

# MEKELLE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND  
HUMANITIES DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH  
LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

**Thesis on: Investigating English Teachers and Students Use of Tigrigna  
Language in English Classes of Ras Alula Aba Nega Secondary School Grade  
10 in Focus**

***BY: GEBREMEDHIN G/EGZIABHER***

**SUBMITTED TO: MESFN EYOB (DR.)**

**JUNE, 2017 E.C**

**MEKELLE, ETHIOPIA**

**MEKELLE UNIVERISTY**

**COLLEGE OF SCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE**

**Investigating English Teachers and Students use of Tigrigna Language in  
English Classes of Ras Alula Aba Nega Secondary School Grade 10 in Focus**

**BY**

***GEBREMEDHIN G/EGZIABHER***

***ADVISOR: MESFN EYOB (DR)***

**JUNE, 2017**

**MEKELLE, ETHIOPIA**

## ASSURANCE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

This is certify that the thesis prepared by: Gebremedhin Gebregziabher with investigating English teachers & learners use of Tigrigna in English classes of at Alula Aba Nega Secondary and Preparatory School grade 10 in focus and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for MA Degree with the regulation of the university & meet the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Name of candidate	date	signature
_____	_____	_____
Name of Advisor	date	signature
_____	_____	_____
Signature of board of Examiners		
Name of External Examiner	date	signature
_____	_____	_____
Name of Internal Examiner	date	signature
_____	_____	_____

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

First and for most, I would like to thank the almighty God for the successful accomplishment of my study. Without his help, it is impossible to be achieved.

Next to this, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Mesfn Eyob (Dr) for his insightful and constructive comments, professional guidance and detailed advice throughout the development of this thesis. I am very much indebted to the kindness, patience, and warm-welcome he has shown me in the course of the study.

Second, I must thank; my wife, W/ro Werkalem Mamo, my friends Mengesha B, Abrha W, and Solomon A. Similarly, my thanks to Ato Solomon F, director of Ras Alula Aba Nega Secondary School and the English teachers of the school all in one who have been providing constant support to all my achievement. I will be forever grateful for your support and love.

Finally, I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to all my family members who gave me their moral support and encouragement in my work.

# Table of Content

## Contents

### page

ASSURANCE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR.....	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	III
Table of Content.....	IV
LISTS OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	VII
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3 Objective of the Study.....	7
1.3.1 General Objective.....	7
1.3.2 Specific Objectives.....	7
1.4 Research Questions.....	7
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	8
1.6 Scope of the Study.....	8
1.7 Limitation of the Study.....	8
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	10
2.1 Historical of Using L1 in English Language Learning.....	10
2.1.1 The monolingual approach.....	12
2.1.2 The bilingual approach.....	15
2.2 Empirical studies about role of L1 in L2.....	16
2.3 Students' and teachers' attitudes toward using L1 in English Classrooms.....	19
2.3.1 Learners' attitude toward using L1 in L2 classroom.....	19
2.3.2 Learners' and teachers' attitudes toward using L1 in L2 classroom.....	20
2.4 The Main points of View against to L1 Use.....	21
2.5 The L1 Learning Disagreement.....	21
2.6 The Categorization of Arguments of Language.....	22

2.7	The Nature of the Teaching Materials and the Target Language Teachers Training System: .....	23
2.8	What is the Popular Arguments Supporting the L1 use in EFL Classes? .....	23
2.8.1	Supporting of Arguments the L1 Pedagogical Roles .....	24
2.8.2	Arguments Supporting Psychological Roles of L1 .....	25
2.9	What are the Purposes of Using Mother Tongue in the EFL classes? .....	26
2.10	Judicious Use of Mother Tongue in the Young Learners' EFL Classroom .....	28
2.11	Factors Affecting Teachers and Learners' Language Choice .....	30
CHAPTER THREE: Research Design and Methodology .....		31
3.1	Methodology .....	31
3.2	Research Design .....	31
3.3	Population of the Study .....	31
3.4	Sampling techniques .....	32
3.4.1	Selection of the school .....	32
3.4.2	Selection of grade level .....	32
3.4.3	Selection of students .....	32
3.4.4	Selection of English teachers .....	33
3.5	DataCollection Instruments .....	33
3.6	Questionnaires .....	33
3.7	Interview .....	34
3.8	Observation .....	34
3.9	Methods of Data Analysis .....	35
3.10.	Procedures of Data Collection .....	35
3.11	Quality controls .....	35
3.11.1	Validity and Reliability .....	35
3.11.2	Ethical Consideration .....	36
CHAPTER FOUR:DATA ANALYSISand DISCUSSION .....		37
4.1.	Responses from students' questionnaire regarding the English teacher's use of Tigrigna .....	37
4.1.1	Analysis of the extent to which EFL teachers use Tigrigna in students questionnaire .....	38
4.1.2	Analysis of Purposes Responses from Students Questionnaire .....	39
4.1.3	Analysis of causes Responses from Students Questionnaire .....	42
4.1.4	Analysis of Conditions Responses from Students Questionnaire .....	43
4.1.5	The Data Taken from Classroom Observation .....	46

4.2	The Data Taken from Classroom Observation Relating to EFL Teachers’ use of Tigrigna .....	48
4.3	The data taken from EFL teachers’ interview based use of Tigrigna .....	50
4.3.1	The data taken from EFL teacher’s interview based on conditions .....	51
4.3.2	The data taken from EFL teachers’ interview based on purposes .....	51
4.3.3	The data taken from EFL teachers based on causes.....	52
4.4	Discussion.....	53
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARIES, CONCLUSION &RECOMMENDATION.....		57
5.1	Summary of the Finding .....	57
5.2	Conclusion ofthe Findings .....	58
5.3	Recommendations of the study .....	59
REFERENCES .....		60
APPENDIX ONE.....		68
	Instruction one .....	68
	Instruction two .....	69
APPENDIX TWO.....		71
APPENDIX THREE.....		73
APPENDIX FOUR .....		74

## **LISTS OF ABBREVIATIONS**

AVR= Average

TL = Target Language

L1= First Language

L2=Second Language

GTM = Grammar Translation Method

MT = Mother Tongue

L2 = Second Language or Foreign Language

ELT = English Language teaching

EFL = English as a foreign language

FL= Foreign Language

F= Frequently Response

SLA = Second language Acquisition

Ss = Students

St = Student

T = Teacher

T1 = Teacher 1

T2 = Teacher 2

T3 = Teacher 3

T4 = Teacher 4

T5 = Teacher 5



## **CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION**

In this part of the study the researcher had discuss the essential elements of the research. Such as, the back ground of the study, statement of the problem, general and specific objective of study, significance, and scope of the study .The back ground would give information of the problem to be explored in the study and had explain what led the researcher to doing the proposal. In addition, the researcher had discussed same educational trends related to the problem and same personal backgrounds .Next to the background, the researcher had placed statement of the problem. In this part of the proposal the researcher was outlined the context of the study. After this, study the researcher was formulated the general and specific objectives of the study briefly and clearly. Lastly the researcher had discussed the importance of the research in terms of the problem situation was outlined the scope of the study.

### **1.1 Background of the Study**

In the place of L1 in teaching a target language or second language changes as per the world look changes in ELT. Learning English is considered essentially by many people, and more particularly by those who want to find better job or get a good education. For this reason, many countries all over the world have embraced the English language to be the source of their education as well as the language of the curricula. More importantly, the concept of Anglicization has dominated education and caused many people to stop using their mother tongue in favor of English more specifically, in class room instruction for the purpose of immersion. A such, it is found that in many countries the medium language for teaching subjects such as chemistry, biology, mathematics and other is in English. It is essential to discriminate here between teaching other subjects using English as medium and teaching English as a second language or foreign language, which is the core of this proposal to investigate (Khedir, 2018). The view of using English to teach in class rooms is still a hotly debated issue among linguists and researchers. This is due to the other beliefs that the use of the mother tongue is a helpful and useful facilitator for second language learning, English in particular. For instance, according to Jancova (2010), referring to Howat (1984), that the view of using L1 in EFL classes started during the time of grammar translation method of teaching L2 (English).

According to Elmetwally (2012), learning a second/foreign language comes along with the pedagogical principles governing the way(s) it is taught, i.e. the learning theories and teaching approaches. One of the most crucial issues that should be taken into consideration is the medium of

instruction. In this regard, there are two distinctive, opposing approaches in the field of English language learning: the monolingual and bilingual approaches. The former advocates the sole use of the target language (TL), and considers the use of students' first language as a Learning hindrance in the process of learning the TL. On the other hand, the latter sees learners' mother tongue (MT) as a beneficial tool that may facilitate and contribute to learning the target language. The difference in perspective between these two approaches led to an unsettled debate regarding the value of using learners' MT in English language classrooms. It is worth mentioning that first language and mother tongue are synonymously and interchangeably used in this research

Richard and Rogers (1996), state the bilingual teaching approach was employed mostly by the time of grammar translation method of L2 teaching. However, as Cole (1998), and Prodromou (2001), expresses that after world war second (1945) many ELT approaches like direct method, audio lingual method and the current advisable communicative language teaching method had used without including the learners L1 in EFL class room.

During this time ELT approaches that emphasis give to L1 in EFL classes varies from context to context. For example, Cool (2001),referring to Howatt (1984),stated that mother tongue using in EFL classes seems to be on and off fashion considering the thought the present day method. Carless (2008), also justified that in the prose's of acquiring a new language encouraging learners to express what they thought in the target language freely is essential. Butzkamu (2003), cited in Jancova (2010),states that most formal teaching documents in many countries required as monolingual attitude to the foreign language teaching as possible. Yimer (2012), claimed that English is as a medium of instruction is having a pernicious effect on Ethiopian Education attainment even though it is a foreign language in Ethiopia with little support from the media outside educational establishments.

Such an assumption is widely accepted by those who still support the use of Grammar Translation Method (GMT) in their second or foreign language teaching class rooms. Furthermore, Eldrige (1996) Such an assumption is widely accepted by those who still support the use of Grammar Translation confirmed that it has not been proved empirically that restricting the use of the mother tongue in the class room will improve learners' efficiency; for this reason it is considered old-fashioned to not include the mother tongue in class room instruction (Atkinson, 1987). As final remark, from the theoretical point of view, the use of mother tongue in class room should not be

restricted, and it should be used according to the needs of learners' as well as the class room situation (Atkinson, 1993; Weschler, 1997; Nation, 2003; Norman, 2008).

Hopkins (1989) stated that using L1 in EFL classes could enhance student confidence and it is essential to facilitate teacher-learner interaction, and to facilitate students learning. Al-Hinia (2011), as cited in Mhmutonglu and Kicir (2013), pointed out that one of the roles the using of L1 is to reduce students anxiety and it make the learning environment more relaxed by using mother tongue as means that students come up with cultural background knowledge in to the class room as well.

According to the McNabb, (1989) the new Ethiopian Transitional Government Educational policy has been formulated and it gives the nations to choose their nationalities language as instructional media in the primary education system. As a result, many nationality languages are using as instructional media in primary schools in all regions of the country .Therefore, Tigrigna is giving as a subject from grade 1-12, the same as English subject. When, the Ethiopian People Revolutionary Front (EPRDF) government replaced the Derg in 1991. Teaching EFL in the study area begins in grade one that using L1 for translation due to learners limit exposure and prior knowledge about the target language (English).Weschler (1997),stated that the habit of using mother tongue start right there students and teachers make use of Tigrigna in English classes.

By considering of this which recommend the reasonable use of L1, EFL teachers and students are too much using L1 to teach the target language. It has also debated on the extent of employing L1 in EFL classes' .Notion (2003), described that the class room management in the L1 can be a source of meaning full L2 input for the learners, and he advised that teachers use as alternative L2 strategy whenever possible such as visual prompts, miming and situational contexts. In addition Atkins (1987), as cited in Mahmotoglu and Kicir (2013), they said that the over use of L1 during EFL classes has different problems. The teacher and the students cannot understand any language items unless they are only translate in to their L1. In addition to that, the learners also speak anything with no doubt to their teachers in their mother tongue even if they have the skill to express what they mean in English (L2) and the learners fail to realize the using English during class room tasks.

The arguments about the facilitative role of limited and reasonable use of mother tongue along with the negative consequences of its over use ,which is force me to examine the purpose and extent that investigating English teachers and learners' need to use Tigrigna in EFL classes at Alula Aba Nega Secondary School in Abyi Adi Woreda.

## 1.2 Statement of the Problem

According to (Cook, 2001; Krashen, 1981) the use of L1 in L2 classes has always been controversial because different theories of L2 acquisition present different hypotheses about the value of L1 use in L2 classes. Some theorists have advocated an English only approach believing in the identical nature of the process of L2 and L1 learning, and arguing that maximum exposure to L2 and least to L1 are essential because interference from L1 knowledge obstructs L2 learning process.

But, some language educationists have argued against the complete elimination of L1 from L2 classes (Nation, 2003; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Cook, 2001) and have contended that a judicious and well-planned use of L1 can yield positive results. For instance, the teacher can use it for clarification (as a supportive device) when students fail to understand his ideas told in L2 (Tang, 2002). L1 can also be used to introduce new vocabulary and teach abstract ideas (Atkinson,1987). Other educators suggest how over-use of L1 can be reduced. To decrease the use of L1, teachers need to provide students with contextual meanings of words (Auerbach, 1993).

The Ethiopian policy proclaimed that nationalities can use their language as a medium of instruction especially in elementary schools so that translating English in to learners mother tongue became one of the common class room activities after the transitional government recognized the right on nationalities. The role of using L1 in L2 classes was not limited in elementary schools. It was also used in high schools and preparatory schools as a tool in the teaching learning process even if there are controversial ideas regarding its uses.

Different from what various authoritative and empirical experience sources propose much reliance on using Tigrigna during EFL classes. This practice might cause by various factors which teachers and learners are randomly switching the code on/off .Thus it also seemed the reason of English teachers' needs for easy deliver of the daily lesson they use the learners' mother tongue. In other sense, the English teachers may not give any emphasis for the improvement of the target language. English teachers also tend to believes that students might not understand their lessons in the target language if they don't use learners L1 so that they over use the L1 as needed with no considering its negative impact.

Many confusions and communication breakdown in a monolingual language classroom occur due to a teacher's strict adherence to L2-only policy. For learners with limited L2 proficiency, this situation can be restraining since they are unable to express themselves very well. They might have difficulty understanding a concept, but fear of being reprimanded for using their L1 to show their

confusion prevents them from speaking up. In this case, teachers themselves were found it difficult to determine whether learners have fully understood the introduced concepts. In contrast, when L1 use is allowed, learners would feel more secured to express themselves, and teachers can diagnose what has been learned, what remains to be taught and which students need further assistance. Therefore, the integration of L1 into L2 classroom improved classroom dynamics as it provides a sense of security and validates the learner's lived experiences, and allowing them to express themselves (Zulfikar, 2018).

Many teachers have been using first language in Second language classes without knowing the reason behind using it. They also don't know L1 can be an effective tool to teach second or foreign language. Although the use of L1 might hinder L2/FL learning but it might contain several advantages too. The unable to use the optimal level of L1 in L2 class can attributed pupils' behavior to negative attitudes toward the L2, and lack of motivation or excessive use of L1 use by in-service classroom teachers. (Turin, T. A. 2014).

According to Al-Nofie (2010) studied on students and teachers attitudes towards using L1 (Arabic) in Saudi Arabia showed that their attitude towards L1 in L2 (English) in class room had a positive and the learners wanted L1 to be used in a certain situation.

In addition to that, (Kim Anh, 2010), directed a study on the similar topic towards using L1 using in (Vietnamese) and said that L1 is very important to teach English and it plays a great significance role in English class room. Both they stated that L1 should use in emergency situations, and it can be effective in the right situation at the right time. Mohmoudi(2011),also conducted a study on "the use of L1 in EFL class room in Iran" stated that an excessive use of L1 in the context of Iranian school is not supported.

From my own experience and observation, English teachers seemed to use the learners L1 language unintentionally, and they seemed that they use it sloppily and over use without having clear cut objective in the current situation when the emphasis of L2 teaching shifted from grammar accuracy to the improvement of major English language skills for communication purpose. In addition to that, in my many years of teaching experience, the researcher also observed that English teacher's use of L1 in the study area in EFL classes was not consistent. Some of them use intuitively or without evidence when it was needed. Some others also use extensively with no considering of the negative impact of over use. Others also strongly disagree the use of mother tongue in target language and they undermined their colleagues who always used Tigrigna during EFL classes.

However, the researcher personally believes that as long as the primary objective of the English classroom is to make sure communication and common understanding between teachers and students, then, why one disregards the limited and reasonable use of the learners' native language in the L2 classroom? But, the risk is when L1 is inappropriately used in L2 class which may in turn negatively affects mastery of target language.

The discussed arguments about the facilitative roles of limited and reasonable use of learners mother tongue along with the negative consequences of its overuse forced me to raise questions: how much? why? and when? Mother tongue should be used at this grade levels? But, there is no clear and precise answer to the question: how much?

Some scholars express their views on how much of L1 should be used in the EFL classroom. For example, Tang (2002) and Nazary (2003) note moderate and judicious use of the mother tongue is advantageous, and facilitates L2 learning. But, the two terms „moderate“ and „judicious“ still do not show the exact amount for which they stand for, and are subject to personal judgments. Atkinson (1987), however, specifies that a ratio of 5% L1 use to about 95% L2 may be more profitable. Tang (2002) as well, suggests a five to ten percent of L1 use to be facilitative in the English classes.

According to Ibrahim, (2019), expresses EFL teachers' using of L1 always may have its own negative impact on English language improvement in order that it will needed to be used properly. Therefore, the primary objectives of EFL classes are making sure the communication and common understanding between teachers' and students. Thus, would not ignore the limited and reasonable use of L1 language during the L2 classroom. However, the risk is when L1 is not properly use in EFL classes which may have the negative effects on the mastery of the target language.

