An Investigation into the Use of L1 in EFL Classes in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq

Sangar Ismail Hamad Khoshnaw

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts
in
English Language Teaching

Eastern Mediterranean University
August 2014
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

_____
Prof. Dr. Elvan Yılmaz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülşen Musayeva Vefalı
Chair, Department of English Language Teaching

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

_____
Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan
Supervisor

Examining Committee
_____
1. Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam   _____

2. Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan   _____

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev _____

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to identify the attitudes of students and teachers toward the use of L1 (Kurdish) in English as a foreign language (EFL) classes in basic and high schools in the city of Erbil in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. It also investigated if attitudes of the learners change across different levels of study and gender. Besides, it tried to find out the students' and the teachers' perceived needs for L1 use in their classes. Finally, it looked into the students' and the teachers' actual uses of L1 to see when, where, and for what purposes they use it and to identify whether level of study and gender affect the students' use of Kurdish.

This research study was designed as a case study in which qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection were employed. The participants included 98 students and 4 teachers from 7th grade and 11th grade classes. The data was collected through a student questionnaire, a teacher questionnaire, teacher interviews, and classroom observations.

The results of the study showed that the teachers and students were positive toward the use of Kurdish in English classes. However, the students were more positive than the teachers. While students believed that Kurdish can often be used in English classes, the teachers preferred moderate and sometimes use of it. The results also showed that the attitudes of 11th grade students were more positive than those of 7th grade students and that the difference between them was statistically significant. Similarly, the female students showed more positive attitudes than the male students did toward the use of Kurdish; yet, the difference was not statistically significant. It

was found that the teachers use Kurdish usually because the students' proficiency level was not adequate to understand English-only classes. Moreover, they thought it helps students understand and learn better, it helps teaching new vocabulary and difficult topics, and it saves time. Students reported that they use Kurdish because they think they are not proficient in English enough to speak it and it helps them understand and learn English. The results of the classroom observations showed that teachers and students used Kurdish extensively in different situations and for a variety of purposes while very little English was used by them. Finally, the findings showed that 11th grade students used much more L1 than 7th grade students did and that male students used more Kurdish than female students did. However, the difference between males' and females' use of Kurdish was not very considerable.

In the light of the findings of the study, some pedagogical implications for a judicious and moderate use of L1 and implications for further research were proposed.

Keywords: student attitudes, teacher attitudes, L1 (Kurdish), L2 (English), use of L1, gender, level of study

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, Irak Kürdistan Bölgesel Yönetimi'nin Erbil şehrinde bulunan ortaokul ve liselerdeki yabancı dil olarak İngilizce sınıflarında anadil (Kürtçe) kullanımına yönelik öğrencilerin ve öğretmenlerin tutumlarını belirlemeyi hedeflemiştir. Ayrıca, bu araştırma öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin söz konusu sınıflarda anadil kullanımı ile ilgili algısal ihtiyaçlarını da bulmayı amaçlamıştır. Bunlara ek olarak, öğrencilerin tutumlarının sınıf seviyesi ve cinsiyete bağlı olarak değişip değişmediği de incelenmiştir. Son olarak, ne zaman, nerede ve hangi amaçlar için Kürtçe kullanıldığını ve bunun sınıf seviyesine ve cinsiyete bağlı olarak değişip değişmediğini görmek için öğrencilerin ve öğretmenlerin sınıftaki gerçek anadil kullanımlarına bakılmıştır.

Bu araştırma nitel ve nicel yöntemlerin kullanıldığı bir olgu çalışması olarak tasarlanmıştır. Katılımcılar, 7. ve 11. sınıflardan toplam 98 öğrenci ve dört öğretmenden oluşmaktadır. Çalışmanın verileri öğrenci anketi, öğretmen anketi, öğretmen mülakatları ve sınıf gözlemleri yoluyla toplanmıştır.

Çalışmanın sonuçları, öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin İngilizce sınıflarında Kürtçe kullanımına karşı tutumlarının olumlu olduğunu göstermiştir. Ancak, öğrencilerin tutumları öğretmenlerinkine göre daha olumludur. Öyle ki, öğrenciler İngilizce sınıflarında sık sık Kürtçe kullanılabileceğini düşünürken, öğretmenler ölçülü bir şekilde, bazen kullanılmasını tercih etmişlerdir. Öğretmenlerin genellikle Kürtçe'yi öğrencilerin dil seviyelerinin yalnız-İngilizce olan dersleri anlamaya yetmeyeceği için kullandıkları da tespit edilmiştir. Ayrıca öğretmenler, anadil kullanımının

öğrencilerin daha iyi anlamalarına ve öğrenmelerine katkı sağladığını, yeni kelimelerin ve zor konuların öğretilmesine yardımcı olduğunu ve zaman kazandırdığını düşündüklerini ifade etmişlerdir. Öğrenciler ise, İngilizce seviyelerinin bu dili konuşmaya yeterli olmadığını düşündükleri ve anadil kullanımının İngilizce'yi anlama ve öğrenmelerine yardımcı olduğuna inandıkları için Kürtçe kullandıklarını bildirmişlerdir. Ayrıca, çalışmanın sonuçları 11. sınıf öğrencilerinin tutumlarının 7. sınıf öğrencilerinin tutumlarından daha olumlu olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu farklılık istatistiksel olarak da önemlidir. Aynı şekilde, kız öğrencilerin Kürtçe kullanımına karşı tutumları erkek öğrencilerin tutumlarından daha olumludur. Fakat, bu farklılık istatistiksel olarak anlamlı değildir. Sınıf gözlemlerinin sonuçları ise öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin farklı durumlarda çeşitli amaçlarla yaygın bir şekilde Kürtçe kullandıklarını ve İngilizcenin çok az kullanıldığını ortaya koymuştur. Son olarak, 11. sınıf öğrencilerinin 7. sınıf öğrencilerinden, erkek öğrencilerin de kız öğrencilerden daha fazla anadil (Kürtçe) kullandıkları görülmüştür. Ancak, kız ve erkek öğrenciler arasındaki farklılık çok fazla dikkate alınacak bir farklılık değildir.

Çalışmanın bulguları ışığında, anadilin makul (akıllıca) ve ölçülü olarak kullanılması için bazı sezdirimler ve ileriki çalışmalar için bazı öneriler sunulmuştur.

Anahtar kelimeler: öğrenci tutumları, öğretmen tutumları, anadil (Kürtçe), ikinci dil (İngilizce), anadil kullanımı, cinsiyet, sınıf seviyesi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ALM   Audiolingual Method

CLL   Community Language Learning

CLT   Communicative Language Teaching

DM   Direct Method

EFL   English as a Foreign Language

ELT   English Language Teaching

GTM   Grammar Translation Method

L1   First Language

L2   Second/Foreign Language

SLA   Second Language Acquisition

SPSS   Statistical Package for the Social Science

TPR   Total Physical Response

UAE   United Arab Emirates

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a background to the study by discussing the issue of L1 use in L2 classes and showing different views about it. More specifically, it focuses on L1 (Kurdish) use in L2 (English) classes in the city of Erbil in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. Then it shows the reasons behind choosing this topic by listing some problems. Next, it presents the purpose of the study and the research questions. After that, it explains why this study is significant and what the benefits of the expected findings would be. Finally, it provides the definition of some terms that are used in this study.

1.1 Background of the Study

During the process in which the Kurdistan Region of Iraq is opening fast to the outside world and undergoing great development, knowing the English language has become a must for many people. In order to meet new challenges, the government of the region has made a number of attempts to reconstruct and reform the system of English language education in the Kurdistan Region and as a result a new English language course book, namely Sunrise, has recently been introduced. However, according to the researcher's informal observations during his experience as an EFL teacher as well as his discussions with his colleagues, many learners have difficulties in learning to speak English at schools, even in their last year of high school. This can be due to many factors, including the use of first language (L1) in second

language (L2) classrooms which has been one of the controversial issues throughout the history of language teaching regarding its influence on L2 learning.

In the literature, whether L1 should or should not be used in L2 teaching and learning and whether its use has positive or negative influence on learning and teaching L2 have been extensively discussed. For example, some researchers provide various reasons and arguments for avoiding L1 use (e.g., Cook, 2001, 2008; Eldridge, 1996; Krashen 1982; Krashen & Terrell, 1995) and maximizing L2 use in L2 classes (Cameron, 2001; Ellis, 2005, 2012). To illustrate, Cook (2008) provides a number of arguments that have been put forward in the literature to avoid the use of L1 and conducting the majority of the class in L2. First, children learning their L1 do not have an L2 available. Second, students should keep the two languages separate in their minds rather than linking them. Finally, in many language classes L1 use is avoided because of practical reasons; such as students with different first languages or the teacher's ignorance of students' L1. Furthermore, Eldridge (1996) is against L1 use in L2 classes, arguing that it "is a strategy that yields short-term benefits to the second language learner, but with a risk of hampering long-term acquisition" (p. 310).

On the other hand, some other researchers show that L1 use plays the role of a facilitator in L2 learning (e.g. Bhooth, Azman, & Ismail, 2014; Cook, 2001; Damra & Al Qudah's, 2012; Dujmović, 2007; El-dali, 2012; Ellis, 2012; Harmer, 2007; Jones, 2010; Mart, 2013; Martínez & Olivera, 2003; Miles, 2004; Sipra, 2007; Stapa & Majid, 2012; Willis & Willis, 2007). For example, Willis and Willis (2007) point out some circumstances in which L1 use can be beneficial, such as quick translation with unfamiliar words and making sure students have understood instructions. El-

dali (2012) also argues for the inclusion of L1 in L2 classes, claiming that L1 use "reduces anxiety, enhances the affective environment for learning, takes into account sociocultural factors, facilitates incorporation of learners' life experiences, and allows for learner centered curriculum development" (p. 72).

However, many researchers and scholars are opponents of excessive use of L1 arguing that it hinders L2 learning and it must be used only when it is necessary (e.g. Çelik, 2008; El-dali, 2012; Ellis, 2005, 2012; Forman, 2005; Gabrielatos, 2001; Hashemi & Sabet, 2013; Hidayati, 2012; Jones, 2010; Kalanzadeh, Hemati, Shahivand, & Bakhtiarvand, 2013; Khati, 2011; Nation, 2003; Pan & Pan, 2010; Voicu, 2012). For example, Voicu (2012) calls for a balanced and flexible use of L1 and argues that L2 must be used as the medium of instruction when possible and that L1 can be used only when it is necessary. Additionally, Khati (2011), Nation (2003), and Pan and Pan (2010) suggest that L2 use should be maximized and that L1 needs to be used only under certain conditions and circumstances.

In short, there are different views regarding the inclusion and exclusion of L1 in L2 teaching. "The use of the students' native language in foreign language classes has always been a matter of to be or not to be" (Kalanzadeh et al., 2013, pp 30-31). Therefore, it is difficult to take the decision about whether to use the L1 or not and this is a common dilemma that language teachers usually encounter. All of these factors provided the motivation for this study. Besides, in the curriculum used in the region, there is not any policy that bans or limits the use of Kurdish in English classes; the education policy of the Ministry of Education does not have any written document that prohibits and limits the use of Kurdish in English classes. As a result,

Kurdish language can be and is (according to the researcher's preliminary, informal observations) overused by both teachers and students in English classes.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The attitudes and perceptions of teachers and students toward the use of L1 in L2 classrooms have been extensively investigated in different contexts and the results have been quite mixed and sometimes contradictory. For example, in two studies, Taşkın (2011) with Turkish preparatory EFL students and teachers and Hashemi and Sabet (2013) with Iranian university students and teachers, it was found out that the teachers had negative attitudes toward using L1 in L2 classes whereas the students showed positive attitudes toward its use. On the contrary, the findings of Kalanzadeh et al. (2013) study with Iranian high school EFL students and teachers showed that students were in favor of using more L2 (English) whereas the teachers were in favor of using more L1 (Persian).

Hamze's (2010) study in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) with secondary school students and teachers and Nazary's (2008) study with Iranian university students show that the participants had negative attitudes toward the use of L1 in their English classes. On the contrary, Al-Nofaie's (2010) study with Saudi teachers and students and Jingxia's (2010) study with Chinese undergraduate students and teachers show that students and teachers attitudes toward the use of L1 (Arabic) in L2 (English) classes were positive. In brief, the findings of the aforementioned studies about the attitudes of teachers and students toward the use of L1 in L2 classes have been different not only in different contexts, but also in similar contexts, and therefore the results have been confusing and not conclusive.

With regard to the context of Kurdistan Region of Iraq, after reviewing the literature, only one study (Mohammad, 2013) was found about this topic. Mohammad (2013) investigated the attitudes of students and teachers at Computer Institutes in some cities and towns in the region and it was found that the students were positive about using L1 in L2 classes while the teachers were in favor of more L2 and less L1 use. However, no studies were conducted in the city of Erbil with basic and high school students and teachers. Besides, it is not possible to generalize the previous findings in different contexts to the Kurdish context because the attitudes of teachers and students toward the use of L1 in L2 classes may vary from one context to another.

In addition, the researcher's preliminary, informal observations have shown that the teachers and students in the schools in Erbil use L1 excessively in EFL classes and many researchers (Çelik, 2008; El-dali, 2012; Ellis, 2005, 2012; Forman, 2005; Gabrielatos, 2001; Hashemi & Sabet, 2013; Hidayati, 2012; Jones, 2010; Kalanzadeh et al., 2013; Khati, 2011; Nation, 2003; Pan & Pan, 2010; Voicu, 2012) claim that excessive use of L1 in L2 classes is a hindrance to L2 learning.

On the other hand, there is a considerable amount of literature which support the view that judicious and moderate use of L1 can facilitate the processes of learning and teaching L2 (Anh, 2010; Bhooth, Azman, & Ismail, 2014; Çelik, 2008; Dujmović, 2007; El-dali, 2012; Hamze, 2010; Juárez & Oxbrow, 2008; Kafes, 2011; Kelleher, 2013; Mart, 2013; Miles, 2004; Nazary, 2008; Pan & Pan, 2010; Salah, 2012; ; Schweers, 1999; Sipra, 2007; Tang, 2002; Voicu, 2012). However, there is not much consensus regarding what the judicious use of L1 actually means. Therefore, knowing how, when, where, and for what purposes teachers should make use of L1 in L2 classes is still a subject for debate because L1 can facilitate learning

5

and teaching if used properly and it can disrupt them if used without a clear rationale (Prodromou, 2002, cited in Çelik, 2008). On the other hand, many disadvantages have been attached to the use of L1. For example, Voicu (2012) points out the following disadvantages:

- Using L1 in difficult situations may become a habit for both teachers and students.

- As languages differ more or less, the use of L1 may sometimes misguide L2 learning.

- Owing to L1 transfer, some lexical or grammatical errors may sometimes emerge when teachers teach in L1.

- The use of L1 in L2 classes may prevent the teacher to provide students with enough comprehensible input which is a prerequisite for acquiring any language.

Because of all these factors, problems, and disadvantages, this study attempts to investigate the use of Kurdish in English classes in the city of Erbil in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

Because of the above-mentioned reasons and problems, the main purpose of this study is to identify the attitudes of basic and high school students and teachers toward the use of L1 (Sorani Kurdish) in L2 (English) classrooms in the city of Erbil in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. In addition, the study attempts to explore when, where, and for what purposes the teachers and the students use L1 in L2 classes.

To these general aims, more specifically, the study first intends to see if there is any gap between the teachers' and the students' attitudes toward the use of L1 in L2 classes. Second, the study seeks to find out how gender and level of study affect students' attitudes. Third, it inquires into the teachers' and students' perceived needs for using L1 in their English classes. Finally, it attempts to explore the teachers' and the students' actual use of L1 in L2 classes and to identify if the students' actual use of L1 changes depending on the level of study and gender.

1.4 Research Questions

This study aims at answering the following research questions:

1. What are the teachers' attitudes toward the use of L1 in EFL classes?

2. What are the students' attitudes toward the use of L1 in EFL classes?

3. Is there a difference between the attitudes of the teachers and those of the students?

4. Do the attitudes change between low level and high level students?

5. Do the attitudes change between male and female students?

6. What are the teachers' perceived needs for L1 use in EFL classes?

7. What are the students' perceived needs for L1 use in EFL classes?

8. When and where and for what purposes is L1 used in EFL classes by the teachers and the students?

9. Does the students' actual use of Kurdish in English classes change across different levels of study?

10. Does the students' actual use of Kurdish in English classes change across gender?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The present study is significant in many ways. Firstly, in language education, the attitudes of teachers and students can be predictors of success in learning and teaching that language as they shape their classroom practices and have the potential to influence what occurs in the classroom. This makes it important and necessary to study and investigate attitudes.

Secondly, this investigation will be the first study in the city of Erbil regarding the use of Kurdish in English classes. Therefore, teachers, teacher trainers, administrators, and curriculum designers can know about and be aware of the attitudes teachers and students have toward L1 use and their actual use of L1 in their classes, and they will consequently make the necessary changes. For instance, teachers will have a chance to evaluate their own teaching methods and techniques and make necessary modifications; teacher trainers and administrators will review the whole teaching system to establish the optimum level of L1 use in L2 classrooms; and curriculum designers and materials writers will re-evaluate the program that is offered and re-design activities which increase or decrease teaching in L1.

Thirdly, the study may not only increase the teachers' and students' awareness about their attitudes toward L1 use and their classroom practices, but also help them gain a better understanding of when, where, on what occasions, and for what purposes L1 can be used in L2 classes. Accordingly it can enable teachers to understand what they should do to help their students make use of their L1 more effectively to facilitate learning.

Finally, the findings of this study may function as an additional reference study for researchers who wish to study the attitudes toward using L1 in L2 classrooms as the findings of the previous studies have been quite mixed and contradictory. Besides, not many of the above-mentioned studies have been conducted to investigate learners' and teachers' attitudes and the congruence between them, especially in basic and high school contexts. Furthermore, not much information concerning what actually happens in L2 classes in terms of L1 use exists in the literature. To this end, the present study will attempt to contribute to these issues.

1.6 Definition of Terms

The terms that are used throughout the present study refer to the definitions specified in the following way:

- **L1:** The first language or the mother tongue of the learners. In the present study, it refers to Sorani Kurdish. This dialect of Kurdish is the present official and standard language in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq.

- **L2:** The second or foreign language that the learners are learning. In the present study, it refers to English, and it is a foreign language in the context of the present study.

- **Attitudes:** Brown (2007) defines attitudes as "a set of personal feelings, opinions, or biases about races, cultures, ethnic groups, classes of people, and languages" (p. 377). In the present study, the term attitudes, or sometimes perceptions, is used for students' and teachers' beliefs, feelings, opinions, and tendencies toward the use of Kurdish in English classes.

1.7 Summary

This chapter provided a background of the study by showing proponents and opponents of the use of L1 in L2 classes. Next, it illustrated the reasons behind

choosing this topic of study by illustrating the issue of L1 use in Kurdish schools in Erbil and identifying some other problems. After that, it demonstrated the purpose of the study and the research questions and how the expected findings can be significant to teachers, teacher trainers, administrators, and materials developers. Finally, it provided the definition of some terms used throughout this study. The next chapter will provide a comprehensive literature review of many aspects on the issue of L1 use in L2 classes.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter, first, explains the role of L1 use in different approaches and methodologies of language teaching. Next, it discusses the arguments that have been made regarding the use of L1 in L2 teaching and learning. It shows the reasons and justifications that have been used to support or discourage the use of L1. It also shows some arguments against using L1 extensively. Then it presents the occasions of using L1 in the classroom. It shows the suggestions that have been made by different scholars regarding suitable occasions of L1 use, and reviews many studies to demonstrate how L1 is actually used in different contexts. After that, it highlights the reasons and motivations for which teachers and students switch to L1 in L2 classes. Furthermore, this chapter presents the factors that have been reported to affect the amount and purposes of L1 use, including age, gender, proficiency level, context (EFL and ESL), and attitudes. The last section focuses on attitudes of teachers and students toward using L1 in L2 classes in different contexts. It shows that attitudes vary not only across different contexts, but also in similar ones.

2.1 The Place of L1 in Language Teaching Methodology

Throughout the history of language teaching methodology, the use of L1 in L2 learning has been treated quite differently. While some methods totally avoid the use of L1, some others make extensive use of it and others limit it.

In the **Grammar Translation Method (GTM)**, one of the first methods of language teaching, the main purpose of learning an L2 is not to learn to speak it, but to build knowledge of the language structure as a basis for learning to read literature and translate from L2 to L1 (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Therefore, in GTM classes, the process of learning and teaching L2 is carried out in the learners' L1. Teachers use L1 to explain the meaning of L2, ask and answer questions. Similarly, students use their own L1 to answer the teacher's questions because "the ability to communicate in the target language is not a goal of foreign language instruction" (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 16). Brown (2001) states that one of the characteristics of GTM is that classes are conducted in L1, with little active use of L2, in a way that virtually nothing is done to develop the ability of the learners to communicate in L2. In short, in GTM classes, L1 is the medium of instruction and it is used extensively by teachers and students.

On the other hand, in the **Direct Method (DM)**, the main purpose of learning an L2 is to learn to communicate with it and it supported the premise that L2 learning should be similar to L1 learning and consequently no other languages should be used in L2 learning (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Therefore, the language of instruction in this method is L2 and the teachers should be native and native-like in that language and they must do their best to avoid L1 use because meaning must be conveyed directly in L2 with no reference to the students' L1. Larsen-Freeman (2000) clarifies that "the Direct Method has one very basic rule: No translation is allowed" (p. 23). In short, in the DM, L1 should be completely banned and the classes should be conducted exclusively in L2.

Later, the theoretical foundations of the DM were criticized for being too strict in using L1, and therefore it was redirected to the **Audiolingual Method (ALM)**. In this method, the purpose of language learning is to be able to communicate with it and no or very little use of L1 was allowed because it was believed that L1 and L2 have different linguistic systems and that they must be kept so separate that L1 interferes as little as possible in acquiring L2 (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

After the popularity of the ALM declined because it was found impractical to teach long-term oral proficiency (Brown, 2001), the **Silent Way** was put forward by Caleb Gattegno. It was one of those innovative methods appeared during the 1970s with focus on learner needs and abilities. In this method, students learn from each other and teachers are usually silent and offer help only when it is necessary because the role of the teacher is not to dominate the class but to serve the learning process (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). L1 is not used to give meanings of new vocabulary because translation should be avoided, yet, it can be used to give instruction when it is necessary, such as when the teacher wants to help the students develop their pronunciation skills or when giving feedback to students whose proficiency levels are low. In short, L1 is use allowed only when it is needed to aid L2 learning.

Suggestopedia is another method of the spirited 1970s. It was derived from Georgi Lozanov's belief that learning will be faster and more effective if psychological barriers to learning are removed. Larsen-Freeman (2000) explains that in classes where Suggestopedia is used, baroque music is played and students are seated in soft, comfortable chairs while the students work from long L2 dialogues and their translations. The teacher uses L1 when it is necessary, but its use is gradually

diminished as the students get more proficient in L2. The teacher also tries to take all the responsibility to help students learn to use L2 for everyday communication.

Among the methods appeared in the 1970s was **Community Language Learning (CLL)** that was based on the students' affective learning. In this approach, teachers help students use L2 communicatively (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). The students are seated in a circle and interpersonal relationships are established first in their L1. Therefore, students' L1 has an active role in the initial phase of enhancing students' security and self-assurance. Besides, students' L1 is sometimes employed in L2 classes to provide literal translation of L2 words to clarify their meanings as well as to give instructions in the early stages of learning (Cook, 2001). Yet, as they progress, more and more L2 should be used in a way that very little of students' L1 is employed.

Total Physical Response (TPR) is another method of the spirited 1970s which was founded by James Asher. TPR shares some principles of the L1 acquisition, assuming that L2 learning must be similar to child language acquisition (Brown, 2001). Therefore, TPR classrooms give great importance to listening comprehension before speaking, and listening activities are supported by a series of physical responses. Regarding the role of L1 in TPR classes, it can be very rarely used after the introduction of the method, which is in L1, and the meaning of new words should be conveyed through body movements (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

None of the methods of the spirited 1970s remained popular for a long time and their use was refused, or at least decreased, because of the criticisms made on them regarding their limitations as well as their practical and theoretical problems. After

that, more attention was paid to functional and communicative potential of language and **Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)** was developed. CLT was based on communicative language use since it was believed that students first need to develop their L2 communicative competence in order to be able to communicate (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Therefore, with the appearance of the CLT, the main goal of language teaching became communication. Larsen-Freeman (2000) explains that in this approach, the teachers are regarded as facilitators and students as active participants in their own learning process while language is considered an a vehicle for communication in the classroom rather than an object to be studied. Therefore, instructions are given to students in L2. However, the use of L1 is not banned and it can be judiciously employed when necessary, yet, L2 should be used in the classroom not only during communicative activities, but also for explaining the activities to the students or when giving homework, and students are encouraged to use L2 productively and receptively.

On the other hand, the **Natural Approach**, founded by Krashen and Terrell (1995), shares some features with previous approaches even though it (as its founders claim) is a coherent approach which is fairly easy to adapt to different needs. They also claim that this approach is consistent with SLA theories, or more specifically, Krashen's five hypotheses, namely, Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, Monitory Hypothesis, Natural Order Hypothesis, Input Hypothesis, and Affective Filter Hypothesis. The main goal of this approach is communication skills, i.e., the ability to communicate with native speakers of the TL. Because this approach suggests that L2 learning should be similar to L1 acquisition and children who learn their L1 do not have another language to resort to, L1 use is not encouraged. To avoid L1,

especially in low level classes, this approach allows using less than complete sentences in L2 so that students do not have to fall back on L1.

Last, none of the methods of language teaching that appeared in 1970s and 1980s remained popular because they were not effective in solving problems in language teaching or catering for all learners. By the 1990s, which was known as the **postmethod era**, many applied linguists and teachers moved away from the belief that there is a need for new and better approaches and methods, or which method is better or worse than the other, or which one is right or wrong. They came to the conclusion that teachers need to choose best teaching practices for their students and contexts out of the methods and approaches that fit with their own views of teaching and learning L2 (Brown, 2001). This approach was called **Eclectic Approach** and it was thought to be the best solution so that differing needs of students would be accommodated. Teachers who follow this approach are responsible to find possible methodological options that are relevant first to their learners and then to their own theories of learning and teaching (Brown, 2001). Therefore, it is the teachers' responsibility to decide whether L1 is to be used in the class or not, what amount of L1 is to be used, for what purposes it can be used, and whether students can make use of their native language.

In short, it can be concluded that L1 has been treated differently in each method or approach as some of the aforementioned methods of language teaching are in favor of its incorporation in L2 classes and some are not. There have been changes in the use of L1 from using it excessively (as in the GTM) to banning it (as in the DM and the ALM), and to limiting it (as in the spirited method of the 1970s and the CLT).

Moreover, the functions of L1 use are different in most of the language teaching methods, except in the DM and the ALM where no L1 use is allowed.

2.2 Arguments about the Use of L1 in L2 Classes

There have been many arguments and debates surrounding the role of L1 in L2 learning. While some arguments support the monolingual or L2-only approach to language teaching where no L1 can be used, many others support the bilingual approach to language teaching where L1 can be used. On the other hand, some other arguments have been made against extensive use of L1 where L1 use is encouraged to be limited and maximum of L2 use is encouraged. A consensus about whether to use it or not has not been reached yet. This section accounts for these different arguments and illustrates theoretical and empirical evidence to support them.

