0704	64.3189	38.8508	41.7186	29.8697
	N	66	66	66	66	66
	Std. Deviation	11.13711	1.23854E1	6.97111	7.72964	5.99846
Punjabi	Mean	49.6776	66.3457	41.0627	42.3386	31.4259
	N	27	27	27	27	27
	Std. Deviation	13.18075	1.42846E1	8.36102	10.32754	8.09133
Saraiki	Mean	50.5613	68.6893	42.3507	43.8838	32.0508
	N	59	59	59	59	59
	Std. Deviation	10.73369	8.61213	6.52094	7.50812	6.12323
Others	Mean	45.7059	74.9167	47.2885	47.7500	37.9750
	N	4	4	4	4	4
	Std. Deviation	7.74537	1.20641E1	6.97682	8.14776	6.28510

Table 9 shows ANOVA mean results of Teachers' mother tongue wise. It illustrates that the Saraiki language category has a maximum mean value (M=50.561) than Punjabi language category (M=49.677), Urdu language category (M=49.070) and other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri)

(M=45.705). Similarly, the impact of L1 use in the L2 sub-category shows that other languages (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) category has maximum value (M=74.916) than Saraiki language category (M=68.689), Punjabi language category (M=66.345) and Urdu language category (M= 64.318). The third sub-category, which is the reasoning of L1 use in L2, reveals those other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) has maximum value (M=47.288) than Saraiki language category (M=42.350), Punjabi language category (M=41.062) and Urdu language category (M=38.850). The situation and atmosphere of L1 use in the L2 category, which is the fourth sub-category, indicates that other languages (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) also has the maximum value (M=47.750) than Saraiki language category (M=43.883), Punjabi language category (M=42.338) and Urdu language category (M=41.718). The fifth and last sub-category, which is the 'Contribution of L1 use in L2' category, also strengthens the idea that other languages (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) category carries the maximum value (M=37.975) than Saraiki language category (M= 32.050), Punjabi language category (M= 31.425) and Urdu language category (M=29.869).

Discussions on the Results of the Study

The answers to the research questions and the discussion on those answers are as under.

RQ 1: What is the influence of teachers' mother tongue on the use of national language in L2 teaching in EFL classroom at degree level?

Teachers' Mother Tongue

Statistically, the most significant correlation of teachers' mother tongue was found with the reasoning of national language/L1 use in L2 and the same correlation was found in the contribution of L1 use in L2. On the other hand, in the case of the rest of the three sub-categories, i.e. perception and belief, impact and situation, the non-significant correlation was found. Urdu mother tongue in case of impact of L1 use in L2 revealed statistically inversely significant correlation, and Saraiki mother tongue showed statistically significant directly proportional correlation with Urdu mother tongue. The rest of the mother tongues in case of impact of L1 use in L2 showed statistically non-significant correlation. Similarly, a non-significant correlation was found in the case of reasoning of L1 use in L2. In the case of a contribution of L1 use in L2, the Urdu mother tongue indicated a statistically significant inverse correlation with other mother tongues, i.e., Balochi, Pushto and Rangri. Conversely, all other correlations were statistically non-significant compare to means of

mother tongue. The research findings indicated that the teachers showed a highly positive attitude toward the use of L1 in L2 classroom with respect to 'reasoning and contribution sub-categories', and this correlation is the most significant. It signifies that teacher are highly encouraged toward the use of L1 due to certain reasons. It's possible that they want to employ L1 because they think that English language learners are more motivated if their mother tongue is used in the classroom. Another reason could be that the teachers want to use L1 as students are more inspired when their mother tongue is used in pair/small-group work and translation activities. This study is consistent with the study of Cook (2005), Auerbach (1993), Cole (1998), Schweers (1999) and Wigglesworth (2003) as their findings also indicated that L1 carries weight in translation practices, explanation of difficult concepts, classroom management and building rapport among students pair work in and outside classroom activities.

RQ 2: What is the impact of students' mother tongue on the use of national language in L2 learning in the foreign language classroom?