The Ethiopian researcher ,Nigatu (2013),also carried out a study on “the use of L1 in EFL class room”, and he stated that the purpose of using L1 in EFL classes is to describe new words, describe difficult concepts give instructions, maintain class room discipline, and he checked students comprehension. Nigatu (2013), addressed the current study in the context of Hadiyyaa language, and he conclude that both teachers and students were interested in using of L1 in L2 of Hadiyyaa at the lower grade levels. Even though the topics are related, my work is different from Nigatu's work in a certain areas. First, Nigatu's study focused on exploring the use of L1 including teachers and students perception, the relative amount, frequency & purpose of L1 ( Hadiyasa) used in English classroom, however, my study focused on investigating the English teachers and learners use of

Tigrigna in EFL classes. Second, the participants in Nigatus study were primary school students & English teachers while in my study the participants were secondary school students & EFL teachers. Thirdly, Nigatus research in the context of Hadiyyasa while my research was in the context of Tigrigna.

Having this gap in mind, this study focused investigating the English teachers and students use of Tigrigna language English classes since it needs to be studied further so as to investigate whether English teachers use Tigrigna in English classes or not. The conditions, purposes, and causes of using Tigrigna in EFL classes were the main focus of my study.

### **1.3 Objective of the Study**

#### **1.3.1 General Objective**

The general objective of this study is investigating the English teachers and learners' use of Tigrigna language in English classes of Alula Aba Nega Secondary school grade 10 in focus and the problem to find out the solutions.

#### **1.3.2 Specific Objectives**

The specific objectives of the study were intended:

- 1, identify the teachers purpose of using Tigrigna (L1) during English classes.
- 2, to identify the causes that make teachers use (Tigrigna) in English class room.
- 3, to explore the conditions that English teachers use of L1 in English language teaching classes at the propose sites.
- 4, to investigate which extent English teachers' use of Tigrigna in English language classes.

### **1.4 Research Questions**

In order to achieve the above specific objectives the researcher had tried to answer the following questions.

- 1, what are the causes that EFL teachers use Tigrigna English classes?
- 2, for what purpose do English teachers use Tigrigna in EFL classes?
- 3, in what situations do English teachers use Tigrigna in EFL classes?
- 4, how often frequently do teachers and students use their L1 in the English class room?

## **1.5 Significance of the Study**

Since this study mainly focusing, on investigating the English teachers and learners use of Tigrigna (L1) in English classes. Therefore, using L1 was very important tool for improving students' language skills when it was used properly but the EFL teachers had not use effectively in the class room. Because of this, the study was conduct to examine the teacher practice of using Tigrigna in EFL classes. Thus after this study would expect to have different advantages':

- English language teachers became conscious of the role L1 in teaching & learning target language & reexamine their foreign language at Alula Aba Nega Secondary School.
- It may help the teachers acquire awareness about the well-judged & limited use of L1 in L2 in Alula Aba Nega Secondary School.
- It may provide information for teachers and students to understand when and also how to use L1 in English language teaching classes.
- It may enable the all English teachers of the school have common agreement regarding the use of Tigrigna in EFL classes.
- It may serve as a source of direction to other researchers.

## **1.6 Scope of the Study**

This research was limited to investigating the English teachers and learners' use of Tigrigna in English classes of grade ten students' in Alula Aba Nega Secondary School, and Abiyi Adi woreda at central zone of Tigray in 2017. Dou to that, the researcher has elected Alula Aba Nega Secondary school because the school is my work place & which is nearest to me from the two high schools.

## **1.7 Limitation of the Study**

While conducting this study the researcher might face problems. Such as, participants' constraints and the other problems that the researcher expects to face those same participants had not to give information for the data (quantitative and qualitative data) as the researching process unplayable. Moreover, it was expected that same of the questionnaires were invalid. Same respondents were not committed to fill the questionnaires as carefully as possible. It was also expected that the response given by same participants were unreliable. The respondents will not give full attention to fill the questionnaire. In addition to that, in accessibility of computer and its skill , luck of abilities research

work or having a shortage of knowhow of research method and English teachers might not interested to be observe and record by the researcher and having lack of experience to did a research towards the researcher was faced.

## **CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITRATURE**

In this chapter the researcher had incorporate different topics that related with his research topic. He was take ideas from the discussions of different scholars saying about the historical back ground of the investigating English teachers and learners use of Tigrigna in English classes, points of view against L1 use, the L1 learning argument and other supportive points to L1 has been the researcher presenting.

### **2.1 Historical of Using L1 in English Language Learning**

The Classical Method, also referred to as grammar-translation method (GTM), dominated the English language teaching (ELT) profession during the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>centuries (Richards & Rodgers 2001). It mainly focused on reading and writing, as the second language only served scholastic and academic purposes. This approach was characterized by its heavy reliance on translation and explicit explanations of grammar rules. The target language was minimally used as classroom communication was mainly through L1. In addition, pronunciation was almost given no attention, whereas vocabulary was taught in the form of bilingual lists of separate words (Brown 2007).The vast popularity of this approach was due to the fact that it requires few specialized skills on the part of teachers. Tests of grammar rules and of translations are easy to construct and can be objectively scored” (Brown 2007).

Despite its popularity, this school of teaching received tremendous criticism from a lot of researchers and linguists as it only focused on the written skills and totally ignored the spoken aspect of the target language (Brown 2007). Learners were not exposed enough to the target language, which consequently resulted in their inability to use L2 communicatively. Richards and Rodgers (2001,) argue that there have been no attempts in literature to support the GTM as a pedagogical theory, or even “relate it to issues in linguistics, psychology, or educational theory”.

The beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century witnessed the rise of the Direct Method (DM).This approach prevailed due to the political circumstances during this period of time. There was an active immigration wave toward America after World War I. As a reaction, the rise of the Americanization Movement symbolized the anti-foreign sentiment against the new immigrants. The DM was an important factor and an effective way to promote the spirit of unity, patriotism and loyalty. This had a direct impact on ELT, and resulted in excluding learners’ native language and solely adopting the L2 as the only medium of instruction (Auerbach 1993).

Moreover, due to the massive immigration waves from Europe, it seemed impractical to rely on the L1 in learning a second language, as there was no shared mother tongue among the immigrant learners. Hence, the target language was adopted for classroom communication. Bostock (1973, p. 41) states “the most frequently asserted benefit of monolinguals is social and political integration, particularly in relation to the assimilation of migrants”. It was also associated with concepts like democracy, loyalty and national unity (Portes and Schauflyer 1994).

The use of L1 to L2 was almost universal and readily accepted, and it gives emphasis on the written word. Auerbach (1999), viewed at the history of L1 use in the L2 class room quickly shows periodic but normal or formal changes were there. In the 19 century, this trend slowly reversed itself towards a monolingual approach to language teaching lesson due to a shift towards an emphasis on the spoken words. During the 20 century the effect of the mass migration, colonialism and a large increase in research in the field could further strengthen the monolingual approach. Because of this, the early 20 century, the particular purpose of the L1 has been out of fashion and has little or no public support (Cook 2002).

In fact, the use of L1 in EFL class room started to be seen as uncommunicative, boring, pointless and not relevant (Harmer, 2001). In other sense, this method was challenged for doing or nothing to enhance the students communication ability in their language (Brown, 2000). Thus, lack of public support seems to have led modern language teachers to associate the use of translation with the Grammar translation Method (Edge 1986; Linder 2002). According to Linder (2002), when the teachers associate translation activities with the Grammar Translation Method, and other traditional language teaching, they pay attention to consider such activities as non-communicative and non-natural. In fact, teachers’ pay attention to assume the exclusion of L1 as the only to the fruit full of the Grammar Translation Method (Auerbach 1993).

Harbord (1992) said that, the Direct Method of teaching just over a hundred years ago also a great contribution to the idea of that all L1 should be excluded from the class room. The idea of the Direct Method was that the second language learning mirrored in the first language acquisition: a lots of oral interactions, a little grammatical analysis and no translation .In addition to that, the Direct Method the Audio lingual Method, thus emphasized banning the use of language and viewed L1 and L2 as two different systems that should not be linked so as to avoid L1 interference. Brown (2000), the direct method would soon be caused when it failed in the public education system, but it would have a lasting influence on ESL/EFL class rooms. In similar context Krashen (1981),

mentioned that comprehensible input should provide opportunities for not consciously known and understood learning which leads to achieve language competence. For that reason, the superiority of L2 or target language may indicate to make L1 in the class room. Other scholars also believe that the focus on the foreign language can enhance communication ability and activate both conscious and unconscious learning. In addition to that, they added learners could to understand the message even when they do not know the exact meaning of words or structures, which indicate that they do not need to grasp all the words they read or hear.

### **2.1.1 The monolingual approach**

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the ELT profession witnessed a comprehensive change in researchers' and teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward second language learning. The GTM started to decline as it failed "to enhance a student's communicative ability in the [target] language" (Brown 2007). This paved the way for the Direct Method to emerge. The prevailing notion was that learners should learn a second language in the same way they acquired their L1 (Brown 2007). Instead of focusing on the written form of the TL, the focus shifted to oral skills. This entailed banishing L1 from L2 classrooms, as it was believed to be more of a hindrance than a Facilitating tool toward L2 learning.

The monolingual approach as a pedagogical methodology influenced and contributed to the rise of the Communicative Approach (CA), especially during the 1970s and 1980s. The CA strongly suggests that L2 should be taught monolingual through authentic classroom activities. It also urges teachers to refrain from using their learners' L1, as such practices are "irrelevant in learning the second language" (Pennycook 1994). Consequently, non-native English teachers, who worked in an English-only environment, always felt guilty when resorting to learners' L1 to facilitate learning for doing something, they believed, against the principles governing good teaching practices at this period of time (Auerbach 1993; Ferrer and.; Atkinson 1987).

It is worth mentioning that teachers' practices are not only governed by institutional policies. Rather, they are shaped by their pedagogical attitudes and beliefs. It is true that educational policy makers in some countries have adopted the English only Notion as part of their institutional policies. However, teachers not only adopt the English-only approach due to institutional pressure, but they also believe that the exclusive use of L2 will enable their students to learn the TL faster than when L1 is allowed (Yphantides 2009).

The monolingual approach has prevailed due to the tremendous support received from researchers and linguists. L2 advocates call for full immersion in the target language and complete banishment of L1 from the FL classrooms. The main reason is that there is a limited opportunity for L2 learners to get exposed to the TL outside the classroom. This makes the quality of L2 input and the quantity of exposure to TL significantly critical (Duff & Polio 1990; Edstrom 2006). Chaudron (1988,) argues that L2 teachers are urged to maintain a rich TL environment where “not only instruction and drill are executed, but also disciplinary and management operations”. This approach argues that learners should be immersed in the target language, as the L2 learning process is similar to learning the L1. Krashen (1982) suggests adopting a *natural approach* when learning an L2, which requires immense exposure to the target language through meaningful and spontaneous communication. Ellis (1984) emphasizes the importance of using the target language for both instruction and classroom management. He criticizes teachers’ choice to use their learners’ L1 to explain lessons, organize activities and/or manage behavior as this deprives L2 learners from valuable input in the TL.

Despite the support obtained from some researchers and linguists, the monolingual approach has received considerable criticism and opposition (Atkinson 1987; Auerbach 1993; Phillipson 1992; Prodromou 2002; Swain & Lapkin 2000; Vanderheijden 2010; Wechsler 1997). Firstly, it has been criticized for its impracticality and the fact that immense exposure to the L2 is not always enough to learn. It is considered impractical because the “majority of teachers of English are non-native speakers” (Phillipson 1992), and those teachers do not master the target language at the same level of proficiency (Phillipson 1992). Concerning immersion, it is true that the quantity of exposure to L2 plays a significant role in learning the language (Phillipson 1992). Nevertheless, there are other factors that contribute to learning a language, e.g. trained teachers, an effective assessment system and course book material. Secondly, the monolingual approach assumes that the process of learning a second language is similar to acquiring one’s MT. However, this does not prove to be true, as age is one of the determining factors in L2 learning process. Brown (2007) draws on the differences in language learning process between adults and children.

When children learn two languages, this happens simultaneously. However, this is not the case with adults; whether it occurs in formal or informal settings, adults learn a second language systematically. This involves formulating grammatical rules using their L1 knowledge to guide them to bridge the linguistic gap they cannot fill in L2. Thirdly, part of the criticism toward the monolingual approach is its failure to differentiate between English as a second language (ESL) and

English as a foreign language (EFL). ESL refers to teaching English where “the language is necessary for everyday life ... or in a country in which English plays an important role in education, business, and government” (Richards & Schmidt 2002). In western countries, e.g. Canada, Australia, and the US, L2 learners are immersed in the TL outside the classroom. In addition, the learners come from different language backgrounds and, consequently, there is no shared L1 among them. Therefore, there should be a common language for instruction and communication in class, which is English.

On the other hand, an English teacher “implies the use of English in a community where it is not the usual means of communication” (Abbott 2001). This describes the situation where L2 learners come from the same linguistic background and share the same L1. In this context, learners only learn English in formal classroom settings, as they do not have much contact with the target language in the outside world. Hence, the difference in nature between EFL and ESL necessitates adopting more effective teaching approaches suitable for each context.

Fourthly, the monolingual approach assumes that using L1 limits learners’ opportunities to get exposed to the target language. However, banishing L1 from L2 classrooms is an unjustified decision. The judicious use of L1 positively supports learning the target language. Insisting on using L2 during complex linguistic and cognitive tasks means denying learners their right to use a beneficial and valuable cognitive tool they possess (Swain & Lapkin 2000). In addition, students’ reliance on L1 gradually diminishes as they become more competent in the TL (Vanderheijden 2010; and Prodromou 2002).

Finally, the English-only approach does not appreciate that the mother tongue always exists in learners’ minds even during their EFL/ ESL classes (Wechsler 1997). Whether it is admitted or not, learners especially the low-level ones, tend to use their L1 during collaborative work at different degrees to scaffold new information and understand difficult concepts (Anton and Dica-milla 1999; Slavin 2006). Swain and Lapkin (2000,) argue that students always approach learning an L2 with expertise in their L1, and this expertise remains a somewhat unexplored resource”. The total banishment of learners’ L1 in EFL classrooms limits learners’ learning opportunities and promotes the sense of L2 superiority to their L1. In order to empower L2 learners when they fail to learn, they “should have as many tools as possible at their disposal- in the learning environment- to develop new learning” (Vanderheijden 2010). As has been seen above, the monolingual notion has been subject to a lot of criticism as it has ignored learners’ prior knowledge and the fact that L1 already

exists in the learners' mind when they approach the TL. The following section explores the bilingual notion and examines the principles it underlies.

### **2.1.2 The bilingual approach**

There has been a profound assumption in ELT that the more students are exposed to English, the more quickly they will learn; as they hear and use English, they will internalize it to begin to think in English" (Auerbach 1993). The only way to help them master the L2 is by forcing them to use it. Any reference to learners' L1 was seen as a sign of unprofessionalism and lacking proficiency. Prodromou (2000, quoted in Hitotuzi 2006) claims that learners' L1 has been treated as a "skeleton in the cupboard, (...), a taboo subject, a source of embarrassment, and on the part of teachers, a recognition of their failure to teach properly, i.e. using 'only English'".

However, a lot of Practitioners and researchers have started to re-examine the role of L1 in facilitating learning a second language during the last few decades. Dellerand Rinvolutri (2002,) believes that "the mother tongue is the womb from which the second language is born". Therefore, it is not practical to banish L1 from L2 classrooms, as learners' L1 can be a beneficial tool for language learning (Macaro 2001; Willis & Willis 2007). Banishing it from L2 classroom does not necessarily mean banishing it from learners' mind, and this will result in impeding learners to think (Hitotuzi 2006). There is no rationale behind using a monolingual pedagogy, as "the very subject we teach is, by definition, bilingual" (Widdowson (2003). Atkinson (1987), who is considered an influential L1 advocate, argues that learners' L1 has been a *neglected resource* in monolingual English classrooms. He identifies the main reasons contributing to the lack of interest in exploring the potentiality of L1 as a classroom resource: 1) negative association between the use of L1 and the grammar-translation method; 2) the fact that one "can only learn English by speaking English" (Atkinson 1987); 3) native speakers receiving their teaching training in an exclusive monolingual environment; and 4) finally the prevalence of learning theories promoting the exclusive use of the L2.

Atkinson's (1987) and Auerbach's (1993) writings encouraged a considerable number of professionals and researchers to re-examine their teaching practices and beliefs, and reconsider the role L1 might play and the potential benefits it might bring into L2 English classroom as a facilitating tool. Atkinson (1987) blames the "gap in methodological literature" for the feeling of guilt teachers had for allowing their students use their MT in L2 classroom.

L1 supporters (Atkinson 1987; Auerbach 1993; Cook 1999; Cummins 2007; Mahmoud 2006; Nation 2003; Schweers 1999) have identified a lot of reasons justifying the use of learners' first language, which will be suggested below. Whether admitted or not, learners' L1 is used in FL classrooms by some students and teachers. It has the potential as a pedagogical classroom resource to create authentic and relevant learning opportunities in the target language (Cook 1999). It should be seen as an effective classroom resource to enhance and maximize students' learning. Auerbach(1993) argues that L1“allows for language to be used as a meaning-making tool and for language learning becoming a means of communicating ideas rather than an end in itself”. Instead of ignoring the fact that it exists in the learners' minds, L1 can be used to activate learners' prior knowledge. Besides, the mother tongue, especially for the beginners, is a final resort when communication fails, as “the natural desire to communicate impels learners to use their L1 to fill in gaps in communication, a strategy that successfully moves their acquisition of the L2 forward” (Mahmoud 2006).Moreover, allowing L1 in the L2 classroom positively affects students' motivation and increases their participation, as it reduces learners' anxiety and lowers their affective filter.

As mentioned earlier, the bilingual approach assumes that learners' L1 has a significant role to play in English classrooms. A considerable number of studies have been conducted to examine its potentiality. Some of these are highlighted in the section below.

## **2.2 Empirical studies about role of L1 in L2**

There have been a lot of recent empirical studies exploring the role L1 might play in L2 classrooms. They have been conducted in different learning contexts where English was sometimes the L1. Table 2.1 below summarizes some of these studies.