2.2.1 Arguments Against the Use of L1 in L2 Classes

Some arguments have been made by advocates of the L2-only position to support the monolingual approach to language teaching where L1 use should be avoided. Cummins (2005) shows some general assumptions that underlie monolingual instruction though they have minimal research basis. The assumptions include: (a) instruction should be exclusively in the L2 without falling back on the students' L1; (b) using bilingual dictionaries must not be used; (c) translation should be avoided; and, (d) L1 and L2 should be kept rigidly apart. Cook (2001, 2008) also outlines three theoretical arguments from second language acquisition (SLA) research that have been made to support the avoidance of L1 in L2 classes. The first argument is that because children acquiring their L1 do not have L2 to resort to, L2 learning should not depend on another language. This argument claims that L2 learning should be similar to L1 acquisition, without falling back on another language. A language teaching method based on this claim is the TPR, stages of which resemble

the stages infants go through when acquiring their L1. Furthermore, the Natural Approach which was based on Krashen's theories suggests that adult learners need to acquire L2 similar to children acquiring their L1 (Krashen and Terrell, 1995).

However, this argument has been criticized because even though L1 and L2 learning share many similarities, they differ in a number of ways. For example, Forman (2005) emphasizes that L1 and L2 learning are qualitatively and quantitatively different from each other and consequently L2 learning must not be replicated as L1 learning. Similarly, Martínez and Olivera (2003) show many differences between L1 and L2 acquisitions as well as between the nature of L1 and L2 user:

> The acquisition of the L1 is innate, subconscious, takes place effortlessly and fulfills the basic human need for communication, whereas the acquisition of an L2 takes place voluntarily, consciously, requires great effort and is not a basic need as the L2 learner does already have his/her L1 to communicate with. … L1 acquisition is developed in natural environment where the L1 user is exposed to great amount and quality of input compared to the limited time of exposure the L2 learner has in a class and the type of input which, despite the teachers' efforts to stimulate a very naturalistic environment, is actually very artificial as they are just "playing the game" of being in common everyday circumstances. (p. 196)

Moreover, Macaro (1997) explains that language is related to psychological development and therefore comparing the psychological development stages of a baby with those of a child of 11, whose understanding of the world is predominantly through the L1, is not possible. Cook (2008) also does not support that argument: "If the first language is to be avoided in teaching, this ban must be based on other reasons than the way in which children learn their first language" (p. 182).

The second theoretical argument made in the literature to avoid the use of L1 in L2 learning and teaching is that L1 and L2 should not be linked in the learners' minds, but kept apart at all times (Cook, 2001, 2008). This argument adopts a

compartmentalized view of the languages in the same mind. This view is inspired by the belief that learning to communicate in L2 independently of the use of L1 is a prerequisite and beneficial for the development of L2 learning. A language teaching method based on this argument is the ALM claiming that because L1 has a different linguistic system from L2, they should be kept separate so that L1 interferes as little as possible in L2 acquisition (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

Similar to the first argument, this argument has also been criticized for some reasons. For example, Kelleher (2013) states that banning the use of L1 is impossible because even if students do not speak in L1, they do think in it. Cook (2001), on the other hand, states that any attempt to put L1 and L2 in separate compartments in the mind will fail because of the fact that the compartments are connected. Further, Cook (2008) states that L1 and L2 cannot be separated in practice as their phonology, vocabulary, syntax, and sentence processing are interwoven and very far from separate even though they are distinct in theory.

The third theoretical argument shown by Cook (2001, 2008) as well as by Harmer (2007) to avoid L1 use in L2 learning is that students should be exposed to the real use of L2 for communication purposes which is by nature restricted if the students' L1 is used. Using L1 will not only reduce the exposure learners will have to the L2, but also reduces their opportunities to use L2. Cameron (2001) acknowledges that the amount and type of exposure are the fundamental elements of FL learning because students have very little exposure outside the classroom and therefore the L2 teacher has to provide a considerable amount of exposure to the L2. Ellis (2005, 2012) argues that successful language learning requires extensive L2 input. Thompson (2006) studied the factors that affect the use of L1 and L2 by teachers and

students and found that the more L2 was used by teachers, the more it was used by students.

This view is parallel to the interactionist perspective which is supported by Krashen's Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982) as well as Krashen's Natural Approach (Krashen and Terrell, 1995) which call for learning L2 through maximized L2 input. This idea implies no place for L1 as it is thought to deprive students of the right kind of L2 input. Krashen (1982) also states that speaking fluency cannot be taught directly, rather, in the presence of enough quantity of input, it will emerge over time with no elicitation required from the teacher. Moreover, Forman (2005) argues that L2 learners need to be exposed to the L2 in different forms, from authentic to simplified to constructed so that they can experience how the L2 sounds, looks, and works. Students need to be provided with a rich L2 environment in a way that they are exposed to great amount of hearing and interacting in L2 and provided with enough opportunities to interact and communicate in L2 (Qadri, 2006).

Yet, in spite of the advantages of exposing students to as much L2 as possible, a counterargument to that claim is made by Cook (2001) explaining that this belief does not challenge the use of L1 in L2 classes but calls for maximizing L2 use rather than avoiding L1. Elridge (1996), on the other hand, explains that increasing the quality and quantity of L2 use is not automatically obtained through decreasing L1 use in the classroom, rather we should concentrate on ways of maximizing L2 use.

In short, none of the three above-mentioned arguments to avoid the use of L1 in L2 classes could be proven by research. They are only advice which are based on the reasoning that students should encounter as much of the L2 as possible (Cook, 2001).

Lavan (2001) indicates that the use of students' L1 cannot be entirely eliminated from L2 class, but some strategies need to be employed in order to promote maximum use of L2.

A further argument is made by Brown (2007) and Cameron (2001) who believe that because L2 learners will use their prior experiences, including those of their L1, to understand L2 words and sentences or to facilitate the process of L2 learning, negative transfer or interference may occur which hinders the process of L2 learning, especially when the two languages have different systems. However, this claim has not yet been supported by research. Lightbown and Spada (1993, cited in Brown, 2007) outline some popular ideas and claims within SLA research that are not supported by research and they are still myths about SLA, one being the belief that most of the L2 learners' mistakes result from the interference of their L1. Cook (2008) asserts that it is not possible to put all the blame on transfer from L1 for everything that goes wrong in L2 learning but rather different aspects of L2 learning should be examined and accordingly it must be found out how and when the L1 is involved in L2 learning. Karim (2003) reports some research studies regarding the influence of L1 on L2 reading and concludes that L2 learners transfer their previous linguistic and cognitive skills from their L1 to facilitate their reading in L2.

Additional arguments that support the exclusion of L1 in L2 classes are provided by Voicu (2012). They are: (a) resorting to L1 may become a habit for students and teachers whenever they come across difficulties, (b) using L1 may mislead the students if its universal governing language systems are different from those of L2, (c) errors may emerge due to the L1 transfer, and (d) L1 use may limit enough comprehensible input.

21

A practical reason to avoid L1 use in L2 classrooms is having multicultural and multilingual classes where students do not share the same L1 or the teacher does not know students' L1 (Cook, 2008). This is the most powerful argument supporting the monolingual approach to language teaching, especially in second-language contexts where the only way to conduct classes is through the use of L2 as the medium of instruction. Harmer (2007) notes that L1 use needs to be avoided when the teacher does not share the students' L1 or at least the L1 of all the students. He goes on explaining that this does not mean that the teacher cannot ask students to translate a sentence into L2 or ask them if there is an equivalent for an expression in their language, but that the teacher has to discuss with the class the issues of L1 and L2.

2.2.2. Arguments for the Use of L1 in L2 Classes

There have been some changes in the perceptions on the value of L1 in L2 learning especially after most of the aforementioned claims against L1 use in L2 learning were criticized for not being proven by research. Auerbach (1993) argues against L2-only classes stating, "the rationale used to justify English only in the classroom is neither conclusive nor pedagogically sound" (p.15). Eldridge (1996), Jones (2010), and Macaro (2001) report that there is no empirical study so far to support the claims denying the value of L1 and the notion that excluding L1 in L2 classes would necessarily improve learning efficiency. Moreover, prohibiting L1 in L2 classes has been reported to result in negative consequences. For example, in the UAE, using L1 (Arabic) in L2 classes is prohibited. Qadri (2006) conducted a study in that context and found that no Arabic was employed due to its ban by administration policies and as a result teachers were in trouble with their administration. Similarly, Hamze (2010) conducted another study in the same context and found out that there was minor use of L1 because teachers sometimes had difficulty in conveying meaning

and students had difficulty in understanding. Therefore, he proposed that this issue needs to be reviewed and rethought and the usefulness of L1 must be officially acknowledged by the policy makers, administrators, and curriculum designers so that its use can be employed.

Cook (2001) also notes that using L1 in L2 classes is a natural phenomenon in a context where the students share the same L1 and therefore he suggests that "it is time to open a door that has been firmly shut in language teaching for over 100 years, namely the systematic use of the first language (L1) in the classroom" (p. 402). Furthermore, Harmer (2007) explains, "it makes no sense to deny the importance of the students' L1 in their L2 learning" (p. 135). Likewise, Willis and Willis (2007) support the use of L1 as they quote the comment of one teacher in Argentina who states that "Let's not be afraid of L1. One of the barriers that has been hard to break is the idea that using the L1 in the English class is a sin" (p. 26). They continue that:

> Most teachers do not think it's a good idea to ban use of L1 outright. Beginner and low level learners have been known to suffer, feeling they have no way to contribute in class or communicate with their teacher. We used to feel that if we allowed L1 in an English lesson, it was the thin end of the wedge – learners would no longer try to express themselves in English – but now we recognize the advantages of using L1 in certain cases. (p. 220)

The arguments and reasons in favor of L1 use in L2 classes are manifold. In sociocultural theory, the role of L1 is regarded as a beneficial tool that scaffolds L2 learner production and accelerates private speech (Ellis, 2012). Likewise, Bhooth, Azman, and Ismail (2014) assert that L2 students can employ L1 as a scaffolding strategy as it serves social and cognitive functions and promotes collaborative work to facilitate their learning. They go on suggesting that similar to students, teachers

can use L1 as a pedagogical tool to facilitate students learning experience and to enhance engagement in the classroom.

Moreover, L2 input is acquired by learners when the affective filter is low (Krashen & Terrell, 1995), and many researchers (Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001; El-dali, 2012; Ellis, 2012; Jones, 2010; Kelleher, 2013; Sipra, 2007) claim that the use of L1 in L2 classes assists students in lowering the level of anxiety and other affective barriers to L2 learning, and students will consequently experience higher levels of motivation for L2 learning and establish rapport in the classroom. Jones (2010) also explains that without the support of L1, students will experience a loss of confidence. Kelleher (2013) maintains that L2 learners will decrease the amount of L1 use as they become more confident and relaxed and maximize L2 use. Furthermore, Auerbach (1993), Mart (2013), and Pan and Pan (2010) state that students will gain the sense of security in L2 learning through the use of L1. Scrivener (2011) claims that using L1 can arise genuine interest in the subject matter and that students need to be free to use their L1 whenever they want though English should be used most of the time.

In addition, Martínez and Olivera (2003) display some advantages that L1 has in SLA, such as, L1 eases L2 learning with the similarities between them, it saves time and effort, it helps using translation as a technique or strategy in L2 learning, and it avoids ambiguity and guarantees that students understand the meaning. Jones (2010) explains that comprehension and memorization of L2 words will be easier when students translate them into L1. Additionally, Pan and Pan (2010) agree that L1 facilitates L2 learning as its use helps students in understanding tasks and solving problems. Moreover, Damra and Al Qudah's (2012) study concludes that using L1 in

L2 classes assists students in gaining awareness and knowledge about the relationship between L1 and L2 as well as in finding out various methods to practice and to express themselves in the L2.

Additionally, a number of studies in the literature support the view that judicious and moderate use of L1 can facilitate the processes of learning and teaching L2 (Anh, 2010; Bhooth, Azman, & Ismail, 2014; Çelik, 2008; Dujmović, 2007; El-dali, 2012; Hamze, 2010; Juárez & Oxbrow, 2008; Kafes, 2011; Kelleher, 2013; Mart, 2013; Miles, 2004; Nazary, 2008; Pan & Pan, 2010; Salah, 2012; ; Schweers, 1999; Sipra, 2007; Tang, 2002; Voicu, 2012).

Along with these arguments, some empirical evidence is available showing the positive effects of L1 use in L2 learning. With regard to studies in foreign language (FL) contexts, Bhooth, Azman, and Ismail (2014) investigated the use of Arabic in an EFL reading classroom in a University in Yemen and found out that the students perceived the use of Arabic as a functional strategy and that it helped them in comprehending their reading materials. Another example is by Damra and Al Qudah (2012) who conducted a study at a secondary school in Jordan to investigate the influence of L1 use in teaching grammar and found that it helped students not only in formulating hypotheses about language, but also in developing explicit understanding about how L2 grammar functions. Similarly, Stapa and Majid (2012) examined the influence of the use of L1 (Bahasa Melayu) in developing ideas in L2 writing in a secondary school in Malaysia and found out that the experimental group who used their L1 could perform better in generating ideas before writing than those students in the control group.

Finally, studies in second language (SL) contexts where all students share the same L1 provide similar results. For example, Miles (2004), in attempting to demonstrate that L1 (Japanese) does not hinder, but facilitates, L2 learning, conducted two experiments. In the first experiment, three first-year university classes – one banned L1 use, one permitted its use only by students, and in the last, L1 was used by both teachers and students – were observed for five months and the results showed that the class who used L1 showed a better improvement in the area of speaking. In the second experiment, four lessons, two of which excluded L1 (Japanese) use and the other two included L1 use, were given to one class and the findings showed that there was a considerable improvement in the classes where L1 was used.

2.2.3 Arguments Against Extensive Use of L1 in L2 Classes

Along with the differing arguments regarding the inclusion and the exclusion of L1 in L2 classrooms, a number of suggestions have been made to limit and systematize it so that overusing L1 will be avoided. If used extensively, L1 will take the role of a hindrance to rich L2 exposure while L2 learning needs intense amount of L2 input in the classroom, especially in FL contexts where students have very little opportunity for L2 exposure outside the classroom. Jones (2010) warns that "over use resulting in little L2 exposure, and dependence on the L1" (p. 9). Therefore, Swain and Lapkin (2000, p. 268, cited in Hamze, 2010) argue that L1 should neither be banned, and nor be used as an alternative to L2, rather it must be used to support L2 learning. Kalanzadeh et al. (2013) conducted an empirical study in a high school in Iran and found that L1 (Farsi) was used extensively in L2 (English) classes and consequently had a demotivating effect on the students. To conclude, unquestioned use of L1 will be disadvantageous to L2 learning.

Similarly, Prodromou (2002, cited in Çelik, 2008) mentioned that whether to include or exclude L1 in L2 classes is multifaceted as it can facilitate learning and teaching if used properly and it can disrupt them if used without a clear rationale. He explained that L1 in L2 classes can be *a drug* (though with threpeutic potential, it can damage your health and may become addictive), *a reservoir* (a resource from which we draw), *a wall* (an obstacle to teaching), *a window* (which opens out into the classroom, if we look through it we see the students' previous learning experience, their interests, their knowledge of the world, their culture), *a cruch* (it can help us get by in a lesson, but it is recognition of weakness), and *a lubricant* (it keeps the wheel of a lesson moving smoothly, it thus saves time).

Consequently, following Prodromou's metaphors and the above-mentioned disadvantages of overusing L1, it has been suggested that L1 must be used systematically. For example, Kelleher (2013) claims that L1 must be used sparingly and in a pre-planned way in order to have positive influence on L2 learning. Gabrielatos (2001) also states that using L1 is not a sin, but "learners and teachers alike need to be aware of the limitations and pitfalls of L1 use in the classroom, as unprincipled use of L1 can have long-lasting negative effects on the learners' awareness and production of the target language" (p.6). Therefore, once L1 is accepted to be used in L2 classes, it is essentially important to limit possible excessive use of L1 and to understand when and for what purposes it is best and valuable to employ it. Ellis (2005, 2012) and Forman (2005) argue that L2 teachers should use L1 as little as possible so that the amount of L2 input will be maximized as successful language learning requires extensive L2 input. Çelik (2008) explains that L1 use should be used as long as it accommodates, rather than hindering or

obstructing, and that it should be reduced as students progress toward more L2 proficiency.

Atkinson (1987, cited in Qadri, 2006, p. 27), who strongly supports L1 use, lists the following potential negative effects of too much reliance on the use of L1 in L2 classes:

1. The students begin to feel that they have not really understood any item of language until it has been translated.
2. The students fail to observe the distinction between equivalence of form, semantic equivalence, and pragmatic features, and thus the teacher oversimplifies to the point of using crude and inaccurate translation.
3. Students speak to the instructor in L1 even when they are quite capable to expressing what they mean in L2.
4. Students fail to realize that during many activities in the classroom it is essential that they use only English.

Similarly, El-dali (2012) explains the dangers of overusing L1 in L2 classes citing that it discourages students from thinking in L2 and consequently they will not take it seriously as a means of communication and they will develop a habit of mental translation.

Therefore, to prevent overuse of students' L1 in order not to let these negative effects occur, many strategies have hitherto been put forward. To begin with, Nation (2003) stresses on changing the attitudes and perceptions of L2 students to using L2 which can be achieved through informing students of the learning goals of the tasks, discussing the value of using L2, discussing the problems and providing solutions, setting up a monitoring system, and using non-threatening tasks. Similarly, Harmer (2007) and Willis and Willis (2007) suggest that teachers discuss the issue of L1 use with their classes so that students will know when L1 use is appropriate and productive and when it is inappropriate and counterproductive. Students and teachers

eventually can draw up a set of clear guidelines to be followed. They also suggest that teachers should encourage and persuade students to use L2 as much as possible. A stronger version of this last suggestion is made by Voicu (2012) who argues that the teacher needs to actively manage when and how L1 is used in the class. However, Willis and Willis (2007) advice teachers to make sure that the students are aware of why it is useful to use L2 as much as possible and to tell students to "use it to learn it" (p. 220). They also encourage L2 teachers to ask their students the reasons for which they employ L1 in class, and accordingly help them overcome the problems and difficulties. Regarding different amount of L1 use with students at different levels of proficiency, Harmer (2007) explains that when students' English improves, less L1 is needed; "the more they work in English, the better their English will get, and the better their English is, the less need we have for L1" (p. 135).

To conclude, even though many arguments have been made with regard to the pros and cons of L1 use, nowadays the problem does not concern the value of it but rather how much of it should be allowed for and in what occasions.

2.3 Occasions of L1 Use in L2 classes

Although there seems to be an agreement among the majority of language instructors and researchers that L1 can facilitate the processes of L2 learning and teaching if used judiciously, there is not much consensus regarding what the judicious use of L1 actually means. Therefore, the main subject for debate is not whether L1 is to be used or not, but rather when and how to use it in L2 classes. As a result, numerous suggestions have been made in the literature showing suitable occasions for using L1 in L2 classes. Besides, many studies have attempted to observe the occasions of the actual use of L1 in L2 classes. This section will first show a number of suggestions

that have been made in the literature for appropriate uses of L1 in L2 classes and then it will review a number of studies that have examined classroom discourse to identify the occasions in which teachers and students actually used L1 in their classes. Because teachers and students use L1 for different functions and on different occasions, they will be explained separately.

2.3.1 Teachers' Use of L1

Cook (2001, p. 413) recommends some factors to be considered if L1 is to be used: *efficiency* (Can something be done more effectively through the L1?)*, learning* (Will L2 learning be helped by using the L1 alongside the L2?)*, naturalness* (Do the participants feel more comfortable about some functions or topics in the first language rather than the second?)*,* and *external relevance* (Will use of both languages help the students master specific L2 uses that they may need in the world beyond the classroom?). In addition, the appropriate amount of teachers' use of L1 cannot be defined universally. Pan and Pan (2010) explain that the quantity of teachers' use of L1 depends on students' level of proficiency and teaching purposes and that L1 must be used on a decreasing scale from low to high levels of proficiency.

In the literature, many occasions on which teachers' use of L1 in L2 classes can be suitable and appropriate have been proposed. The occasions are summarized as:

- Explaining grammar (Cook, 2001, 2008; Damra & Al Qudah, 2012; Jones, 2010; Mahmutoğlu & Kıcır, 2013; Sabb, 2011; Voicu, 2012)
- Conveying meaning of words and sentences (Cameron, 2001; Cook, 2001, 2008; Jones, 2010; Juárez & Oxbrow, 2008; Mahmutoğlu & Kıcır, 2013; Martínez and Olivera, 2003; Sabb, 2011; Voicu, 2012; Willis & Willis, 2007)

- Testing (Cameron, 2001; Cook, 2001, 2008; Jones, 2010; Martínez & Olivera, 2003; Schweers, 1999)

- Explaining test instructions (Cook, 2001; Voicu, 2012)

- Explaining tasks and exercises or giving instructions for teaching activities (Cameron, 2001; Cook, 2001, 2008; Martínez & Olivera, 2003; Prodromou, 2002; Sabb, 2011; Schweers, 1999)

- Explaining aspects of the foreign language (Cameron, 2001)

- Checking for understanding (Cameron, 2001; Juárez & Oxbrow, 2008; Prodromou, 2002; Schweers, 1999)

- Eliciting language (Cameron, 2001; Schweers, 1999)

- Focusing pupils' attention (Cameron, 2001)

- Talking about learning (Cameron, 2001; Harmer, 2007)

- Giving feedback (Cameron, 2001; Cook, 2001; Voicu, 2012)

- Analyzing errors (Juárez & Oxbrow, 2008)

- Managing the class (Cameron, 2001; Cook, 2001, 2008; Jones, 2010; Sabb, 2011; Voicu, 2012)

- Setting up pair and group work (Prodromou, 2002)

- Keeping the social atmosphere of the class in good repair, e.g., exchanging jokes or talking about aspects of their lives (Cameron, 2001; Harmer, 2007)

- Making comparison between L1 and L2 (Harmer, 2007; Juárez & Oxbrow, 2008; Prodromou, 2002; Scrinever, 2011; Voicu, 2012)

- Doing translation exercises (Harmer, 2007; Sabb, 2011; Schweers, 1999; Voicu, 2012)

- Explaining cultural aspects like proverbs, idiomatic expressions, songs, and jokes (Voicu, 2012)

- Explaining teaching methods used in class (Schweers, 1999; Voicu, 2012)

- Explaining difficult concepts (Juárez & Oxbrow, 2008)

- Raising confidence (Juárez & Oxbrow, 2008)

- Explaining the rationale of language learning activities (Juárez & Oxbrow, 2008)

- Generating ideas in writing (Stapa & Majid, 2012)

- Clarifying materials from a lesson (Duff & Polio, 1990)

In addition to these suggested occasions for using L1, several studies have been carried out to observe classroom discourse for the purpose of identifying occasions where teachers actually used L1 in their classes. The studies show that teachers used L1 in their classes when giving instructions for tasks and activities (Grim, 2010; Hoff, 2013; Khati, 2011; Macaro, 1997; Salah, 2012; Sipra, 2007; Tang, 2002), giving exam instructions (Al-Nofaie, 2010), doing classroom tasks (Eldridge, 1996; White & Storch, 2012), explaining meaning of new and/or words (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Grim, 2010; Hamze, 2010; Hoff, 2013; Jingxia, 2010; Khati, 2011; Polio & Duff, 1994; Salah, 2012; Sipra, 2007; Tang, 2002; Taşkın, 2011; Thompson, 2006; White & Storch, 2012), translating sentences and phrases (Kalanzadeh et al., 2013; Salah, 2012), explaining complex concepts and ideas (Khati, 2011; Sipra, 2007; Tang, 2002), explaining grammar (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Grim, 2010; Hoff, 2013; Jingxia, 2010; Kalanzadeh et al., 2013; Khati, 2011; Sipra, 2007; Taşkın, 2011; Thompson, 2006; White & Storch, 2012), explaining complex grammar rules (Hamze, 2010; Polio & Duff, 1994; Salah, 2012; Tang, 2002), managing class (Grim, 2010; Hamze, 2010; Hoff, 2013; Jingxia, 2010; Kafes, 2011; Macaro, 1997; Polio & Duff, 1994; Salah, 2012; Taşkın, 2011; Thompson, 2006; White & Storch, 2012), dealing with

classroom administration issues (Thompson, 2006), emphasizing some points (Jingxia, 2010), establishing solidarity or a relationship with the class (Grim, 2010; Hamze, 2010; Jingxia, 2010; Kafes, 2011; Khati, 2011; Polio & Duff, 1994; Sipra, 2007; Thompson, 2006; White & Storch, 2012), communicating with students (Salah, 2012), facilitating understanding by quoting other's words (Jingxia, 2010), explaining idioms and proverbs (Sipra, 2007), explaining colloquial expression (Sipra, 2007), explaining prepositional phrases (Sipra, 2007), explaining slang and taboo words (Sipra, 2007), giving suggestions to learn effectively (Sipra, 2007), explaining new topics or assignments (Salah, 2012; Thompson, 2006), asking questions (Salah, 2012), responding to students' use of L1 (Thompson, 2006), confirming students' responses (Khati, 2011), attracting students' attention (Salah, 2012; Taşkın, 2011), checking students' comprehension (Kafes, 2011; Macaro, 1997; Salah, 2012), motivating students (Salah, 2012; Taşkın, 2011), making students' feel confident (Khati, 2011), helping students express themselves (Salah, 2012), talking about the previous lesson (Salah, 2012), revising and summarizing material already covered (Taşkın, 2011), doing classroom discussion (Hamze, 2010), practicing English (Polio & Duff, 1994), doing conversation tasks (Nation, 2003), giving feedback (Macaro, 1997; Taşkın, 2011), discussing cultural points (White & Storch, 2012), preparing for writing tasks (Nation, 2003), and discussing intensive reading (Nation, 2003).

2.3.2 Students' Use of L1

Students, similar to teachers, are likely to use L1 in L2 classes on different occasions. In the literature, a variety of occasions have been proposed on which students' use of L1 can be appropriate and advantageous. The occasions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Asking for help from teacher or peers (Cameron, 2001)

- Asking questions (Duff & Polio, 1990)

- Responding to teacher's questions (Cameron, 2001)

- Summarizing an article or short story orally in L1 to check understanding (Scrinever, 2011)

- Checking their understanding of language (Cook, 2001; Schweers, 1999)

- Saying what they have to do in the task to check their understanding (Willis & Willis, 2007)

- Translating new words into L1 to check for comprehension (Willis & Willis, 2007)

- Translation exercises (Harmer, 2007)

- Keeping the social atmosphere of the class in good repair, e.g., exchanging jokes or talking about aspects of their lives (Harmer, 2007)

- Explaining cultural aspects like proverbs, idiomatic expressions, songs, and jokes (Voicu, 2012)

- Explaining tasks to each other (Cook, 2001)

- Clarifying materials from a lesson (Duff & Polio, 1990)

- Negotiating roles they are going to take (Cook, 2001)

- Testing (Martínez & Olivera, 2003)

- Practicing listening and reading comprehension skills (Martínez & Olivera, 2003)

- Developing circumlocution strategies (Schweers, 1999)

- For mediation practices, such as helping a friend who does not speak any English (Scrinever, 2011)

- Within classroom activities, such as small-group activities (Cook, 2008; Schweers, 1999)

In addition to these suggested occasions where students' use of L1 can be beneficial, many studies have attempted to observe L2 classes to explore the occasions on which students actually used L1. These studies documented that students used L1 in their classes when practicing English (Al-Nofaie, 2010), participating in pair work activities (Al-Noafaie, 2010), asking questions (Al-Nofaie, 2010), contrasting L1 and L2 (Al-Nofaie, 2010), translating unknown words (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Eldridge, 1996; Kalanzadeh et al., 2013; Thompson, 2006), establishing solidarity or a relationship with the teacher (Thompson, 2006), indicating lack of comprehension (Thompson, 2006), explaining new topics or assignments (Thompson, 2006), doing classroom administration (Thompson, 2006), dealing with procedural matters (Eldridge, 1996), floor-holding, i.e. temporary way of dealing with a problem or satisfying a need (Eldridge, 1996), commenting, evaluating, and talking about tasks (Eldridge, 1996), clarifying or emphasizing (Eldridge, 1996), and taking notes (Kalanzadeh et al., 2013).