Students' Mother Tongue

Statistically, the most significant correlation of students' mother tongue was found with perception and belief of national language/L1 use in L2 and the same correlation was found with the impact of L1 use in L2. But 'reasoning' of L1 use in L2 showed a statistically non-significant correlation. Conversely, the fourth sub-category, situation and atmosphere of L1 use in L2, showed the most significant correlation statistically. On the other hand, the fifth and the last sub-category, which is the contribution of L1 use in L2, showed a statistically non-significant correlation. Results of the sub-categories of 'perception/belief and impact' of L1 use in L2 revealed that students showed highly positive attitudes regarding L1 use in their EFL classrooms. The findings of the research indicated that the students revealed a highly positive attitude toward the use of L1 in L2 classroom with respect to 'perception/belief and impact' of L1 use in L2 sub-categories' and this correlation is the most significant as the students are prompted to use L1 to become more proficient in English language and literature. Similarly, they were highly motivated to use Urdu while

comprehending summaries and short questions, letter writing and paraphrasing the text in BA/BSc and B. Com courses.

Correlation between Teachers' and Students' Variable (Mother Tongue) and National Language (Urdu) use in L2

Compare Mean of Teachers' Mother Tongue

In the case of perception and belief of L1 use in L2, Saraiki mother tongue showed the highest mean value and the other languages category, i.e. Balochi, Pushto and Rangri, showed the lowest mean value and similarly, the impact of L1 use in the L2 sub-category showed that other languages (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) category showed the highest mean value and the lowest mean value was found in the Urdu mother tongue category and the similar mean value correlation was found in case of sub-categories such as reasoning, situation and contribution of L1 use in L2 pedagogy. The findings of the study indicated that the teachers who have Saraiki as their mother tongue have a high inclination toward the use of it in their classroom setting due to the socio-cultural factor such as their multilingual aptitude and their emotional attachment with their mother tongue. On the other hand, other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) showed the lowest mean value. The reason for this low mean value could be the very few respondents. Contrary to this, the impact' of L1 use in L2 sub-categories revealed that teachers from the 'other' languages category have positive attitudes in their English classroom but teachers having Urdu as their mother tongue are not willing to use their mother tongue while teaching English.

Compare Mean of Students' Mother Tongue

In the case of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) indicated the highest mean value, and the Punjabi mother tongue showed the lowest mean value. Similarly, the impact of L1 use in the L2 sub-category shows that other languages (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) category signified the highest mean value, and the Urdu mother tongue indicated the lowest mean value. The third sub-category, the reasoning of L1 use in L2, reveals those other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) has the highest mean value and Punjabi mother tongue indicated the lowest mean value. The situation and atmosphere of L1 use in the L2

category indicate that other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) has the highest mean value and Punjabi mother tongue has the lowest mean value. The fifth and last sub-category, which is the 'Contribution of L1 use in L2, shows that other languages (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) category carries the highest mean value and Punjabi mother tongue showed the lowest mean value.

Results about the use of students' mother tongue revealed that the native speakers of Balochi, Pushto and Rangri are highly motivated and desirous of using their mother tongues in their EFL classroom and the possible reason behind this intention was their poor schooling and low proficiency level in L2. Contrary to it, Urdu speakers are highly discouraged from using their mother tongue in L2 classroom as they want to attain high proficiency level in L2. Similarly, findings of the study also indicated that the students who have Balochi, Pushto and Rangri languages as their mother tongue in the second sub-category are highly motivated and have a high tendency toward the use of their mother tongue in their L2 classroom setting due to the socio-cultural factors such as their limited access to the quality education, their restricted aptitude toward English language and their emotional attachment with their mother tongues. On the other hand, native speakers of the Punjabi language are highly dispirited to use their mother tongue in L2 classroom as they want to attain maximum exposure and high proficiency level in L2. The same results are repeated in the sub-category 'contribution' of L1 use in L2. Similarly, Macdonald (1993) believes that the focus on L2 can improve communication and set in motion both mindful and unconscious learning. Moreover, it creates confident learners and challenges them to communicate with others through their restricted language.

Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

Primarily, it becomes visible from the findings of the study indicated that the teachers who have Saraiki as their mother tongue have a high inclination toward the use of it in their classroom setting due to the socio-cultural factor such as their multilingual aptitude and their emotional attachment with their mother tongue. On the other hand, other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) showed the lowest mean

value. The reason for this low mean value could be the very few respondents. Contrary to this, the impact' of L1 use in L2 sub-categories revealed that teachers from the 'other' languages category have positive attitudes in their English classroom but teachers having Urdu as their mother tongue are not willing to use their mother tongue while teaching English. Secondly, results of the second category indicated that the students who have Balochi, Pushto and Rangri languages as their mother tongue in the second sub-category are highly motivated and have a high tendency toward the use of their mother tongue in their L2 classroom setting due to the socio-cultural factors such as their limited access to the quality education, their restricted aptitude toward English language and their emotional attachment with their mother tongues. On the other hand, native speakers of the Punjabi language are highly dispirited to use their mother tongue in L2 classroom as they want to attain maximum exposure and high proficiency level in L2. The same results are repeated in the sub-category 'contribution' of L1 use in L2.

Contribution/Originality of the Study

This study attempted to explore the influence of teachers' and students' mother tongue on the use of L1 in L2 teaching/learning at degree level in the three Divisions of Southern Punjab. Its significance stemmed from the following considerations:

- The current study is original since it shows and determines whether teachers' and students' mother tongue impact the use of L1 in L2 teaching/learning in EFL classrooms.
- The current study would assist curriculum developers in designing appropriate syllabi to make EFL teaching and learning more beneficial in the Pakistani context.
- The influence of teachers' and students' mother tongue on the use of L1 in L2 teaching/learning contributes to students' and teachers' prospective expansion of meaning.

Limitations of the Study and Research Gaps

- The present study was just limited to find out the influence of teachers' and students' mother tongue on the use of L1 in L2 teaching/learning at degree level. But in

future researches on this theme can be applied to school going L2 beginners and their instructors concurrently for the striking views of the marked inhabitants.

- This study was conducted only at the Government colleges and universities of Southern Punjab. Contrary to this, in future studies, sub-campuses of the government sector universities, schools, private universities, their sub-campuses, schools and colleges can also be combined for enhanced understanding of the topic.

References

Al-jadidi, H. S. (2009). Teaching English as a foreign language in Oman: an exploration of English Language teaching pedagogy in tertiary education. PhD thesis, *Victoria University.*

Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. TESOL, 4, 50-70.

Bley-Vroman, R. (1990). The logical problem of foreign language learning. *Linguistic Analysis, 20*(1-2), 3-49.

Brown, H. (2000). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. Longman: *San Francisco.*

Brown, J. D. (2001). Using surveys in language programs. New York*: Cambridge University Press.*

Brooks, N. H. (1964). Language and language learning: theory and practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Byram, M. ed., (2000). The Routledge encyclopedia of language teaching and learning. London: *Routledge Publications.*

Cameron, L. (2001). Teaching languages to young learners. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press.*

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. Llurda, (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.

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.

Ghabanchi, Z., & Vosooghi, M. (2006). The role of explicit contrastive instruction in learning difficult L2 grammatical forms: a cross-linguistic approach to language awareness. *The Reading Matrix, 6*(2), 144-153.

Halliwell, S., & Jones, B. (1991). On target teaching in the target language. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Howatt, A. P. R. (2004). A History of English Language Teaching. Oxford: *Oxford University Press.*

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).

Kim, Y. Y. (1997). Communicating with strangers: An Approach to Intercultural Communication (3rd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill. One of the most up-to-date and comprehensive attempts at a fully-articulated theory of intercultural communication.

Krashen, S. (1981). Second language acquisition and second language learning. Oxford: *Pergamon*.

Kupferberg, I. (1999). The cognitive turn of contrastive analysis: empirical evidence. *Language Awareness, 8*(3-4), p. 210-222.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. 2nd ed. Oxford: *Oxford University Press.*

Macaro, E. (1997). Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' code switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *Modern Language Journal, 85*, 531-548.

Macdonald, C. (1993). Using the target language. Cheltenham: Mary Glasgow.

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.

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.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). Approaches and methods in language

teaching. New York: *Cambridge University Press*.

Schweers, W. J. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 Classroom. English Teaching Forum, 37(2), 6 - 9.

Stern, H. H. (1992). Issues and Options in 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.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: the uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research,* 4(3), 251-274.

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.

Wigglesworth, G. (2003). The Role of the First Language in the Second Language Classroom: Friend or Foe. *English Teaching,* 57(1), 17- 32.

Willis, J. (1996). A Framework for Task-Based Learning. New York: *Longman Publications.*