**Table 1.1** Empirical studies assessing the role of L1 in L2 classrooms

Researchers	Focus	Findings
Schweers (1999)	Role of Spanish in learning English	Raising awareness of the language Similarities/differences between L1 and L2 may facilitate learning L2.
Swain &Lapkin (2000)	Role of L1 in facilitating complex classroom activities	Students use L1 (English) for task management, focusing attention, and Interpersonal interaction.
Juárez&Oxbrow(2008)	The use of translation as an Effective cognitive learning strategy	Students are in favor of using translation activities along with the judicious use of their L1
Storch& Wigglesworth (2003)	Impact of task type on learners' use of L1	L1 is used to clarify and manage the joint Composition task, whereas it is used to discuss Vocabulary on the reconstruction task.
StorchAldosari (2010)	Effect of task type on learners' use of L1 (Arabic) during pair-work activities in EFL classrooms	Weaker pairs use L1 more often than stronger Ones.L1 is important in task management as well as serving other cognitive, social and Pedagogical functions.
Scott and De LaFuente(2008)	Learners' use of L1 and TL to solve a grammar problem	When allowed to use L1, learners work more Collaboratively. Learners also resort to L1 (English) as a scaffolding assistance tool.

**Source:** from Elmetwally, E. (2012). The students' & teachers' attitudes towards the use of learners' mother tongue in English language class rooms.L1 supporters believe that there are a lot of possible classroom occasions where using learners' first language could be beneficial. Auerbach (1993) argues that L1 maybe beneficially used to manage any situation in the instructional process, which sounds interesting, as she does not seem to have considered the significant importance of L2input in EFL classrooms. In other words, allowing L1 to be widely used results in tremendous decrease in learners' opportunities to practice the TL. Anton and Dicamilla(1999) suggest that L1 also can be helpful when exploring content in more detail and when shifting from one stage in a lesson to another.

Cummins, (2007), claims that learners' L1 may play a vital role in promoting L2 proficiency because "it can function as a stepping stone to scaffold more accomplished performance in the L2".Nation (2003) urges teachers to give the due respect to their learners' L1. Otherwise, the learners would feel that their MT is inferior to the TL, which will result in negative attitudes towards the L2. He also suggests adopting a balanced approach, where L1 is perceived as an asset

and L2 learning opportunities can be maximized. A lot of empirical studies indicate that L1 is an invaluable tool that facilitates learning an L2 (Anton & Dicamilla 1999; Juárez & Oxbrow 2008; Schweers 1999; Storch & Aldosari 2010; Swain & Lapkin 2000).

However, welcoming the mother tongue to L2 classrooms brings about some risks that should be considered. Exposure to the target language is essential in the process of learning an L2, and the over reliance on L1 minimizes the learners' opportunities to practice the target language (Atkinson 1987; Cianflone 2009). This is particularly crucial in an EFL context where the learners do not have much contact with the target language in the outside world (Turnbull 2001).

Consequently, L2 learners will have a very limited opportunity to practice the target language. Duff and Polio (1990) researched how much L2 was used in FL classrooms. The study involved thirteen teachers. Their findings showed that the participant teachers were not aware of the quantity and frequency learners' first language may be utilized in EFL classes, as the use of L2 widely ranged between ten to hundred per cent. It also indicated that, in several cases, a lot of students had a very limited exposure to the target language. Swain and Lapkin (2000) argue that L1 use should be available for learners in the target language classrooms. However, it should not "be actively encouraged as it may substitute for, rather than support, second language learning."

As indicated above, the bilingual approach claims that L1 is an effective classroom resource that facilitates learning. However, it cannot be "a suitable basis for a methodology" (Atkinson (1987, p. 247). Instead, there is a need to explore how to incorporate it into teaching as a pedagogical tool that enhances the learning process of another language. Teachers should be aware of the opportunities and drawbacks of allowing the L1 to be used in L2 classrooms. Their decision, therefore, to shift to any of these languages is determined by the learning context (Stern 1992). The relation between the two languages should, hence, be viewed as complementary not opposing. The studies highlighted above indicate that L1 has the potential as a facilitating learning tool. However, there is still a need to explore learners' and teachers' views in this regard. As mentioned in [1.2], decisions to adopt the monolingual or bilingual approach have been made without taking learners' and/or teachers' input into consideration. Since they are the ones who are directly affected by such decisions, the next section aims to shed the light on some studies that examine their perceptions toward the use of L1 in English classrooms.

## **2.3 Students' and teachers' attitudes toward using L1 in English Classrooms**

There have been a number of attempts to examine learners' and teachers' perception toward using learners' L1 in FL classrooms. The section below highlights some of these studies, which took place in different learning contexts.

### **2.3.1 Learners' attitude toward using L1 in L2 classroom**

Prodromou (2002) conducted a well-known research investigating the perceptions of 300 Greek students regarding the use of their native language to learn a foreign language (English). The study aimed to find out whether learners' proficiency level affected their attitude toward using L1. The findings revealed that the beginner students showed a more positive attitude toward the use of Greek in English classes. In a similar study conducted in an Iranian context, Nazary (2008) used Prodromou's (2002) questionnaire to examine tertiary students' perceptions of using Farsi in EFL classrooms, and whether their attitudes varied according to their English proficiency.

In an attempt to explore students' perceptions of using Arabic in EFL classes, Mouhanna (2009) surveyed 124 students at a foundations English program in one of the UAE tertiary institutions. Mouhanna's study is of special interest, as it took place in a context similar to the current investigation, the UAE. The results indicated that learners' attitudes toward using L1 varied according to their English proficiency level. Level 1 (beginner) students supported more Arabic use in the English classroom than Level 3 (advanced) students. These findings came in line with other studies: the higher the English proficiency level was, the less reliant the students were on L1 use (Prodromou 2002). Mouhanna (2009, p. 15) concluded that, due to "lower level students' high demand for L1 use", there was a need to incorporate Arabic as a pedagogical tool for learning English.

Brooks-Lewis (2009) conducted an interesting study into adult learners' perceptions toward the inclusion of their MT (Spanish) in the L2 classroom. The learners showed overwhelmingly positive attitudes toward using their L1 while learning an L2. They believed that it was beneficial as it made learning English easier. Moreover, they felt that using Spanish acknowledged their prior knowledge as adults. Brooks-Lewis concluded that the inclusion of L1 as a tool to empower learners "is a learner-centered methodology which not only allows but invites the learner to become actively and consciously involved in the language learning experience".

### **2.3.2 Learners' and teachers' attitudes toward using L1 in L2 classroom**

Schweers (1999) investigated the value of using learners' MT (Spanish) in the English classroom at Puerto Rico University. The collected data revealed that the majority of students and teachers had positive attitude toward using Spanish during English lessons. Both teachers and students thought it was appropriate to use L1 to explain difficult concepts, check understanding and define new vocabulary items.

However, they did not see a value of using L1 to test. Schweers argued that L2 could "be learned through raising awareness to the similarities and differences between the L1 and L2" (p. 13). He also stressed the importance of bringing learners' L1 back to L2 classes as this would lead to positive attitudes toward learning another language. Limited and judicious use of L1 could be tolerated because of its pedagogical and affective benefits.

Another important study was carried out by Burden (2001). It explored the issue of when learners and their teachers felt there was a need to use Japanese in English classes. The results indicated that there was a general agreement between teachers and students regarding the importance of L1 use in the TL classes. The surveyed teachers and students also believed that it was acceptable to use L1 to explain new vocabulary, give instructions, teach grammar and check comprehension. Burden emphasized the value of occasional inclusion of L1 in L2 classes to meet learners' psychological need of not portraying their MT as an inferior to the TL.

Tang (2002) researched both students' and teachers' attitudes toward using their mother tongue (Chinese) during L2 (English) classrooms. The study findings indicated that students as well as teachers held positive attitudes toward using L1 (Chinese) during English classes. They saw a value of using L1 to discuss difficult grammatical rules and to explain challenging vocabulary items, to practice new phrases and expression. Tang concluded that "limited and judicious use of the mother tongue in the English classroom does not reduce students' exposure to English, but rather can assist in the teaching and learning processes".

In a similar study, Sharma (2006) examined teachers' and learners' attitudes toward using Nepali in EFL classes. The results showed that the students and teachers realized that Nepali should be used in the English classes. They thought that it was important to utilize L1 to explain difficult vocabulary, discuss complex grammar rules, clarify difficult concepts, and practice the use of new expressions and phrases. Sharma argued that banishing L1 from English classroom would

negatively affect students 'progress as this would "certainly deprive the students of certain opportunities to learn more and better".

In an Arab context, Al-Nofaie (2010) carried out research to examine the Saudi teachers' and students' attitudes toward using Arabic as a facilitating learning tool in the English classroom. The findings indicated that the study participants had positive attitudes toward using L1 in EFL classes. Both teachers and students were convinced of the value of limited and judicious use of Arabic in English classes. They believed that excessive use of Arabic would hinder their learning and affect it negatively. They also preferred to use Arabic to a) give exam instructions, b) translate new words, and) contrast between English and Arabic.

## **2.4 The Main points of View against to L1 Use**

The main issue of use or not to use the L1 in the L2 class room has been thou during language teaching learning process. There are two approaches with regarding to using the L1 in EFL teaching classes. Those are the Monolingual approach and the Bilingual approach. Different linguists disapprove using L1 in EFL teaching on the ground that it hinders. For example, in monolingual approach the inclusion of L1 in L2 class room is not acceptable (Tang, 2002) because of that L2 It considered that as facilitates (Richard and Rogers, 2001) and maximizes exposure (Krashen, 1981) to the target language. Notion (1978),showed that ,using L1 was considered as indirect and time consuming and an obstacle to advance the study of L2 and thinking in the L2 and hindered to develop the fluency in L2 (Tafese,1988).This idea was emerged during the introduction of the direct method around the turn of the 20 century (Harbord, 1992). In this idea, the monolingual approach express that the foreign language should be the only medium of instruction in the class room. According to Sharma, (2006) the rational for using only the target language in the class room that more students are exposed to English, the more quickly they will learn; as they hear and use English, they can internalize it to begin to think in English; the only way they can learn it is if they are forced to use it. In addition to that, he added that when L1 is use, mistakes may emerge owing to negative L1 transfer.

## **2.5 The L1 Learning Disagreement**

The L1 learning idea is developed by both Krashen and Terrel (1983).Both Krashen and Terrel, argues of monolingual approach, that learners acquire the following same way they acquire their L1. Those scholars believe that L2 learning follows a process similar to L1 learning and claim that

exposure is vital in the learning of L2. In other way, learners of L2 should be open to view to L2 environment as much as possible. Krashen (1985), expressed the only L2 use in the class room stated that comprehensible input is the only cause variable in second language acquisition. That means that success in a foreign language can be attributed to input alone (Brown, 2000). In this manner, he says that the entire lesson as much as possible should be in L2, as using the mother language during the EFL in class room prevent students from acquiring the valuable input in the L2 since there was a clear relation between comprehensible input in L2 and proficiency ( krashen, 1985). In similar view, according to Deller and Renvolucris (2002), they said that, do not support the random use of the native language and warn the language a teacher of the negative effects of it's over use during the EFL classroom.

## **2.6 The Categorization of Arguments of Language**

The same as, Stern (1992), argue that the L1 to L2 association is a certain fact of whether we like it or not the new knowledge is get from the basement previously acquired knowledge. The variety scholars, seem to be agrees in a simple notion that an attempt to keep L1 from the target language class room is hardly reasonable since the L1 and L2 are both frequently present in the learners" remember as well as in the learning activities that the learners engage in. The one significance point argument that led to have bad more was the afraid of interference errors. The argument is that translation fosters are sense of incorrect equivalence between the two languages resulting in the inter language errors (Cook 2002,).In order to eradicated and eliminated the errors affected by L1 learners interferences and students are motivated to express the use of mother tongue (L1) as a means of learning the teaching language.

There for, the analysis reported that it helped students to notice areas of differences between Portuguese and target language (English) and review that their hypothesis regarding what is difference and what is similar in the above mentioned two languages. Due to that it could be possibly conclude from the scholars point of view that motivating learners to relate the target language (L2) to the mother tongue (L1) so as to help them to discover their similarities and difference between the two languages likely reduces the possible happens of the transfer errors even though the mother tongue interferences is there. Therefore, as a teacher from my personal perspective, I believe that the use of mother tongue may interfere with and hinder the process of learners inter language development since their reasoning may become dependent non association and the learners might not develop the important framework to put sense relations in target

language (L2) dependence on L1 framework in spite of the fact that shapes the target learners of learning English or (L2).

## **2.7 The Nature of the Teaching Materials and the Target Language Teachers Training System:**

There is one common believes among the groups of mother tongue use that the target language learners (L2) have little or no exposure to the target language outside the class room. Harbord(1992), said that the class room communication in the target language as much as possible in the view that most teachers and theorists agreed. Yet, this does not mean that mother tongue should not be used at any cost. According to Cook (2001) and Turnbull (2001), teachers can be maximizing the use directly without simply going to the learner's mother tongue or learners' first language. Turnbull (2001), also stated the principle that promotes maximum teachers use of target language acknowledges that L1 and L2 can exist simultaneously. The researcher again believes that if one assumes the basic true communication it should be comprehensible input as used by Krashen, teachers should be fill the classroom with as much of the target languages possible as obviously acceptable and using the students native language necessary. In relation to that, most of modern English Language Teaching make no reference to the learners first language according to the following scholars, (Atkinson 1987; Buck master 2002; Frankenberg-Garcia 2000). Thus, using L1 in the English language teaching materials has contribution to keep students first language well away from the classroom by making of teachers feel unease about first language use in the English classroom.

## **2.8 What is the Popular Arguments Supporting the L1 use in EFL Classes?**

AS clearly mentioned in the above, the monolingual approach maintain that using only L2 shows students are with maximum input, assuming the L1 use for language learning as disadvantage. Auerbach (1993), suggested that the use of translation as a teaching technique has long been viewed with doubt by many language teachers, of course it altogether as matter of principle. That is the more learners are exposed to target language, the more quickly they can learn, as they hear and use L2, they can internalize and begin to think in L2. However the monolingual approach has been condemned by different researchers, teachers, and learners who hold the idea that the first language is important in EFL classes at more than one level. The evidence from both research practices says

that the underlying principle used to justify English only in the classroom is neither conclusive nor pedagogically sound. According to Cummins (1981), he suggested that strong initial literacy is a key factor in the successful second language acquisition and academic success.

According to Phillipson (1992) philosophy the Monolinguals implies the rejection of the experiences of other languages, meaning the exclusion of the child's most powerful i existential experience. The elimination of the native language within the context of ESL instruction may obstruct language acquisition clearly because it mirrors disempowering relations. Researchers who argue bilingual approach like Atkinson (1993) Macaro (2001); Deller and Rinvoluceri (2002); Widdowson (2003); and Harbord (1992) argued that L1 shows a powerful source that can be used to enhance foreign language learning, but it should be used in the principled way. In line with that, Harbord (1992) said that many English language teachers have tried to create English only classrooms, but they have found that they have failed to get the meaning across, leading students' lack of understanding and improper.

### **2.8.1 Supporting of Arguments the L1 Pedagogical Roles**

The supporters of L1 during the EFL classes they uses students mother tongue has a variety advantageous to the learners. In favor of pedagogical roles; Bolitho (1983) states that target language learners do not come to the class with their blank mind. They use their mother tongue experiences to cope with the new challenge or target language learning. Because of this, he suggests teachers should familiar with the learners' first language or mother tongue language. Widdowson,(2003), observes that can be essential pedagogic and ended in some conditions the most effective means of learning. In addition to that, Stern (1992), also believes that target language learners always make references to the language they already know and they can be endowed with comprehensible input using the first language.

Auerbach (1933), said that Learners use their first language as a strategy of studying their target language even outside the classroom since translation is a natural occurrence and inevitable part of second language acquisition even where formal classroom learning does not occur. Students will also try to examine a target language structure or lexical item using their mother tongue whether they are allowed or not Harbord (1992),In this manner, treating the students the using first language as a resource instead of considering it as a challenge to the target language learning will help to improve more authentic users . That is to say, owing to their native language skills and varied

experiences translation is believed to be a significance tool in the gap between what learners bring and which is new in target language. Because of this, whether we like it or not the new language is learned on the basis of the previously acquired language (Stern,1992). Besides, using mother tongue in the English classroom compensates teachers weakness in using the L2 (Miles,2004). Obviously, all teachers are not native speakers. In other sense, the proficiency of the English language teachers may not be very good or may not have good communication skill.

## **2.8.2 Arguments Supporting Psychological Roles of L1**

In addition to, using mother tongue mainly plays emotional or psychological role scholars who are believes in favor of reasonable L1 use contend that students in such a way it could create a more conducive learning environment, which in turn, increase the L2 acquisition process by empowering the learners to feel more over confident and feel a freedom. Concerning this view, Langer (2001) advocates that permitting the mother tongue during the classroom, teachers can give to their student's important tool to arrive at a target full communication. During acquiring the second language is to some extent is feeling dependent on the socially determined value attributed to the L1 which can be either reinforced or difficult in the classroom. When someone is forbid from using his or her mother tongue language, Langer describes that one to be a wares he or she feels in a lower position or unimportant.

According to Shamash (1990) repeated in Auerbach (1993) believes on that using the L1 language permits the students to experiment and take risks in English language. Shamash's also view in, Auerbach (1993) herself guesses that beginning with mother tongue language use provides it feels a sense of security and authenticates of learner experiences permitting them to express themselves.

Harmer (2001), and Megyes , (1992), they stated that the prohibition of using the first language is disapproval of its value and relegation. This contention of first language may results in complex psychological problem on the mind of the learners (Tang, 2002). Its exclusion enhance exposure to target language may not necessarily to be productive (Miles, 2004). Even though the proponents of the bilingual approach permit that exposure to target language is very significant, they contend that factors like the quality of teaching materials, well trained teachers and sound method of teaching are more useful than the amount of more exposure (Philipson, 1992). Hence, they stated that the exclusion of first language can be taking as a guarantee to the effective teaching and learning of target language. Frankly speaking, the use of first language may help learners in decreasing

emotional problems, and increasing their over confidence in their ability to successfully grasp the target language (Atkinson, 1987; Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001; Harbord, 1992).

Those all scholars specifically shows that low proficient of English language learners usually have complicatedness in expressing of their thoughts or feelings with confidence and precision, so they should be permit to fall back on their first language to understand the target language (Atkinson,1987; Auerbach, 1993; Harbord, 1992).