However, the amount of L1 used by students in L2 classes is affected by some factors. Jones (2010) explains that the extent students use L1 depend on the requirements of class activities, task types, and students' level of proficiency.

2.4 Reasons for Using L1 in L2 Classes

In section 2.3, many occasions for using L1 in L2 classes were explained. First, some occasions that have been suggested in the literature for appropriate use of L1 were shown. Then some occasions where teachers and students have actually made use of

L1 in their classes were explained. This section will focus on why L1 is used, that is, the reasons and justifications for which teachers and students want to use L1 rather than L2.

In the literature, many reasons and justifications have been pointed out as teachers' and students' perceived needs for L1. For example, Sipra (2007) shows three reasons for using L1 in L2 classes. First, where all the students share the same L1, communications are more natural to be done in L1. Second, using L1 is easier and more communicatively effective. Third, students, especially those who are shy or less proficient in L2, feel embarrassment when using L2. Scrinever (2011), on the other hand, explains that children and young learners use L1 because (a) it is easier to speak L1, (b) their L2 use is always corrected by the teacher, (c) they are afraid of making mistakes in front of their peers, (d) it is not 'in' to speak in L2, (e) the teacher pretends not to understand their L2, (f) it is difficult to say in L2 what they want to say, (g) they do not bother if the teacher cannot hear them, and (h) it is easier for all to communicate in L1.

Regarding teachers' use of L1 in L2 classes, Çelik (2008) provides two types of motives: *physical/mechanical factors* (e.g. to save time, to help students avoid confusion about complex concepts and ideas in L2, to be more effective for students, to stimulate memory and semantic processing, to increase students' awareness of the processes of language learning) and *social/emotional factors* (e.g. to help students not create any negative feeling toward L2 and its community by prohibiting L1 because it is their identity).

Several studies have been conducted to identify the reasons for which teachers and students switch to L1 in L2 classes. Tang (2002), for example, conducted a study in Beijing with first-year university students and their teachers. The teachers expressed that they revert to students' L1 because it is more effective, it is less time-consuming, it helps students not get confused, it greatly helps comprehension, and because of students' low level of proficiency. The students, on the other hand, reported that they use their own L1 because it helps them better understand difficult concepts and new vocabulary items, it makes them feel at ease, comfortable, and less stressed, and it makes them feel less lost. Similarly, Schweers (1999) studied EFL students' and teachers' use of L1 in Puerto Rico and showed that L1 (Spanish) was reported to be used by the teachers because students can understand better, write better, and feel that their L1 is valued and respected. Students, on the other hand, stated that they use L1 because it is more comfortable and they feel less tense and less lost when they use L1. Another study to investigate reasons behind teachers' use of L1 was conducted by Hashemi and Sabet (2013) in Iran. The results showed that the university learners and teachers use L1 (Persian) in L2 (English) classes because it reduces anxiety, it is more comfortable, it helps students understand the lesson much better, and it helps them express their feelings easier. Teachers also reported that they use L1 because of their students' low proficiency in L2. Again, Al-Nofaie's (2010) study with intermediate classes in Saudi Arabia lists students' level as a justification given by teachers and understanding better and feeling confident as justifications provided by students.

In another study by Jingxia (2010) who looked into university teachers' justifications for switching from English to Chinese in English classes, the teachers reported many factors, such as, students' L2 proficiency, distance between Chinese and English,

teaching materials, lesson content and objectives, their own L2 proficiency, policy of the department on using L2, their perceptions toward the use of L1, traditional methods of teaching, testing system, and situational factors. Moreover, Anh (2010) examined the Vietnamese university teachers' reasons and justifications for using L1 in L2 classes. The teachers stated that they use L1 in L2 classes because it is less time-consuming, it creates less-stressed environment for learning, it helps students understand more clearly and better, and it helps students in improving their translation skills. Salah (2012) also investigated reasons for which Palestinian EFL teachers use L1 in L2 classes and found out that the reasons include saving time, making students feel less stressed, helping shy students, motivating students, and facilitating communication with students. Similarly, Timor (2012) questioned the reasons behind teachers' use of L1 (Hebrew) in L2 (English) classes in elementary and secondary schools in Israel. The teachers put forward the following arguments and justifications:

- It helps explaining difficult issues.

- Low-level students have difficulty in understanding L2.

- If L1 is not used, weaker students will be discouraged and frustrated.

- L1 explanations are more thorough.

- It provides confidence.

- It saves time.

- It is a short-cut and the most efficient way to clarify issue.

- The classes are overpopulated and diverse.

- It reduces students' anxiety.

Another study was conducted by Brooks-Lewis (2009) to examine why university students in Mexico are in favor of using L1 in L2 classes. The reasons reported by the students included helping to understand, facilitating classroom participation, making L2 learning easier and more meaningful, dissolving the sense of rupture in knowledge, forgetting or replacing identity or the L1, gaining confidence and a sense of achievement, and inspiring language learning, and self-awareness. Lastly, another study to explore students' reasons for using L1 (Nepali) in L2 (English) classes in EFL secondary schools in Nepal was conducted by Khati (2011). The students indicated that they communicate in L1 because (a) it is difficult for them to pronounce many L2 words, (b) their friends usually make fun of them when they try to speak L2, (c) they are afraid of the teachers' negative feedback when they make mistakes, (d) they lack sufficient L2 practice, (e) low achievers, compared to high achievers, do not get encouraged enough and consequently will not get enough opportunity to practice speaking, (f) it is easier to speak L1, (g) they do not understand what their teachers say, and (h) the teachers prefer to use L1 more than L2 and they do not encourage its use.

2.5 Factors Affecting the Use of L1 in L2 Classes

In the literature, countless suggestions regarding appropriate uses of L1 in L2 classes have been made and many reasons for that have been reported by teachers and students. Besides, it has been argues that many factors can influence the amount and purpose of L1 use. For example, Demir (2012, p. 22) cautions that before deciding to employ L1, it is essential to consider these factors:

- What we mean by "using L1"
- Context (EFL or ESL, in EFL case, is the class monolingual or not, does the teacher know students' L1; how much time is available for teaching grammar)
- Teaching goal (communication and/or translation)
- Learners' age

- Language learning traditions students have already experienced
- L2 proficiency level
- Students' learning style (synthetic/analytical)

Břenková (2007) also agues for the proper balance between L1 and L2 and claims that it is important to examine factors such as age, level of L2 proficiency, the place of L1 and L2 in their previous classes, particular stages of the lesson, and the communicative ability of teachers in L2. In short, the factors that influence the use of L1 include some teacher-related factors, student-related factors, and context-related factors. This section will explain such factors as age of students, gender of students and teachers, L2 proficiency level of students and teachers, context, and attitudes of students and teachers toward the use of L1. Meanwhile, it will present the results of some empirical studies to support the effects of these factors.

2.5.1 Age

Age of the students has been recorded to be an important factor that influences the amount of students' use of L1 in L2 classes. For example, Florence (2009, cited in Sabb, 2011) conducted a study with adult language learners and showed that a reason that the learners preferred to use L1 in their L2 classes was their age. However, Břenková (2007), who agrees that age has an impact on language choice, shows two different arguments about this issue. The first argument is that more L2 is used in young learners' classes for the purpose of providing the language input and that this is not advantageous for these learners because they are unable to communicate or understand the teacher's use of L2 and when they are forced to do so, they feel stressed, confused and unmotivated. The second argument is that in young learners' classes, compared to advanced ones, L1 is more often employed, not only by students who are still unable to communicate in L2, but also by their teachers.

Al Sharaeai (2012) also studied the influence of age of learners on their use of L1 and found out that while young learners tended to use more L1 as they were not very confident in using L2, older learners were more willing to use L2. The middle age learners, on the other hand, held a position in the middle of the two extreme age groups.

Regarding L1 use in teaching learners at elementary age, Sabb (2011) explains that using L1 in teaching elementary age language students has some advantages for them; more specifically, teaching these students to read in their L1 can improve their L2 reading ability because learnt skills can be transferred from one language to another.

2.5.2 Gender

Another factor that might have an effect on the use of L1 in L2 classes is gender. Some studies have shown that the use of L1 is related to students' and teachers' gender. With regard to the effect of teachers' gender and the use of L1 in L2 classes, Qadumi (2007) conducted a study with Palestinian EFL teachers and found out that male teachers tended to use Arabic more than their female colleagues because the female teachers had more commitment to the advice they received from training courses and the supervisors' rules. However, the findings are not always consistent. For example, Salah (2012) investigated whether male or female Palestinian EFL teachers use L1 (Arabic) differently in primary schools and concluded that the difference between the two groups' use of L1 was not significant.

Students' gender, on the other hand, was studied by Mohammad (2013) in the context of Iraq with Kurdish students and teachers in computer institutes. The results showed that gender was an important variable as male students showed more positive tendency to use L1 than female students did. He also studied the effect of teachers'

gender on their attitudes toward the use of L1, but the results did not show any significant difference between them.

2.5.3 Proficiency Level

Proficiency level of the learners and the teachers is one of the most salient factors that can affect the use of L1 in L2 classes. Cameron (2001) relates the purposes of L1 use with the teachers' and students' level of proficiency and explains that when teachers are not confident, prepared, or proficient enough, they switch to L1 to compensate for these factors. She also explains that teachers use L1 to compensate for many problems that emerge from learners' ability and level of proficiency. Thompson's (2006) study in an attempt to investigate the factors that influence using L1 revealed that proficiency level of the teachers and the students are considerably correlated with the amount of L1 use. For example, the higher the L2 proficiency level of the teachers was, the more L2 (and the less L1) was employed by teachers, and similarly the higher the level of the class was, the more L2 (and the less L1) was employed.

Pan and Pan (2010) mention that it is not possible to define a single guideline for appropriate quantity of L1 use in L2 classes because it is determined by the proficiency level of the learners as well as the purposes of instruction. Sabb (2011) believes that using L1 is particularly appropriate for beginner-level L2 learners. Therefore, L2-only classes might not be appropriate for them. For example, Sabb (2011) cites Florence's (2009) study with adult Chinese L2 learners reporting that they chose to study L2 in bilingual classes rather than monolingual classes because they were at the beginning level. Besides, in intermediate or advanced level L2 classes, teachers use more L2 and less L1 with more proficient L2 students (Jones, 2010). Similarly, Bhooth, Azman, and Ismail (2014) explain that when students' L2

proficiency increases, students must decrease their dependence on L1. Mouhanna (2009) conducted a study with EFL students in a UAE tertiary institution to explore the influence of students' level of proficiency on their perceptions. The findings revealed that beginner level students reported more need of L1 than advanced level students.

Teachers have also been documented to use L1 because of the students' low level of proficiency in L2. For example, Taşkın (2011) studied the effect of proficiency levels of university students in Ankara on the teachers' and the learners' attitudes towards using L1 in L2 classes and found that teachers showed positive attitudes toward using L1 with intermediate learners and negative attitudes with upper-intermediate ones. In addition, the students' levels had an effect on the attitudes of the students themselves toward L1 use in a way that elementary students showed the most positive attitudes, upper-intermediate students the least positive attitudes, and the intermediate students' attitudes were higher than those of the upper-intermediate students and lower than those of the elementary students. Similarly, Sarandi (2013) examined the effect of the learners' proficiency level and motivation level on teachers' use of L1 in an English preparatory school of a university in Istanbul. The results showed that a considerable number of the teachers whose students lacked the required level of L2 proficiency and had low level of motivation reported more L1 use. Besides, many other researchers suggest the use of L1 with students who are not proficient in L2 (e.g. Cook, 2001; Prodromou, 2002; Tang, 2002). Besides, teachers have been reported to reduce the amount of L1 use as students progress toward higher proficiency levels. For example, Willis and Willis (2007) show how teachers report starting classroom activities in L1 at the beginning of the year and reducing it

to a minimum level by the end of the year as students progress toward higher proficiency.

On the other hand, teachers' own proficiency can affect their own use of L1 in L2 classes. Hoff (2013) explains that knowing when, how and for what purposes they can appropriately use it can be related to the teachers' own proficiency level and competence because using L2 requires sufficient level of proficiency and competence. She also clarified that the quantity of using L1 is affected by both teachers' attitudes toward students' level of proficiency as well as by the students' actual level of proficiency. Likewise, Polio and Duff (1994) show that lacking competence and sufficient experience may cause L1 use which consequently reduces the amount of meaningful interaction that can involve students.

However, the relationship between students' level of proficiency and their use of L1 is not always proven. For example, Eldridge (1996) conducted a study in a Turkish secondary school to explore if such a correlation exists. The results demonstrated that students with high level of proficiency code-switched to L1 similarly to low level ones. Thus, he claims that the assumption that the more proficient the students are in L2, the less L1 they will use might not be correct. Nazary (2008) conducted a similar study in Tehran University among three levels of proficiency (elementary, intermediate, and advanced) to find out if students at different levels of proficiency have different attitudes and views about the significance of using L1 in L2 classes. The results showed that all the students reported negative attitudes toward it, yet the negative attitudes of students at intermediate level of proficiency were deeper than the other two groups.

2.5.4 Context (EFL vs. ESL)

Another factor that can affect the use of L1 in L2 classes is the context, that is, whether the context is second language or foreign language. Starting with second language contexts, Forman (2005) and Thompson (2006) state that making use of students' L1 in ESL contexts is usually unfeasible because the students usually have different L1s which is a big challenge for L1 use even if there is a desire to use it. Therefore, Auerbach (1993) states "no alternative except the complete exclusion of the L1 in the ESL classroom is seen as valid" (p. 15). However, Forman (2005) explains that it is still possible in multilingual classes to use some bilingual resources as well as group-work and translation activities to build upon students' L1.

 On the other hand, in EFL contexts where the students usually share the same L1 with the teacher, Forman (2005) mentions that more L1 can be used. Sabb (2011) argues that in EFL contexts, as much of the L2 as possible should be used as classrooms are the only contexts where students can hear the language. For example, students who participated in Brooks-Lewis' (2009) study preferred L2 use in classes, stating "I would like the teacher to talk more in English because it is the only way that we are going to learn the language" (p. 224). However, students and teachers prefer to use L1 for many reasons. For example, Tang's (2002) study with undergraduate students and teachers in the Chinese context concluded that the majority of the participants (teachers and students) found L1 (Chinese) use in their classes useful and effective. Similarly, Schweers (1999), who worked with EFL undergraduate students and teachers in Puerto Rica, found out that all the teachers and 88.7% of the students reported that L1 (Spanish) should be used in L2 (English) classes.

2.5.5 Attitudes

Attitudes and perceptions of teachers and students toward L1 use can have considerable influence on the amount and purposes of using L1 in L2 classes. For example, in her study with Chinese university teachers and students, Jingxia (2010) found out that teachers' attitudes toward code-switching affected their use of L1. Likewise, Thompson's (2006) study, as already mentioned, attempted to explore the factors that influence teachers' use of L1. A factor that was correlated with the teachers' actual use of L1 was their own attitudes toward it. However, the correlation was not statistically significant. He also found that the students' attitudes towards L1 use had a positive correlation with their actual classroom behavior. Yet, this correlation was not statistically significant, too. On the other hand, a significant correlation was found between the students' attitudes toward their teachers' L1 use and the amount of actual use of L1 by their teachers.

However, attitudes and perceptions do not always match with what occurs in the classroom because other factors might contribute to classroom practices. For example, Qadri (2006) investigated if there is any potential discrepancy between teachers' and students' attitudes toward L1 use in schools in the UAE and their own classroom practices. The findings showed that L1 was not used because of its ban in the country even though the majority of the teachers were in favor of limited use of it. However, the students were against teachers' use of L1 and preferred L2-only classes.

Attitudes and perceptions of teachers and students toward the use of L1 in L2 classes have been extensively studied in various contexts. The next section will review studies conducted about the issue of attitudes and will show how the results have

been quite contradictory and mixed, not only across different contexts, but also in similar contexts.

2.6 Attitudes toward the Use of L1 in L2 Classes

This section consists of two parts. In the first part, the term 'attitudes' is defined and then how attitudes affect language learning and language teaching is highlighted. Besides, different aspects of research regarding attitudes are illustrated. The second part narrows down the topic to a more specific aspect of attitudes, that is, teachers' and students' attitudes toward the use of L1 in L2 classes.

2.6.1 Attitudes and Language Learning and Teaching

Attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs are among those factors that influence language learning. Brown (2007) refers to attitudes as "a set of personal feelings, opinions, or biases about races, cultures, ethnic groups, classes of people, and languages" (p. 377). Teachers' and students' attitudes are considered as an important factor in language learning and teaching and they shape whatever occurs in the classroom. Thompson (2006), for example, explains that teachers' behaviors will be determined by how they think a language is learnt, rather than possible research and training. Therefore, considering them is important in understanding language learning and teaching.

Gardner and Lambert (1972, cited in Brown, 2007), for example, studied the effects of different types of attitudes on language learning. They explained that motivation, which is a construct made up of certain attitudes, can have a great influence on language learning and teaching. Cook (2008) also states that a reason that some students are better language learners than others is definitely because their motivation level is higher. Similarly, Gardner (1985) believes that attitudes and

motivation affect L2 learning as they orient L2 learners to search for opportunities to learn the language. On the other hand, Brown (2007) shows some other certain types of students' attitudes which are positively correlated with language success. He explains that what L2 learners can get benefit from is positive attitudes whereas negative attitudes may bring about decreased motivation, and consequently unsuccessful attainment of proficiency (Brown, 2007).

Numerous studies have investigated the relationship between attitudes and motivation, anxiety, learning strategies, and level of achievement. Further, many studies have looked into what kind of attitudes teachers and/or students have toward language, language learning, language teaching methods, native and non-native L2 teachers, L2 culture, target language use, first language use, etc.

The present study focuses on the attitudes of learners and teachers toward L1 use in L2 classes. These attitudes have been extensively studied in different contexts and the results have been quite inconsistent. The findings vary not only across different contexts, but also in the same context, and not only across different levels of proficiency, but also in the same level.

2.6.2 Teachers' and Students' Attitudes toward the Use of L1 in L2 Classes

In the literature, may studies are found to investigate attitudes of both teachers and students while some studies focus on teachers only and some others on students only. Accordingly, the results of these studies are explained separately.

2.6.2.1 Studies on Teachers' and Students' Attitudes toward the Use of L1 in L2 Classes

Many studies on attitudes of teachers and students toward using L1 in L2 classes have been conducted in different EFL contexts and the results have not been

consistent. Some studies show that teachers and students have positive attitudes toward L1 use. For example, Schweers (1999) conducted a study in a Spanish context in the University of Puerto Rico regarding students' and teachers' attitudes to the use of L1. He found out that 88.7% of the students and all the teachers (100%) believed that L1 (Spanish) should be used in L2 (English) classroom. Moreover, 49% of the students showed that they like their teacher to use Spanish very little, 28.2% sometimes, and 22.3% a lot. Besides, most of the teacher and student participants believed that L1 should be used when explaining difficult concepts. Furthermore, 87% of the students reported that using Spanish in English classes helped them learn English.

Inspired by Schweers' (1999) study, Tang (2002) carried out another study in a Chinese context with first-year English major students with intermediate-level of L2 proficiency and their teachers. The majority of the students (70%) and teachers (72%) showed tendencies to accept L1 (Chinese) use in their L2 (English) classroom. Moreover, 45% of the students showed that they like their teacher to use Chinese *a little*, but 50% chose *sometimes*. Regarding the frequency of L1 use, 60% of the students reported that they like Chinese to be used *sometimes* but 38% of them reported that they like it *very rarely*. Further, while most of the teachers said that Chinese should be used to practice the use of new phrases and expressions, most of the students said that Chinese should be used to explain grammar points and define new words. Additionally, 69% of the students reported that using Chinese in English classes provides little help to learn English, and 22% believe that it helps them fairly much.

Another study was conducted in the Chinese context by Jingxia (2010) with 261 undergraduate university students and 60 instructors teaching students of different education levels. The results indicated that 66% of the students were in favor of teachers' code-switching to the L1 (Chinese) in L2 (English) classes while the percentages for teachers who had the same view was higher (80%).

In a similar study, but in the context of Saudi Arabia, Al-Nofaie (2010) investigated attitudes of students and teachers toward using L1 (Arabic) in L2 (English) classes at an intermediate school. The findings indicated that both the students and the teachers favored employing Arabic for certain situations.

Similarly, Mahmutoğlu and Kıcır (2013) looked into attitudes of teachers and students (with intermediate and upper-intermediate levels) at English Preparatory School of European University of Lefke in Northern Cyprus. The study came to the conclusion that neither the teachers nor the students were against L1 (Turkish) use in L2 (English) classes. They believed that, when necessary, L1 would be beneficial especially if used in the right situations at the right time.

Contrary to the aforementioned studies, a study conducted by Hamze (2010) with teachers and students in secondary level private schools in the UAE showed that the use of L1 (Arabic) was discouraged in the schools and the teachers and the students reported negative attitudes towards it. They did not believe that it would assist learning. Yet, for the purpose of explaining some complex grammar points and new words, they made use of L1. The teachers used it to facilitate students' understanding.

On the other hand, a number of studies show that students' attitudes are completely different from those of teachers. Some studies show that teachers have negative attitudes toward L1 use and students show positive feelings towards it. For example, Taşkın (2011) carried out a study in a preparatory school of a private university in Ankara, Turkey where the education policy is English-only. The results showed that the teachers had negative attitudes toward using Turkish and supported limited use of it whereas the learners showed more positive attitudes toward teachers' use of Turkish. However, the teachers reported that they do not use L1 as a means of communication, rather it is the last choice to help students' understanding when they have difficulty. Besides, intermediate level teachers surprisingly expressed more positive attitudes toward using L1 while elementary level teachers reported negative attitudes. On the other hand, when students' levels were considered, it was found out that the intermediate students had the least positive attitudes, the upper-intermediate level students had medium positive attitudes, and the elementary level students had the most positive attitudes.

Similarly, but in a different context, Hashemi and Sabet (2013) conducted a study with university students and teachers in the context of Iran regarding their attitudes toward using L1 (Persian) in EFL classes. The findings showed that the learners were in favor of using L1 while teachers were in favor of using more L2 than L1 in their classes. However, the teachers did not totally refuse L1, but they opposed to its excessive use. Furthermore, the students agree that L1 can be used for translating, giving instructions, contrasting L1 and L2, and explaining grammar. On the other hand, teachers preferred to use L1 to explain grammatical terms and abstract words, and sometimes to check for comprehension.

On the other hand, the results of some other studies are surprisingly in the reverse direction, that is, when students have negative attitudes toward the use of L1, teachers show positive attitudes. For example, Qadri (2006), who undertook a research in the United Arab Emirates (UAE), indicated that while the students showed negative attitudes toward the use of Arabic and disapproved its use by their teachers, the teachers showed mixed attitudes toward it. They favoured minimum use of it. Similarly, Kalanzadeh et al. (2013) investigated attitudes of teachers and students in high schools in Iran toward the use of L1 (Persian) in EFL classes and they came to the conclusion that students were against excessive use of Persian and they supported English domination in their classes, that is, they were in favor of using more L2 whereas the teachers expressed stronger tendency to use L1.

2.6.2.2 Studies on Students' Attitudes toward the Use of L1 in L2 Classes

Some studies have included only one type of participants, that is, either students or teachers. With regard to studies where only students have participated, the results have not always been similar. For example, a study was carried out by Nazary (2008) with university students in Iran whose proficiency levels were different: elementary, intermediate, and advanced. The results showed that all the students reported negative attitudes toward the teachers' and students' use of L1 (Persian) in L2 (English) classes. Yet, students at intermediate level of proficiency showed more negative attitudes towards it than the other two groups.

On the contrary, many studies show students' positive attitudes toward using L1. To begin with, Dujmović's (2007) study with first-year university students in Croatia whose English language levels were intermediate and upper-intermediate showed that all the students believe that Croatian (L1) should be used in the classroom. Fifty-two percent of them stated that they prefer their teacher to use Croatian sometimes

and 32% of them showed preference for teachers' a lot of use of it. Similarly, Chavez (2003) conducted a study with college students who were learning German language in University of Wisconsin-Madison. The findings showed that the students expressed preference for having both L1 and L2 in the classroom. However, when the students progressed in their L2 learning, they showed a stronger preference for L2.

Juárez and Oxbrow (2008) also looked into the attitudes of first-year university students of EFL toward L1 use in L2 classes in a university in Spain. The students' levels were late elementary or low intermediate (A2/B1). The results of the study revealed that the students show a favourable response toward the judicious use of Spanish in their English classes. Seventy-six percent of them showed positive attitudes toward teacher's explanations of L2 grammatical structures in L1. However, they were not for using L1 for managing the class. In short, students preferred Spanish for linguistic or lexical content rather than metacognitive, social, or affective aspects of the class. Another example is Mouhanna's (2009) study with students in a UAE tertiary institution, results of which showed that lower level students, compared to higher level students, reported more positive attitudes toward L1 use. In comparison to the higher level students, students at low level of proficiency reported more need for L1 stating that it helped them learn English.

Furthermore, Brooks-Lewis (2009) also did a research at two universities in Mexico to identify attitudes of learners toward the inclusion of L1 (Spanish) in L2 (English) classes and concluded that the learners had very positive perceptions to it in language teaching and learning. They expressed that it can be beneficial for language learning. A final example is Břenková's (2007) study which focused on the attitudes of

elementary and intermediate level students toward the use of L1 (Czech) in L2 (English) classes in elementary and secondary schools. The findings demonstrated that the students are advocates of the use of L1, and that elementary level students expressed stronger preference for L1 than students at the intermediate level.

In addition to these, Prodromou's (2002) study pointed out different results according to the level of the students. The study attempted to identify perceptions of Greek learners on the use of L1 at three different levels – beginner, intermediate, and advanced. The findings showed that only 29% of the students at advanced level of study had positive attitudes to teacher's use of L1 in their L2 classes while 58% of the intermediate level students, and 66% of the beginner levels showed positive attitudes to it. Additionally, only 35% of the advanced level students believed that they themselves should use L1 while 53% of the intermediate level ones and 63% of the beginner-level students believed so. In general, the more advanced the students become, the less L1 they reported they need. Nearly similar to this research, Al Sharaeai (2012) conducted another research with university learners in the Midwestern United States with different linguistic backgrounds and levels of proficiency regarding their attitudes toward L1 use in English classes. The results showed that the majority of them neither agreed nor disagreed about having a teacher who knows their L1. Most of them, especially the higher level students, were in favor of English-only classes. They preferred having their L1 a little in the English classrooms.