According to scholars, (Atkison,1987; Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001) they observed that using of first language results in an enhanced willingness by learners to express their ideas. Many target language learners regard to first language use, it is the important tool in the teaching learning process because of this they work together with their peers and teachers using the first language often assists target language learners in their creation of social and cognitive space within effective work can be done towards improving their learning (Anton and DiCamilla, 1988).

In line with this, the teachers' use of first language provides an increased form of input that is more essential for the students, more simply processed, and helps their learning. The ability to switch to a native language, even for a short time, it gives learners a chance to maintain their self-image, get rid of anxiety, it build confidence and feeling independent in their choice of expression. According to scholar Atkinson (1993), the occasional use of first language permits to show that they are intelligent and advanced people. Similarly with that, according to Murakami (1999), in Kenenisa (2003), the using mother tongues identify and therefore, should neither be neglected nor subordinated to any languages.

## **2.9 What are the Purposes of Using Mother Tongue in the EFL classes?**

Based on argues of first language use, most teachers can take the benefit of their learners first language in many occasions despite the fact that they do not advice to use it all the time. Atkins, (1987), lists variety situations of the first language use in target language classrooms: for instance, defining complex ideas, by translating new words and abstract ideas, by checking learners understanding, by giving instructions and classroom management.

Notion (2003), shows that the classroom management in the target language can be a source sense full L2 input for learners. Cole (1997), also suggests that at the initial and lower levels, it may be helpful to use the L1 since the learners at the stage of have no any knowledge about the target

language. In addition to that, he adds first language is justified to be used for variety purposes. It can be used to show the main difference between the mother tongue language and the target language, save a lot of guessing, initiate learners and to increase their anxiety and he also stated that the abstract words or expressions which are challenge to express in the target language should be translated in L1.

Atkinson, (1987), also listed the following an area of the foreign language teaching in which teachers can be make use of first language: eliciting language, checking comprehension, giving instruction, presentation and defining un familiar concepts and words regarding instructions. He had also stated that low level learners often to find it difficult to understand instructions which are given in the target language. Due to that, it is useful to give instructions in the first language therefore the learners understand what the teacher has said and asking them to do.

In addition to that Aurebach (1993), one more time stated some roles of L1 as developing ideas as basement to expressing them in the L2, reducing in habitations, or affective barriers to target language production, eliciting language, providing definition of grammar and teaching vocabulary. In this manner, it insures the learners' emotional and cognitive development; motivating them to express their experiences, needs and feelings and increase their accuracy, clarity and flexibility (Stern, 1992). Urges (1987), still proposes that teachers can make use of first language to check writing and reading comprehension exercises, and teaching listening comprehension. In order to help students to become more reflective and self –regulated, L1 can also be used by teachers to raise awareness of their learner's styles and the strategy they use.

Harbord (1992), states that using L1 facilitates communication and the learning of the target language. Avoidance of the students' first language in the L2 or target language classroom may enhance their level of anxiety which, in line with this, may result in communication anxiety, fear of negative social evaluation and nervousness over the academic evaluation (Meyer, 2008 and Auerbach, 1993). Finally, the mother tongue language represents a powerful source that can be used to increase the target language of learning (Harbord, 1992; Auerbach, 1993).

According to the, Notion (2001), warn teachers against the negative impact of its overuse such as a high level of dependency on the first language (L1) disproportionate use of L1. Depending on this the learners rely heavily on the mother tongue during the EFL classroom will deprive the students of being exposed to English to learn more and better the target language. This idea may supports the

beliefs that using L1 might be harmful for the learners' the learning process since it decreases their opportunities for using the L2 (Pilio Duff, 1994; Turnbull, 2001; and Deller and Rinvoluceri, 2002).

Harmer, (2001), describes that the overuse of mother tongue language obstructs the students' exposure to the target language. That is a risk has been raised against to the overuse of L1.

According to Atkinson (1987), as well, broadly lists the following as possible dangers behind overuse of L1 as follows: the teacher and/ or the students begin to feel that they have not really understood any item of the language until it has been translated. the teacher and/ or the learners fail to observe difference between equivalence of form, semantic equivalence, and pragmatic feature and thus over simplify to the point of using crude and inaccurate translation. Students speak to their teacher using the mother tongue habitually, even when they are quite capable of expressing what they mean. Students fail to realize that during many activities in the classroom it is essential that they use English. In this place, we can realize that the use of L1 in the foreign language teaching cannot be seen a simple decision and the use of first language to a great extent in second language learning will be a hindrance to achievement in the target language.

Therefore, teachers and students need to be conscious of why, when and how much of first language is used in the EFL classes; otherwise, inappropriate use of L1 can have long lasting negative effects on learners production of the target language. In fact, teachers have often been given advice about how to discourage learners from using their L1 in pair/ group. For instance Ur (1996:121), suggests that "if they talking in a small groups, it can be quite challenge to get some classes particularly; the less disciplined and motivated ones to keep to the L2 language." All the same, Cunningham (2000), makes a strong statement that rejecting the use of first language (L1) in pair/ group work is almost equivalent to denying students' access to an essential learning tool: the other students. Students are drawing on each other knowledge (Atkinson 1993). According to Harmer (2001), he believes that the first language is quite acceptable, for instance, when the learners are working in pairs studying a reading text. In the some way he warns that using first

## **2.10 Judicious Use of Mother Tongue in the Young Learners' EFL Classroom**

A number of researchers agree that judicious and planned use of mother tongue can promote target language learning (Ur, 1996; Cameron, 2001) and enhance learners' competence level in the target language. Deller and Rinvoluceri, 2002:10) contend that mother tongue is the womb that the new

languages are born. Atkinson(1987) emphasizes that to ignore the mother tongue in the monolingual classroom is almost certainly to teach with less than maximum efficiency.

Cook (2001) illustrates that MT avoidance promotes a pretend monolingual situation in the foreign language which diminishes classroom reality. She added that the students are pretend native speakers of the second language rather than true L2 users. In Prodromou's (2000) survey in Greek students 65% and 66% of beginner students believe that teachers should know and use students' mother tongue. Here, we can infer that young learners not only need to use their mother tongue but also they need their teachers to employ L1 in the foreign language classroom.

The existing literature on L1 use puts together appropriate and effective L1 use into the following major categories (Chang, 2009; Macaro, 2001; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). The first category is for curriculum access such as conveying meaning of words or sentences, explaining grammar, etc). The second category is for classroom management as organizing tasks, disciplining, and praising students. The third and final grouping is for interpersonal relations (humanization of the affective climate of the classroom, such as chatting with students and telling jokes).

In terms of conveying the meaning of new words, the students' previous L1 learning experience may be beneficial to them because it can be exploited to increase their understanding of the TL (Prince, 1996). According to Atkinson (1993), learning a language is a difficult and often frustrating process for many students, particularly at low levels. In line with Atkinson, Lee (2000) stated that when addressing vocabulary difficulties, students use L1 to confirm or to guess unfamiliar TL words. It is possible that the students' ability to utilize the L1 input enable them to complete their reading tasks more successfully. This argument may be extended to include the fact that teachers can facilitate student learning by making the L1 available complicated words or sentences that would otherwise confuse students if explained in the TL. If a word or sentence is simple enough, it is advisable to take the time to define or explain it in the TL. When a teacher continues using L1 to explain simple vocabulary or sentences, they are using too much L1. In Harbord's opinion, students still require abundant exposure to TL unless instructions communicated in TL lead to miscomprehension and frustration le to them.

However, Harbord (1992) cautions teachers to restrict the use of L1 explanations to abstract complicated words or sentences that would otherwise confuse students if explained in the TL. If a word or sentence is simple enough, it is advisable to take the time to define or explain it in the TL. When a teacher continues using L1 to explain simple vocabulary or sentences, they are using too

much L1. In Harbord's opinion, students still require abundant exposure to TL unless instructions communicated in TL lead to miscomprehension and frustration

## **2.11 Factors Affecting Teachers and Learners' Language Choice**

Both teachers' and learners during the EFL classroom may possibly determine by different factors. As teachers' the language choice, the factors for instance, from the beginning and the service training (Cameron, 2001; Harbord, 1992), have played a very significant role, in factors which affects the teachers and learners in language choice. According to Harbord (1992), said that there is usually in adequate training in alternative target language strategies results in lack of competency and fluency in the target language making the teachers less confident.

## **CHAPTER THREE: Research Design and Methodology**

### **3.1 Methodology**

This chapter is concerned with research design, population of the study, sampling procedure, selection of the school, selection of grade level, selection of students, selection of English teachers, data collection instruments, methods of data analysis and procedure of data collection.

### **3.2 Research Design**

According to Kothari (2004), descriptive type of survey is a method of securing information concerning on existing phenomenon from all or selected members of respondents of the concerned universe. Therefore, in this research design the descriptive survey method was used by integrating both qualitative and quantitative approaches of data collection and analysis so that a clear picture of the problem of the study which has been seen. This is why that enabled the researcher to describe which is the investigating English teachers and learners use of Tigrigna in English classes of Ras Alula Aba Nega Secondary School grade 10 focus & the causes which enforce teachers to use Tigrigna. It also helped the researcher to analyze the data obtained through questionnaire quantitatively, and observations and interviews were analyzed qualitatively and also the researcher has analyzed the data obtain through questionnaire by showing numbers and how many participants they replay frequently and had analyzed quantitatively, from the observations and interviews would analyze by words interpreted qualitatively. Moreover, the study focused on recording the data, analyzing and interpreting the data that was obtained in relation to the study area.

### **3.3 Population of the Study**

The population of the study is grade 10 students and the five (5) available English teachers. The researcher had selected 5 sections from the total of 13 sections by using simple random sampling technique to observe what is actually happening regarding the EFL teachers using Tigrigna in EFL teaching classes. Teachers are the most essential participants in the teaching learning process. Because of, they are considered to be rich sources of the data. In addition to that, the researcher had taken a total 15% and totally 105 students from the total population of 698 students (from 13 sections) of Ras Alula Aba Nega secondary and preparatory school in Aby iAdi Wereda as sample data sources by using simple random sampling technique.

### **3.4 Sampling techniques**

Census sampling techniques has a chance; every member of the population is included in the sample rather than selecting smaller individuals. Therefore, all 5 available English language teachers who are assigned to teach language in the target grade level were taken as a sample through comprehensive census sampling techniques because they are minimum in number and easily manageable. In addition to that, the researcher had taken a total 15% and totally 105 students from the total population of 698 students (from 13 sections) as sample data sources by using systematic sampling technique. This is because; descriptive research typically uses larger samples. It is suggested that from 10-20% of off the accessible population could be selected for the sample (Singh, 2006 as cited in Nigatu, 2013).

#### **3.4.1 Selection of the school**

Here there are two secondary schools in Abyi Adi wereda, these are Meles Zenawi secondary & preparatory school & Ras Alula Aba Nega Secondary & preparatory school. Based on this, I had selected Ras Alula Aba Nega Secondary school by purposive sampling techniques because the school which is my work place & the nearest to my home.

#### **3.4.2 Selection of grade level**

As I mentioned before in the above, in Ras Alula Aba Nega Secondary school there are four grade levels (from grade nine up to grade twelve) .Therefore, the researcher had tried to give equal chance to being selected the participant, who I picked out grade ten (10) by employing lottery system from the above mentioned grade levels.

#### **3.4.3 Selection of students**

In the school where the researcher intended to carry of this research, there were 698 students totally from grade 10, with (5) available teachers at Ras Alula Aba Nega Secondary School. Here the researcher had taken a sample of 15% or approximately 105 students from (13) sections. The rational why the researcher intended to take a sample of 15% students is that he believed a research with a sample of this member of students were manageable. In doing the researcher was use a probability which is called systematic sampling techniques. Systematic sampling allows individuals to be picked up from the whole group, not deliberately but by using the total number of students divide to the sample of the student (15%) and approximately (1, 2, 3, 4, 5 ,6, 7) and take one of the students. Therefore, by writing the name of students from one up to six hundred ninety eight and selecting one student by the intervals of 7 students.

### **3.4.4 Selection of English teachers**

Five English language teachers taken from the four grade level in the schools compound participated in the study as they were directly connected with issue under study. They were taken by census sampling techniques because the available member of the English teachers is included, who are teaching grade ten in the school, as well as all of them they speak Tigrigna as their mother tongue. The teachers had also all degree holders in English and they had more than five years of English teaching experience.

### **3.5 Data Collection Instruments**

This study had adapted a mixed-methods approach by combined or integrated quantitative and qualitative approaches to allow for a breadth of information to be obtained and to investigate the topic in depth. Therefore, in this study there were three types of data gathering tools had proposed to collect data about investigating the English teachers and learners practices Tigrigna in EFL classes.

### **3.6 Questionnaires**

A questionnaire is one of the widely used research tools to elicit information about certain conditions and practices, especially to collect data on different phenomena which are not easily observed such as self-concepts (Selinger and Sahomy, 1989). The researcher has also some understanding from experience that questionnaires help to reach all the subjects in a time saving fashion.

For the main data gathering instrument questionnaire is the tool for gathering the data. The present researcher had used primarily the closed ended questionnaires. Therefore, this questionnaire included items desired to get information about investigating English teachers' use of Tigrigna in English classes and the items had two directions, the first direction has five questions with their alternatives and the second instruction has 19 questions for students, by using the different agreements such as, strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, strongly agree and agree to obtain the data regarding the students' agreement quantitatively. The questionnaire items or questions were taken from Nigatu (2013) with minor modification to make the questionnaire relevant and appropriate for the participant. After the questionnaire will prepare, it was given to experienced teachers and

researchers at school will amend the confusing questionnaire items before distributing for sample respondents of the study.

### **3.7 Interview**

The interview also used process of communication in which the interviewee gives the needed information orally or face to face. According to Best and Kahn (1993) "the purpose of the interviewing people is used to find out what is in their mind –what they think or how they feel about something." Interview could divide in to structured and semi-structured. The semi-structured gives more chance to the interviewee to say what is in his mind. So, in this study, both types of interviews were used but the researcher most of the time had used semi-structured interview because semi-structured interview questions prepared, some of them formally and informally. Comparing to questioner, interview was better for additional clarification in both sides. Whereas, it might expose to the interview in giving all the information he/she have. Here, the researcher had interview (5) English language teachers who had selected the available teachers from grade 10 students that were going to be believed to give reliable information about the investigating English teachers and learners use of Tigrigna (L1) in English classes.

### **3.8 Observation**

This study also needed observation tools of data gathering so as to observe the actual practice of using Tigrigna in English classes at decided school by preparing check lists and using different ways in the class room observation and by registering for how much time the researcher observing. Therefore, the major purposes of the recordings were: to investigate English teachers use of Tigrigna in English classes, occasions in which Tigrigna was used in the English classroom as well as to confirm the data obtained through the observation and telling them that the observations and recordings were for research purposes only.

In line with this, five English teachers had observed two times in each teacher in the selected grade level. During the observation the researcher had use the different check lists with eleven(11) items and audio recorder to the actual class room interaction properly and analyzed their discourse. Those check lists can help me systematically record the observations of L1 or Tigrigna use in English classes. Those categories had selected to better fit the specific context of my research.

### **3.9 Methods of Data Analysis**

The data had analyzed using both quantitatively and qualitatively based on the type of questions prepared and the responses by the respondents. Here the questionnaire items were analyzed quantitatively involving by descriptive mathematical analysis like frequency, percentage and average. In addition to that, the researcher was use tables to the questions collected through closed ended questions; such as strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, strongly agree and agree to obtain the data regarding the students agreement quantitatively and expressed the responses' of the participants how many students they replied frequently and put in the form of average numerically.

The others qualitative data from observation and interview had analyzed and interpreted in words qualitatively. The researcher also should record the data during the observation and interviews analyzed the recorded data in words qualitatively. Therefore, interview which was more helpful to analyzed the interviewees discourse and interpreted effectively from the recorded data.

### **3.10. Procedures of Data Collection**

The data gathering procedures that had used by the researcher first questions were prepared and using pilot test was conducted the experienced teachers and the improvement was taken if same problems were seen. Finally, questions was developed for each type of instrument and they were distributed to the respondents (for learners questionnaire) and then collecting the responded questionnaire wisely from the learners with the school principals and asked (for teachers observation and interview) and collecting the data by using audio record and by writing the interview in words. Interview had also asked and recorded using audio recorders in order to make easy for analysis.

### **3.11 Quality controls**

#### **3.11.1 Validity and Reliability**

Since this research employs data gathering instruments from both qualitative and quantitative approaches, efforts was put in to adequately address the issue of reliability/ dependability and validity/ trustworthiness. Validity is an important term in research that refers to the conceptual and scientific soundness of a research study. Its primary purpose is to increase the accuracy and

usefulness of findings by eliminating or controlling as many confounding variables as possible, which allows for greater confidence in the findings of a given study. Marczyk (2005) cited in (Graziano & Raulin, 2004).

Validity and Reliability of the investigating of English teachers and learner's use of Tigrigna in English classes, after the researcher created different questions, he had given to experienced English teachers to check and comment on the content and also English language teachers were invited to check the validity of the tests.

### **3.11.2 Ethical Consideration**

To have a better validity and reliability consideration about the proposed study the researcher was ready in moral and in commitment. Thus, when it comes to deal with human participant, researchers should carefully care ethical consideration. Furthermore, to protect the participants' rights, moral and to avoid causing them any harm, the researcher assured that the collected data had strictly confidential. Significantly, the participants who involved in the interview of the study were entirely voluntary, and that they can withdraw at any time. As interview had conducted, high standards of ethical consideration should maintain to respondents' private security.

## CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS and DISCUSSION

This section presents interpretations and discussions of the data collected through the questionnaires, classroom observation and interview. In addition to that, this section covers the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data gathered through observation, questionnaire and interview. The data gathered through questionnaire was analyzed quantitatively using percentage and average. On the other hand, data collected through observation and interviews were analyzed qualitatively and were employed in order to crosscheck the results obtained from the questionnaire.

### 4.1.Responses from students' questionnaire regarding the English teacher's use of Tigrigna

Table 4.1 the learners' responses regarding the English teachers' use of Tigrigna

NO.	Items	Alternatives				Total	
		Yes		No			
		F	%	F	%		
1	Does your English teacher use Tigrigna in EFL classes?	90	92%	15	8%	105	100%
3	Does an English teacher use only English in the class in order to make the lesson effective?	21	20%	84	80%	105	100%
4	Students, do you like to use Tigrigna language in English classes?	22	21%	83	79%	105	100%

Based on the above questionnaire results table 4.1 the learners' were asked either their English teachers use Tigrigna or not in EFL classes on number one. Based on that the data collected on this item1,(92%) of the students responded that their EFL teachers employed the learners' mother tongue (Tigrigna) in English classes. But (8%) of the respondents justified that their English teacher did not employed Tigrigna in EFL classes. Thus implied, most of the EFL teachers used Tigrigna in the English classes. To investigate if students are comfortable in such practice of using Tigrigna in EFL classes, they were asked item 3, to respond either they like the use of Tigrigna in their EFL classes or not. Regarding this item, (20%) of the students answered that they like the use of

Tigrigna in English classes, and (80%) of them said that they dislike the use of Tigrigna in EFL classes.

From point of this, we could understand that students dislike the teachers' use of Tigrigna in English classes. Item 4 was also presented to students to respond whether their EFL teachers use only English the lesson in order to make effective. Based on that, the data collected in this item, (21%) of the respondents replied that their teacher used only English in EFL classes, and (79%) of the respondents replied that EFL teachers did not use only English in EFL classes. This showed that the majority of EFL teachers did not use only English in EFL classes to make the lesson effective.

#### **4.1.1 Analysis of the extent to which EFL teachers use Tigrigna in students questionnaire**

According to the following table 4.2 stated, students were asked to give response based on the extent in which their EFL teachers use Tigrigna in English classes on item number 2. Regarding to the data collected in this item, 7(7%) of the students answered that their teacher never employed Tigrigna in English classes. 12(11%) of the participants responded that their English teacher sometimes used Tigrigna in English classes. 75(71%) the majority of the participants responded expressed their English teachers often employed Tigrigna during English classes. The rest of 11(11%) of the participants stated that their teachers always employed Tigrigna during EFL classes. In similar way, the total average of item number 2(82%) is greater than the expected average of the (50%).

Additionally' to the following table 4.2 stated, students were asked to give response based on the extent in which their EFL teachers use Tigrigna in English classes on item number 5, the researcher had tried to asses to what extent do you predict your English teacher to use Tigrigna in English classes. Based on this item, 6(6%) of the participants predicted their English teacher they could never employed Tigrigna in English classes. In line with that, most of the participants 64(61%) predicted that their English teacher should sometimes employed Tigrigna during EFL classes. Whereas 26(25%) of the respondents answered that their EFL teachers often employed Tigrigna in English classes. The final of 9(8%) of the respondents should predicted that their English teacher always used Tigrigna during EFL classes, in the someway, the total average (33%) also stated that it is below the expected average (50%).

The table 4.2: students' responses on the frequency of English teachers' use of Tigrigna in EFL classes and represented as: Never=1, Sometimes=2, Often=3, Always=4.

No	Items	Alternatives								Total		AVR
		1		2		3		4				
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
2	If your answer is "yes" How often does he or she uses Tigrigna in English classes?	7	7%	12	11%	75	71%	11	11%	105	100%	82
5	To what extent do you predict your English teacher use Tigrigna in English classes?	6	6%	64	61%	26	25%	9	8%	105	100%	33

#### 4.1.2 Analysis of Purposes Responses from Students Questionnaire

The following table 4.3: the item 6.2 it states to students to assess their reflection towards the English teachers' purpose of using Tigrigna in EFL classes. Based on that, the item 6.2 students had been asked to show their degree of agreement whether their teacher used Tigrigna or not to ask question in English classes. Concerning this item, 2(2%) of the participants had strongly disagree, 22(21%) were disagree, 21(21%) of the respondents were also neutral, 51(49%) the majority of the respondents were agreed, whereas 9(9%) of them had strongly agreed with an English teacher uses Tigrigna to ask questions. The average value of (77%) is greater than the expected average value (50%). Therefore, from this item I can be concluding that, the EFL teachers used Tigrigna to ask questions during English classes.

Item 6.3 had also proposed to see whether EFL teachers used Tigrigna in English classes to give the clear instruction. Relation to this item, 28(27) of the respondents were disagree, 15(14%) were neutral, in the same way 50(48%) the highest level of respondents were agreed and 12(11%) of them strongly agree. Similarly, the average (73%) showed higher value than the expected average(50%). Therefore, it is clearly stated that the EFL teachers employed Tigrigna in English classes to give clear instruction.

Item 6.4 was concerned whether the English teacher used Tigrigna to give feedback or not. In relation to this item 30(29%) of the participants were disagreed, 13(12%) of the respondents were also neutral, the same as 48(46%) of the respondents were agreed, whereas 14(13%) of the participants were strongly agreed. At the same time, the average value (71%) is greater than the expected average value (50%). Due to that, it implies that EFL teachers employed Tigrigna to give feedback to their students.

The main purpose of the item (6.5) was to see whether the EFL teachers employed Tigrigna to increase relationship with the students. Based on that, 22(21%) of the participants were strongly disagreed, 29(28%) of the respondents were also disagreed, 10(10%) of the respondents had neutral, whereas 25(24%) of the participants had agreed and 19(17%) of them agreed. Likewise, its average value is (48%) less than expected average (50%). Due to that, it showed that the EFL teachers had not employ Tigrigna to increase the relationship with their students.

The main issue of item (6.6) was concerned to see that whether the EFL teachers use Tigrigna to explain complex ideas of language. Based on the data gathered, 11(10%) of the respondents had strongly agreed, 16(15%) were also disagreed, 9(9%) had neutral, whereas 35(34%) of them agreed with the main issue and 34(32%) of the respondents were strongly agreed. Similarly, the expected average value (50%) is higher than the value of the stated total average value (48%). Therefore, it implies that EFL teachers employed the Tigrigna during EFL classes in order to explain the complex concepts of language.

Table 4.3: students responses connected to the teachers' purpose of using Tigrigna during EFL classes, and students degree of agreement: strongly disagree(SDA) =1, disagree (DA) =2, neutral (N) =3, agree (A) =4, strongly agree (SA) =5

No	Items	Responses										AVR
		1		2		3		4		5		
6.1	Related to purpose using Tigrigna	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
6.2	English teacher uses Tigrigna to ask questions	2	2	22	21	21	19	51	49	9	9	77
6.3	English teacher uses Tigrigna to in EFL classes to give clear instruction	-	-	28	27	15	14	50	48	12	11	73
6.4	English teacher uses Tigrigna to give feedback	-	-	30	29	13	12	48	46	14	13	71

6.5	English teacher uses Tigrigna to increase relationship with the students	22	21	32	30	7	7	25	24	19	17	48
6.6	English teacher use Tigrigna to explain complex ideas of language	11	10	16	15	9	9	35	34	34	32	75
6.7	English teacher uses Tigrigna to manage the class room	37	35	25	24	17	16	8	8	18	17	41
6.8	English teacher uses Tigrigna to check STS listening comprehension	30	28	29	28	16	15	28	27	3	3	45
6.9	English teacher uses Tigrigna to check STS reading comprehension	4	4	26	25	23	22	50	48	2	2	72

Additionally, on the table 4.3: item (6.7) also proposed to see that whether the EFL teachers used Tigrigna to manage the class room in English classes. Based on this issue, 37(35%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, 25(24%) disagreed, whereas 17(16%) of the respondents were neutral, 8(8%) of them were agreed and 18(17%) of the respondents had strongly agreed. Due to that, the average value (41%) stated lower value than the expected average (50%). Therefore, the item can be perceived that most of the EFL teachers didn't use Tigrigna to manage the class room situations.

Based on the issue of item (6.8) was to see that whether the EFL teachers used Tigrigna to check their students during listening comprehensions. Based on this issue, 30(28%) of the participants were strongly disagreed, 23(22%) were also disagreed, 21(20%) of the respondents were neutral, however 28(27%) of those were agreed, and 3(3%) of the participants were strongly agreed. The average value of this item is (45%) also stated less value than the expected average (50%). Therefore, the item implied that the EFL teachers did not use Tigrigna to check their students during the listening comprehensions.

The item 6.9 also stated to show that whether the EFL teachers used Tigrigna to their students in reading comprehension. Concerning on this item, 4(4%) of the respondents were strongly disagreed, 26(25%) of them were disagreed, whereas 23(22%) were neutral, and 50(48%) of the majority of the respondents were also agreed, and 2(2%) of them were strongly agreed. The average value (72%) is showed higher average than the expected average (50%). I can be expressed that the EFL teachers used Tigrigna to check their students in reading comprehension.

To sum up, based on the relation purpose related of using L1 (Tigrigna) during EFL classes, I can be completed this item some of the EFL teachers did not used the L1 (Tigrigna) in English classes,

in order to check their students in listening comprehension, to manage their class room and to increase their relation with their students. However, most of the EFL teachers used Tigrigna in English classes in order to give clear instruction, to ask question, to check their students reading comprehension, to give feedback and to explain complex concepts of language in English classes' situation.

#### 4.1.3 Analysis of causes Responses from Students Questionnaire

Based the following table, 4.4: learners had asked whether their English teacher used Tigrigna during English classes because his/her students to reduce language anxiety. On this item 6.2.1, showed that 8(8%) of the respondents were strongly disagreed, 20(19%) of the participants had disagreed, 25(24%) were also neutral whereas 48(46%) of them were agreed, and 4(3%) of them were strongly agreed. The total average value (73%) had also expressed more than the expected average value (50%). Concerning on this item, it is possible to conclude that the EFL teachers used (L1) Tigrigna because to reduce their language anxiety.

On the issue of item 6.2.2, was also designed whether the EFL teachers use Tigrigna in English classes, because of his/her poor language ability. Due to that, the item 6.2.2.stated that, 22(21%) of the respondents were strongly disagreed, 56(53%) of them were disagreed, whereas 9(9%) were also neutral, 11(10%) of them were agreed and 7(7%) were strongly agreed. Therefore, the total average value (26%) of this item is less than the expected average (50%). Concerning on this, I can conclude that the EFL teachers' use of Tigrigna because of their poor language ability.

Table 4.4: the causes of EFL teachers using Tigrigna in English classes: students responses connected to the teachers' causes of using Tigrigna during EFL classes, and students degree of agreement: strongly disagree (SDA)=1, disagree (DA) =2, neutral (N)=3, agree (A) =4, strongly agree (SA) =5

No	Items	Alternatives										AVR
		1		2		3		4		5		
6.2	Related to the causes of using Tigrigna in EFL classes	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
6.2.1	English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes b/c it reduces language anxiety	8	8	20	19	25	24	48	46	4	3	73
6.2.2	English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes b/c his/her language poor ability	22	21	56	53	9	9	11	10	7	7	26

6.2.3	English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes b/c of students poor understanding of the lesson	16	15	21	20	12	11	42	41	14	13	65
6.2.4	English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes b/c it saves a lot of time	11	10	17	16	25	24	42	40	10	10	72

The main purpose of item 6.2.3 was whether the EFL teachers used Tigrigna in EFL classes because of students' poor understanding of the lesson. Based on the data gathered, 16(15%) of the respondents strongly agreed, 21(20%) disagreed, 12(11%) were neutral, whereas 42(41%) of them agreed and 14(13%) strongly agreed. In the same way, the total average (65%) is higher than the expected average value (50%). From this I can perceive that EFL teachers used Tigrigna because of their students' poor understanding of the lesson.

The final item (6.2.4) presented to students response whether the EFL teachers used Tigrigna in EFL classes because it saves a lot of time. In relation to this item, 11(10%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, 17(16%) of them were disagreed, whereas 25(24%) of the respondents were neutral, 42(40%) of them agreed and 10(10%) were also strongly agreed. Likewise, its total average (72%) is also greater than the expected average value (50%). From this point of view, I can perceive the English teachers used Tigrigna in English classes because it can save a lot of time.

In brief, based on the above table 4.4 most of the EFL teachers used Tigrigna to reduce language anxiety, because of their students' poor understanding of the lesson and to save a lot of time.

#### 4.1.4 Analysis of Conditions Responses from Students Questionnaire

Table 4.5: the conditions of EFL teachers using Tigrigna in English classes: students responses connected to the teachers' conditions of using Tigrigna during EFL classes, and students degree of agreement: strongly disagree (SDA)=1, disagree (DA) =2, neutral (N)=3, agree (A) =4, strongly agree (SA) =5

No	Items	Alternatives										AVR
		1		2		3		4		5		
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
6.3	Connected to conditions											
6.3.1	English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes during grammar lesson	11	11	15	14	13	12	39	37	27	26	75
6.3.2	English teacher uses	22	21	13	13	14	13	33	31	23	22	66

	Tigrigna when the lesson is difficult											
6.3.3	English teacher uses Tigrigna when he/she lack of English to express concept clearly	33	31	41	39	9	9	12	11	10	10	30
6.3.4	English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes during new vocabulary lesson	15	14	20	19	7	7	36	34	27	26	67
6.3.5	The English teacher uses Tigrigna when the students fail to understand reading the passage	15	14	19	18	4	4	44	42	23	22	68

In the above statement table 4.5 shows that the conditions of EFL teachers using Tigrigna in English classes: students responses connected to the teachers' conditions of using Tigrigna during EFL classes, and students of agreement. Based on that, the learners' need overall view regarding the possible learning occasions where it is appropriate to use Tigrigna in English classrooms. The students show a positive attitude on all the listed items, except for 6.3.3. As indicated in the table above, the learners' positiveness ranges from thirty percent to seventy five percent. The majority of the learners believe that it is appropriate to use English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes during the grammar lesson (75%). Also, sixty eight percent (68%) think that the English teacher uses Tigrigna when the students fail to understand reading the passage. Almost the same percentage (67%) agrees that English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes during new vocabulary lesson. They also indicate that the sixty six percent (66%) English teacher uses Tigrigna when the lesson is difficult.

In detail, according to the above table 4.5, item 6.3.1 students were asked to show their degree of agreement whether their English teacher using Tigrigna in EFL classes during grammar lesson. Concerning to this item, 11(11%) of the participants were strongly disagree, 15(14%) were disagree, 13(12%) were also neutral, 39(37%) the majority of the participants were agree whereas 27(26%) of them were strongly agreed. The total average value of this item (75%) is greater than the expected average (50%). Therefore, I can be concluded that, the English teachers used Tigrigna in EFL classes during grammar lesson.

Item 6.3.2 was proposed to see whether EFL teachers used Tigrigna in English classes when the lesson is difficult. Based on that, the data collected 22(21%) of the respondents were strongly disagree, 13(13%) disagree, 14(13%) of them were neutral, whereas 33(31%) of the respondents agreed and 23(22%) of them strongly agreed. The total average of this item (66%) showed higher than the expected average (50%). It is clearly indicated that the EFL teachers used Tigrigna in English classes when the lesson is difficult.

Item 6.3.3 was stated that whether the EFL teachers used Tigrigna in English classes when he/she lack of English to express concepts clearly. Relation to this item, 33(31%) of the respondents were strongly agreed, 41(39%) were disagreed, 9(9%) were neutral whereas 12(11%) of the learners agreed and 10(10%) were strongly agreed. At the same time the total average (30%) is lower than the expected average (50%). Therefore it stated that EFL teachers did not use Tigrigna when she/he lack of English to express concepts clearly.

Item 6.3.4 stressed on whether EFL teachers used Tigrigna in English classes during new vocabulary lesson. Based on the collected data 15(14%) of students strongly agreed, 20(19%) were disagreed, 7(7%) of the respondents neutral, 7(7%) were also neutral, 36(34%) the higher respondents of this item were agreed and the rest of the 27(26%) were strongly agreed. The expected average (50%) is also lower than the total average (67%) of this item. Based on that, I can conclude that the EFL teachers used Tigrigna in English classes during new vocabulary lesson.

The item 6.3.5 focused on whether the EFL teachers used Tigrigna when the students fail understand reading the passage. In relation to that, the data collected from the respondents 15(14%) of students strongly agreed, 19(18%) were disagreed, whereas 4(4%) were also neutral, 44(42%) the majority of the respondents were agreed and 23(22%) of them strongly agreed. The expected average (50%) is also lower than the total average value of (67%). Therefore, it can be concluded that the EFL teachers used Tigrigna in English classes when the students fail to understand reading passage.

Generally, from the above table 4.5 almost of the EFL teachers used Tigrigna during the English classes in grammar lesson, when the lesson is difficult, in new vocabulary lesson and when the students fail to understand reading passage with 66% of the minimum total average or more than 66% percent of the given items except 6.3.3 item.

#### **4.1.5 The Data Taken from Classroom Observation**

In my current study, I am going to investigate through direct observations how the teachers and students use L1 within the EFL classroom and reasons for this use. The method that I selected for this study is classroom observations, undertaken with the view that data from direct observation could contrast with, and potentially complement information obtained by different ways. This method will allow me to assess the actual practices of Tigrigna (MT) in the Ras Alula Aba Nega Secondary School during EFL classroom observation.

Since observations allow the researcher the opportunity to see what happens in the classroom and do not rely entirely on what participants say they do, hence, in Dorneyi (2007) terms, “such data can provide a more objective account of events and behaviors than second-hand self-report data” . In line with that, observations are invaluable in terms of providing highly descriptive contextual information about the research setting. Given “the formidable task of documenting the complexity of classroom reality,” it was considered necessary to attempt and create some form of structure to my observations through the use of semi-structured schemes, however, attempting at the same time not to lose sight of the emergent nature of the investigation (Dorneyi, 2007).

The classroom observations made possible the direct, systematic, and principled covering of specific areas of interest during observations (Nunan, 1992). I pre-planned and carried out observations purposefully to serve the specific research questions and objectives in relations to the extent of L1 use and various functions of this use for teachers and students. Due to time constraints, it was so difficult to me to observe the actual classroom observations two times, but as much as possible I did it the actual classroom observation by using note making and audio recording with the support of my colleagues.

Therefore, as I have observed in the two round classroom observation situation, most of the English teachers used L1 (Tigrigna) in English classes in the following conditions. During vocabulary presentation, while they were teaching the following topics. Teacher 1 used or employed the students L1 during reading passage with title of “travel behaviors “on page( 44) in the actual classroom observation in round 1. Teacher 2 also used L1 when discussing the meaning of words in the given passage contexts in round 1 on page (48) about “travel behaviors.” When managing the classroom, Teacher 2, in round 1 used Tigrigna even though there was the students’ disciplinary problem in the class room. During the reading passage, in round 2, teacher 1 was teaching a reading comprehension in the similar classroom observation in round two.