2.6.2.3 Studies on Teachers' Attitudes toward the Use of L1 in L2 Classes

On the other hand, studies that have been conducted to find out attitudes of only teachers toward using L1 in L2 classes show mixed results. Some studies show that teachers hold positive attitudes toward it. For example, Sarandi (2013) conducted a

54

study in Turkey with preparatory school teachers of a university in Istanbul who were teaching three different proficiency levels (A2, B1, B2). The results showed that although the English-only policy was advocated by the school and that all the teachers were informed about this, the majority of the teachers were still in favor of using Turkish (L1). Likewise, in the context of Israel, Timor (2012) studied 112 elementary and secondary school EFL teachers and found out that the teachers expressed positive tendencies toward using L1 (Hebrew) in L2 (English) classes stating that it can be useful for the purpose of teaching and sometimes for managing classrooms. Again, Anh (2010) conducted a study in the context of Vietnam with university teachers and the results showed that all the teachers supported the use of L1 (Vietnamese) in English language teaching (ELT) reporting that it can play a positive role in the classroom. However, the majority of the teachers advocated the minimum use of it.

However, in contrast to Anh (2010), Sarandi (2013), and Timor (2012), Qadumi's (2007) study in Palestinian schools concluded that the teachers had positive attitudes toward using L1 only in teaching reading, but negative in teaching writing, listening, speaking, and other situations. As a whole, it can be concluded the teachers were not in favor of using L1. Nevertheless, the results of a study conducted in Palestine by Salah (2012) to discover what kind of attitudes primary school teachers have towards L1 (Arabic) use in EFL classes demonstrated that their attitudes were moderate. They indicated that L1 can sometimes be used for specific reasons. In short, they were against overuse of Arabic and supported limited use of it.

2.6.2.4 Summary of the Studies

To summarize, it can be concluded from all the above reviewed studies that not only attitudes of the students have been different from those of the teachers, but also that

students in different studies have shown different and contradictory attitudes and so do teachers. Besides, different attitudes emerge not only across different contexts, but also in similar contexts. For example, as mentioned above, in the context of Iran, Hashemi and Sabet's (2013) study and Kalanzadeh et al.'s (2013) study show completely different findings. While in the former, students showed positive attitudes toward L1 use and teachers had negative attitudes, in the latter students showed negative attitudes and teachers had positive attitudes. However, the level of study for those students and teachers were different. Yet, there have been studies in similar contexts conducted with the same level participants, but the results have been different. For example, two studies (Sarandi, 2013; Taşkın, 2011) in the context of Turkey in preparatory schools of two universities show different results. In the former, teachers had positive attitudes toward L1 use, in the latter teachers were negative. However, the two studies were conducted in two different cities.

The present study was conducted in basic and high schools in the context of Erbil city in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. No studies were found in the literature to have been conducted in this city in basic and high schools. However, a study was conducted by Mohammad (2013) in other cities and towns with students and teachers at a level different from the present study. Mohammad (2013) investigated attitudes of teachers and students toward using L1 (Kurdish) in L2 (English) classes at Computer Institutes in three cities and four towns in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. The results showed that the teachers had positive attitudes toward using L2 and they did not value L1 in the classroom while students showed more tendencies toward using L1.

2.7 Summary

This chapter, first, focused on the place of L1 in different teaching approaches and methods. It showed that the use of L1 has been treated differently throughout the history of language teaching methodology. After that, the chapter extended the discussion to show arguments that have been made for and against the use of L1 and recently made arguments about judicious use of L1. The chapter went on to show the suggested uses of L1 in L2 classes. Next, it reviewed why teachers and students revert to their L1. It also explained the factors that influence the amount and purposes of L1 use. Finally, it reviewed some studies to show how attitudes toward L1 use have been different and contradictory in many studies. In the following chapter, the methodology employed in this study will be presented.

Chapter 3

METHOD

This chapter first describes the research design employed in the study. Then it shows the context where the current study has been carried out. Next, it explains the purpose of the study and lists the research questions. After that, it provides detailed background information about the participants. Then it describes the instruments used for collecting the data and piloting of them as well as the procedures for carrying out the data collection. After that, it discusses the techniques employed to analyze the collected data. Finally, it presents the limitations and delimitations of the study.

3.1 Overall Research Design

In this study, quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection were employed. Dörnyei (2007) defines quantitative method as data collection procedures which bring about numerical data that must be analyzed by statistical methods and qualitative method as procedures of data collection that produce mainly open-ended, non-numerical data. Although these two methods provide different types of data, Creswell (2009), Dörnyei (2007), and Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012) explain that these two methods are not as discrete and exclusive as they appear and that the distinctions made between them are not absolute. Creswell (2009) states that these two methods must be viewed as two different ends of a continuum, and therefore, a study can be more qualitative than quantitative or vice versa. As a result, Creswell

(2009), Dörnyei (2007), and Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012) provide a third type of data collection method, namely mixed method, which resides in the middle of the continuum since both qualitative and quantitative methods are employed in the same study.

Creswell (2009) and Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012) argue that through the use of mixed method, researchers can gain more and different kinds of data than they would get from only one method and therefore, the strength of such a study is greater than either qualitative and quantitative method. Therefore, researchers will gain a better, and probably complete, understanding of the research problems. Moreover, it improves the reliability and validity of the results. Accordingly, a mixed method of data collection has been used in this study.

Moreover, this study is a case study adopting descriptive and interpretive approach. Yet, according to Dörnyei (2007), case studies are labeled as qualitative studies even though quantitative method of data collection is sometimes included. Nunan (1992), however, explains that the case study is a hybrid in which various methods of data collection and data analysis is employed rather than only a single method. Dörnyei (2007), on the other hand, defines case studies as methods of data collection and organization used to enhance our understanding of the unitary character of the case or object under study. Case studies are advantageous in that they provide examples of real people in action in real situations which help researchers describe, analyze, and interpret the case under study and generalize it to other similar cases.

Dörnyei (2007) reports that the use of a case study is beneficial because:

> The case study is an excellent method for obtaining a thick description of a complex social issue embedded within a cultural context. It offers rich and in-depth insights that no other method can yield, allowing researchers to examine how an intricate set of circumstances come together and interact in shaping the social world around us. (p. 155)

To collect the data for this study, triangulation approach, which is the use of two or more methods of data collection, was employed. Triangulation approach is useful because by making use of both quantitative and qualitative data, more than one standpoint can be studied and consequently the richness and complexity of human behavior can be outlined and clarified more fully (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). Using triangulation and collecting data from various instruments is useful since depending exclusively on one method may not provide enough data about the topic under study or sometimes inaccurate data might be achieved while using multiple resources can be used to contrast them with each other to see if the same results are achieved. For these purposes, questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations were used for the data collection in this study.

In short, this study is a case study in which both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection are used. It is also descriptive and interpretive. The data was collected through triangulation method using *student and teacher questionnaires* to obtain data about students' and teachers' attitudes toward the use of L1 and the reasons for which they employ L1 in their L2 classes; *teacher interviews* to get a better understanding of their attitudes, the reasons behind employing L1, and the reasons that their students use L1; and *classroom observations* to identify the occasions on which the teachers and the students actually use L1 in their L2 classes.

3.2 Context

This study was conducted in an EFL context during spring semester of the academic year 2013-2014 in four different public (governmental) schools, located in the city of Erbil in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. The schools were Dldar Basic School for Boys, Andesha Basic School for Girls, Zozk High School for Boys, and Sarwaran High School for Girls. To clarify why four different schools were chosen for the study, it is necessary to mention about the education system in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq.

The schools in the region are composed of two levels: basic schools going from grade 1 to grade 9 and high schools going from grade 10 to grade 12. Basic schools are usually separated into two groups (grades 1-6 and grades 7-9). The two groups study in either two different schools or in the same school but one in the morning and the other in the afternoon. This is due to two main reasons. First, the number of students is too high and they all cannot be accommodated in one school. Second, public schools in the whole Iraq, including the Kurdistan Region, are gender segregated from grades 7-12 while they are mixed from grades 1-6. Regarding high schools, they are also grouped into two groups (schools for boys and schools for girls) since, as noted earlier, the schools are gender segregated. Therefore, the two groups study either in different schools or the same school but at two different times, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon. Because one purpose of the study was to compare the attitudes of female and male students in two different levels (7th and 11th grades), the researcher had to choose four different schools as in the government public schools male and female students and 7th and 11th grade students cannot be found in one school. Therefore, the schools that were involved in the study

included one for 7th grade male students, one for 7th grade female students, one for 11th grade male students, and one for 11th grade female students. All the four schools were located in the same area of the city.

There was a reason behind choosing 7th and 11th grades for this study rather than other grades. As one of the aims of the study was to compare the attitudes of students in two different levels regarding the use of L1 in L2 classes, the researcher chose samples of 7th and 11th grades so that there could be some gap between the two levels to allow comparison of them. Lower than 7th grade students were not chosen because, first, they are beginner-level students and they need more L1 use in L2 classrooms (according to what I learnt from the literature review), and second, they might be too young to understand the purpose of questionnaires and to be able to respond to them. On the other hand, 12th grade students, who are at the highest level in high schools, were not chosen because these students have to take a national baccalaureate exam, grades of which have a great role in determining their departments at university and as a result, they usually study for the test and the teachers usually teach for the test and a great deal of Kurdish is employed in their classes (based on the researchers' personal teaching experience and informal observations as well as discussions with the colleagues). Therefore, these classes do not reflect the actual teaching and learning practices occurring in the schools. For this reason, one grade lower than 12th was chosen as the high level participants of the study. Therefore, these two levels were chosen to be able to better analyze the differences between them regarding the use of Kurdish in their English classes.

In the schools of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq, before the new course book, Sunrise, was introduced, English subject used to be taught from grade 5. However, after the

new course book was introduced, the whole curriculum was changed and now English language is an obligatory subject for all students, taught from grade 1 to 12. Because this course book was recently introduced, the students who are currently studying in grade 7 started studying English subject from grade 1 while 11th or higher grades started studying English subject from grade 5. In these two grades (7th and 11th), English is studied five class hours a week, each for a period of 40 minutes. The textbooks that are studied in these two levels are Sunrise 7 and Sunrise 11. The students and teachers are allowed to use L1 (Kurdish) in classes as there is no written document to ban the use of L1 in L2 classes.

The four schools are briefly introduced in Table 3.1 below. These four classes were first observed. Then, questionnaires were administered to teachers and students in those classes. Finally, the teachers participated in the interviews.

Table 3.1: Information about the schools

School Names	Grades	Students' Gender	Chosen classes	No. of students	Teachers' Gender
Dldar Boys' Basic School	7, 8, 9	Male	7	29	Male
Andesha Girls' Basic School	7, 8, 9	Female	7	30	Female
Zozk Boys' High School	10, 11, 12	Male	11	17	Male
Sarwaran Girls' High School	10, 11, 12	Female	11	22	Female

3.3 Research Questions

The main aim of the current study is to investigate the attitudes and perceptions of basic and high school students and teachers toward the use of L1 (Kurdish) in L2 (English) classrooms in the city of Erbil in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq and to identify the effect of gender and level of study on the students' attitudes. The study

also attempts to explore when, where, and for what purposes the teachers and the students use L1 in L2 classes. For these purposes, the following research questions are addressed:

1. What are the teachers' attitudes toward the use of L1 in EFL classes?
2. What are the students' attitudes toward the use of L1 in EFL classes?
3. Is there a difference between the attitudes of the teachers and those of the students?
4. Do the attitudes change between low level and high level students?
5. Do the attitudes change between male and female students?
6. What are the teachers' perceived needs for L1 use in EFL classes?
7. What are the students' perceived needs for L1 use in EFL classes?
8. When and where and for what purposes is L1 used in EFL classes by the teachers and the students?
9. Does the students' actual use of Kurdish in English classes change across different levels of study?
10. Does the students' actual use of Kurdish in English classes change across gender?

3.4 Participants

A total of four teachers and 98 students from four different schools, namely Dldar Boys' Basic School, Andesha Girls' Basic School, Zozk Boys' High School, and Sarwaran Girls' High School, in the city of Erbil in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq participated in the present study. Below is some background information about both the students and the teachers.

3.4.1 Students

The study included 98 students from 7th grade basic schools and 11th grade high schools in the city of Erbil in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. The students' age ranged between 12-19 (M = 15.04). Slightly more than half of the students were female (53.1 %, n = 52), and while the male students constituted 46 students (46.9%). All the participants were Kurds and they were all native speakers of Sorani Kurdish. Sorani is the present standard Kurdish in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. It has become the dominant written form of Kurdish, the education's standard language, and the medium of communication among government bodies.

The student participants were learning English as a foreign language and they were studying English as it was an obligatory lesson for all students. The English level of the students was defined by the school grades they were in. According to the materials developers and the Sunrise Curriculum, students in the 7th grade are expected to be at A2 level (which is Waystage or Elementary level) according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and students from 11th grade are expected to be at B1 level (which is Threshold or Intermediate level) according to the CEFR (*Sunrise Curriculum,* 2010). Table 3.2 below summarizes all the background information about the students.

As shown in Table 3.2, the number of students in 7th grade was 59 (60.2%). Their age ranged between 12-17 (M = 13.66). Thirty of them were female and 29 were male. All of them had been learning English for 7 years, starting from when they started going to school. The female and male students were studying at two different schools as the educational system does not allow girls and boys in grades 7 to 11 to study in the same school.

Table 3.2: A summary of the students' background information

Characteristics	Categories	No. of students	Percentage
Classes	Class 1 (7th grade, male)	29	29.6
	Class 2 (7th grade, female)	30	30.6
	Class 3 (11th grade male)	17	17.3
	Class 4 (11th grade, female)	22	22.4
School grade	7	59	60.2
	11	39	39.8
Gender	Male	46	46.9
	Female	52	53.1
Age	12	7	7.1
	13	26	26.5
	14	11	11.2
	15	11	11.2
	16	7	7.1
	17	28	28.6
	18	7	7.1
	19	1	1.0
Total		**98**	**100**

On the other hand, the number of students in 11th grade was 39. Their age ranged between 16-19 (M = 17.12). Twenty-two of them were female and the other 17 were male. All of them had been learning English for 7 years as some years ago English lesson used to be offered from grade 5 to 12 while now it is offered from grade 1 till 12. Again, the female and male students were studying at two different schools because the educational system separates boys and girls in that level of studying as well.

3.4.2 Teachers

The teacher participants were teachers of these four classes (n = 4), two were male and two were female. The two female teachers were teaching the female students, one in the 7th grade and the other in 11th, and the two male teachers were teaching the

male students, one in the 7th grade and the other in 11th. The teachers' age ranged

between 30-40 (M = 35) and their teaching experiences ranged between 8-14 years

(M = 10). They were all Kurds and their mother tongue was Sorani Kurdish. They all

graduated from universities with Bachelor degree in English language. Table 3.3

below shows a summary of their background information.

Table 3.3: A summary of the teachers' background information

Characteristics	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Teacher 3	Teacher 4
Age	40	31	39	30
Gender	Male	Female	Male	Female
Teaching experience	9 years	9 years	14 years	8 years
Last academic qualification	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.

3.5 Data Collection Instruments

As mentioned previously, triangulation approach of data collection was employed by

using questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations.

3.5.1 Questionnaires

Questionnaires were the main data collection instruments used in this study to collect

quantitative data about the students' and teachers' attitudes toward the use of

Kurdish in English classes as well as their perceived needs for it. Brown (2001, cited

in Dörnyei, 2007, p. 102) defines questionnaires as "any written instruments that

present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react

either by writing out their answers or selecting from among existing answers" which

can be used to measure facts, behaviors, attitudes, etc.

Using questionnaires is very advantageous in many ways. Dörnyei (2007) explains

that through using questionnaires, the researchers can obtain answers to questions in

a systematic and disciplined manner and that large numbers of people can respond to

them at the same time which helps researchers gather a large amount of information in a short time. Hopkins (2008) states that questionnaires are a quick and simple method of getting large and rich information about different aspects of the classroom, curriculum, or teaching method. To this end, two questionnaires were used in this study: student questionnaire and teacher questionnaire.

3.5.1.1 Student questionnaire

The student questionnaire (Appendix A) consisted of two parts: Background Information and The Questionnaire. The Background Information part was used to collect demographic data about the students' age, gender, nationality, L1, and years of learning English. The second part of the student questionnaire was used to collect data about students' attitudes toward and perceived needs for the use of Kurdish in English classes.

The questionnaire was adapted from Schweers' (1999) and Prodromou's (2002) questionnaires. Their questionnaires functioned as the basis in designing the questionnaires used in the present study though some questions were adapted from other studies (Anh, 2010; Qadri, 2006; Salah, 2012; Tang, 2002; Taşkın, 2011; Thompson, 2006) and few were designed by the researcher in the light of literature review. The questionnaire consisted of seven main questions, with Q5, Q6, and Q7 having a number of subitems. The reliability of the questionnaire was calculated using Cronbach alpha formula, and it was found to be 0.90. This shows that the degree of internal consistency is high, and that the instrument is considerably reliable.

Students were asked to respond to the questionnaire through choosing from 5-point likert-scale ranging from "Always" to "Never". Although Schweers' (1999) and

Prodromou's (2002) questionnaires were to be answered by choosing between only two options; "yes" or "no", for the present study it was preferred to change them to 5-point likert-scale to enable the participants identify and show the extent of their positive or negative attitudes toward and the degree of their perceived needs for the use of Kurdish in their English classes. The student questionnaire is described below.

Q1-Q6 were designed to identify students' attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes. Q1 asks whether teachers should use Kurdish in English classes and Q2 inquires whether students should use Kurdish in English classes. Q3 asks about the extent to which using Kurdish in English classes helps students learn English and Q4 about the extent that the students think Kurdish should be used in their English classes. Q5 inquires into students' attitudes toward 19 situations in which English teachers may use Kurdish in their classes. In addition, an open-ended subitem was added at the end so that students would note down some situations, other than those provided before, where they think teachers can employ L1. Q6, on the other hand, asks about students' attitudes toward eight situations in which students may use Kurdish in English classes. In addition, an open-ended subitem was added at the end so that students would note down some situations, other than those provided before, where they think students can employ L1.

On the other hand, the last question, Q7, investigates the reasons for which the students themselves prefer to use Kurdish in their English classes. This question is followed by nine possible reasons for which the students switch to Kurdish in English classes as well as an open-ended subitem at the end asking about other reasons for which the students use Kurdish in their English classes.

The student questionnaire was originally written in English (Appendix A), but then translated into Kurdish (Appendix B) to make sure that the students fully understand it. Two English language teachers whose L1 was Kurdish cooperated in translating the questionnaire into Kurdish. To ensure that the translation was accurate, the back-translation method was employed. The Kurdish version of the questionnaire was given to another English language teacher with M.A. degree whose L1 was Kurdish and who had not seen the English version of the questionnaire and he was requested to translate it into English. Then the original version of the questionnaire and the back-translated questionnaire were compared to ensure that the Kurdish translation of the questionnaire reflected what it meant to investigate. After some revisions, a final Kurdish version of the student questionnaire was prepared.

3.5.1.2 Teacher questionnaire

The teacher questionnaire (Appendix C) also consisted of two parts: Background Information and The Questionnaire. The Background Information part was utilized to obtain some demographic data about the teachers' age, gender, nationality, L1, years of teaching experience, the grade(s) they were teaching, last academic qualification, and field of study. The second part of the questionnaire was employed to gain data about the teachers' attitudes toward and perceived needs for the use of Kurdish in English classes.

The questionnaire that had already been designed for the student participants was adapted as a teacher questionnaire. Most of the questions remained the same. Yet, some changes were made. For example, Q3 in the student questionnaire *"To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you learn this language?"* was replaced with two other questions: Q3 *"To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you teach this language?"* and Q4 *"To what extent using*

Kurdish in your English classes helps your students learn this language?". Similarly, some subitems in Q7 of the student questionnaire were changed. For instance, the subitem *"it helps me understand difficult concepts and topics better"* was replaced with two other subitems *"it helps me teach difficult concepts and topics better"* and *"it helps my students understand difficult concepts and topics better.* These changes were made in these questions and subitems so that they, first, fit the teachers' teaching practices and, second, some data would be gained about the teachers' attitudes regarding whether they think using L1 can help their students.

The teacher questionnaire was translated into Kurdish by the same staff who translated the student questionnaire and back-translation method was also employed to ensure that the translation was accurate. However, for the administration of the questionnaire with the teachers, the questionnaires were organized in a way that the English version of the questionnaire and its Kurdish translation were provided together side-by-side (see Appendix C).

3.5.2 Teacher Interviews

Another data collection instrument used in this study was teacher interviews. McDonough and McDonough (1997) argue that conducting interviews is useful as "it has a potential for openness and allows control of what is revealed to remain more or less with the respondent, giving room for individual expression and broaching of new topics" (p. 172). Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012) explain that interviewing has many benefits for the researchers such as establishing rapport, clarifying questions, following up unclear or incomplete responses, etc. Furthermore, researchers can get benefit from using interviews to check for the accuracy of the impressions gained from questionnaires and/or observations. Hopkins (2008) argues, "individual interviews are often very productive sources of information for a

participant observer who wants to verify observations they have previously made"
(p. 110).

For these purposes, in the present study, individual interviews were carried out with
the four teacher participants whose classes had already been observed, and who had
already responded to the questionnaire. The purpose of the interviews was to gain
some qualitative in-depth data about their attitudes toward the use of L1 in L2
classes, to further explore their beliefs and practices as well as to compare their
attitudes with their classroom practices.

The interviews were of semi-structured type. Dörnyei (2007) defines semi-structured
interviews as having "a set of pre-prepared guiding questions and prompts, the
format is open-ended and the interviewee is encouraged to elaborate on the issues
raised in an exploratory manner" (p. 136). In the present study, the interviewees were
asked 12 open-ended questions (see Appendix D) as well as some follow-up
questions depending on the situations and issues raised during the interview.

3.5.3 Classroom Observations

The last instrument of data collection used in the present study was classroom
observations. Classroom observations were conducted to help the researcher
investigate actual teaching and learning practices and gain more insight into how
frequently and on what occasions the teachers and the students actually use Kurdish
in English classes. Before administering the questionnaires and interviews, each of
the four classes were observed and audio-recorded for three class hours (120
minutes). In addition to observing and audio-recording the classes, the observations
involved noting down the activities in which the teachers and the students used

Kurdish as well as the frequency of its use in two checklists: a checklist for teachers' use of L1 and another for students' use of L1 (see Appendix E).

The first part of the observation checklists was used to document the teacher's name and gender, the school name, the number of students and their gender, the class level, the unit, lesson and topic of the study, and the date and time. The two checklists were used to record the occasions of teachers' and students' use of L1 and its frequency. The given occasions in the checklists were exactly the same as those given in the questionnaires. Besides, some space was left at the end of each checklist to note down other situations of L1 use which were not in the list.

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

After asking the Ministry of Education in Iraqi Kurdistan Region Government for permission to go to some schools in the city of Erbil for the purpose of data collection, the permission was obtained and they provided the researcher with a letter of support (see Appendix F) that helped the researcher to go to any school in the city and ask their administrators for cooperation in the data collection of this study. Having the support letter from the Ministry of Education, no schools refused the request for administering the study there.

Four schools in the same area of the city were selected. They gave the researcher full support for conducting the study. After talking to the English language teachers of the four schools, each chose a class in which the study could be conducted. The data collection started with classroom observations. Three class hours were scheduled with each teacher to carry out the observations. Before the first hour of observation, the students were also informed that the classes would be observed for research

purposes. Then each class was observed and audio-recorded for 3 forty-minute class-hours (a total of 120 minutes). The teachers' and students' use of L1 and some samples of them were recorded in the observation checklists. The observations were carried out by the researcher during a period of two weeks at different times of the week.

After completing the classroom observations, the student questionnaire was administered by the researcher in one class hour. It took about 25 minutes, but for some slower students it took up to 35 minutes. A consent form was attached to each questionnaire (see Appendices A and B) on which the purpose of the study was defined and it was also stated that their names and identities would be kept confidential and that their responses would be used only for research purposes. In addition, they were orally told that their teachers and administrators would not know about their responses and they would not affect their grades. The signed consent forms were collected before the students started responding to the questionnaires. The consent form and the questionnaire were both in Kurdish (Appendix B).

After completing the administration of the questionnaires with the students, the teachers were administered a questionnaire. The teacher questionnaire was similar to the student questionnaire, with a few additional items. Yet, the questionnaires included both the English version and the Kurdish translations side-by-side as well as consent forms for teachers to fill in and sign (see Appendix C). Having to teach other classes that day, the teachers asked to take the questionnaires home and bring them back the day after and it was scheduled to conduct the interviews (the last data collection instrument) after collecting their questionnaires.

The semi-structured interviews with the four teachers whose classes had been observed took place in quiet offices and they were audio-recorded. The teachers were told in advance that they would be audio-recorded. The interviews were conducted mostly in English, with few switching back to Kurdish when necessary or difficult to communicate the ideas. Each interview took 20-30 minutes.

3.7 Piloting

Before administering the questionnaires to the students, a piloting was conducted. The questionnaire was given to twelve 7th grade students at Dldar Boys' Basic School, one of the schools where the study was being conducted. The students were not those who were involved in the actual study. The students were all boys whose ages ranged between 12-14.

The piloting was administered with the presence of the researcher in the class. Before administering the questionnaire, the students were provided with some instructions about the purpose of the pilot study and then they were asked to respond to the questions. They were also informed that they could call the researcher and tell him about any unclear question, or even a word, in the questionnaire that they had difficulty in understanding. While responding to the questionnaire, the students gave very few comments and asked very few questions about some words and questions. After that, the students were asked to provide alternative ways of expressing and rewording those words and questions to make them more clear and understandable. During that period, notes were taken by the researcher. Thereafter, some very few changes were made according to the feedback received from the students.

3.8 Data Analysis

The collected data was analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. The quantitative data, which was gained from the questionnaires, was analyzed through the use of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software, version 20.0, whereas the qualitative data, which was gained from the interviews and classroom observations, was analyzed through transcribing and coding.

To analyze the demographic data obtained from the first part of the teacher and student questionnaires, descriptive statistics were used through which numerical results by means of tables were achieved. Regarding the second part of the questionnaires through which data about attitudes and perceptions of the participants toward the use of L1 and reasons behind it was achieved, descriptive statistics were calculated through SPSS to find out frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations for each response of the questions. In addition, the responses to the 3 open-ended subitems in the teacher and student questionnaires were transcribed, categorized and analyzed qualitatively. The responses that were irrelevant were dismissed and those which were already in the list were not accounted for. On the other hand, since the study also aimed at comparing attitudes of (a) male and female students, and (b) 7th and 11th grade students toward the use of Kurdish in English classes, independent t-tests were used to examine if any statistically significant difference exists between each group.

With regard to teacher interviews, the audio-recorded data and the notes taken during the interviews were fully transcribed, and then categorized under questions for each

teacher separately. The analysis was also supported with some quotes from the data obtained from the teacher interviews.

With regard to the analysis of the collected data from the classroom observations, the audio-recording, the checklists, and the notes taken during the observations helped in the subsequent analysis. All the occasions on which Kurdish was used during the observations were transcribed, coded, and then categorized according to the observation checklists. For other occasions of L1 use that were not in the checklists, some other categories were added. The frequency of Kurdish use on each occasion was not measured by its length, rather a word or a number of words or sentences in Kurdish which seemed to serve a particular purpose were considered as one occurrence. Hence, using one Kurdish word to explain the meaning of a word and using many phrases or sentences to give instructions were both recorded as one occurrence. The analysis was supported by tables showing the occasions and the frequencies of the use of Kurdish which were followed by some samples and patterns of Kurdish use by the teachers and the students.

3.9 Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

There are some limitations to the present study which can be addressed in future studies. To begin with, from the findings of this study, generalizations cannot be made to other contexts for two reasons. First, the current study was restricted in its scope regarding the number of teacher participants (N = 4) and because of this small number of teachers, it was not statistically possible to investigate if the differences between teachers' and students' attitudes are statistically significant. Second, it did not take into consideration all possible variables (e.g. teachers' and students' age, teachers' and students' L2 proficiency level, students' learning styles, teaching goal)

77

that might influence the actual use of L1 in L2 classes and attitudes toward it. Third, as there are two types of schools in the city of Erbil, public and private, this study was limited to public schools and did not involve private schools. Another limitation of the study can be related to data collection methods. Student interviews were not carried out to elicit more in-depth data about students' attitudes toward and perceived needs for the use of L1.

On the other hand, there are some delimitations to this study. First, the classes were audio-recorded so that loss of data would be decreased. Second, triangulation approach for the data collection was used which is useful to study more than one standpoint and to obtain enough data about the topic under study. Third, no studies have already been conducted in this particular context to investigate basic school and high school teachers' and students' attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes.

3.10 Summary

In this chapter, the overall research design of the study was demonstrated. It was explained how quantitative and qualitative data were collected through triangulation of data collection. Then the context of the study was presented and the education system in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq was explained. Next, the purpose of the study and the research questions were listed. After that, detailed background information about the student and the teacher participants were provided. Following the introduction of the three data collection instruments, namely questionnaires, teacher interviews, and classroom observations, the procedures of data collection as well as piloting the questionnaires were discussed. Then, how the collected data was analyzed was explained. Finally, the limitations and delimitations of the study were

presented. In the next chapter, the results of the present study will be demonstrated in the light of the research questions.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the present study based on the data obtained from students and teacher questionnaires, teacher interviews, and classroom observations. It shows the students' and teachers' attitudes toward and perceived needs for the use of Kurdish (L1) in English (L2) classes. It further compares and contrasts the attitudes of teachers and students. It goes on identifying if attitudes of students change across gender and level of study. Additionally, it demonstrates the situations in which Kurdish was actually used in English classes by both teachers and students, and finally it shows if gender and level of study have any influence of the amount and purposes of the use of Kurdish. The results of the present study are demonstrated in the light of the research questions.

4.1 Research Question 1: What are the teachers' attitudes toward the use of L1 in EFL classes?

As stated previously in Chapter 3, four teachers whose classes were observed participated in this study: T1 (7th grade, male), T2 (7th grade, female), T3 (11th grade, male), and T4 (11th grade, female). They responded to the questionnaire and then they were interviewed. The analysis of the teachers' responses to Questions 1-7 in the teacher questionnaire and questions 1-8 and 11 in the teacher interview were brought together to find out the four teachers' attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes. The results of their responses are shown below.

4.1.1 Analysis of the Teacher Questionnaire

With regard to the analysis of the teacher questionnaire, the teachers' responses for each question followed by the mean of all the teachers' responses are demonstrated in Tables 4.1-4.4.

Teachers' responses to Questions 1 to 5 are summarized in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Results of Q1 to Q5 in the teacher questionnaire

Questions	T1	T2	T3	T4	M	SD
1. Should the teacher use Kurdish in English classes?	3	3	1	3	2.50	1.00
2. Should the students use Kurdish in English classes?	2	3	1	3	2.25	.96
3. To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you teach this language?	3	4	3	4	3.50	.58
4. To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps your students learn this language?	3	4	3	5	3.75	.96
5. How often do you think Kurdish should be used in your English classes?	2	3	1	1	1.75	.96

Note: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = Sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

For Q1, responses of T1, T2, and T4 were comparatively positive. They believed that English teachers should *sometimes* use Kurdish in English classes while T3 was entirely negative and stated that teachers should *never* use Kurdish in English classes. The total mean for Q1 was 2.50 which is located somewhere between *rarely* and *sometimes*. This shows that generally the teachers did not completely oppose to teachers' use of Kurdish, rather they prefer it to be limited and used in certain situations where necessary.

In their responses to Q2, T2 and T4 provided similar responses as they did to Q1. T2 and T4 thought that students should *sometimes* use Kurdish in English classes while T3 again showed completely negative attitude and stated that students should *never* use it. On the other hand, T1's answer was somewhere between the other three teachers. She thought that students should *rarely* use Kurdish in English classes. The mean for their answers to Q2 was 2.25 which is something between *rarely* and *sometimes*, yet closer to *rarely*. This shows that the teachers believed students can *rarely* use Kurdish in English classes, rather than totally avoiding it or overusing it. Yet, compared to their responses to Q1, they prefer a bit more use of English by teachers than by students.

As for both Q3 "To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you teach this language?" and Q4 "To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps your students learn this language?", T1 and T3 chose *sometimes* and T2 marked *often* while T4 chose *often* for Q3 and *always* for Q4. The total mean for Q3 was 3.5 which is something between *sometimes* and *often* while the mean for Q4 was 3.75 which is much closer to *often*. These demonstrate that the teachers believe using Kurdish facilitates teaching and learning of English. Yet, they thought that using Kurdish helps students learn more than it facilitates teachers' instruction.

Regarding Q5, T3 and T4 said that Kurdish should *never* be used, and T1 believed that it should *rarely* be used. However, T2 responded comparatively more positively as she stated that Kurdish should *sometimes* be used. The mean for their responses to this question was 1.75 which roughly corresponds to *rarely*. This implies that they prefer Kurdish to be used limitedly in English classes.

Q6 with its 19 subitems (Q6A-Q6S) as well as an open-ended subitem aimed at identifying teachers' attitudes toward their use of Kurdish in some specific situations. Table 4.2 summarizes teachers' responses to the subitems, the mean and standard deviation for each subitem, and then the total of Q6 for each teacher and the mean of these total scores to show the teachers' attitudes toward the overall use of Kurdish by teachers.

The data in Table 4.2 demonstrates that the teachers had the highest positive attitude (M = 4.50) toward the use of Kurdish in English classes for the purpose of translating English texts into Kurdish (Q6S). T1, T2, and T4 thought that teachers can *always* use Kurdish in their classes to translate texts from English to Kurdish while T3 believed that they can *sometimes* do so. The mean for this subitem was something between *often* and *always* (4.5) which indicates that the teachers believed English texts should usually, if not always, be translated to Kurdish.

Another high positive attitude of teachers was assigned to Q6F. T1 and T2 believed that teachers can *always* revert to Kurdish to discuss the teaching methods used in the class while T3 and T4 said that teachers can *sometimes* make use of Kurdish for that purpose. The mean for this situation of Kurdish use was 4.00 which represents *often* use of Kurdish. Similarly, with regard to Q6L, the mean for teachers' responses was 4. T1 and T2 believed that teachers can *often* use Kurdish in English classes to give suggestions on how to learn more effectively (i.e. provide students with language learning strategies) and T4 believed that English teachers can *always* use Kurdish for that purpose. However, T3 thought that only *sometimes* Kurdish should be used by teachers in order to give suggestions on how to learn more effectively.

Table 4.2: Results of Q6 in the teacher questionnaire

Question 6. English teachers can use Kurdish in their classes to:	T1	T2	T3	T4	M	SD
A. Explain new words	4	4	1	2	2.75	1.50
B. Explain grammar	4	4	3	2	3.25	.96
C. Explain the similarities and differences between Kurdish and English	3	3	2	3	2.75	.50
D. Give instructions for activities, tasks, homework, etc.	5	4	1	1	2.75	2.06
E. Check for comprehension (e.g. reading, listening, or grammar comprehension)	3	5	1	3	3.00	1.63
F. Discuss the teaching methods used in class	5	5	3	3	4.00	1.16
G. Explain difficult concepts or topics	3	5	2	3	3.25	1.26
H. Summarize material already covered	2	4	2	4	3.00	1.16
I. Assess students' performance	1	5	1	2	2.25	1.89
J. Joke around with students	4	2	1	3	2.50	1.29
K. Help students feel more comfortable and confident	3	4	2	5	3.50	1.29
L. Give suggestions on how to learn more effectively	4	4	3	5	4.00	.82
M. Give suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively	3	5	3	3	3.50	1.00
N. Give feedback to students	3	3	3	3	3.00	.00
O. Manage the class	1	5	2	3	2.75	1.71
P. Give administrative information (course policies, announcements, deadlines, attendance, etc.)	4	5	3	3	3.75	.96
Q. Talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments	2	5	2	3	3.00	1.41
R. Do brainstorming prior to an activity, e.g. writing or reading	3	5	3	1	3.00	1.63
S. Translate a text from English to Kurdish	5	5	3	5	4.50	1.00
Q6 Total	3.26	4.32	2.16	3.00	3.18	.89

Note: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = Sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

On the other hand, teachers showed the least positive attitude toward Q6I and Q6J.

With regard to Q6I, T1 and T3 believed that teachers should *never* use Kurdish to

assess students' performance, T4 thought that teachers can *rarely* employ it, and T2

stated that teachers can *always* make use of Kurdish to assess students' performance. Yet, after all, the mean (2.25) shows that teachers believe teachers can make use of very little Kurdish while assessing students' performance. With regard to Q6J, "Teachers can use Kurdish in English classes to joke around with students", the teachers' responses were all different (T1 *often*; T2 *rarely*; T3 *never*; and T4 *sometimes*). The mean for their responses was 2.50, which is the midpoint of *rarely* and *sometimes*. This implies that teachers can make little use of Kurdish to establish solidarity or relationship with students through joking around with them.

Finally, the average of all the subitems listed under Q6 shows that T2 had the most positive attitude toward teachers' use of Kurdish in English classes (M = 4.32). Overall, she believed that teachers can *often* make use of Kurdish for all the purposes. On the contrary, T3 showed the least positive, yet not completely negative, attitude (M = 2.16). He thought that teachers can *rarely* revert to Kurdish in English classes. Besides, T1's (M = 3.26) and T4's (M = 3.00) attitudes were moderate. They thought that English language teachers can *sometimes* make use of Kurdish in English classes for all the purposes listed in Q6. The overall mean for all the teachers' responses was 3.18 which roughly represents *sometimes*. This shows that the teachers generally believe that teachers can *sometimes* revert to Kurdish in English classes.

Lastly, an open-ended subitem followed all the subitems of Q6 which asked the teachers "In what other situations do you think teachers can use Kurdish in English classes". None of the teachers provided any information for this question; they left it blank.

On the other hand, Q7 with its eight subitems (Q7A-Q7H) as well as one open-ended

subitem dealt with teachers' attitudes toward students' use of Kurdish in English

classes. The results of the teachers' answers to each subitem and then the total of Q6,

as well as the mean scores for the subitems and the total are summarized in Table

4.3.

Table 4.3: Results of Q7 in the teacher questionnaire

Question 7. Students can use Kurdish in English classes to:	T1	T2	T3	T4	M	SD
A. Talk during pair-work or group-work activities	3	5	2	5	3.75	1.50
B. Ask "how do we say '…' in English?"	1	4	3	5	3.25	1.71
C. Translate an English word into Kurdish to show they understand it	4	4	3	5	4.00	.82
D. Translate a text from English to Kurdish to show they understand it	3	4	3	5	3.75	.96
E. Do brainstorming prior to an activity (e.g. writing or reading)	3	5	3	5	4.00	1.16
F. Talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments	4	5	2	5	4.00	1.41
G. Discuss the teaching methods used in class	5	5	3	5	4.50	1.00
H. Check for comprehension (e.g. reading, listening, or grammar comprehension)	2	5	2	5	3.50	1.73
Q7 Total	3.13	4.63	2.63	5.00	3.84	1.15

Note: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = Sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

According to the data illustrated in Table 4.3, the teachers showed the most positive

attitude toward students' use of Kurdish to discuss the teaching methods used in

class (Q7G). T1, T2, and T4 said that students can *always* use Kurdish for this

purposes while T3 indicated that students can only *sometimes* revert to Kurdish. The

mean for their responses to this subitem (4.5) is located somewhere between *often*

and *always*. That is, they highly support students' use of Kurdish while discussing

with their teachers methods of teaching used in class. On the other hand, the teachers' lowest positive attitude was assigned to Q7B, that is, students' use of Kurdish to ask "how do we say '…' in English"". With regard to the use of Kurdish by students for this purpose, the teachers' responses were as follows: T1 *never*; T2 *often*; T3 *sometimes*; and T4 *always*. The mean for this item was 3.25 which is slightly higher than *sometimes*. Hence, it can be concluded that the teachers prefer students to use sometimes Kurdish and sometimes English when they ask how they can say something in English.

When all the subitems of Q7 are put together to identify the extent to which the teachers believe that student can make use of Kurdish in different classroom activities, the average of their responses show that T4 showed the most positive attitude toward students' use of Kurdish. The mean for her responses recorded the highest (5.00) as she chose *always* for all the subitems. This shows that T4 believes that students can *always* use Kurdish in English classes. On the other hand, T2 comparatively had the least positive attitude (M = 2.63). She believed that students can almost *sometimes* use English. It can be inferred that she did not oppose to the use of Kurdish by students, rather she preferred limited use of it. The overall mean of the teachers' responses to all the subitems in Q7 was 3.84 (close to *often*), which shows that the teachers were positive toward students' use of Kurdish.

As for the open-ended subitem "In what other situations do you think students can use Kurdish in English classes", the teachers did not add any other situations and they left it blank.

To summarize, the teachers' overall attitudes toward using Kurdish in English classes were found by calculating the average of the means of questions 1 to 7 for each teacher as well as for all the teachers. Their overall attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes are summarized in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4: Results of Q1-Q7 in the teacher questionnaire (Teachers' overall attitudes toward using Kurdish in English classes)

Questions	T1	T2	T3	T4	M	SD
TOTAL Q1-Q7	3.13	4.25	2.22	3.53	3.28	.85

Note: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = Sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

This table reveals that the teachers' attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes were different. T2 had the highest positive attitude (M = 4.25) while T3 had the least positive attitude (M = 2.22). However, none of the teachers were completely against the use of Kurdish, rather the degree of their positive attitudes were different. The mean for all the teachers' attitudes was 3.28 which is something between *sometimes* and *often*, but much closer to *sometimes*.

To conclude, the analysis of the data gained form the teacher questionnaire shows that the teachers' attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes were moderate and that they believe Kurdish can *sometimes* be used in English classes. This implies that they are against extensive use of Kurdish and at the same time against banning it, rather they argue for *judicious* use of it.

4.1.2 Analysis of Teacher Interviews

The four teachers who responded to the questionnaire were subsequently interviewed. As already mentioned, questions 1-8 and question 11 in the teacher

interview (Appendix D) aimed at identifying teachers' attitudes to the use of Kurdish in English classes. The analysis of their responses to these questions is shown below.

As for Q1, "Should teachers use Kurdish in English classes? Why or why not?", T1, T2, and T4 were more positive than T3. T1, T2, and T3 explained that teachers should sometimes use Kurdish, especially when students encounter difficulty in understanding. T1 explained that teachers need to use Kurdish sometimes, but not always, and that it is impossible to use English all the time and entirely avoid Kurdish. However, regarding high school students, he recommended less use of Kurdish as they are expected to better understand English. Besides, T2 was for "sometimes Kurdish, sometimes English". T4, on the other hand, showed some negative attitudes toward the use of L1 in L2 classes as she explained that students will not get benefit from teaching English in another language: "How could you learn a language if you don't practice it?", she said. However she subsequently stated that sometimes when students do not understand something, teachers should use L1. When they were asked about the reasons for their responses, T1, T2, and T4 believed that students' proficiency level in English is so low to understand their teachers without Kurdish explanations. T4 also added that using Kurdish saves her time. She exemplified that when she teaches grammar in English and notices that her students do not understand, she has to teach it again in Kurdish.

On the contrary, T3 stated that Kurdish should not be used in English classes so that students will get used to English and that when they come to high school, they will be able to speak English fluently. However, even though he stated "never is better", he did not believe that Kurdish can completely be avoided and that when students do not understand, very little of it can be used. Yet, he said that the amount of Kurdish

used should continuously be decreased so that when they reach high school, no Kurdish should be used.

Similarly, with regard to Q2, "Should students use Kurdish in English classes? Why or why not?", T1, T2, and T4 showed more positive attitude than T3. T1, T2, and T4 believed that students can make use of Kurdish whenever they have difficulty in using English. When they were asked about the reasons for their responses, they all referred to students' difficulty in expressing in English what they want to. T1, for example, explained that his students can only produce some basic expressions in English which they study in their book as "Classroom English", but not beyond these. In addition to this reason, T4 provided more other reasons. She believed that students can sometimes use it because: (a) their level is low and they do not have competence in speaking English, (b) they do not have a good background in using English, (c) some students feel shy to speak English, and (d) some students are afraid of making mistakes. T3, on the other hand, was against students' use of Kurdish. He stated that if teachers allow them to use Kurdish, it will become a habit for them and they will use it even to express easy and simple sentences. However, he subsequently stated that students can use very little of Kurdish because they sometimes cannot express everything in English. Yet, he emphasized that this little use of L1 should be gradually decreased as students progress toward higher proficiency levels.

In their responses to Q3, "How often do you think Kurdish should be used in English classes?", T1 stated that it should sometimes be used. T2 supported its use only when it is necessary, such as when students have difficulty to understand. However, T3 believed that it is better for teachers to never use Kurdish at all but that students can sometimes use Kurdish when it is difficult for them to speak English. On the other

hand, T4, although already argued for sometimes use of Kurdish by teachers and students when it is necessary, she responded to this question more negatively stating that it should never be used.

With relation to Q4, "When do you think English teachers can use Kurdish in their classes?", T1 highly supported the use of Kurdish in teaching grammar. He thought that 40-50% of grammar instruction should be in Kurdish. He also argued for using Kurdish in explaining the meaning of new words, providing information or suggestions about reading, giving directions for homework, and checking for students' understanding. He also advocated the use of Kurdish in helping them with how they can learn more effectively: "I always tell them to use English-Kurdish dictionaries and keep them with themselves as their friends". T2, on the other hand, emphasized the necessity of using Kurdish in teaching grammar, saying "Grammar is very important and students have to understand it, no matter how and in what language, Kurdish or English". She also found it necessary to use Kurdish in explaining the meaning of new and difficult words. However, she did not support the use of Kurdish for class management and other administrative purposes.

On the contrary, T3, opposing to the use of Kurdish, thought that it can be used only in teaching very complex grammar points when it is very difficult for students to understand. He did not support L1 use for explaining the meaning of new words, managing classroom, and administrative purposes. Finally, T4 supported the use of Kurdish in explaining new words and difficult grammar topics on the one hand, and Kurdish and English for classroom management and organizations, giving assignments and taking the attendance, on the other. However, she did not support the use of Kurdish for some basic classroom routines such as "clean the whiteboard",

"come here and write down this sentence", "please be quiet", and the like since students understand these.

Likewise, upon Q5 "When do you think students can use Kurdish in English classes?", T1 argued that students can use Kurdish when they ask questions, work in pairs or groups, talk about exams and assignments, and translate words to Kurdish. He also stated that even in the coursebook (Sunrise 7), there are some activities which ask students to make lists of words in English and Kurdish. On the other hand, T2, T3, and T4 stated that students can use Kurdish to ask questions when they have difficulty in understanding, for example, the meaning of new words or grammar. T2 also added that students can sometimes resort to Kurdish for classroom routines: "Students can ask in Kurdish when they want to take permission to go out".

Q6, "To what extent do you yourself use Kurdish in your English classes?", aimed at finding out if teachers are aware of how much Kurdish they use in their classes. T1 explained that he uses Kurdish 20% of class time. T2 stated that she uses Kurdish when students cannot understand. She exemplified this by saying "I teach grammar points in English but when they do not understand, I teach it again in Kurdish". However, she explained that she sometimes avoids Kurdish and uses simple English and her students can understand. She also said that she does not use Kurdish when talking about exams and assignments. T3 admitted that 30% of his classes is conducted in Kurdish. He spelled out that he uses Kurdish in teaching grammar, and explaining meaning of difficult words. He also added that his students use Kurdish whenever they are unable to speak English. T4, on the other hand, indicated that she always employs Kurdish to explain the meaning of difficult words and some difficult grammar topics. She also said that she sometimes uses some Kurdish for managing

and administering classes. Additionally, she stated that she uses Kurdish in exams to explain to her students what they have to do. Finally, she admitted that she translates all the reading passages in the Literary Reader, sentence by sentence, to help students understand the stories.

As for Q7, ("To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you teach this language?") and Q8, ("To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps your students learn this language?"), T1, T3, and T4 believed that using Kurdish does not make teaching easier but it facilitates students' understanding. T1, however, stated that using Kurdish helps students to some extent in understanding but that it consequently affects them negatively as they get used to depending on Kurdish whenever they cannot speak and depending on their teachers' use of Kurdish when they cannot understand. He also explained that students lose self-confidence. T3 and T4 did not agree that teaching in Kurdish is easier than teaching in English or that English-only instruction is more difficult; they argued that it is easier to teach in English. On the contrary, T2's response to this question was comparatively different. She believed that using Kurdish always helps her as it makes teaching easier and saves time. However, she mentioned that using Kurdish never helps students' learning and that it has negative influences on them.

The last question, Q11, aimed at identifying teachers' reactions to banning the use of Kurdish in English classes: "How would you feel if the Ministry of Education prohibited the use of Kurdish in English classes? More specifically, do you think it would create problems and difficulties in your teaching? And how would you deal with these problems and difficulties? What techniques would you use to deal with these problems?". T1, T3, and T4 said that they would be happy and support it if the

use of Kurdish was prohibited whereas T2 completely opposed to it. T3 explained that if the ministry banned the use of Kurdish in English classes, students would not have any excuse to use Kurdish or oppose to the teachers' use of English as his students once did so: "I tried to conduct English-only classes at the beginning of the academic year, but my students went to the headmaster and complained that I did not use any Kurdish and that they did not understand the lessons". Similarly, T4 stated that students, then, will not have any excuse to ask the teacher to speak in Kurdish. She indicated that when she first started teaching in that school, she started teaching in English but students highly opposed to it as they said they could not understand.

With regard to the consequences of the prohibition of Kurdish in English classes, T1 and T2 believed that at first such a decision would create some difficulties for students to understand and for teachers to teach and that it would need more effort from the teacher and take more time. T2, in spite of being against English-only policy, admitted that such a policy would be beneficial, not only for students to learn the language, but also for teachers to improve their English. T3 and T4, on the other hand, did not think that English-only policy would bring about any problem or difficulty for teachers, but that student would have some problems and difficulties in understanding the teacher at the beginning, but in the course of time, they would get used to it.

When they were asked about their preferred techniques to solve the problems that might emerge, the teachers provided different answers:

- T1: giving students more homework; encouraging the use of dictionaries; suggesting watching English TV channels; and making group-work activities.

- T2: making groups and mixing high level students with low level ones; brining enjoyment to classes to encourage and motivate students; asking students to use dictionaries; using CDs in the classroom; and changing the teacher if necessary.

- T3: not allowing students to use Kurdish; and practicing the language everyday (e.g. role-plays).

- T4: Students may need to go to training courses; they must do much self-study; and they should read books and watch good lessons on the internet. Teachers have to design various activities; set more quizzes; and ask students to make posters.

T3 also explained that these problems and difficulties would be temporary and in the course of time students would get used to English-only instruction.

To sum up, T1, T2 and T4 showed more positive attitudes toward the use of Kurdish and they comparatively preferred more Kurdish than T3 who had negative attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes claiming that Kurdish should be very rarely used, only to teach very difficult grammar topics.

4.2 Research Question 2: What are the students' attitudes toward the use of L1 in EFL classes?

As already indicated in Chapter 3, 98 students of 7th and 11th grades from four different schools responded to the questionnaire. Questions 1-6 in the student questionnaire aimed at eliciting data about the students' attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes. The results concerning the students' responses to these

questions are shown in Tables 4.5-4.10, which are followed by detailed descriptions of the results.

With regard to Questions 1-4, students' responses are summarized in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Results of Q1 to Q4 in the student questionnaire

Questions	Never (1) %	Rarely (2) %	Sometimes (3) %	Often (4) %	Always (5) %	M	SD
Q1	6.1	21.4	49.0	15.3	8.2	2.98	.97
Q2	9.2	35.7	34.7	12.2	8.2	2.74	1.06
Q3	8.2	24.5	12.2	38.8	16.3	3.31	1.24
Q4	2.0	38.8	32.7	15.3	11.2	2.95	1.04

In response to Q1, "Should the teacher use Kurdish in English classes?", nearly half of the students (49%) believed that teachers should *sometimes* use Kurdish in English classes while 21.4% of them thought that teachers should *rarely* use L1. On the other hand, 15.3% said that they can *often* use it. Besides, only 8.2% of the students chose *always* and only 6.1% thought that teachers should *never* make use of Kurdish in English classes. The mean for students' overall responses to Q1 was 2.98 which shows that the students are not against teachers' use of L1 but that they are against teachers' overuse of it. In other words, they believe that English teachers should neither entirely avoid Kurdish nor use it extensively; rather they prefer English teachers to *sometimes* use it.

As for Q2, "Should the students use Kurdish in English classes?", nearly similar percentage of students chose *rarely* (35.7%) and *sometimes* (34.7%) while only 12.2% of the students believed that students should *often* use Kurdish in English classes. On the other hand, the option "*never*" was chosen by only 9.2% of the

students and "*always*" by 8.2%. The mean for students' attitudes toward students' use of Kurdish in English classes was 2.74, which is something between *rarely* and *sometimes,* but closer to *sometimes*. This shows that they are not in opposition to Kurdish use by students, rather they believe that students should *sometimes* use it. However, in comparison with their answers to Q1, they prefer more use of Kurdish by teachers than by students.

Regarding Q3, "To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you learn this language?", 38.8% of the students believed that it *often* helps them learn English but 24.5% of them believed that it *rarely* does so. On the other hand, 16.3% of the students said that it *always* helps them learn English and 12.2% said it *sometimes* does so. Besides, only 8.2% of them thought it *never* helps them learn English. The mean for their answers to Q3 was 3.31 which implies that students believe the use of Kurdish *sometimes* facilitates learning.

In their responses to Q4 "How often do you think Kurdish should be used in your English classes?", 38.8% of the students thought that it should *rarely* be used while 32.7% believed that it should *sometimes* be used and 15.3% preferred *often* use of it. Yet, 11.2% of the students expressed that it should *always* be used while only 2% of them thought it should *never* be used. The mean for their answers was 2.95, which indicates that they believe Kurdish can *sometimes* be used in English classes, regardless who uses it, teachers or students. This is parallel to and verifies their answers to Q1 (M = 2.98) and Q2 (M = 2.74) where they believed that teachers and students should *sometimes* make use of Kurdish in English classes.