In line with that, in the second round classroom observation, during grammar presentation lesson, while the teachers they were teaching the following topics. Teacher 3 employed L1, when he was teaching about simple past on page (50). Teacher 4 also used L1 when he taught about “different types of sentences based on their structure” with its appearance on page (52-53) in the first round observation class. Teacher 3 used L1 while he was teaching about using comma and semi-colon on page (62-63) in the round two. Teacher 4 also practiced students L1 when he was teaching about word formation or parts of speech on page (78-79) in the second round. Teacher 5 also practiced learners L1 when he was teaching on the topic of “adverbs of manner” with its appearance on page (82-83) in the first round and about reading passage in the second round.

In the following table 4.1, I stated the total number of classes used in the present study indicating with a tick (✓) the two classes round in each English teacher which were audio recorded and the five teachers which I observed.

Table 4.1 Number of teachers observed with Audio recorded

Number of teachers	Observed teachers	Audio recorded
T1	✓	✓
T2	✓	✓
T3	✓	✓
T4	✓	✓
T5	✓	✓

A significant feature of my data collection method is that it does not depend entirely on what participants’ say they do but rather what is documented. Here I collected data from the observed classes through the instruments of: observational audio recording and note making. I deemed it crucial to reflect on how to employ the above instruments to document the observations in a fashion that meets the purpose of the present research in an efficient manner.

According to Burns, (1992:82), stated that “to remain aloof and distant and to have little or no contact with the subjects of the research.” Participant observation, on the other hand, involves direct observer participation within the classroom. This form of observation has been criticized on the ground that such involvement could lead the participant to lose sight of those observed and their activities (Merriam, 1998). However, in a teacher centered classroom in the proposed site was, little

benefit would arise from participating with students who were generally passive. Rather, I was more likely to collect rich data through observing both teachers and students.

Finally, the researcher had finished his collecting data by using the audio recording descriptive and detailed note taking process; even though numbers of challenges were getting especially, the students' shyness during audio recording.

## 4.2 The Data Taken from Classroom Observation Relating to EFL Teachers' use of Tigrigna

Table 4. 2 The classroom English with Tigrigna proportions during the EFL classes.

Languages and numbers of words	Observed Teachers'										Average	
	First Round					Second Round						
		T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T1	T2	T3	T4		T5
Total English words spoken by teachers & learners	F	2334	1505	1125	949	1174	1511	1406	1107	816	989	1291
	%	84.6	95.5	73.2	97.2	95.9	76.5	85.4	58.4	97	93.4	83.4
Total Tigrigna words spoken by teachers & learners'	F	425	70	412	27	49	463	240	789	25	70	257
	%	15.4	4.4	26.8	2.8	4.0	23.4	14.6	41.6	3.0	6.7	16.6
Total English & Tigrigna spoken words	F	2759	1575	1537	976	1223	1974	1646	1896	841	1059	1548
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source; from the recorded data and actual classroom observation in English classes.

As I mentioned in the above table 4.2 the researcher had observed five EFL teachers' the practice of using Tigrigna on English classes two times or in two rounds when the EFL teachers' were teaching in the classroom situation. All in one subject the EFL teachers employed the Tigrigna (L1) during the English classes' even if their frequency were different. For instance, Teacher 2 used (4.4%) the students mother tongue, Teacher 4 also used (2.8%) of the Tigrigna language, and the Teacher 5 employed (4.0%) of the learners' first language in the first round of the actual classroom observation. In a similar way, Teacher 4 also employed (3.0%) of the learners first language and Teacher 5 used (6.7%) of the Tigrigna language in the second round of actual classroom observation.

In addition to that, the researcher had also observed five EFL teachers' the use of Tigrigna on English classes two times or in two rounds when the EFL teachers' were teaching in the classroom situation. The English teachers employed the Tigrigna (L1) language during the English classes' even if their frequency were different. For example, Teacher 1 employed (15.4%) of learners first language (Tigrigna) and Teacher 3 also employed (26.8%) of the learners first language during the first round actual classroom observation. In the same way, Teacher 1 also employed (23.4%) of the Tigrigna language, Teacher 2 (14.6%), and Teacher 3 employed (41.6%) of the learners mother tongue during the EFL classes in the second round actual classroom observation.

On my personal point' Tigrigna was the most frequently used by teacher 3; 412 times that was (26.8%) in the first round and 789 times which was (41.6%) of his total words in the second round, and the second frequently words spoken by teacher 1: 425 times that was (15.4%) in the first round and 463; times that was (23.4%) of his total spoken words in the second round actual classroom observation. Due to that, especially Teacher 3 and Teacher 1 were used more mother tongue in the classroom sloppily without intention. The other teachers' also respectively continued in such a way in their EFL classes. No matter how different the frequency was, it was possible to conclude that all the teachers preferred to use their learners' mother tongue while teaching English. See the table 4.2

As clearly shown in table 4.2 the total average percentage (16.6%) of the learners' L1 words were employed in the first and second round actual classroom observation and (83.4%) words of English were used during the EFL classes. Therefore, it was greater than the recommended percentage of L1 employed during EFL classroom. Because of this, it realized that there is unsupported extent use of the mother tongue in English classes and relatively large amount of Tigrigna language more than the suggested empirical sources by impressive researchers regard to the extent of practicing Tigrigna language in English classes by both EFL teachers and learners' in the stated secondary school. According to the authoritative researchers, none of the teachers' talks matches with the suggested amount of utterances by Atkinson, 1987 (95% English words to 5% L1). This figure is even greater than what Tang (2002) reports: 5 to 10% of the class time in Chinese context. Hence, the conclusion can be drawn from this it shows a gap between teachers' and students' use of the L1 and what they carry out in the actual classroom in my study areas.

For this reason, as a researcher I like to suggest that L1(Tigrigna) is likely to be used in the high school levels to help our learners' for the sack of understanding the target language by interpreting the new words and challenging ideas in different topics since learners have negative attitude

towards the target language, they don't have more background knowledge of L2 and so they may use their mother tongue as their reference point. However, the students' mother tongue being employed in the EFL classes in the study areas could be judged to be relatively excess and inappropriate which may in turn enforced learning of the target language. The principle, thus, should be use English where possible and learners' mother tongue where necessary as noted by (Weschler 1997), instead of teaching English in L1 throughout the whole lesson. See appendix five

#### **4.2.1 The data taken from teachers' interview**

Based to interview the EFL teacher's response on the extent in which they use Tigrigna language in English classes, they interviewed the data as follows:

Teacher1 often use Tigrigna in English classes. Teacher2 often use Tigrigna in English classes. According to that, is not advisable however, when we see the student background most of the time, most student do not understand English language easily. When we see their background their lower grade level, it is a habit to communicate using Tigrigna language before this grade level. Teacher3 is also to say, I often use Tigrigna. Teacher4 I sometimes use Tigrigna in English classes. T5 I rarely use Tigrigna in English classes.

According the above interviewed, three teachers (T1, T2& T3) often use Tigrigna; (T4) sometimes used Tigrigna in English classes and (T5) rarely used Tigrigna in English classes. Therefore, from this data what can be drown that there is a different of thought among English teachers regarding the use of students' mother tongue (Tigrigna) in English classes. It shows that English teachers do not have common agreement based on its use.

#### **4.3The data taken from EFL teachers' interview based use of Tigrigna**

According to the data obtained from the interview, the interviewee stated that they used students' mother tongue in English classes even if the extent of using it was not common among them. Concerning this, they were asked whether they use Tigrigna in English classes, & they expressed as T1: yes I use, I often use Tigrigna in EFL classes. T2: yes I use Tigrigna in EFL classes. T3: yes I use. T4: I use Tigrigna in EFL classes T5: I use Tigrigna rarely. Thus, from the data, we understand that all EFL teachers use Tigrigna in English classes.

#### **4.3.1 The data taken from EFL teacher's interview based on conditions**

English teachers were also interviewed regarding the conditions when they used students mother tongue (Tigrigna) in English classes, and they expressed as follows:

T1, T2 & T3 express almost similar idea conserving the condition of using Tigrigna in EFL classes. They use Tigrigna during group discussion, during presentation when the grammar part is difficult to understand, during difficult words and during instructions in group discussion. T4 & T5 are also explained the conditions that lead him to employ Tigrigna in EFL classes as follow. When there is confusion, when the concept is not clear for the students, when there is disagreement or misunderstanding between the teacher and the students, or when there is confusion on the concept just I use Tigrigna. When I order them to do something, just they do not actively involved in that activity. If they do not activity involve in that activity, this help me to understand that they do not know the concept or the instruction, and sometimes, some vocabularies are above their level or beyond their level and students face confusion in such situation I use Tigrigna. In addition to that, if the grammar part is difficult I employ it. But, from my experience most of the time, I use Tigrigna regarding vocabularies. Because words are difficult in their level at that time it is better to tell them in their own mother tongue. From the data above, it is common that all EFL teachers used Tigrigna during group discussion, during instructions, when the lesson is difficult, or when the expression is difficult.

Based on the above data, it realized that EFL teachers mostly used students' mother tongue (Tigrigna) in English classes during group discussion, during instructions, when the lesson is difficult or the expression is difficult, during vocabulary and grammar presentation.

#### **4.3.2 The data taken from EFL teachers' interview based on purposes**

This type of interview has designed, to obtain information about the function of using Tigrigna in EFL classes. Regarding this, interviewed teachers expressed their ideas as follows.

T1 & T2: the main purpose of using Tigrigna in EFL classes is to clarify instruction's and sometimes to make clear the grammar parts, to communicate each other, to clarify the topic as a whole, in order to ask the questions, so as to express the difficult lessons, and in order to manage the class room or the students in a good way. As they said that, they used Tigrigna in this way to enable the students understanding what they said. T3 stated as I used Tigrigna in English classes for different purpose. For instance, I used to make the instruction clear. I use Tigrigna when I get difficult words or new words in English classes. If the students do not understand the lesson during

the teaching learning process, I try to translate them in to Tigrigna. When the reading passage is not clear for them I try to inform or to tell them the general message of the text or the reading text. So I used for this and other purposes in English classes. This idea also prepared by T4. T5: the main purpose of using Tigrigna in EFL classes is to clarify difficult lesson & when the lesson which is not related with their culture & age. See appendix four

In general, all interviewed teachers expressed that the purposes, which are common among them, of using Tigrigna in English classes are used: to clarify instructions, to make clear the grammar parts, in order to ask questions, to clarify the difficult lessons, to manage the class room, so as to make the reading text clear, and to make the expression, the concept or the idea clear.

### **4.3.3 The data taken from EFL teachers based on causes**

Based on the causes of using Tigrigna in EFL classes the teachers responses are presented as follows.

T1, T2 & T3 are expressed that the main cause of using Tigrigna in English class rooms are students back ground as they are Tigrigna speakers the resembles in to their mother tongue & in the lower grade level they adapt using Tigrigna in EFL classes. In other sense, they used their mother tongue language in lower grades level & then they adapt this situations. The influence of lower grades & there is also social influence, when they are out of the school they listen Tigrigna due to this they are not happy only English. The students unable to understand the text, the shortage of time, & also when we see our text book it is very vast. So, in order to cover the portion & sometimes even we teachers also may not have the ability to express the whole using the English language. So, these enforce us to use Tigrigna. Therefore, these are the main causes of using Tigrigna in EFL classes.

T4 & T5 are also stated the cause that let me to use Tigrigna in class in that when I observe the situation, I understand as they do not understand the concept. My own habit also let obligates me to use Tigrigna. Just my habit is that I use Tigrigna. I think that, they do not understand the concept, even the students may know the concept, but I think that they may not understand the concept. I feel in my mind. So my habit also let me use Tigrigna. See appendix four

From the above data showed, the common causes that let EFL teachers to use students L1 in English classes are students back ground of using mother tongue in lower grades, the ability of understanding English expressions, the volume of text book, the nature of the subject matter which

is full of new words the inability of the teacher to express the whole lesson using the English language & teachers own habit of using Tigrigna.

#### **4.4 Discussion**

Based in my research, the first research question was designed to investigate English teachers use of Tigrigna in English classes & the extent in which English teachers' use of Tigrigna in English classes. To investigate this, the researcher employed observation, questionnaire and interview. Therefore, as data gathered from class room observation described, five EFL teachers used Tigrigna in English classes excessively and sloppy even the students do not like this classroom practice. In addition to that, the data obtained from the class room observation also showed that there was unsupported extent (16.6) used Tigrigna in English classes. Therefore, it realized that EFL teachers used Tigrigna more than the suggested empirical sources by authoritative researchers regard to the extent of using L1 in English classes. So, it shows that the EFL teachers do not have common agreement among them concerning its use. Based on the gathered information from the students' questionnaire also, the majority of the students' response that their teachers used Tigrigna in English classes. Most of the students declared that English teachers used an excessive amount of Tigrigna in EFL classes although the students dis like their overuse. From the data gathered in teachers' interviews, all the teachers use Tigrigna in English classes. In other sense, from the total five interviewed teachers, the three teachers often used Tigrigna and the rest two teachers used sometimes and rarely.

Related with this, as it is suggested by researchers like Colman and Daniel (1988) as they cited in Turnbull (2001) stated that 95% use of the target language was seemed appropriate. The some as, Nigatu (2013) referring to Atkins(1987) suggested that the ratio of 5% L1 used to about 95% L2 may be profitable, & Tang (2002) also recommended that 5-10% of L1 use to be facilitative in English language classes. Atkinson (1987) as cited in Mahmutoglu and Kicir (2013) also expressed that overuse of L1 has the following problems. The teacher and the students can feel that they do not really understand any language items unless they are translated in to their L1. The teacher & the students fail to point out the distinctions between equivalence and other features that they may oversimplify through and inaccurate translation. The learners speak to their teachers anything in their mother tongue even if they have the ability to express what they mean in English, and the learners fail to realize the essentiality of using English during classroom tasks. Thus, the researcher

does not suggest the overuse of students' mother tongue in English language classes. But, when it is needed, L1 should be used in a limited amount. This implies that the result of this study and empirical sources never confirmed related to the relative recommended amount of students' L1 use in EFL classes. But the negative impact of L1 use was more or less consistent with the above researcher as observed in classroom observation. See appendix five

The second research question was aimed to identify the purpose of using Tigrigna in EFL classes. Concerning this, the students' questionnaire showed that EFL teachers used Tigrigna so as to ask question, give clear instruction, check reading comprehension, to save time, to provide feedback & explain new concepts of the language. In line with this, the interviewed teachers expressed that they used to clarify instructions, to make clear the grammar parts, in order to ask the questions, to clarify the difficult lessons, to manage the classroom, so as to make the reading text clear, & to make the expression, the concept or the idea clear. As the researcher observed in the actual classroom, EFL teachers used Tigrigna in English classes to make the grammar section clear, to ask questions, so as to give and make clear instructions, to give response for the question when they asked by the students, and to manage the classroom when there is disciplinary problem in the class.

Based on this issue, Khrama and Kaijai (1989) expressed that L1 is vital in L2 learning in order to save time, explaining vocabulary and giving instructions. Samadi, in Mahmutoglu&Kicir (2013) the teachers use the L1 mainly to explain grammar, to translate vocabulary, to manage the classroom well & give instructions. Al-hinai (2011) as cited Mahmutoglu&Kicir (2013) pointed out some of the role off using L1 as follows. It is used to check students understanding and to give instructions. It is also more helpful to explain the meaning of words & express grammar. It is clear that, the finding of this study relation to the purpose of using L1 were almost similar with empirical sources of the researchers' recommendation. And the average value of the students' questionnaire assured that EFL teachers had various purposes to use students' mother tongue even if they did not it properly.

The third research question was also dealt with EFL teachers' causes of using Tigrigna in English classes. The students' questionnaire indicated that English teachers used Tigrigna in EFL classes because of students' poor understanding of the lesson. From the teachers' interview, it is also confirmed that EFL teachers used students L1 in English classes are students' background of using their mother tongue in lower grades, their inability of understanding English expressions, the volume of the text books, the nature of the subject which is full of new words, the inability of the

teacher express the whole lesson using the English language & teachers own habit of using Tigrigna.

Therefore regarding to this research question, based the students questionnaire and teachers interview, one finding to use L1 in EFL classes was students poor understanding of the lesson consistent with Salah (2011) expressed that L1 is used when they are incapable of expressing and understanding the target language. In addition to that, one finding in teachers interview was similar with Cameron (2001) stated that lack of competency and fluency in target language making teachers less confident to use the target language. With this regard, it is true to say that questionnaire & some interview findings were consistent with the above researchers' suggestions, but some other findings from the interview were not similar with it as it can be seen in the teachers interview extract.

The fourth research question was intended to investigate conditions that English teachers use of Tigrigna in EFL classes. As the data stated in students' questionnaire that English teachers use Tigrigna in EFL classes during new vocabulary presentation, during new grammar presentation, when the students failed to understand the reading passage, and when the lesson was difficult to understand. Interviewed teachers claimed that they used Tigrigna during group discussion, during instructions, when the lesson or the expression is difficult. It is also proved during observation that English teachers used Tigrigna during grammar presentation, during vocabulary presentation, reading passage, managing the students' disciplinary problem in class.

Based on this, the findings of this study is consistent with Auerbach (1993) & Cameron (2001) as they stated that students' L1 used on condition of presenting new words and abstract ideas through translation, explanation of complex ideas, managing the classroom, giving instructions, & checking learners' understanding. The same as, Anton & Di Camilla (1998) showed L1 is used during pair or group work to students learning. It is clear that the situations that lead English teachers to use L1 in EFL classes were almost similar with what is recommended by researchers.

In general, the findings obtained in this study proved that EFL teachers have not common agreement among them on the use of Tigrigna language in the English classes. In spite of the fact, EFL teachers used students L1 in certain situation & causes which obligate them for the successful accomplishment of various purposes of teaching the target language. They did not consider the students learning preference, their level of understanding & appropriate situation to use it accordingly. Excessive and sloppy use of L1, considered for hindering students not to have target

language proficiency. Teachers were sometimes seemed to use Tigrigna language without having a particular objective & they did not also use limited amount of L1 in the classroom as obtained in the data gathered through the three data collections instruments.