Q5 with its 19 subitems (Q5A-Q5S) dealt with students' attitudes toward teachers' use of Kurdish in some specific situations, such as explaining the meaning of new words, explaining grammar, managing classes, etc. In addition, the subitems were followed by an open-ended subitem which asked the students about other situations of teachers' use of Kurdish in English classes. Table 4.6 below summarizes students' responses to the 19 subitems and then the total or overall response to Q5.

Table 4.6: Results of Q5 in the student questionnaire

Q5	Never (1) %	Rarely (2) %	Sometimes (3) %	Often (4) %	Always (5) %	M	SD
Q5A	00	5.1	22.4	37.8	34.7	4.02	.89
Q5B	3.1	9.2	20.4	48	19.4	3.71	.98
Q5C	1	18.4	25.5	34.7	20.4	3.55	1.05
Q5D	4.1	12.2	11.2	34.7	37.8	3.90	1.16
Q5E	3.1	7.1	18.4	27.6	43.9	4.02	1.09
Q5F	4.1	12.2	26.5	33.7	23.5	3.60	1.10
Q5G	00	9.2	17.3	29.6	43.9	4.08	.99
Q5H	3.1	17.3	33.7	24.5	21.4	3.44	1.10
Q5I	9.2	6.1	18.4	30.6	35.7	3.78	1.26
Q5J	12.2	28.6	36.7	13.3	9.2	2.79	1.12
Q5K	1	5.1	18.4	35.7	39.8	4.08	.94
Q5L	3.1	4.1	19.4	35.7	37.8	4.01	1.01
Q5M	1	2	14.3	31.6	51	4.30	.86
Q5N	4.1	17.3	25.5	34.7	18.4	3.46	1.11
Q5O	13.3	9.2	15.3	32.7	29.6	3.56	1.36
Q5P	2	6.1	17.3	33.7	40.8	4.05	1.01
Q5Q	00	8.2	20.4	33.7	37.8	4.01	.96
Q5R	3.1	10.2	24.5	34.7	27.6	3.73	1.07
Q5S	3.1	10.2	20.4	32.7	33.7	3.84	1.10
Q5 Total	3.71	10.41	21.36	32.61	31.91	3.79	.49

As can be seen in Table 4.6, their highest positive attitude toward using Kurdish in English classes concerned *giving suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively* (Q5M). Slightly more than half of the participants (51%) believed that teachers should *always* use Kurdish, 31.6% of them preferred *often* use of it, and

14.3% of them said that teachers can *sometimes* make use of it. The mean for this subitem was the highest (4.30) among all the other subitems of question 5. This implies that students need frequent use of Kurdish by teachers in order to learn how to communicate in English more effectively.

Another subitem with highly positive attitude was related to teachers' use of Kurdish in order to explain difficult concepts and topics (Q5G). 43.9% of the students believed that teachers should *always* teach difficult concepts and topics in Kurdish, 29.6% said that teachers can *often* use Kurdish in that situation, 17.3% indicated that they can *sometimes* use Kurdish in order to do so. Only 9.2% of the students stated that teachers can *rarely* use Kurdish with this regard. Yet, none of them totally opposed to it. The mean was 4.08, which shows that the students prefer lots of Kurdish use by their teachers so that they can understand difficult concepts and topics.

Q5K was another subitem which was given highly positive attitude ("Teachers can use Kurdish in English classes to help students feel more comfortable and confident"). Students responded highly positively: 39.8% *always*, 35.7% *often*, 18.4% *sometimes*. Only 5.1% thought that Kurdish can *rarely* be used by teachers for that purpose where only one percent was totally against it. The mean for all their responses was 4.08, that is, in order to make them feel more comfortable and confident, students think that teachers can *often* make use of Kurdish.

On the other hand, the lowest positive attitude toward using Kurdish in English classes belonged to teachers' use of Kurdish to joke around with students (Q5J). 36% of the students preferred *sometimes* use of it, 28.6% of them marked *rarely*, and

13.3% preferred *often* use of it. On the contrary, 12.2% of them responded completely negatively, that is, they believed teachers should *never* make use of Kurdish to joke around with students whereas 9.2% were totally for the use of Kurdish, that is, *always* use of Kurdish. The mean was 2.79, which is something between *rarely* and *sometimes*, yet much closer to *sometimes*. This implies that students believed teachers can *sometimes* use Kurdish in English classes to joke around with them. Even though Q5J, in comparison with all the other subitems in Question 5, has the lowest mean, students' responses were not negative, rather, it implied moderate and *sometimes* use of Kurdish; that is, they neither entirely opposed to the use of Kurdish for that purpose, nor supported extensive use of it. They preferred their teachers to use Kurdish where necessary and beneficial.

The second lowest positive attitude was related to summarizing materials already covered (Q5H). 33.7% of the students expressed that teachers can *sometimes* use Kurdish in English classes to summarize materials already covered, 24.5% of them thought the teachers can *often* do so, and 21.4% chose *always* while only 17.3% preferred *rarely* and only 3.1% preferred *never* use of Kurdish. The mean is 3.44, that is something between *sometimes* and *often*. After all, this shows that students have positive attitudes toward teachers' use of Kurdish when summarizing materials already covered.

The third lowest positive attitude toward teachers' use of Kurdish covered Q5N, that is, giving feedback to students. 34.7% believed that teachers can *often* employ Kurdish and 25.5% believed that they can *sometimes* do it. Besides, 18.4% preferred *always* use of it but 17.3% of them chose *rarely*. On the other hand, only 4.1% of the students believed that Kurdish can *never* be used by teachers when giving feedback

to students. The mean (3.46) is something between *sometimes* and *often*. Yet, this shows that overall, students prefer teachers' use of Kurdish for this situation.

Finally, when taking into consideration all the subitems in Q5 (Q5A to Q5S), the students' overall responses were positive regarding teachers' use of Kurdish for all the classroom situations and purposes listed under Q5. In total, the results for Q5 showed that 32.61% of the students were in favor of *often* use of Kurdish by teachers for all the different purposes; 31.91% preferred *always*, and 21.36% *sometimes* whereas 10.41% marked *rarely* regarding the frequency of Kurdish use by teachers in English classes, and only 3.71% thought that teachers should *never* use Kurdish. The overall mean for all the subitems of Q5 was 3.79, which is something close to *often*. This shows that students in general were positive regading teachers' use of Kurdish for the purposes listed under Q5.

Finally, as for the open-ended question "In what other situations do you think teachers can use Kurdish in English classes?", 54 out of 98 students added some other situations where they think the teachers can make use of Kurdish in English classes. Table 4.7 shows a summary of their responses. The numbers in the table show the number of students.

As can be seen in the table, 24 students preferred teachers to use Kurdish whenever they think that students do not understand and 15 students believed that teachers can use Kurdish when teaching new lessons and topics. Besides, four students thought that teachers need to explain the test rubrics in Kurdish and help them during tests so that they know what they have to do. In addition, four students believed that teachers

need to use Kurdish whenever it is necessary and three students believed that teachers can use Kurdish for all situations and for everything.

Table 4.7: Students' responses to "In what other situations do you think teachers can use Kurdish in English classes?"

Other purposes	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Total
Whenever the teacher thinks students do not understand.	9	9	4	2	**24**
In teaching dialogues	1	0	0	0	**1**
When doing classroom activities	2	0	0	0	**2**
During tests, exams, and quizzes	3	0	0	1	**4**
In teaching new lessons and topics	4	3	2	6	**15**
Translating English sentences	0	0	0	2	**2**
To make the class calm down where there is noise	2	0	0	0	**2**
To tell students to come and write on the board	1	0	0	0	**1**
To ask students why they were late to class	1	0	0	0	**1**
To ask students why they do not study	1	0	0	0	**1**
To make students feel secure and calm, especially when they are afraid of the teacher	1	0	0	0	**1**
In teaching very important topics	1	0	0	0	**1**
When giving notes	0	0	0	2	**2**
Where there are many new words	0	1	0	0	**1**
In teaching difficult topics	0	1	0	0	**1**
When it is necessary	0	4	0	0	**4**
When the teacher feels that a student has a problem	0	0	1	0	**1**
In all situations and for everything	0	1	1	1	**3**
Never	0	0	1	0	**1**

Finally, Q6 with its eight subitems (Q6A-Q6H), dealt with students' attitudes toward students' use of Kurdish in English classes in accomplishing some specific purposes. Besides, the subitems were followed by an open-ended subitem in which students were requested to write down other situations where they think students can use

Kurdish. The results regarding the students' answers to each of the subitems and then to Q6 in total are summarized in Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8: Results of Q6 in the student questionnaire

Q6	Never (1) %	Rarely (2) %	Sometimes (3) %	Often (4) %	Always (5) %	M	SD
Q6A	8.2	14.3	24.5	32.7	20.4	3.43	1.20
Q6B	11.2	11.2	25.5	33.7	18.4	3.37	1.23
Q6C	2.0	7.1	13.3	34.7	42.9	4.09	1.02
Q6D	2.0	4.1	22.4	32.7	38.8	4.02	.98
Q6E	5.1	11.2	32.7	31.6	19.4	3.49	1.09
Q6F	4.1	13.3	19.4	25.5	37.8	3.80	1.20
Q6G	5.1	16.3	26.5	32.7	19.4	3.45	1.13
Q6H	3.1	7.1	23.5	36.7	29.6	3.83	1.04
Q6 Total	5.1	10.57	23.47	32.53	28.33	3.68	.66

According to the data in Table 4.8, students showed the most positive attitudes toward using Kurdish for translating words (Q6C) and translating texts (Q6D) to show that they understand them. Their responses to these two subitems were, to some extent, identical. With regard to translating English words into Kurdish to show their understanding (Q6C), 42.9% of the students marked *always* and 34.7% of them marked *often* while for translating English texts to Kurdish (Q6D), 38.8% chose *always* and 32.7% marked *often*. The mean for the former was 4.09 and for the latter 4.02, both of which show that students preferred to do lots of translation (words and texts) from English to Kurdish to show their understanding.

On the other hand, the lowest positive attitudes were related to Q6B, that is, asking "How do we say '…' in English?". 33.7% of the students wanted to *often* use Kurdish to ask "How do we say '…' in English?", 25.5% of them wanted to *sometimes* ask this question in Kurdish, and 18.4% wanted to *always* use Kurdish.

Besides, 11.2% of the students wanted to *rarely* use Kurdish and similar percentage preferred to *never* use it. The mean for Q6B was 3.37, which locates somewhere between *sometimes* and *often*, yet a little bit closer to *sometimes*. Hence, it can be concluded that the students showed that they prefer to use some Kurdish when asking how they can say something in English. The second lowest positive attitudes were related to Q6A ("Students can use Kurdish in English classes to talk during pair-work or group-work activities"). In their responses, as demonstrated in Table 4.8, nearly one third (32.7%) of the students showed that students can *often* employ Kurdish, 24.5% indicated *sometimes* and 20.4% *always*. Besides, 14.3% preferred to *rarely* use Kurdish and only 8.2% believed that students should *never* use Kurdish during working in pairs or groups. The mean for Q6A was 3.43, which is somewhere between *sometimes* and *often*, yet a little bit closer to *sometimes*. To sum up, the students showed that they prefer to use some Kurdish when working in pairs or groups.

Considering all the subitems in Q6 (Q6A-Q6H) to identify the extent to which the students believe that they can resort to L1 in different situations, the students' overall responses were close to their responses to Q5. Only 5.1% of the students were completely against students' use of Kurdish (*never*) and 10.57% believed that they can *rarely* use it. On the other hand, 32.53% of them believed that they can *often* use Kurdish, 28.33% thought that they can *always* use it, and 23.47% indicated that students can *sometimes* make use of Kurdish. The overall mean for all the subitems of Q6 was 3.68. This shows that students have highly positive attitudes toward the students' use of Kurdish in English classes. They expressed that students can almost *often* make use of L1 in English classes.

Finally, as for the open-ended subitem "In what other situations do you think students can use Kurdish in English classes?", 40 students gave responses. Their responses are summarized in Table 4.9 below. The numbers in the table show the number of students.

Table 4.9: Students' responses to "In what other situations do you think students can use Kurdish in English classes?"

Other purposes	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Total
To tell the teacher that they do not understand	4	3	1	2	10
When it is necessary and important	3	1	0	0	4
To ask questions about the meaning of new words, expressions, or sentences	1	2	0	0	3
When it is difficult for them to speak in English	2	5	3	0	10
During tests, exams, and quizzes	1	0	0	0	1
When they want to speak Kurdish	1	0	0	0	1
When doing classroom activities	1	0	0	0	1
To ask questions about the topic being studied if they do not understand	0	2	1	2	5
To ask the teacher to repeat if they do not understand	0	1	0	0	1
They can use Kurdish until they master English language	0	0	1	0	1
When participating in classroom activities	0	0	1	0	1
To say a Kurdish sentence and ask the teacher for the English equivalent	0	0	0	1	1
In all situations	0	1	1	2	4
Never	1	1	0	0	2

The above table reveals that 10 students believed that students can use Kurdish when they want to tell their teacher that they do not understand the topic being studied and similar number of students said that students can use Kurdish whenever it is difficult for them to speak in English. Besides, five students replied that students can ask

questions in Kurdish about the topic being studied if they do not understand. Four students, on the other hand, believed that students can use Kurdish whenever it is necessary and important and similarly four students believed that students can use Kurdish in all situations.

Overall, the means for all the questions (Q1 to Q6), representing students' attitudes toward using Kurdish in English classes, ranged between 2.74 and 4.30. Their attitudes were either moderate, positive, or highly positive; none of them showed negative attitudes toward using Kurdish in English classes.

To summarize, the students' overall attitudes toward using Kurdish in English classes were found by calculating the averages of the percentages and means for questions 1 to 6. Their overall attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes are summarized in Table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10: Total results of Q1-Q6 in the student questionnaire (Students' overall attitudes toward using Kurdish in English classes)

Questions	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	Always (5)	M	SD
TOTA Q1-Q6	4.4%	13%	23.3%	31%	28.3%	3.66	.48

As can be seen in Table 4.10, 31% of the students believed that Kurdish should *often* be used in English classes, 28.3% believed that it should *always* be used, and 23.3% believed that it should *sometimes* be used. On the other hand, 13% of the students responded that it should *rarely* be used and only 4.4% said that Kurdish should *never* be used. The overall mean of students' responses to all the questions (Q1-Q6) was 3.66, which corresponds to something between *sometimes* and *often*, but closer to

often. In short, the data obtained from the student questionnaire showed that students had relatively high positive attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes.

When it comes to the attitudes of students in each class, it can be seen in Table 4.11 below that they were not consistent. Class 1 (M = 3.46) and Class 2 (M = 3.59) had comparatively less positive attitudes; Class 3 (M = 3.91) and class 4 (M = 3.81) were more positive. The results for each class are summarized in Table 4.11 below (see Appendix G for the results of each class for all the questions and subitems in the student questionnaire).

Table 4.11: Results of Q1-Q6 in the student questionnaire by each class

Questions	Class 1		Class 2		Class 3		Class 4	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Q1	2.69	0.76	2.97	0.93	3.12	0.99	3.27	1.20
Q2	2.48	1.06	2.63	1.07	2.88	1.05	3.14	0.99
Q3	2.62	1.32	3.60	1.13	3.53	1.13	3.64	1.05
Q4	2.83	0.97	2.83	1.18	3.18	1.13	3.09	0.87
Q5 Total	3.66	0.44	3.69	0.49	3.95	0.58	3.96	0.42
Q6 Total	3.42	0.60	3.65	0.64	4.18	0.58	3.70	0.63
TOTA Q1-Q6	3.46	0.41	3.59	0.48	3.91	0.51	3.81	0.43

Note: M (Mean): 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

4.3 Research Question 3: Is there a difference between the attitudes of the teachers and those of the students?

As a result of the analysis of both teachers' and students' attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes, it was found out that there are some differences between them. For the majority of the questions, the students showed more positive attitudes than the teachers. The differences between the means of both groups are uncovered below in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: The differences between the attitudes of teachers and students toward the use of Kurdish in English classes

Questions	Mean	
	Teachers	Students
Should the teacher use Kurdish in English classes?	2.50	2.98
Should the students use Kurdish in English classes?	2.25	2.74
To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you teach this language?	3.50	N/A
To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps your students learn this language?	3.75	N/A
To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you learn this language?	N/A	3.31
How often do you think Kurdish should be used in your English classes?	1.75	2.95
English teachers can use Kurdish in their classes to… (Total of all the subitems A-S)	3.18	3.79
Students can use Kurdish in English classes to … (Total of all the subitems A-H)	3.84	3.68
OVERALL TOTAL	3.28	3.66

Note: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = Sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

The table given above shows that the teachers had less positive attitudes than students regarding Q1 ("Should the teacher use Kurdish in English classes?"). The mean for teachers' responses was 2.50 which is located somewhere between *rarely* and *sometimes* whereas the mean for students' responses was 2.98 which roughly represents *sometimes*. Similarly, for Q2 ("Should the students use Kurdish in English classes?"), the teachers showed less positive attitudes (M = 2.25) than the students (M = 2.74). These means show that the teachers prefer comparatively less use of Kurdish in English classes than the students do.

In terms of Q3 ("To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you teach this language?") and Q4 ("To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps your students learn this language?") in the teacher questionnaire, the teachers' responses were more positive than students' responses for Q3 in the student

questionnaire ("To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you learn this language?"). The teachers believed that using Kurdish *often* helps them teach English a lot (M = 3.50) and their students learn it (M = 3.75) while the students believed using Kurdish in English classes *sometimes* helps them learn the language (M = 3.31).

Another considerable mismatch was found between the attitudes of teachers and students regarding the frequency of L1 use in L2 classes ("How often do you think Kurdish should be used in your English classes?"). The mean for teachers' responses was 1.75 and it was 2.95 for students' responses. This shows that students prefer more frequent use of Kurdish in English classes compared to teachers who prefer rare use of it.

As for the last two questions in both questionnaires, the results were different. Q6 in the teacher questionnaire (which corresponds to Q5 in the student questionnaire) had 19 subitems regarding different purposes for which teachers can use Kurdish, and the attitudes of the teachers were less positive than those of the students as for this question. The attitudes of students for all the subitems were more positive, except for the subitems F ("Discuss the teaching methods used in class") and S ("Translate a text from English to Kurdish") where teachers showed more positive attitudes (see Appendix H for the results of all the questions and subitems). Overall, the results show that students have more positive attitudes (M = 3.79), compared to teachers (M = 3.18), regarding teachers' use of Kurdish for the different purposes listed under the question.

On the contrary, as for the last question which had 8 subitems regarding different purposes for which students can use Kurdish, the results indicate that students are more positive to half of the subitems and the teachers were more positive to the other half (see Appendix H). However, the total result of all the subitems of this question shows that the teachers (M = 3.84) had very slightly more positive attitudes than the students (M = 3.68). Yet, both groups argue that students can *often* resort to Kurdish for the purposes listed under this question.

To conclude, when all the questions and subitems are taken into account to find the differences between the attitudes of teachers and students toward the use of Kurdish in English classes, it is revealed that students (M = 3.66) were more positive than teachers (M = 3.28). Approximately, the students believe that L1 can *often* be used while the teachers believe that it can *sometimes* be used.

4.4 Research Question 4: Do the attitudes change between low level and high level students?

In order to show the differences between attitudes of 7th grade students and those of 11th grade students, the means of both groups were compared. Table 4.13 below shows that 11th grade students were more positive than 7th grade students with regard to all the main questions and the majority of the subitems of Q5 and Q6, except for the subitems Q5F, Q5M, Q5O, Q5Q, and Q6H where 7th grade students showed slightly more positive, and Q5P for which both groups had similar attitudes. (see Appendix I for the results of all the questions and subitems).

Overall, the total results (Q1-Q6) show that the two groups had different attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes and the 11th grade students' overall

attitudes toward the use of Kurdish outweigh the attitudes of 7th grade students. The mean for 7th grade students' attitudes was 3.53 which is something between *sometimes* and *often* while the mean for 11th grade students' attitudes was 3.85 which is much closer to *often*. The findings indicate that even though both groups have positive attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes, the attitudes of 11th grade students were comparatively more positive.

Table 4.13: Students' attitudes based on level of study

Questions	School Grade	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean
Q1	7	59	2.83	.85	.11
	11	39	3.21	1.11	.18
Q2	7	59	2.56	1.06	.14
	11	39	3.03	1.01	.16
Q3	7	59	3.12	1.31	.17
	11	39	3.59	1.07	.17
Q4	7	59	2.83	1.07	.14
	11	39	3.13	.98	.16
Q5	7	59	3.67	.47	.06
Total	11	39	3.96	.49	.08
Q6	7	59	3.54	.63	.08
Total	11	39	3.91	.65	.10
TOTAL	7	59	3.53	.45	.06
Q1-Q6	11	39	3.85	.47	.07

Note: Mean: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

In order to understand whether these differences are statistically significant, independent t-test was carried out. The results of the t-test for the main questions are shown in Table 4.14.

According to the results of the t-test, there are statistically significant differences between attitudes of 7th grade and 11th grade students in Q2, Q5 Total (and six of its subitems: Q5A, Q5B, Q5C, Q5G, Q5H, Q5S), Q6 Total (and three of its subitems: Q6B, Q6C, Q6D) while the differences between the two groups in the remaining

questions and subitems are not statistically significant (see Appendix J for the detailed results of the t-test for all the questions and subitems).

Table 4.14: Results of independent t-test for students' attitudes based on level of study

Questions		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-t)	MD	SED
Q1	Equal variances assumed	4.33	0.04	-1.89	96.00	0.062	-0.37	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.79	67.10	0.077	-0.37	0.21
Q2	Equal variances assumed	1.40	0.239	-2.18	96.00	0.032	-0.47	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.19	83.81	0.031	-0.47	0.21
Q3	Equal variances assumed	5.77	0.018	-1.87	96.00	0.065	-0.47	0.25
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.95	91.81	0.055	-0.47	0.24
Q4	Equal variances assumed	0.31	0.579	-1.40	96.00	0.166	-0.30	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.42	86.41	0.159	-0.30	0.21
Q5 Total	Equal variances assumed	0.04	0.844	-2.92	96.00	0.004	-0.29	0.10
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.89	78.65	0.005	-0.29	0.10
Q6 Total	Equal variances assumed	0.29	0.593	-2.84	96.00	0.006	-0.37	0.13
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.82	79.58	0.006	-0.37	0.13
TOTAL Q1-Q6	**Equal variances assumed**	**0.12**	**0.727**	**-3.44**	**96.00**	**0.001**	**-0.32**	**0.09**
	Equal variances not assumed			**-3.42**	**79.22**	**0.001**	**-0.32**	**0.09**

Note: Sig. (2-t) = Sig. (2-tailed), MD = Mean Difference, SED = Std. Error Difference

As for Q1, "Should the teacher use Kurdish in English classes?", the given sig. (2-tailed) value (0.077) is greater than 0.05. This indicates that the differences between

attitudes of 7th and 11th grade students regarding teachers' use of Kurdish in English classes were not statistically significant. However, the value of sig. (2-tailed) for Q2, "Should the students use Kurdish is English classes?", was 0.032 which is smaller than 0.05. This shows that the differences between attitudes of the two groups were statistically significant, with 11th grade reporting higher positive attitudes than 7th grade. On the other hand, for Q3 "To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you learn this language?" (sig. 2-tailed = 0.055) and Q4 "How often do you think Kurdish should be used in your English classes?" (sig. 2-tailed = 0.166), no statistically significant differences between the attitudes of 7th and 11th grade students were found.

Q5 had 19 subitems, and statistically significant differences were found between the attitudes of 7th grade and 11th grade students in Q5A "Explain new word", Q5B "Explain grammar", Q5C "Explain the similarities and differences between Kurdish and English", Q5G "Explain difficult concepts or topics", Q5H "Summarize materials already covered", Q5S "Translate a text from English to Kurdish" with 11th grade students being more positive. For the remaining subitems of Q5, the t-test showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups' attitudes. However, the total results of all the subitems of Q5 (Q5A-Q5S) showed that the differences between 7th grade and 11th grade students were statistically significant (Sig. 2-tailed value = 0.004 < 0.05) with 11th grade students showing more positive attitudes.

Finally, as for Q6 and its eight subitems, statistically significant differences were found between the attitudes of 7th grade and 11th grade students in Q6B "Ask "how do we say '…' in English?"", Q6C "Translate an English word into Kurdish to show

they understand it" and Q6D "Translate a text from English to Kurdish to show they understand it" with 11th grade students being more positive. However, no statistically significant differences were found for the remaining subitems of Q6. The value of sig. (2-tailed) of the total of all the subitems of Q6 (Q6A-Q6H) was 0.006, that is, the differences between attitudes of 7th grade and 11th grade students were statistically significant, with the attitudes of 11th grade students exceeding those of 7th grade students.

To understand if the differences between their overall attitudes are statistically significant, a t-test was conducted to the total of Q1-Q6 and statistically significant differences were found between the attitudes of the two groups. The sig. (2-tailed) value was 0.001 that is smaller than 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that 11th grade students had statistically significant more positive attitudes than 7th grade students and that level of study appears to be a significant factor in determining, or at least influencing, students' attitudes and perceptions regarding the use of Kurdish in English classes.

4.5 Research Question 5: Do the attitudes change between male and female students?

To answer this question, first the means of the responses of male and female students were compared to show how different their attitudes were, and second, independent t-test was carried out to reveal if the differences between them were statistically significant.

Table 4.15 below shows that female students' attitudes outweigh male students' attitudes in Q1 "Should the teacher use Kurdish in English classes?", Q2 "Should the

students use Kurdish in English classes?", Q3 "To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you learn this language?", and the total of Q5 "English teachers can use Kurdish in their classes to…". However, not for all the subitems of Q5 female students were more positive, rather for some of them the male students showed more positive attitudes (see Appendix K for the results of all the questions and subitems).

On the other hand, male students showed more positive attitudes for Q4 "How often do you think Kurdish should be used in your English classes?" and the total of Q6 "Students can use Kurdish in English classes to…". However, in some subitems of Q6, the results were different, with female students having more positive attitudes than male students (see Appendix K for the result of all the questions and subitems).

Table 4.15: Students' attitudes based on gender

Questions	Gender	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean
Q1	Male	46	2.85	.87	0.13
	Female	52	3.10	1.05	0.15
Q2	Male	46	2.63	1.06	0.16
	Female	52	2.85	1.06	0.15
Q3	Male	46	2.96	1.32	0.19
	Female	52	3.62	1.09	0.15
Q4	Male	46	2.96	1.03	0.15
	Female	52	2.94	1.06	0.15
Q5	Male	46	3.77	.51	0.08
Total	Female	52	3.80	.48	0.07
Q6	Male	46	3.70	.69	0.10
Total	Female	52	3.67	.63	0.09
Total	**Male**	**46**	**3.63**	**.50**	**0.07**
Q1-Q6	**Female**	**52**	**3.68**	**.47**	**0.06**

Note: Mean: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

After all, as can be seen in Table 4.15, the mean for female students (3.68) in the average of all the questions (Q1-Q6) is greater than the mean for male students

(3.63). Even though the means for both groups are closer to *often*, the slight differences between the means indicate that female students were more positive than male students in the use of Kurdish in English classes.

Having a look at the size of differences between the means of these two groups for all the main questions and the total of all, it can be seen that there are slight differences between them, except for Q3. The mean for male students in this question is 2.96 and for female students 3.62.

Finally, in order to understand whether these differences are statistically significant, independent t-test was done. The results of the t-test are shown in Table 4.16 (see Appendix L for the detailed results of the t-test for all the questions and subitems).