## **CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARIES, CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION**

### **5.1 Summary of the Finding**

Based on the data analysis & discussions the following major findings are drawn. In addition to that, the main objective of this study was that investigating English teachers and learners' use of Tigrigna in English classes at Ras Alula AbaNegu secondary & preparatory school grade 10 in focus. Concerning this objective, the study tried to answer the following research questions which were designed on the beginning of the study.

- 1 what are the causes that English teachers use Tigrigna in English classes?
- 2 for what purpose do English teachers use Tigrigna in English classes?
- 3 In what situations do English teachers use Tigrigna in English classes?
- 4 How often frequently do teachers and students use their L1 in the English class room?

The above objective and based on the research question designed of the study, the classroom observation, students questionnaire and teachers interview were designed to gather the detail data from teachers & students either English teachers use Tigrigna in EFL classes, to investigate conditions that English teachers' use Tigrigna in English classes, purpose that English teacher use Tigrigna in EFL classes. How often do the teachers use L1 in EFL teaching & learning classes, and the causes that let English teachers use Tigrigna in English classes? After this point, the classroom observation employed for 5 English teachers and the researcher also observed two times to see the actual practice of L1 in English class. The questionnaire was again distributed to 105 students' and the semi structured interviews were employed for 5 English teachers.

Therefore, the data gathered through all instruments were analyzed using mixed approaches i.e. quantitative & qualitative approach. The data instruments were designed and adapted to point out the conditions, the purpose, the causes and the amount of using Tigrigna used when English teachers' teach in EFL classes. Due to that, the collected quantitative data were analyzed using simple descriptive statistical tools for instance, frequency, percentage and average. The qualitative data were also interpreted verbally.

Based on the data gathered, the following the major pillar finding of this study. Most English teachers often used Tigrigna. The English teachers used Tigrigna during group discussion, when the lesson is difficult, during grammar presentation, during vocabulary presentation, if there is a

reading passage. The English teachers used Tigrigna to ask questions, to make the instruction clear, to give responses for the questions when they asked by the students, & to manage the classroom when there is students disciplinary problem in the class. Students background of using their mother tongue in the lower grade levels, students inability of understanding English expressions, the volume of the text book and the nature of the subject that is of new words were also causes to use Tigrigna.

## **5.2 Conclusion of the Findings**

To collect the data for this study, the researcher had conducted a study on the English teachers using and causes of using Tigrigna in EFL classes. The researcher collected the data gathering by using the three instruments (classroom observation, questionnaire and interview) were employed. Therefore on the data collected and analyzed, the researcher reached the following conclusions.

The English teachers used students (L1) Tigrigna excessively in EFL classes as it is indicated in the result of the study. In addition to that, the students were not also interested by their teachers over use of Tigrigna in English classes. Due to the information obtained from the students' questionnaire & teachers' interview, I concluded that the English language teachers that used an excessive L1 in EFL classes was not intentional & well managed.

In addition to this the finding declares that the English teachers used Tigrigna on the grammar presentation, on vocabulary presentation, when they asking questions, on giving instruction, on giving answers, managing the classroom if there is students disciplinary problem and when there is a reading passage. Thus it is drawn from the finding that EFL teachers used Tigrigna not only during the mentioned before conditions but also in most of ordinary expressions haphazardly with no selecting the situation which used Tigrigna. However, using students' mother tongue in any time without plan and appropriate conditions may lead English teachers unable to achieve their primary objective of teaching the target language. Therefore, I concluded that it is essential to use Tigrigna intentionally and purposefully.

From the data obtained through students questionnaire and teachers interview, most of the English teachers declared Tigrigna in English classes because the students background of using their mother tongue in the lower grade level, students inability to understand English expressions, the large size of the text book, and nature of the subject matter which is full of new words. But, whenever the causes which make the lesson difficult, one can overcome the challenges by designing different and

appropriate language teaching strategies rather than immediately using Tigrigna, using L1 should be the last option to tackle the problems. Unless teachers do this, using L1 in any conditions may badly hurt the teaching learning process of the target language.

### **5.3 Recommendations of the study**

Based on the data analysis and discussions, summary of the major findings and conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are forwarded for the investigating of the English teachers and learners towards using Tigrigna language in EFL classes, so that it may benefit for the future research & the educational system.

- The English teachers should have the common agreement among them based on the use of students L1 to teach their students nearly similar without making difference among them at least in the some school & grade level.
- The English teachers should be aware in the extent of using students L1 or Tigrigna in EFL classroom to use appropriately.
- Different workshops & seminars might be used to give orientation for English teachers based on the use of L1 in EFL classes to create common thought among them.
- English teachers should use the limited amount of learners L1 in EFL classes purposefully to be the role model of their students to make them active & to use the target language well.
- The English teachers should be with their own purpose to use L1 (Tigrigna) by considering the students willingness without ignoring their feeling towards its use.
- The English teachers should not use Tigrigna with no considering their students learning choice and their interest.

## REFERENCES

- Abbott, G. (2001). **'English as a Foreign Language'**, in R. Mesthrie (ed). *Conics encyclopedia of sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd, pp. 467-472.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). **The mother tongue in class room; a neglected resource?**.ELT Journal volume 41 14 fro<http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/> at Duke University on March 14, 14, 2020
- Atkinson, D (1993).**Teaching monolingual classes**.London Longman.
- AL-Hinia, M.K. (2001), **"The Use of the L1 in the Elementary English Language Classroom"**<http://www.moe.gov.eg/portal/sitebuilder/English>.
- Al-Nofaie, H. (2010). **The Attitudes of Teachers and Students towards Using Arabic in EFL Classrooms in Saudi Public Schools.A case study**, Novitas-ROYAL (Research on youth and Language), 4 (1), 64-95.
- Antonn, M.&DiCamilla, F.(1998). **Socio-Cognitive Functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom**.Canadian Modern Language Review,
- Auerbbach, E. (1993). **Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom**, TESOL Quarterly,27(1) pp.9-32
- Bostock, W. (1973).**Monolingualism in Australia**.The Australian Quarterly,vol.45.pp39-52.
- Burden, P. (2001).**When do native English speaking teachers and Japanese college students disagree about the use of Japanese in the English conversation classroom?** *The Language Teacher* [online], vol. 25(4). [Accessed 9 November 2019].Availableat: [http://www.jalt-publications.org/old\\_tlt/articles/2001/04/burden](http://www.jalt-publications.org/old_tlt/articles/2001/04/burden)

- Burns, A. (1999) **Collaborative action research for English language teachers**. Cambridge: CUP.
- Brown, H.D. (2000). **Principles of Language Learning and teaching** , Fourth Edition. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H.D. (2007). **Principles of language learning & teaching**. 5<sup>th</sup>ed. New York; Pearson Education.
- Buckmaster, R.(2002). **Using L1, On-line internet**. Available: <http://iatefl.org.pl/nletter18/nlet182.html>.
- Brooks-Lewis, K. A. (2009). **Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning**. *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 30(2), pp. 216–235.
- Cameron, L (2001). *Teaching Languages to Young Learners* Cambridge university press.
- Carless, D. (2008). **Students' Use of the mother tongue in the task-based classroom**; *EL Journal*, 62 (4).
- Choffey, S. (2001). **The L1 Culture in the L2 Classroom**, *Modern English Teacher*, 10(2),pp.54-58.
- Cole, S. (1997). **The Use of L1 in Communicative English Classrooms**, *The Language Teacher JALT Journal*, on-line internet. Available: <http://www.JALTPublications:Org/tlt/files\98\dec\cole>.
- Cook, G. (2002). **Breaking Taboos; English Teaching professionals**, Issue:pp.5-7
- Cook, V. (2001a). **Second Language Learning and Language Teaching** ; London: Arlond.
- Cummins, J. (1981). **The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students in schooling and language minority students: A theoretical frame work**. Los Angeles: California State University, Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

- Cunningham, C (2000). **Translation in the Classroom: A Useful Tool for Second Language Acquisition**, Online internet. Available: <http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/pdf>.
- Cunnings Worth, A.(1995). **Choosing Your Course Book**; Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Cianflone, E. (2009). **L1 use in English Courses at University Level, a survey of Literature on students and teachers' perspectives**. *ESP World* [online], vol. 8(22), pp. 16. 31 April 2020 Available at [http://www.espworld.info/Articles\\_22/issue\\_22.htm](http://www.espworld.info/Articles_22/issue_22.htm)
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language research: research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Pre
- Deller, S.&Rinvoluceri,M.(2002). **Using the Mother Tongue**, Delta Publishing: London.
- Dulay, H.& Burt, M.(1973). **Should we teach children syntax** *Language Learning*, 23,245-258.82
- Dornyei, Z. (2007)*Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edge, J.(1986). **Acquisition Disappears in Adultery: Interaction in the Translation Class**, *ELT journal*.40 (2),pp.121-125.
- Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development: a study of classroom interaction and language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamum.
- Eldrige, J. (1996). **Code-switching in a Turkish Secondary School**.*ELT Journal* .50.
- Elmetwally, E. (2012). **Students' & teachers' attitudes towards the use of learners' mother tongue in English language class rooms**; The British in Dubai.3
- Frankenberg-Garcia, A.(2000). **Using Portuguese in the Teaching of English**, On-line internet. Available: [http://www.portuguesmct.pt/Frankenberg-Garcia 2000b.doc](http://www.portuguesmct.pt/Frankenberg-Garcia%202000b.doc).
- Gabriel Atos, C. (2001). **L1 use in ELT: not a skeleton, but a bone of connection**. *TESOL Greece Newsletter*, vol. 70(June), pp. 6-9.

- Koul, L. (1984). **Methodology of Educational Research**. 3rd ed. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing Ltd.
- Harbord, J. (1992). **The Use of Mother Tongue in the Classroom**, *ELT Journal*.46 (4), pp.350-355.
- Harmer, J.(2001). **The Price of English Language Teaching** ; Edinburg Gate:PearsonEducationLtd.Available<http://www.Geocits.com/HawsTongue>.
- Hopkins,S. (1988). **Use of mother tongue in the classroom.A neglected resource**; *ETLJournal*.41 (4), pp.241-247.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). **A history of English language teaching**; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hitotuzi, N. (2006). **The learner's mother tongue in the L2 learning-teaching symbiosis**. *PROFILE*, vol. 7, pp. 161-171.
- Ibrahim, A. I. (2019). **Investigating the Needs and Drawbacks of L1 in L2 Education: Students' Perception**.
- Jancova, L. (2010). **Translation and the Role of the Mother Tongue in EL**.Diploma Prace; Palackeho V Olomouci: Katedrajazyka.
- Jose, F. & Gonzalez (1998). **Methods of research and thesis writing**. Paris National Boore, AceptMarulas.
- Juarez, C. R. &Oxbrow, G. (2008). **L1 in the EFL classroom: more a help than a hindrance?** *PortaLinguarum*, vol. 9, pp. 93-109.
- Kothari, CR. (2004). **Research methodology: methods and techniques**. Second edition, New age International Publisher India.
- Kim Anh, K. H. (2010). **Use of Vietnamese in English language in Vietnam: Attitudes ofVietnamese university teachers**.*ELT Journal*.
- Krashen, S. (1981).**Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning**; Oxford: Pergamon.

- Krashen, S. & Terrell, T. (1983). **The Natural Approach**: language acquisition in the classroom, pergamon.
- Khedir, A. (2018). **Theory and Practice in Language Studies**. Saudi Arabia University
- Lado, R. (1964). **Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach**. New York Pergamon.
- Linder, D. (2002). **Translation; English Teaching Professional, Issue 23**, pp.39-41.
- Macaro, E. (2001). **Analysis students' teachers' code switching in foreign language classrooms**. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 531-548.
- Mahmoud, A. (2006). **Translation and foreign language reading comprehension: A neglected didactic procedure**, in *English Teaching Forum*, 44 (4), 28-33.
- Mahmoudi, L. (2011). **The use of Persian in the EFL classroom: the case of English Teaching and Learning at pre-university level in Iran**.
- Mahmutoglu, H & Kicir, Z. (2013). **The use of mother tongue in EFL Classroom**. Lefke University.
- Mouhanna, M. (2009). **Re-examining the role of L1 in the classroom**. *UGRU Journal*, vol. 8 (Spring), pp. 1-19.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). **Native or Non-Native: Who's Worth More?** *ELT journal* 46(4), pp.340-349.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998) **Qualitative research and case study applications in education**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Meyer, H. (2008). **The Pedagogical Implications of L1 in the L2 Classroom**; <http://www.kyoai.ac.jp/college/oc>
- Selinger, H. W., and E. Shohamy. (1989). **Second Language Research Methods**: Oxford University Press.
- Miles, R. (2004). **Evaluating the Use of L1 in the English language Classroom**. School of Humanities. Centre for English Language studies Department of English. University of Birmingham.
- McNabb, C. (1989). **Language Policy and Language Practice: Implementation Dilemmas in Ethiopian Education**. Stockholm University

- Nazary, M. (2008). **The role of L1 in L2 acquisition:** attitudes of Iranian university students.  
*Novitas-ROYAL*, vol. 2(2), pp. 138-15
- Nunan, D. (1992) **Research Methods in Language Learning.** Cambridge University Press
- Norman, J.(2008). **Benefits and draw backs to L1 use in the L2 class room.** Paper presented at the JALT 2007 conference, Tokyo
- Notion, P. (2003). **The role of the first language in foreign language learning.** Asian EFL Journal on line. [www.asian-efljournal.com/dec](http://www.asian-efljournal.com/dec)
- Nigatu, H.(2013). **Exploring the use of L1 in the EFL classroom;** The case of Hadiya with particular reference to grade 5 in some selected primary school of HadyaZone. MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language* London: Longman.
- Porters, A & Schauffler, R. (1994). **Language & the second generation;** bilingualism yesterday & today *International Migration Review*, vol 28. pp. 640-661.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). **Linguistic imperialism;** Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prodromou, L. (2001). **From Mother Tongue to Other Tongue:** what is the place of the learners “mother tongue in the EFL classroom? Online internet. Available: <http://www.tesolgreece.com/mother>.
- Prodromou, L. (2002). **From mother tongue to other tongue.** *Teaching English* [online]. [Accessed 20 October 2020] Available at: <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/articles/mother-tongue-other-tongue>
- Richards, J.C. & Rogers, T.S. (2001). **Approaches and methods in language teaching;** New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rinvolucri, M. (2001). **Mother Tongue in the Foreign Language Classroom:** Why and How, *Modern English Teacher*.
- Scott, V. M. & De La Fuente, M. (2008). **What’s the problem L2 learners’ use of L1 during consciousness-raising, form focused tasks.** *The Modern Language Journal*, pp. 100-113

- Schweers, W. Jr. (1999). **Using L1 in the Classroom**. *English Teaching Forum*, vol. 37 (2), pp. 6-13.
- Sharma, K. (2006). **Mother tongue use in English classroom**: NELT, 11(1-2), 80-87.
- Stern, H. (1992). **Issues & Opinions in Language Teaching**; Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Slavin, R.E. (2006). **Educational psychology: Theory and practice**. 8 th Boston Pearson Education
- Storch, N. & Aldosari, A. (2010). **Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class**. *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 14(2), pp. 355–375.
- Storch, N. & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). **Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting?** *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 37 (4), pp. 760-770
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (2000). **Task-based second language learning: the uses of t first language**. *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 4(3), pp. 251-274.
- Tafese, G. (1988). **The Use of Vernacular in Teaching English**: A Survey of Addis Ababa Zone For Junior Secondary Schools. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Tang, G. (2002). **Using L1 in the English Classroom**; *English Teaching forum*, tomasello.87
- Tomasello, M. & Herron, C. (1989). **Feedback for Language Transfer Errors**: The Garden Path Technique, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11 pp 385-395.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). **There is a Role for the L1 in Second & Foreign Language language Teaching**. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(4), pp. 531-540.
- Turin, T. A. (2014). **Reasons behind using L1 at primary level in English classes of Bangladeshi English medium schools** (Doctoral dissertation, BRAC University).
- Ur, P. (1996). **A Course in Language Teaching**; Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Urgese, T. (1987). **L1 as a Useful Tool in Teaching Foreign Language**; *English Teaching Forum*.
- Vanderheijden, V. (2010). **“Is that English I hear over there?” Rethinking the prohibition on L1 use in foreign language learning**. *TPFLE*, vol. 14 (1), pp. 3-17.

Weschler, R. (1997). **Uses of Japanese (L1) in English Classroom**: Introducing the Functional Translation Method, The Internet TESL Journal, on-line. Available: <http://www.aitech>.

Widdowson, H. G.(2003).**Defining Issues in English Language Teaching**; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Willis, D. & Willis, J., (2007).**Doing task-based teaching**.Oxford:OxfordUniversity Press.

Yimer, L. (2012). **The Problem of Using English as a Medium of Instruction in English Ethiopia**; with reference to Gedeo&Sidamo Zones Primary schools. Asian Journal of Research in Social Science & Humanities.

Zulfikar,T. (2018). **Rethinking the Use Of L1 In L2 Classroom**: Vol. 6, No. 1, 43-51.

## **APPENDIX ONE**

### **MEKELLE UNIVERSITY**

#### **COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES**

##### **DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGES**

##### **AND LITERATURE**

### **Student's Questionnaire**

#### **Dear Students,**

The aim of this study is to investigate English teachers & learners use of Tigrigna in English classes at Ras Alula Aba Nega Secondary School grade 10<sup>th</sup> focus. Please, be informed that all the collected data is confidential and will only be used for research purposes. So, I will be grateful if you respond to the following sentences honestly as your answers will help teachers and educators to better understand your needs. Your input is very important to understand the value of using Tigrigna in English classes. The researcher needs not to write your name

**Instruction one; *Read the following questions carefully and choose the correct answer.***

1. Does your English teacher use Tigrigna language during EFL classes?

- A) Yes                      B) no

2. If your response is 'yes' in item one, how often does he or she use it?

- A) Always                  B) often                  C) sometimes          D) never

3. Does an English teacher use only English in the lesson in order to make the lesson clear?

- A) Yes                      B) no

4. Students, do you like to use Tigrigna language in English classes?

- A) Yes                      B) no

5. To what extent do you predict your English teacher to use Tigrigna in English classes?

- A) Always                  B) often                  C) sometimes      D) never

**Instruction two; please read the following sentences about EFL teachers practices of using Tigrigna in English classes and give your responses by using tick (√) mark under any of the scores given. Key: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree**

NO	ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5
6.1	<b><i>Connected to Purpose</i></b>					
6.2	English teacher uses Tigrigna to ask questions					
6.3	English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes to give clear instruction					
6.4	English teacher uses Tigrigna to give feed back					
6.5	English teacher uses Tigrigna to increase relationship with the students					
6.6	English teacher use Tigrigna to explain complex ideas of language					
6.7	English teacher uses Tigrigna to manage the class room					
6.8	English teacher Tigrigna to check STS listening comprehension					
6.9	English teacher uses Tigrigna to check STS reading comprehension					
6.2	<b><i>Connected to the causes</i></b>					
6.2.1	English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes because it reduces language anxiety					
6.2.2	English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes because his/her poor language ability					
6.2.3	English teachers uses Tigrigna in EFL classes because of students poor understanding of the lesson					
6.2.4	English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes because it saves a lot					

	of time					
6.3	<b><i>Connected to conditions</i></b>					
6.3.1	English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes during grammar lesson					
6.3.2	English teacher uses Tigrigna when the lesson is difficult					
6.3.3	English teacher uses Tigrigna when he/she lack of English to express concepts clearly					
6.3.4	English teacher uses Tigrigna in EFL classes during new vocabulary lesson					
6.3.5	The English teacher uses Tigrigna when the students fail to understand reading the passage					

**APPENDIX TWO**

**መቀለዩኒቨርሲቲ**

**እንግሊዘኛ ቋንቋን ስነ ፅሁፍን ትምህርቷ ክፍለ**

**ብተመሃሮ ዘምላእ ሕቶ**

ዝተከበርኩም ተምሃሮ ኣብዚ ሕዚ ሰዓት ናይ እንግሊዘኛ መምህራን ኣብ ራእሲ ኣሉ ላኣባ ነጋካል ኣይብርኪቤ

ትትምህርቲ ናይ ተምሃሮ ኣፍመፊ ትሒ ቋንቋ ኣብ እንግሊዘኛ ክፍለ ግዜ መግዝብ ገብምን ታይዝ ኣክል መጠ

ንንብምን ታይም ክንያ ያት ወይም ኩነታት እናተጠቀሙ ከምዘሎ ወይም ህስስቦን ግት እናካየድ ኩይር ከብ።

ስለዚ ብቲ ፅንግት መሰረት ብኣኩም ክምላእ ዝክእል መረጃ መሰብሰቢ ሕቶ ተዘጋጅዮ ኣሎ #

ብዙይ መሰረት ንእችት ህብዎት ክክለኛ መልሲ ነቲ ፅንግት ታይም ስኽዕ ያብይ ኣስተዋፅኦ ኣለዎ።

ብዙይ መሰረት እትህብዎ መልሲ ነዚ ፅንግት ግላማ ጥራሕ ዝውዕል እምበር ንምንም ዝገልፅ ኣይኮነን።

ስምኩም ምፅሓፍ ኣድላይ ኣይኮነን። ንእትገብሩ ለይምት ሕብባር ኣቶ ዲመየ መስግን #

መምሪ ሒሓድ ነዞም ዝስዕቡ ሕቶ ታትብ ኣግባብ ኣንቢብኩምት ክክለኛ መልሲ ዝሓዘፊ ደልም ረፀ #

1. ናይ እንግሊዘኛ መምህር ካ/ኪ ኣብ እንግሊዘኛ ክፍለ ግዜ ትግርኛ ይጥቀምዶ ?

ሀ. እወ ለ. ኣይጥቀምን

2. ኣብ ሕቶ ቁፅራ ሓደ ዝሃብ ካዮ/ኪዮ እወ እንተኾይ ነንክን ደይ ግዜ ዝኣክል ይጥቀም?

ሀ. ኩሉ ግዜ ለ. ብዙሕ ግዜ ሐ. ሓደ ሓደ ግዜ መ. ኣይጥቀምን

3. ናይ እንግሊዘኛ መምህር ካ/ኪ ኣብ እንግሊዘኛ ክፍለ ግዜ ትግርኛ ክጥቀምት ደሊ/ዩ ዶ? ሀ. እወ ለ.

ኣይደልን

4. ናይ እንግሊዘኛ መምህር ካ/ኪ ዕለታዊ ትምህርቱ ውዕኢ ታዊን ምግባር ትግርኛ ቋንቋ እንተዝጥቀም ዶ

ምሓሸወይስ ? ሀ. እወ ለ. ኣይደልን

5. ናይ እንግሊዘኛ መምህር ካ/ኪ

ትግርኛ ቋንቋ ኣብ እንግሊዘኛ ክፍለ ግዜ ንክን ደይ ግዜ ዝኣክል ክጥቀም ኣለዎ ኢልካ/ኪ ትሓስብ/ቢ ? ሀ.

ኩሉ ግዜ ለ. ብዙሕ ግዜ ሐ. ሓደ ሓደ ግዜ መ. ኣይጥቀምን

መምርሒ ክልተ

ቲብይ ዝኣምነዞም ዝስዕቡ ሙሉ እሓሳባት ብትዕግስቲ ብምንባብ ናይ እንግሊዘኛ መምህሮም ትግርኛ ቋንቋ ብ

ኸመይ ክምዘጥቀሙ እናዝጥቀሙ ሉም ክንያት ዝምልከት ኣብ ዝተቐመጡ

ሙ/ሓሳባት ቅድሚት ኣብ ዝተገብሩ ናይ ውዕኢ ትመግለፂ ናይ "X" ምልክት ኣቕምጡ #

መግለፂ ነጥብ ታት

1=ብጣዕሚ ኣይስማዕምን      2=ኣይስማዕምን      3=ምውሳኔ ኣይክእልን      4=ተስማዕሚ 0

5=ብጣዕሚ ተስማዕሚ 0

ሪጋ	ዝክናወኑተግባራት	ዝተወሃበክብደት				
		1	2	3	4	5
6.1	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ኣብእንግሊዘኛክፍለግዜትግርኛዝጥቀመሉዕላማ					
6.1.1	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ትግርኛዝጥቀምንተምሃሮሕቶክሓትትእንትደሊ ዩ።					
6.1.2	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ትግርኛዝጥቀምንዕለታዊ ት/ቲ መእተዊንምግባር ዩ					
6.1.3	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ትግርኛዝጥቀምንተምሃሮመልሲንምሃብ ዩ					
6.1.4	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ትግርኛዝጥቀምምስተምሃሮዘለዎርክብንምጥንኻር ዩ					
6.1.5	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ትግርኛዝጥቀምዝተሓላለኸናይቋንቋሐሳብንምግላፅ ዩ					
6.1.6	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ትግርኛዝጥቀምእቲክፍሊንምቁፅፃር ዩ					
6.1.7	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ትግርኛዝጥቀምተምሃሮዝተምሃሮዎንምርግጋፅ ዩ					
6.1.8	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ትግርኛዝጥቀምተምሃሮኡዘንበብዎምንባብምርድኦምንምርግጋፅ ዩ					
6.1.9	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ርናኣብኣብእንግሊዘኛክፍለግዜትግርኛዝጥቀምኣብክፍሊውሽጢዝርኣዩናይተምሃሮስነምግባርፀገማትንምስትኸኻል ዩ					
6.2	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ኣብኣብእንግሊዘኛክፍለግዜትግርኛዝጥቀመሉምኸንያት					
6.2.1	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ኣብኣብእንግሊዘኛክፍለቋንቋግዜትግርኛዝጥቀመሉእንግሊዘኛቋንቋእንትጥቀምክፈጥሮዝኸእልናይቋንቋስሓተትንምቕናስ ዩ					
6.2.2	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ኣብኣብእንግሊዘኛክፍለቋንቋግዜትግርኛዝጥቀመሉምኸንያትብዘለዎትሑትናይእንግሊዘኛቋንቋክእለት ዩ					
6.2.3	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ኣብኣብእንግሊዘኛክፍለቋንቋግዜትግርኛዝጥቀምተምሃሮዕለታዊትምህርቶምንምቕባልብዘለዎምትሑትዓቕሚምኸንያት ዩ					
6.2.4	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ኣብኣብእንግሊዘኛክፍለቋንቋግዜትግርኛዝጥቀመሉትግርኛምጥቃምዕለታዊትምህርቱንምውዳእግዜስለዝቁጥበሉዩ					
6.3	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ር ኣብእንግሊዘኛክፍለቋንቋግዜትግርኛዝጥቀመሉኩነታትዝምልከት					
6.3.1	እንግሊዘኛ መ/ርናኣብኣብእንግሊዘኛክፍለግዜትግርኛዝጥቀምኣዱሽሰዋስውኣብዝወሃበሉግዜ ዩ					
6.3.2	እንግሊዘኛ መ/ርናኣብኣብእንግሊዘኛክፍለግዜትግርኛ ት/ቲ ከቢድኣብዝኾነሉግዜ ዩ					
6.3.3	እንግሊዘኛ መ/ርናዝጥቀመሉእቲ መ/ር ኣሳቡብግልፂንምግላፅእንግሊዘኛክሓፅሮከሎ ዩ					
6.3.4	እንግሊዘኛ መ/ርናኣብኣብእንግሊዘኛክፍለግዜትግርኛዝጥቀምኣደሽቲቃላትኣብዘምህረሉግዜ ዩ					
6.3.5	ናይእንግሊዘኛ መ/ርናትግርኛዝጥቀምተምሃሮምንባብኣንቢቦምምርዳእእንትኣብዮም					

	የ					
6.3.6	እንግሊዘኛ መ/ርና አብ እንግሊዘኛ ክፍለ ግዜ ትግርኛ ዝጥቀሙሉ ናይ እንግሊዘኛ ትግርኛ ንቋንቋ ኣጠ ቻቕ መኣምንም ውድዳር እንትደሊ ዩ					

**APPENDIX THREE**

**MEKELLE UNIVERSITY**

**COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGES**

**AND LITERATURE**

**Interview for Teachers**

**Dear Teachers,**

The main purpose of this interview is to assessing the EFL teachers & learners practices of using Tigrigna in the English language classroom. I would like to assure that any data collected will be anonymous and confidential. Thus, you are kindly request to express your own ideas and feeling to the following questions.

1. Teacher, do you use the learners L1 (Tigrigna) during the English classes? If not, why not?
- 2.If your answer is ‘yes’ in question number one what is your purpose of using it Tigrigna?
3. To what degree or how often do you use Tigrigna during EFL classes?
4. During which time or when do you use Tigrigna in English classes?
5. What are the causes that make you use Tigrigna during English classes?

## **APPENDIX FOUR**

### **EFL TEACHERS INTRVIEWS**

1, Do you use Tigrigna in EFL classes? If not, why not?

T1: ok, yes I use, I often use Tigrigna in English classes for the students especially or during instructions. I also sometimes use especially if he grammar part is difficult to understand during this time I also used the students mother tongue that means Tigrigna.

T2: yes, I use Tigrigna in English classes.

T3: emm... yes, I use.

T4: I use Tigrigna in English classes.

T5: ok, I rarely use Tigrigna in English classes.

2. If your response is 'yes' in question number 1 what is the purpose of using it?

T1: the purpose of using Tigrigna EFL classes is to clarify instructions & sometimes to make clear the grammar parts; in general, to communicate each other. In other way to clarify the topic as whole I use that means this is the purpose of using Tigrigna.

T2: emm... the main purpose of using Tigrigna in English classroom is, ziii.... are so as to clear instructions, in order to as the question, in order to express the difficult lessons & in order to manage the classroom or the students on a good way, and I use Tigrigna em,,, in this way to understand the students What I am said.

T3: yeb, I use as I said before. I use Tigrigna in English classes for zi,, different purpose. For instance, eh,, when I think em,, from the start, the instruction is not clear, to make the instruction clear, I use Tigrigna when get difficult words, or vocabularies or new words in English class,,, if they do not understand during teaching learning process and I try to translate them in to Tigrigna and when the reading passage is not clear for them em,,, I also try to inform or tell them the general message of the text and such, I use for this & other purposes Tigrigna during English classes.

T4: the purpose of using Tigrigna in EFL classes is to make the concept or the idea clear. Because sometimes there may be difficulty, the concept may be difficult for the students. So to make it clear just I use Tigrigna. For example, em,,, if the instructions may not clear for them and sometimes there may be words that you may not get synonyms.

T5: the purpose of using Tigrigna in English classes is to clarify the lesson and em,,, when the lesson which is not related their em,,, their age and culture. If there are also conditions that I use Tigrigna in EFL classes. Eh,,, when sometimes the students may be confused because the concept may be difficult for them and the concept beyond their level. During that, I used Tigrigna.

3. How often do you use Tigrigna in English classes?

T1: I often use Tigrigna in EFL classes. Because the students they have adapted using or translation in to their mother tongue due to this I use sometimes when it is so difficult, em,,, due to this I sometimes use, and as much as possible, they can understand what I said.

T2: I often use Tigrigna in English classes; it is not advisable, but when we see the students background most of the time most of the students do not understand English language easily. Em,,, from their grade levels and it is a habit a habit to communicate using Tigrigna language.

T3: yeb,,,, it is possible to say I often use Tigrigna language.

T4: of course,,, I sometimes use. I sometimes use Tigrigna in English classes.

T5: em,,, I rarely use. In fact, for the clarity of my students I rarely use Tigrigna in English classes.

4. When do you use Tigrigna in English classes?

T1: em,,, I use during group discussion, & also during presentation also I translate in to their mother tongue that means my presentation and I advise them to use English language. That means during difficult words & during instructions in group discussion and presentation I use; especially if the grammar part is difficult to understand I use it.

T2: ok,,, during the vocabulary parts I use Tigrigna in English classroom or in order to clear the vocabulary parts, when the lesson is difficult I use Tigrigna in this way.

T3: as I said before, there are different situations that I use Tigrigna in English classes. As I said, it might be new, vocabulary new word, it may be the text asks us to translate. For example, how can

you form plurals in your mother tongue for example, in English we add 's' or such it says, so how can you form plurals in your mother tongue it says.

T4: when there is confusion, when the concept is not clear for the students or when confusion creates on them or when there is disagreement or misunderstanding between the teacher and the students I use. So, when the confusion creates or when there is confusion on the concept just I use Tigrigna. Because when I order the students to do something, just they do not actively involved in that activity. If they do not actively involved in that activity, this help me to understand that they do not know the concept or the instruction.

T5: ok, I use the students L1 during the situations of, it may be vocabulary, it may be grammar it depends on. Em,, from my prior experience most of the time, I use Tigrigna regarding vocabularies. Because words are difficult in their level at that time it is better to tell them in their own mother tongue.

What are the causes that let you use Tigrigna in English?

T1: yes, there are different causes like the students background. It let me use Tigrigna in English classes as they are Tigrigna speaker they resembles in to their mother tongue and in lower grade they adapted using Tigrigna in EFL classes. That means teachers, they teach them; they over use their mother tongue language in lower grades & then they adapt such situations.

As students toll me, in the lower grade even their teachers use excessive amount of Tigrigna in English lessons because of this influence of lower grades, & social influence, or when they are out of the school they can listen Tigrigna due to this they are not happy to use only English.

T2: ok, the main cause of that I use Tigrigna in English classroom is ee...the students unable to understand the text, & em... the shortage of time and also. Because when I use English language in our classroom the students do not understand the text easily, when use Tigrigna they understand easily, after that we can jump to the next portion.

T3: em.... The causes are students' ability by themselves yes, by itself not by themselves. The student's ability by itself yes is one cause to use Tigrigna. The text book by itself is also another cause to use Tigrigna even when I say the text book it is full of new words as it is grade ten you know it is what the more difficult grade from grade nine.

T4: em... the cause that let me to use Tigrigna in English class is that when I watch them or when I observe them, just they understand as they do not understand the concept. Therefore, to make the concept of the idea clear or to make it easily understandable to the students just I use Tigrigna. Of course, eee... my own habit also let me or it obligates me to use Tigrigna. Just my habit is that I use Tigrigna just when I think that they do not understand it even they may know it the concept, even the students may know the concept, but I think they may not understand the concept. I think in my mind. So my habit also let me to use Tigrigna.

T5: the main cause of using Tigrigna in English class is the students' ability when they don't understand what the text say you have to translate it. Of course it is not advisable as an English teacher or as a foreign language teacher, it might not be advisable but it is the last point to use Tigrigna. Ya.. I know this one using Tigrigna may not be what emmm.... advisable to use the English class. When I say I use but they may not understand. Even the method may say this one, but even the higher institutions up to university level the teachers use mother tongues, why because while we are learning even, we as a student there in the university, when we may not understand what they want to say.

✓ **APPENDIX FIVE**

**Check lists for observing teachers use of L1**

**Round one**

<b>No</b>	<b>English Teachers code</b>	<b>T1</b>	<b>T2</b>	<b>T3</b>	<b>T4</b>	<b>T5</b>
1	Does the teacher use L1 to greet students?					
2	Is L1 used during the setup of the lesson?					
3	Does the T explain complex vocabulary in L1?					
4	Are instructions given using a mix of L1 & L2?					
5	Is the T use L1 to clarify grammar points?					
6	Does the T use L1 to check for understanding?					
7	Is the T use of L1 for classroom managements?					
8	Does the T switch to L1 when addressing behavioral issues?					
9	Does the T respond to students in L1 when necessary?					
10	Is the T use of L1 to summarize the lesson?					
11	Does the T provide L1 translation of key vocabulary at the end?					

## Check lists for observing teachers use of L1

### Round two

No	English Teachers code	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5
1	Does the teacher use L1 to greet students?					
2	Is L1 used during the setup of the lesson?					
3	Does the T explain complex vocabulary in L1?					
4	Are instructions given using a mix of L1 & L2?					
5	Is the T use L1 to clarify grammar points?					
6	Does the T use L1 to check for understanding?					
7	Is the T use of L1 for classroom managements?					
8	Does the T switch to L1 when addressing behavioral issues?					
9	Does the T respond to students in L1 when necessary?					
10	Is the T use of L1 to summarize the lesson?					
11	Does the T provide L1 translation of key vocabulary at the end?					