The results of the t-test show that there are significant differences between attitudes of male and female students in Q3, Q5G, and Q6E. As for Q3, "To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you learn this language?", the value of sig. (2-tailed) was 0.008. This shows that the difference between the two groups for this question was statistically significant, with female students having more positive attitudes accordingly. In terms of the subitems Q5G "English teachers can use Kurdish in their classes to explain difficult concepts and topics", the value of sig. (2-tailed) is lower than 0.05 (0.031) and this shows a statistically significant difference between the attitudes of male and female students, similarly, with female students being more positive. Lastly, for the results of Q6E, "Students can use Kurdish in English classes to do brainstorming prior to an activity (e.g. writing or reading)", the given value of sig. (2-tailed) was 0.032. This shows that the difference between the two groups was statistically significant, with male students having more positive

attitudes than female students (see appendix L for the results of Q5G and Q6E). Regarding the remaining questions and subitems, no statistically significant differences between attitudes of male and female students were found.

Table 4.16: Results of independent t-test for students' attitudes based on gender

Questions		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-t)	MD	SED
Q1	Equal variances assumed	0.68	0.413	-1.26	96.00	0.209	-0.25	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.28	95.56	0.204	-0.25	0.19
Q2	Equal variances assumed	0.07	0.797	-1.01	96.00	0.316	-0.22	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.01	94.40	0.317	-0.22	0.21
Q3	Equal variances assumed	3.09	0.082	-2.71	96.00	0.008	-0.66	0.24
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.68	87.59	0.009	-0.66	0.25
Q4	Equal variances assumed	0.88	0.35	0.07	96.00	0.947	0.01	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			0.07	95.03	0.946	0.01	0.21
Q5 Total	Equal variances assumed	0.11	0.743	-0.38	96.00	0.704	-0.04	0.10
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.38	92.53	0.706	-0.04	0.10
Q6 Total	Equal variances assumed	0.92	0.34	0.21	96.00	0.836	0.03	0.13
	Equal variances not assumed			0.21	91.47	0.837	0.03	0.13
TOTAL Q1-Q6	**Equal variances assumed**	**0.23**	**0.634**	**-0.53**	**96.00**	**0.595**	**-0.05**	**0.10**
	Equal variances not assumed			**-0.53**	**92.91**	**0.596**	**-0.05**	**0.10**

Note: Sig. (2-t) = Sig. (2-tailed), MD = Mean Difference, SED = Std. Error Difference

To understand if the differences between male and female students' overall attitudes are statistically significant, a t-test was conducted to the total of Q1-Q6 and no statistically significant difference was found between them. The sig. (2-tailed) value was 0.595 that is greater than 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that male and female students did not have statistically significant different attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes and that gender does not appear to be a significant factor in determining or influencing students' attitudes and perceptions regarding this issue.

4.6 Research Question 6: What are the teachers' perceived needs for L1 use in EFL classes?

The teachers' perceived needs for the use of Kurdish in English classes were obtained by analyzing Q8 in the teacher questionnaire as well as Q9 in the teacher interview. As for Q8 in the teacher questionnaire, there were 11 subitems (Q8A-Q8K) to which the teachers responded to indicate their reasons for employing Kurdish in their classes. There was also an open-ended subitem at the end of the subitems for which the teachers were requested to provide other possible reasons accordingly. Their responses to Q8 in the questionnaire are summarized in Table 4.17.

The table shows that the first three highest frequent reasons for which the teachers make use of Kurdish were the ones which help students learn and understand (Q8K, Q8I, and Q8G). To be more specific, the teachers reported that they mostly revert to Kurdish because it helps students remember vocabulary items more easily (Q8K). The mean for this subitem was 4.50 which is something between *often* and *always*. This shows that, according to the teachers, using Kurdish to a large extent helps

students remember vocabulary items. The second most frequent reason for which the teachers use Kurdish was because it helps students understand new vocabulary better (Q8I). The mean was 4.25, which closely represents *often*. The teachers' responses to these two subitems show that they believe using Kurdish helps students comprehend and subsequently remember vocabulary items more easily. The third highest frequent reason for which the teachers use Kurdish in their classes was "It helps my students understand difficult concepts and topics better" (Q8G). T1 and T2 believed that it *often* helps students in understanding difficult concepts and topics better while T3 and T4 believed that it *sometimes* helps students in doing so. The mean (3.50) was something between *sometimes* and *often* which shows that the teachers make use of Kurdish as they believe that it facilitates students' understanding of difficult materials.

Table 4.17: Results of Q8 in the teacher questionnaire

Question 8. I prefer to use Kurdish in my English classes because:	T1	T2	T3	T4	M	SD
A. It's more comfortable	3	3	1	3	2.50	1.00
B. I am less tense	2	3	2	1	2.00	.82
C. I feel less lost	2	2	2	1	1.75	.50
D. It makes me feel more confident and secure	2	3	1	1	1.75	.96
E. It encourages/motivates me	1	4	1	1	1.75	1.50
F. It saves time	3	4	2	3	3.00	.82
G. It helps my students understand difficult concepts and topics better	4	4	3	3	3.50	.58
H. It helps me teach difficult concepts and topics better	3	3	3	3	3.00	.00
I. It helps my students understand new vocabulary better	4	4	4	5	4.25	.50
J. It helps me teach new vocabulary better	4	3	3	3	3.25	.50
K. It helps my students remember vocabulary items more easily	5	4	4	5	4.50	.58
Q8 Total	3.00	3.36	2.36	2.64	2.84	.435

Note: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

While the above-mentioned three findings revealed that teachers use Kurdish because it helps students' understanding and learning, the second three highest reasons for teachers' use of Kurdish were related with making teaching easier. For example, the teachers believed that using Kurdish *sometimes* helps them teach new vocabulary (M = 3.25), and difficult concepts and topics (M = 3.00) better, and it saves time (M = 3.00). Consequently, it can be concluded that teachers use Kurdish because it *often* helps students' understanding and learning and because it *sometimes* helps their teaching. However, the lowest frequent reasons were attached to Q8C, Q8D, and Q8E. The means for all these three subitems were 1.75, which is closer to *rarely* than it is to *never*. Hence, it can be seen that the least possible reasons for which teachers make use of Kurdish are because they feel less lost, or it makes them feel more confident and secure, and it encourages them.

Considering each teacher separately, Table 4.17 above demonstrates that the teachers show differences in their responses to different reasons. However, when they were finally asked *"For what other reasons do you use Kurdish in your English classes?"*, the teachers provided no other reasons and left the question blank.

In addition to the results obtained from the teacher questionnaire, the analysis of Q9 in the teacher interview ("Why do you prefer to use Kurdish in your English classes?") showed that all the teachers reportedly use Kurdish because it helps students understand. They believed that students' low level of proficiency in English is usually an obstacle to their understanding of English instruction without Kurdish explanation. However, when T2 was asked if the main reason is students' low proficiency levels, she unexpectedly answered "and my level, too". She stated that teachers should also be proficient in English to be able to use it. Therefore, she

explained that she feels more comfortable when she teaches in Kurdish and English. Additionally, T1, T2, and T4 said that they use Kurdish because it saves time, too. They explained that when they teach something in English, they usually have to teach it again in Kurdish so that students can understand it. On the contrary, T3 disagreed that he feels more comfortable when he uses Kurdish or that it saves time. Similarly, T4 stated that she does not feel comfortable when she speaks Kurdish; rather, she is more comfortable when speaking English.

4.7 Research Question 7: What are the students' perceived needs for L1 use in EFL classes?

Q7 in the student questionnaire sought to find out students' responses regarding their perceived needs for the use of Kurdish in English classes. Additionally, Q10 in the teacher interview aimed at identifying teachers' beliefs regarding the reasons for which their students use Kurdish.

To begin with, Q7 in the student questionnaire had nine subitems (Q7A-Q7I) to which students responded to specify their reasons for using Kurdish in English classes. Additionally, there was one open-ended subitem for which students were asked to provide other reasons for L1 use. The students' responses to the subitems are summarized in Table 4.18.

As can be seen in the table, students use Kurdish in their English classes because it *often* helps them remember vocabulary items more easily (Q7I) and to understand new vocabulary better (Q7H). As for Q7I, 35.7% of students marked *always* and the same percent marked *often* as the frequency that using Kurdish helps them remember vocabulary items more easily. On the other hand, with regard to Q7H, 39.8% of the

students reported that they prefer to use Kurdish because it *always* helps them understand new vocabulary better and 36.7% of them indicated that it *often* helps them. The mean for the former was 4.11 and for the latter 4.01, which are pertaining to be *often*. Hence, their responses revealed that they use Kurdish in their classes because it *often* helps them understand and remember vocabulary items more easily.

Table 4.18: Results of Q7 in the student questionnaire

Q7	Never (1) %	Rarely (2) %	Sometimes (3) %	Often (4) %	Always (5) %	M	SD
Q7A	5.1	7.1	28.6	28.6	30.6	3.72	1.13
Q7B	8.2	15.3	26.5	27.6	22.4	3.41	1.23
Q7C	6.1	14.3	27.6	32.7	19.4	3.45	1.14
Q7D	5.1	17.3	13.3	23.5	40.8	3.78	1.29
Q7E	6.1	14.3	11.2	31.6	36.7	3.79	1.25
Q7F	14.3	7.1	27.6	24.5	26.5	3.42	1.34
Q7G	3.1	11.2	14.3	36.7	34.7	3.89	1.10
Q7H	5.1	5.1	13.3	36.7	39.8	4.01	1.10
Q7I	2.0	6.1	13.3	35.7	35.7	4.11	.99

Another high frequent reason and justification for which students revert to Kurdish in English classes is because it helps them understand difficult concepts and topics better (Q7G). 36.7% of the students reported that they use Kurdish because it *often* helps them better understand difficult materials and 34.7% believed that it *always* helps them in that. Besides, 14.3% expressed that it *sometimes* helps them in that while 11.2% believed that it *rarely* helps them. On the other hand, only 3.1% believed that it *never* helps them in understanding difficult concepts and materials. The mean for students' responses to this subitem was 3.89, which closely corresponds to *often*. This indicates that students resort to Kurdish as it *often* makes understanding difficult concepts and materials easier.

In general, the students' responses to reasons and justifications listed under Q7 as subitems were not negative; the means for their responses ranged between 3.41 and 4.11. That is, they have different reasons and justifications for reverting to their mother tongue in their English classes. Yet, the most frequent responses were related to reasons that using Kurdish assists them in comprehending and remembering the materials being studied in the classes, mostly vocabulary items.

In terms of reasons provided by each class, they were not consistent and they showed differences in their responses to different reasons. Table 4.19 below shows the results of Q7 for each class.

Table 4.19: Results of Q7 in the student questionnaire by each class

Q7	Class 1		Class 2		Class 3		Class 4	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Q7A	3.76	1.30	3.50	1.04	4.29	.92	3.55	1.06
Q7B	2.83	1.23	3.43	1.19	3.82	1.24	3.82	1.01
Q7C	3.21	1.18	3.23	1.04	3.82	1.13	3.77	1.15
Q7D	3.38	1.37	3.63	1.22	4.12	1.36	4.23	1.07
Q7E	3.07	1.28	3.87	1.28	4.18	1.02	4.32	.95
Q7F	3.14	1.33	3.37	1.33	3.59	1.42	3.73	1.32
Q7G	3.31	1.23	3.87	1.14	4.41	.71	4.27	.77
Q7H	3.52	1.21	3.83	1.21	4.65	.61	4.41	.67
Q7I	3.90	1.01	3.77	1.19	4.71	.47	4.41	.67
Q7 Total	3.34	0.78	3.61	.78	4.18	.68	4.06	.71

Note: M (Mean): 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

Finally, as for the open-ended subitem *"For what other reasons do you use Kurdish in your English classes?"*, 34 students responded and noted down other reasons. Their reasons are summarized in Table 4.20 below. The numbers in the table show the number of students.

As illustrated in Table 4.20, 16 students reported that they use Kurdish because they think it helps them understand better and 10 students explained that their English is not good enough to speak so that they use Kurdish. Besides, five students stated that they use Kurdish because it helps them learn English better and two students explained that they use Kurdish because it is easier to speak with it. Similarly, two students stated that they use Kurdish because they are Kurdish. This shows that these two students believe avoiding Kurdish is not possible as it is their mother language.

Table 4.20: Students' responses to "For what other reasons do you use Kurdish in your English classes?"

Other reasons	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Total
My English is not good enough to speak with it.	5	3	1	1	**10**
It helps me understand better	4	4	4	4	**16**
It helps me learn English better	3	1	1	0	**5**
It is easier	1	1	0	0	**2**
I am Kurdish	1	0	0	1	**2**
I do not know how to ask in English about the meaning of new words	1	0	0	0	**1**
Kurdish is our language	1	0	0	0	**1**
I don't use Kurdish because I know English and I do not like to use Kurdish	0	1	0	0	**1**
It helps me learn more English words	0	0	0	1	**1**

On the other hand, the analysis of Q10 in the teacher interview (*"For what reasons do you think your students use Kurdish in your class?"*) showed that all the teachers believed their students use Kurdish as their proficiency level is not high enough to speak English. T1 also explained that due to their low level, it is easier for them to speak Kurdish and that they feel more comfortable when they use Kurdish. He also added that some students use Kurdish as they think it helps them. In addition, T2 mentioned that some students are not motivated and they do not like the lesson and

as a result they prefer not to use English. T3, on the other hand, explained that students use Kurdish because they do not have a good background in using English in basic school levels before they come to high school.

4.8 Research Question 8: When and where and for what purposes is L1 used in EFL classes by the teachers and the students?

The analysis of the classroom observations was made by using two checklists (one for teachers and the other for students). The checklists were made out of the given occasions of L1 use in the questionnaires to note down the occasions and frequencies of Kurdish use. All the occasions of L1 use that appeared in the observed classes were transcribed, and then categorized. In each checklist, there was some space left at the end to record other purposes of Kurdish use that could not fit any of the categories in the checklists. Accordingly, some other categories were added according to the other uses of L1 that could not fit any of the given occasions.

In this study, four classes were observed: a 7th grade male class (Class 1), a 7th grade female class (Class 2), an 11th grade male class (Class 3), and an 11th grade female class (Class 4). All the observations lasted 12 class hours (480 minutes) in total. The structure of the lessons in all four classes was nearly the same. The lessons included presentation of a new topic, explanation of grammar, working on reading passages, explaining the meaning of words, and doing activities and tasks. The analysis of the observations showed that teachers and students used Kurdish in English classes on different occasions. In the following sections (4.8.1 and 4.8.2), results of teachers' and students' actual uses of Kurdish, and the occasions and the frequencies of Kurdish use appeared in the observed classes are demonstrated.

It is worth mentioning that the use of Kurdish more times does not always mean using it for a longer period. For example, explaining the meaning of a word may need the use of one Kurdish word while giving instructions may need many words and/or phrases and explaining grammar many sentences or even more. Therefore, high numbers of occurrence of L1 use does not always mean more Kurdish use than the lower numbers of it. In short, a word or a number of words or sentences in Kurdish which seemed to serve a particular purpose have been considered as one occurrence with no consideration of the length of Kurdish use.

4.8.1 Teachers' Use of Kurdish

After the observations and listening to all the recordings, it was revealed that most of the class time was in Kurdish while very little English was used. Overall, the four teachers used Kurdish extensively (501 times) for a variety of purposes and on different occasions. The occasions where teachers used Kurdish and the number of their occurrences are summarized in Table 4.21.

The table shows that class management was the first most frequent purpose (138 times) for which the teachers used Kurdish. Nearly most of the class managing speeches were performed in Kurdish. Class management included warning students, keeping the class calm, drawing students' attention, telling them to move from one activity to another, arranging seats, managing time, encouraging students to participate in class activities, and some other classroom routines. The second most frequent use of Kurdish (92 times) was to explain the meaning of new words. The teachers usually translated the new words into Kurdish. Sometimes, they asked the students about the meanings of the new words to check for comprehension or to assess them, and then if they did not have knowledge of them, the teachers gave the Kurdish meanings of them.

Table 4.21: Overall uses of Kurdish by the four teachers

Occasions of Kurdish use by teachers	Number of Occurrence
Explaining new words	92
Explaining grammar	18
Explaining the similarities and differences between Kurdish and English	1
Giving instructions for activities, tasks, homework, etc.	45
Checking for comprehension	39
Discussing the teaching methods used in class	0
Explaining difficult concepts or topics	3
Summarizing materials already covered	16
Assessing students' performance	19
Joking around with students	5
Helping students feel more comfortable and confident	2
Giving suggestions on how to learn more effectively	1
Giving suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively	0
Giving feedback to students	27
Managing the class	138
Giving administrative information	2
Talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments	32
Doing brainstorming prior to an activity	4
Translating a text from English to Kurdish	4
Explaining similarities and differences between L1 and L2 culture	1
Explaining the meaning of sentences	33
Answering students' questions	17
Giving life lessons	2
TOTAL	**501**

The third most frequent occasion of Kurdish use by teachers, as can be seen in Table 4.21 above, included giving instructions (45 times). The instructions ranged from giving a few words to a number of words or sometimes a few sentences. Checking for comprehension in Kurdish was another aspect of Kurdish use which occurred 39 times. It included asking students if they understood, if they could give other examples of the material just studied, and if they had questions. It also involved asking students some questions about the material being studied. Additionally, the teachers used Kurdish 33 times to translate English sentences into Kurdish and 32 times to talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments. The latter included

explaining question types for exams as well as giving homework and checking who did the homework.

Additionally, using Kurdish while giving feedback to students occurred 27 times. This involved correcting students' mistakes in classroom activities and tasks and sometimes praising students after they had done tasks correctly. Furthermore, the teachers also used Kurdish 19 times for the purpose of assessing students' performance. The teachers tried to assess students' general ability in English through asking questions about the meaning of words, phrases, and sentences as well as asking about the materials already studied.

A noteworthy occasion of L1 use included explaining grammar (18 times). Nearly all the instruction of grammar topics occurred during the observations was done in Kurdish. The number of occurrences of teaching grammar in Kurdish is less than some other categories, yet more time was spent on them, compared to other functions, since they were all explained in detail in Kurdish. English was very rarely used to teach grammar.

There were also some other uses of Kurdish on other occasions as shown in Table 4.21 above. Yet, two occasions "discussing the teaching methods used in class" and "giving suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively" never occurred in any of the classes, neither in English nor in Kurdish.

When the teachers in four classes are compared, it can be seen that the teachers were not consistent with each other in using Kurdish. Not only the number of occurrences of Kurdish use, but also the occasions of using Kurdish vary from teacher to teacher.

Some teachers used more Kurdish than others. Table 4.22 below shows the purposes of using Kurdish by each teacher as well as the number of occurrences for each purpose.

Table 4.22: Uses of Kurdish by each teacher

Occasions of Kurdish use by teachers	Number of Occurrences			
	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4
Explaining new words	33	7	18	34
Explaining grammar	3	3	5	7
Explaining the similarities and differences between Kurdish and English	1	0	0	0
Giving instructions for activities, tasks, homework, etc.	12	19	2	12
Checking for comprehension	10	8	4	17
Discussing the teaching methods used in class	0	0	0	0
Explaining difficult concepts or topics	2	0	1	0
Summarizing materials already covered	5	1	3	7
Assessing students' performance	6	4	1	8
Joking around with students	1	0	0	4
Helping students feel more comfortable and confident	1	0	0	1
Giving suggestions on how to learn more effectively	1	0	0	0
Giving suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively	0	0	0	0
Giving feedback to students	3	5	7	12
Managing the class	16	36	14	72
Giving administrative information	0	0	1	1
Talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments	13	3	4	12
Doing brainstorming prior to an activity	1	0	0	3
Translating a text from English to Kurdish	1	0	1	2
Explaining similarities and differences between L1 and L2 culture	1	0	0	0
Explaining the meaning of sentences	10	0	3	20
Answering students' questions	0	1	14	2
Giving life lessons	2	0	0	0
TOTAL	**122**	**87**	**78**	**214**

Teacher 1 (T1)

Teacher 1 did most of the speaking in his classes and there was very little teacher-student interaction. He used a lot of Kurdish (122 times) and on different occasions

in his classes. He used Kurdish the most (33 times) to explain the meaning of 33 new and unknown vocabulary such as *syllable, funny, longer, adjective, history, compare, than, expensive, price, good at, favourite, guess, first,* etc. The second most frequent use of Kurdish was for managing his classes (16 times), such as telling students to keep quiet, be careful, write what was written on the board, move from one activity to another as well as to warn them about their misbehavior. However, he also used English to manage his classes saying "Don't' speak, please!", "Be quiet.", "Open your books on page 76.", "Follow what he reads", etc. He sometimes translated some of them to Kurdish to make sure they understand what they have to do.

Moreover, talking about tests, quizzes and other assignments is another category that Kurdish was used for by T1. He used Kurdish 13 times to tell the students what they had to do and prepare for the coming classes and also to check their homework and assignments. However, he never talked about tests and quizzes. Similarly, the teacher switched to Kurdish 12 times to give instructions for activities, tasks, and homework. He used to tell them how to do classroom activities and tasks as well as homework and assignments. However, sometimes both English and Kurdish were employed by T1 to accomplish this purpose.

T1 also used Kurdish 10 times for checking comprehension which included asking questions relevant to the topic being studied. For example, after he taught comparative adjectives, he used Kurdish to ask students about when *–er* and when *more* should be used to make comparative adjectives, how many syllables some specific words are, and how the adjectives like *nice, funny* can be turned into comparative. Similarly, he used Kurdish 10 times for explaining the meaning of

sentences, such as *"Which one do you want?", "I love going to parties", "What do you like doing in the evening?",* and *"Here you are.".*

Table 4.22 above also shows some other uses of Kurdish for some other purposes. However, Kurdish was never used to discuss the teaching methods used in class, to give suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively, and to answer students' questions. However, this does not mean that English was used to perform these functions; rather they never occurred in the class, neither in English nor in Kurdish.

Teacher 2 (T2)

T2's class was more interactive, compared to the other three classes and there was a lot of teacher-student interaction. Despite some use of Kurdish, she used comparatively more English. The teacher did not do most of the speaking in his classes; rather, students were actively involved. Even though T2 used Kurdish 87 times, the purposes for which it was used, compared to the other three teachers, covered only a few categories. She used Kurdish the most (36 times) in order to manage her class. It included moving from one activity to another, arranging students' seats, telling them to come and write something on the board, asking students to clean the board, telling them to listen carefully, arranging role-play activities, managing time, encouraging students to participate, and warning them not to forget to bring their books. However, the teacher sometimes used English to manage her class (e.g. "hands down", "keep quiet", "open your books") and sometimes both English and Kurdish. She used English to manage her class and then Kurdish to make sure they understand.

The second most frequent use of Kurdish was for giving instructions for activities, tasks, and homework (19 times). However, sometimes instructions were given in English and sometimes this was followed by instructions in Kurdish. Furthermore, the teacher used Kurdish eight times to check for comprehension; for instance, she asked them in Kurdish "Did you all understand?", "Do you have any questions?", "Who can give an example, then?", "What did Kathy say?", "So, what is the right answer here?", etc. An additional use of Kurdish was for explaining new words. She used Kurdish seven times to show the meaning of words, such as *good at, hate, like, love, wearing, which,* and *comparative adjective*.

There were also some other uses of Kurdish, as shown in Table 4.22 above, for different purposes. However, there were some categories that did not occur in the observed lessons, neither in English nor in Kurdish.

Teacher 3 (T3)

T3 used the least Kurdish (78 times), in comparison with the other teachers. However, it was observed that most of class time was spent on making students busy with reading long texts aloud and writing answers to the questions that follow the texts on the board and he, compared to the other three teachers, did not do much speaking in the class as he was a quiet teacher. Yet, teacher-student interactions and communication were all in Kurdish.

T3 used Kurdish on various occasions in his classes. His most frequent use of Kurdish (18 times) was to explain new words such as *together, future, imagined, waved, expectation, apprentice, cause, effect, alone, excited*, etc. Sometimes, he asked students in English about the meaning of a word and students gave the Kurdish

meaning if the word was familiar to them. When the students had no idea about the meaning of the word, the teacher gave them the Kurdish meaning by himself.

Kurdish was also frequently used for class management. He used Kurdish 14 times to tell students to pay attention to the lessons and to be quiet, to choose a student to go to the board and write answers of some questions, etc. Similarly, Kurdish was used 14 times by the teacher to answer students' questions. Their questions were all related to grammar topics being studied. Moreover, as for giving feedback to students, the teacher reverted to Kurdish seven times. The feedback concerned students' mispronouncing and misspelling words, punctuation mistakes, and wrong answers to questions.

Additionally, there were some other uses of Kurdish as illustrated in Table 4.22. Similar to other classes, some occasions never occurred during the observations, neither in English nor in Kurdish.

Teacher 4 (T4)

In comparison with the other three teachers, Teacher 4 used the most Kurdish (214 times). She rarely tried to speak English. The teacher was very active but she did not do all the speaking in the class. The students were also participating in classroom activities. It was observed that the teacher and her students were very close and friendly to each other and that all the interactions and communication between them were in Kurdish.

T4's use of Kurdish covered most of the categories in the observation checklist. She used Kurdish for many different purposes with differing times of occurrence. The most widely used Kurdish (72 times) was for managing the classroom. She used

Kurdish to inform students when she wanted to move the class from one activity to another and to tell them to open their books, to choose students to read or to come to the board and write answers to activities, to ask them to clean the board, to tell them not to talk to each other and keep quiet, to warn them not to misbehave, to arrange seating, etc.

The second most frequent use of Kurdish was for explaining new vocabulary. She used Kurdish 34 times to explain the meaning of 34 words such as *disappear, pick up, job, community, therefore, as a result, easier,* and *complicated.* Another frequent use of Kurdish (20 times) concerned translating 20 English sentences into Kurdish, such as *"What is getting better for people who want a job?", "The journey starts inside you.", "I didn't go to school because I was sick.", "I'd like to tidy up my room.",* etc.

Similarly, T4 widely used Kurdish to check for comprehension. She switched to Kurdish 17 times to check whether the students had questions about the topic being studied, whether they understood, whether they could produce more examples as well as to ask them some specific questions about the topic. Furthermore, the teacher used Kurdish 12 times for each of the purposes of giving instructions for activities, tasks, and homework, talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments, as well as giving feedback to students. Talking about tests, quizzes, and assignments included explaining to students what questions in her exams would look like, giving homework and assignments, and checking who had done homework. The feedback included positive feedback (praising) and corrective feedback (correcting the mistakes students made).

On the other hand, Kurdish was resorted to by the teacher for some other purposes as shown in Table 4.22 above. Again, similar to the other teachers, some other purposes did not occur in the classroom, hence Kurdish use was not found for them.

4.8.2 Students' Use of Kurdish

The students in all the classes overused Kurdish. They rarely used English, except for some very basic words and expressions such as *yes, no, ok, thank you* or when they were reading or doing an activity. However, students in Class 2 used comparatively more English and less Kurdish. Besides, students in Class 1, 3 and 4 addressed their teachers in Kurdish, using "mamosta" meaning "teacher", and they very rarely used the English word "teacher" whereas students in Class 4 addressed their teacher in English. However, addressing the teacher is not categorized in Table 4.23 below because it was difficult to count the number of its occurrences for two reasons: (a) students addressed the teacher in Kurdish continuously many times "teacher, teacher, teacher", and (b) many students together addressed the teacher in Kurdish at the same time.

Overall, the students in the four classes used Kurdish 243 times and on different occasions. Table 4.23 below shows that the most frequent occasion where students used Kurdish (123 times) was dealing with classroom routines and management. Classroom routines and management covered various functions such as when students raised their hands and asked the teacher to do an activity, to read, or write an answer on the board, or when they said they did not understand something, or when they wanted to make sure or show that they understood or they knew what was going on in the class, or when they asked the teacher what they had to do, or when they asked the teacher for permission to go out for a reason or to change their seats or to close/open the door/window, or when students talked with the teacher about

absentees, or when students asked the teacher if they could start writing now, or when students asked the teacher if he wanted the board to get cleaned, etc.

Table 4.23: Overall uses of Kurdish by the four classes

Occasions of Kurdish use by students	Number of Occurrences
Talking during pair-work or group-work activities	0
Asking "how do we say '…' in English"	0
Translating an English word into Kurdish to show they understand it	57
Translating a text from English to Kurdish to show they understand it	0
Doing brainstorming prior to an activity	1
Talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments	14
Discussing the teaching methods used in class	0
Checking for comprehension	2
Asking questions	22
Answering teacher's questions	19
Explaining the meaning of sentences	5
Dealing with classroom routines/management	123
TOTAL	243

The second most frequent purpose of Kurdish use by the students was related to translating English words. Students used Kurdish 57 times to translate 57 English words into Kurdish. They usually gave the translations of the words when their teachers asked them about the meanings of the words. Likewise, students resorted to Kurdish 22 times to ask their teachers questions about the content and topic of the lesson, and 19 times to answer teachers' questions when the teacher wanted to check for comprehension or assess their performance. Students also used Kurdish 14 times to talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments, such as asking about homework and assignments, showing that they had done homework, and asking about question types in tests.

Additionally, there were some other uses of Kurdish for some other purposes, such as explaining the meaning of sentences (5 times), checking for comprehension (2 times), and doing brainstorming prior to an activity (once). Finally, there was no Kurdish use, for some other purposes such as talking during pair-work or group-work activities, asking "how do we say '…' in English?", translating a text to Kurdish, and discussing the teaching methods used in class. These activities did not occur in the class, neither in English nor in Kurdish. For example, none of the teachers brought pair-work and group-work activities into the classrooms and none of the students asked how they could say something in English.

On the other hand, the amount and purposes of students' use of Kurdish varied from class to class. Table 4.24 summarizes the amount and purposes of Kurdish use by each class.

Table 4.24: Uses of Kurdish by each class

Occasions of Kurdish use by students	Number of Occurrences			
	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
Talking during pair-work or group-work activities	0	0	0	0
Asking "how do we say '…' in English"	0	0	0	0
Translating an English word into Kurdish to show they understand it	10	7	25	15
Translating a text from English to Kurdish to show they understand it	0	0	0	0
Doing brainstorming prior to an activity	1	0	0	0
Talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments	6	1	3	4
Discussing the teaching methods used in class	0	0	0	0
Checking for comprehension	0	0	2	0
Asking questions	1	1	17	3
Answering teacher's questions	5	2	4	8
Explaining the meaning of sentences	2	1	0	2
Dealing with classroom routines/management	16	15	46	46
TOTAL	**41**	**27**	**97**	**78**

Class 1

Students in Class 1 did the least speaking in the class and nearly all of this was in Kurdish, except for very few times of using some very basic English words. The students even addressed the teacher in Kurdish. Their level of proficiency in English seemed to be so low that even when their teacher sometimes used very simple language, he then had to translate it into Kurdish so that students could understand.

The students used Kurdish 41 times and for various purposes. They used Kurdish 16 times to deal with classroom routines and management. Besides, Kurdish was resorted to by students ten times to translate English words into Kurdish, such as *more, easy, adjective, than, picnic, tortilla,* etc. Further uses of Kurdish took place to talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments (six times), to answer teacher' questions (five times), to explain the meaning of sentences (twice), and to ask questions (once). On the other hand, some other purposes did not occur in the class; for example, students never worked in pairs or groups. Hence, no Kurdish use was found for these purposes as illustrated in Table 4.24.

Class 2

Similar to their teacher, students in Class 2 used the least Kurdish and the most English in comparison to the other classes. They looked very motivated and they were actively involved in classroom activities. They practiced role-paly activities in English, and answered many questions of the teacher in English. Besides, they very rarely addressed the teacher in Kurdish; rather, they mostly used the English word "teacher" or "Miss". When their teacher was asking questions in English, they used to answer in English; they even sometimes answered their teacher's Kurdish questions in English. However, when their teacher used Kurdish to manage the class, students reacted sometimes in Kurdish and sometimes in English.

Overall, students in Class 2 used Kurdish 27 times. Many purposes for which they employed Kurdish aimed at dealing with classroom routines/management (15 times) and translating English words into Kurdish to show they understood them (seven times). Regarding the latter purpose, the students were asked by their teacher about the Kurdish meanings of some words such as *wear, play, terrible voice, instrument,* etc. Finally, there were some other uses of Kurdish such as twice for answering teacher's questions, and once for talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments, once for asking questions, and once for explaining the meaning of sentences. The other categories of Kurdish use did not occur in this class.

Class 3

Unlike their teacher who used the least Kurdish in the class, students in Class 3 used the most Kurdish, compared to students from the other three classes. The students did not use English, except for some very basic words such as *yes, no,* or *teacher*. All the interaction between the teacher and the students was in Kurdish. The students even addressed the teacher in Kurdish except for very few times. Moreover, student-student communication was found to be in Kurdish.

In total, the students in Class 3 used Kurdish 97 times for different purposes. Dealing with classroom routines and management was the most widely observed purpose of students' use of Kurdish (46 times). They never used any English for that purpose. The second most frequent use of Kurdish by students (25 times) was for translating ten English words into Kurdish to show they have understood them. They gave the Kurdish meanings of the words when the teacher asked them about their meanings. The words included *losing, shoulder, imagined, waved, smart, wrong, boat, alone, buy* etc. Furthermore, they asked their teacher 17 questions in Kurdish. All their questions concerned the grammar topics being studied. Finally, additional uses of

Kurdish covered answering teachers' questions (four times), talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments (three times), and checking for comprehension (twice).

Class 4

Similar to their teachers who used the most Kurdish compared to the other teachers, students in Class 4 used a lot of Kurdish, but not more than students in Class 3. They used English only to say *yes, no,* or *ok*. They also addressed the teacher in English, even when they tended to speak Kurdish. Even though there was a lot of interaction between the teacher and his students, nearly all of this was in Kurdish.

The students used Kurdish 78 times. The most frequent use of Kurdish (46 times) was related to dealing with classroom routines and management. Students seemed reluctant to use English for this purpose. Additionally, when their teacher asked them about the meanings of some new words, they translated them into Kurdish. To do that, they used Kurdish 15 times. The words included *repair, damage, harder, therefore, as a result, put down, effect*, etc. Another purpose of using Kurdish was related to answering teacher's questions (eight times). Yet, it is worth mentioning that the teacher asked the questions in Kurdish and the students answered them in Kurdish. Some other instances of the use of Kurdish aimed at talking about tests, quizzes, and assignments (four times), asking questions (three times), and explaining the meaning of sentences (twice). However, the other categories of Kurdish use did not occur in this class.

4.9 Research Question 9: Does the students' actual use of Kurdish in English classes change across different levels of study?

The analysis of the classroom observations showed that there were some differences between 7th grade classes and 11th grade classes regarding the amount of Kurdish used by the students. The overall results of the actual uses of Kurdish in English classes across the two levels are demonstrated in Table 4.25 below.

Table 4.25: Overall uses of Kurdish across different levels

Occasions of Kurdish use by students	Grade 7 classes	Grade 11 classes
Talking during pair-work or group-work activities	0	0
Asking "how do we say '…' in English"	0	0
Translating an English word into Kurdish to show they understand it	17	40
Translating a text from English to Kurdish to show they understand it	0	0
Doing brainstorming prior to an activity	1	0
Talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments	7	7
Discussing the teaching methods used in class	0	0
Checking for comprehension	0	2
Asking questions	2	20
Answering teacher's questions	7	12
Explaining the meaning of sentences	3	2
Dealing with classroom routines/management	31	92
TOTAL	**68**	**175**

As can be seen in the above table, for many of the purposes 11th grade students used Kurdish more than 7th grade students did. The most noticeable difference between the two levels regarding the use of Kurdish is related to dealing with classroom routines/management. Grade 11 classes used Kurdish 92 times for dealing with classroom routines/management while Grade 7 classes revert to Kurdish for this purpose only 31 times. However, dealing with classroom routines/management is the most frequent purpose, in comparison with the other purposes, for which Kurdish

was employed in both levels of study. The second most frequent uses of Kurdish in each level of study concerned "translating an English word into Kurdish to show they understand it", yet with a big difference between them. 11th grade students used Kurdish in 40 times while students at 7th grade used Kurdish for this purpose only 17 times. Another apparent divergence between the two levels corresponded to students' use of Kurdish when asking questions. 11th grade students used Kurdish for this purpose 20 times while 7th grade students did so only twice. Similarly, another variation between the two levels of study belongs to "answering teacher's questions". 11th grade students resorted to Kurdish for this purpose 12 times while 7th grade students only 7 times.

On the other hand, the two levels of study used the same amount of Kurdish to talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments. They both used Kurdish 7 times for this purpose. However, 7th grade students were not found to use remarkably more Kurdish than 11th grade students for any of the purposes. Lastly, the total numbers of Kurdish use by both groups show that 11th grade students used Kurdish 175 times while 7th grade students used it only 68 times. In short, it can be concluded that higher grade students used more Kurdish than lower grade students did and that level of study can be a factor that affects the amount of L1 use in L2 classes.

4.10 Research Question 10: Does the students' actual use of Kurdish in English classes change across gender?

The analysis of the classroom observations exhibited some differences between male and female students regarding the use of Kurdish in English classes. The table below shows the occasions and frequencies of the actual uses of Kurdish by male and female students.

Table 4.26: Overall uses of Kurdish across gender

Occasions of Kurdish use by students	Male classes	Female classes
Talking during pair-work or group-work activities	0	0
Asking "how do we say '…' in English"	0	0
Translating an English word into Kurdish to show they understand it	35	22
Translating a text from English to Kurdish to show they understand it	0	0
Doing brainstorming prior to an activity	1	0
Talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments	9	5
Discussing the teaching methods used in class	0	0
Checking for comprehension	2	0
Asking questions	18	4
Answering teacher's questions	9	10
Explaining the meaning of sentences	2	3
Dealing with classroom routines/management	62	61
TOTAL	**138**	**105**

As can be seen in Table 4.26, even though there was not much difference between male and female students regarding the use of Kurdish, for many of the purposes male students used Kurdish, to some extent, more than female students did. To illustrate, male students' use of Kurdish outweigh female students' use of it in "translating an English word into Kurdish to show they understand it". Male students made use of Kurdish 35 times for this purpose while female students used it only 22 times. Another noticeable difference between the two groups concerned "asking questions". Male students asked questions in Kurdish 18 times while female students did so only four times. As for talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments, male students likewise used more Kurdish (9 times) than female students (5 times).

On the contrary, female students were not found to use remarkably more Kurdish than male students for any of the purposes. However, the two groups used nearly the same amount of Kurdish for "answering teachers' questions" and "dealing with

classroom routines/management". However, the total numbers of Kurdish use by the two groups show some divergence between male and female students, with male students exceeding female students. Male students used Kurdish 138 times while female students used it 105 times. Consequently, even though the difference between the two groups' use of Kurdish does not seem to be as great as the difference occurred between 7th and 11th grade students, it can be concluded that gender may have little impact on the use of L1 in L2 classes.

4.11 Summary

In this chapter, the results of the present study were presented. More specifically, the attitudes of students and teachers regarding the use of Kurdish in English classes were revealed and then compared with each other. Furthermore, the potential differences between attitudes of male and female students and between 7th grade and 11th grade students were demonstrated. In addition, the actual uses of Kurdish by both students and teachers were unveiled. Finally, the effect of gender and level of study on the actual use of Kurdish were shown. Having answered all the research questions in this chapter, the next chapter is devoted to the discussion of the findings, conclusion of the study, and implications for teaching and further research.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

This chapter discusses the results in relation to the research questions by considering the relevant literature. It also provides a conclusion of the study. After that, it presents pedagogical recommendations deduced from the results of the study and finally it provides suggestions for further research.

5.1 Discussion of Results

In this section, the results of the study are discussed in the light of the research questions.

Research Question 1: What are the teachers' attitudes toward the use of L1 in EFL classes?

The results of the teacher questionnaire and teacher interviews showed that the teachers were a little bit more positive toward teachers' use of Kurdish than students' use of it. A reason might be that they may prefer their students to do more speaking practice and use English to learn it. This is parallel to Willis and Willis' (2007) suggestion to students "use it to learn it" (p. 220). The teachers also believed that using Kurdish facilitates teaching and learning a lot. This coincides with what many researchers (Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Dujmović, 2007; Jones, 2010; Mart, 2013; Miles, 2004; Sipra, 2007; Stapa & Majid, 2012) argue for; that is, appropriate use of L1 can facilitate L2 learning. This is also in harmony with Anh's (2010) study, in which teachers believed that using L1 can play a positive role in the classroom. Yet, it is in

opposition with Hamze (2010) in which the teachers did not believe using L1 would facilitate learning.

Even though the attitudes of the teachers in the present study were positive toward the use of Kurdish in English classes, they preferred very limited use of it. This perception matches with the attitudes of teachers in some other studies (Qadri, 2006; Salah, 2012; Taşkın, 2011).

As for some specific occasions of Kurdish use, the findings showed that the teachers had extremely high positive attitudes toward teachers' use of Kurdish mostly for the purpose of translating English texts. This reminds the role of L1 use in GTM (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). The teachers' highly positive attitudes might be due to their beliefs about students' proficiency level. They may believe that students are not proficient enough to understand the long reading passages or 'literary reader' episodes in Sunrise textbooks.

The teachers also had very positive attitudes toward using Kurdish when discussing teaching methods used in the class. Using L1 for this purpose is also suggested by Schweers (1999) and Voicu (2012). They were also positive toward using Kurdish for giving suggestions on how to learn more effectively. Besides, the teachers showed very positive attitudes toward students' use of Kurdish when discussing teaching methods used in the class and translating English words to show their understanding. This latter occasion is also proposed by Willis and Willis (2007). The teachers also preferred students to use L1 when they do brainstorming prior to an activity and when talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments.

Overall the teachers' attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes were positive, except for one of the teachers, and they preferred moderate and sometimes use of Kurdish in English classes. They may have this attitude because, according to them, the students' level of proficiency is so low to understand English-only classes. This implies that teachers were not against the use of Kurdish in English classes, but they seemed to be against overusing it and therefore they argued for limiting it. Possible reasons for this might be because the teachers are aware of the disadvantages of overusing Kurdish in English classes and/or because the teachers believe students' proficiency level is not high enough to understand English-only classes. The positive perceptions of teachers contradict with the results of Hamze (2010), Qadumi's (2007) and Taşkın (2011) in which teachers were not in favor of using L1, but match with the results of many other studies (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Anh, 2010; Jingxia, 2010; Mahmutoğlu & Kıcır, 2013; Salah, 2012; Sarandi, 2013; Schweers, 1999; Tang, 2002; Timor, 2012) in which teachers had positive attitudes toward the use of L1 in their classes.

Research Question 2: What are the students' attitudes toward the use of L1 in EFL classes?

According to the results of the student questionnaire, the students were positive related to the use of Kurdish by students and teachers, but they seemed to be against overusing it. They believed that teachers and students can sometimes make use of Kurdish in English classes. This can be explained by their potential awareness of the benefits of judicious and moderate use of L1. This perception is also supported by the findings of Kalanzadeh et al. (2013), and Juárez and Oxbrow (2008). Yet, the students of the present study had slightly more positive attitudes toward teachers' use of L1 than students' use of it. They preferred to do more speaking in English and less

in Kurdish and use what they learn from their teachers. This is consistent with the suggestion made by Willis and Willis (2007): "use it to learn it" (p. 220). The students also believed that using Kurdish can sometimes assist learning English. This belief is in line with the results of Schweers' (1999) and Brooks-Lewis' (2009) studies but it is totally in opposition with Hamze's (2010) study in which students believed that L1 use does not assist students' learning. The reason for this belief might be that they are likely to believe that L1 use does not always help L2 learning, rather they may believe that it helps learning if used only when it is necessary.

In terms of the teachers' use of Kurdish, the students had extremely highly positive attitudes toward teachers' use of Kurdish in giving suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively. This can be due to their lack of or insufficient speaking ability and their need to improve it. They were also very positive to teachers' use of Kurdish when explaining difficult concepts and topics. A possible explanation for this might be due to their low level of English proficiency and having difficulties in understanding difficult topics and concepts without Kurdish explanation of them. This is consistent with the results of Schweers' (1999) study.

Similarly, another finding of the present study showed that the students had very positive attitudes toward teachers' use of Kurdish to make students feel more comfortable and confident. A possible explanation for this might be that they may have high anxiety when using English and they need teachers' use of Kurdish to help them feel at ease. They also asked for teachers' use of Kurdish whenever they have difficulty in understanding and also when teaching a new topic for the first time.

On the other hand, regarding students' use of Kurdish, they were positive to translating English words and texts into Kurdish to show their understanding. Translation is also mentioned by students in Hashemi and Sabet's (2013) study. Moreover, the students in the present study also expressed very high positive tendency to use Kurdish whenever it is difficult for them to speak in English and also to tell the teacher that they do not understand. They seemed to be worried about their lack of ability to speak and understand English.

Overall, the students had highly positive attitudes (M = 3.66) toward the use of Kurdish in English classes. They may feel more comfortable when Kurdish is used in the class due to their insufficient ability to understand English instructions and to use it. This is parallel to the findings of some other studies (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Břenková, 2007; Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Chavez, 2003; Dujmović, 2007; Hashemi & Sabet, 2013; Jingxia, 2010; Mahmutoğlu & Kıcır, 2013; Mohammad, 2013; Schweers, 1999; Tang, 2002; Taşkın, 2011) and contradictory to the findings of others (Hamze, 2010; Nazary, 2008; Qadri, 2006).

Research Question 3: Is there a difference between the attitudes of the teachers and those of the students?

The results revealed that the students, compared to the teachers, showed more positive attitudes regarding teachers' and students' use of Kurdish in English classes. In other words, the students preferred more Kurdish use while the teachers preferred rare use of it. This can be explained by students' low level of English proficiency and consequently its being easier for them to communicate and say whatever they want in Kurdish (Scrinever, 2011).

The teachers were more positive regarding teachers' use of Kurdish to give suggestions on how to learn more effectively. This is in line with what Cameron (2001) and Harmer (2007) suggested, that is, using L1 to talk about learning. They also showed more positive attitudes to teachers' use of Kurdish when discussing teaching methods used in class. This is also suggested by Schweers (1999) and Voicu (2012). On the other hand, the students were more in favor of teachers' use of Kurdish for giving suggestions on how to communicate more effectively and helping students feel more comfortable and confident. They were also more positive toward teachers' use of Kurdish for explaining difficult concepts and topics. Using L1 for this purpose is also proposed by Juárez and Oxbrow (2008). However, the teachers and the students had nearly similar beliefs with respect to teachers' use of Kurdish for the purposes of giving suggestions to students on how to learn more effectively and joking around with students.

On the other hand, as for students' use of Kurdish, the teachers showed more positive attitudes for discussing teaching methods used in the class and doing brainstorming prior to some activities. They were also comparatively more positive toward students' use of Kurdish when talking during pair-work and group-work activities. This purpose of L1 use was also recommended by Cook (2008). However the students indicated more preference for making use of Kurdish when checking for comprehension. This was also put forward by Cook (2001) and Schweers (1999). Again, they were more positive than the teachers regarding students' use of Kurdish to translate English texts into Kurdish to show their understanding. However, they showed nearly similar positive attitudes toward students' use of Kurdish for translating English words into Kurdish to show their understanding.

Overall, the students were more positive than the teachers regarding the use of Kurdish in English classes. This is in accordance with some earlier studies (Hashemi & Sabet, 2013; Taşkın, 2011) in which the students were more positive than the teachers but it is in contradiction with some others (Kalanzadeh et al., 2013; Jingxia, 2010; Qadri, 2006; Schweers, 1999) in which the teachers showed more positive attitudes.

Research Question 4: Do the attitudes change between low level and high level students?

Although the comparison between the 7th grades and the 11th grades showed many differences, not all of them were statistically significant. For example, their attitudes toward teachers' use of Kurdish in English classes did not differ statistically significantly. They both believed that teachers should sometimes use Kurdish in English classes, but this differs from the results of Prodromou's (2002) study in which lower level students were more positive toward teachers' use of L1. However, 11th grade students were more positive than 7th grade students regarding students' use of Kurdish. The reason for this can be that they lack the experience of using L2 in their previous levels of study. This finding disagrees with Prodromou's (2002) study in which lower level students believed that they should use more L1 than higher level students.

Similarly, 11th grade students were more positive as for teachers' use of Kurdish when explaining new words, grammar, the similarities and differences between Kurdish and English, and difficult concepts or topics. They were also more positive to teachers' use of Kurdish when summarizing materials already covered and translating English texts into Kurdish. A possible explanation for students' positive attitudes toward the use of L1 in teaching grammar and explaining new words can be

151

due to their limited knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. Therefore, they prefer their teachers to teach them in Kurdish to make their comprehension easier. Likewise, a possible explanation for 11th grade students being more positive to teachers' translating texts might be due to having long episodes of the Literary Reader which are located at the end of their coursebook and long reading texts in the teaching units while 7th grade coursebooks lack the Literary Reader stories and long texts. 11th grade students may want to understand those stories and hence they, in comparison with 7th grade students, may prefer more translation of texts. As for students' use of Kurdish, 11th grade students showed greater tendencies to use Kurdish when asking "how do we say '…' in English?", translating an English word into Kurdish to show they understand it, and translating a text from English to Kurdish to show they understand it. 11th grade students seemed to want to show or check that they understand translations of words and texts.

The results concerning the overall attitudes showed statistically significant differences between 7th and 11th grade students, with 11th grade students having more positive attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes. However, it was expected that when students progress in their L2 learning, they have stronger preferences for more L2 and weaker preferences for L1. Harmer (2007) explains that when students' English improves, less L1 is needed "the more they work in English, the better their English will get, and the better their English is, the less need we have for L1" (p. 135). However, this might be related to their years of English learning experience. 7th grade students started studying English at school at grade 1 when they were 6. Hence, they had 7 years of learning experience. As for 11th grade students, they started studying English at school at grade 5 when they were 11 years old. They similarly had approximately 7 years of learning experience. As a result, because they

were overloaded with more difficult materials, too much grammar, long texts, and less frequent words, they may need more L1 to understand. This can also be explained by what they think they need. The low level students may want to learn English as quickly as possible and consequently they think they need to be exposed to less Kurdish, i.e. to as much English as possible. High level students, on the other hand, may think that they are proficient and they have already been exposed to sufficient English and that using Kurdish in the class is not a problem. However, this finding is parallel to the findings in Taşkın (2011) where upper-intermediate level students were more positive than intermediate students, however, beginner level students were more positive than the other two levels. This finding contradicts with the findings of Nazary (2008) in which intermediate level students were more negative than elementary level students and those of Břenková (2007), Mouhanna (2009), and Prodromou (2002) in which lower level students were more positive than higher level students as regards L1 use.

Research Question 5: Do the attitudes change between male and female students?

The comparison between the means of male and female students' responses showed some differences. However, only a few of these differences were statistically significant. For example, female students were more positive than male students regarding the extent to which using Kurdish helps them learn English. The female students were also more positive regarding teachers' use of Kurdish when explaining difficult concepts and topics. This is in line with students' beliefs in the study conducted by Mohammad (2013) at Computer Institutes in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. On the other hand, in the present study, male students were more positive regarding students' use of Kurdish when doing brainstorming prior to an activity.

Finally, no other statistically significant differences were found between the attitudes of the male and female students.

The overall results showed no statistically significant differences between the attitudes of the male and female students toward the use of Kurdish in English classes; that is, the gender did not seem to be a factor that affects attitudes of students toward L1 use. This finding contradicts with Mohammad's (2013) study where students' gender was found to affect their attitudes toward the use of L1 in L2 classes.

Research Question 6: What are the teachers' perceived needs for L1 use in EFL classes?

The teachers provided many reasons for using Kurdish in their classes. They all stated that they use Kurdish mostly because it often helps students understand and subsequently learn more easily because their level of proficiency in English is not high enough to understand English instruction without Kurdish explanations. This reason is also mentioned by teachers in some earlier studies (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Anh, 2010; Hashemi & Sabet, 2013; Jingxia, 2010; Schweers, 1999; Tang, 2002; Timor, 2012). The teachers in the present study also said that they use Kurdish because it helps students understand and subsequently remember vocabulary items. They seemed to look at vocabulary as a very important element of language that students need to master in order to learn the language, and consequently teachers need to do everything to make comprehension easier, including the use of Kurdish in teaching them. They may believe that without Kurdish, students may have difficulties in understanding and remembering meanings of words. This matches with the findings of Hazme (2010) in which the teachers, as a result of the English-only policy and the prohibition of L1 use, had great difficulties in conveying meaning. Jones (2010) also

explains that comprehension and memorization of L2 words will be easier when students translate them into L1. The teachers in the present study also stated that they use Kurdish because it helps students understand difficult concepts and topics. This may be because the teachers believe that students' level in English is not high enough to understand difficult materials without teachers' use of Kurdish. Therefore, they may want to help students avoid confusion about complex concepts and topics in L2 by explaining them in Kurdish. This is also highlighted by Çelik (2008).

Furthermore, the teachers stated that they use Kurdish because it sometimes helps them teach the language. For example, they believed that it is easier for them to teach new vocabulary and difficult concepts and topics through the use of Kurdish. This is parallel to Timor's (2012) study where the teachers explained that using L1 helps explaining difficult issues. They also believed that using Kurdish in English classes saves time. The reason for this can be that whenever they teach something in English, they have to teach it again in Kurdish to make sure that students understand. This perceived need for Kurdish use is also mentioned by both Çelik (2008) who categorizes it as a physical or mechanical factor and Martínez and Olivera (2003) who supported L1 use to save time and effort. It is also consistent with the findings of some other studies (Anh, 2012; Salah, 2012; Tang, 2002; Timor, 2012) where the teachers explained that they use L1 because it is less time-consuming.

Besides, only one of the participant teachers explained that her proficiency level in English is low and prevents her from using English. This justification is also provided by teachers in a study conducted in China by Jingxia (2010). This is also in line with Hoff (2013) who mentioned that knowing when, how, and for what purposes they can appropriately use L1 can be related to the teachers' own

proficiency level and competence because using L2 requires sufficient level of proficiency and competence. Therefore, using L1 is easier and more communicatively effective (Salah, 2012; Sipra, 2007) especially when students' and teachers' L2 proficiency level is not sufficient to use L2.

Research Question 7: What are the students' perceived needs for L1 use in EFL classes?

Similar to the teachers, the students provided many reasons for using Kurdish in their English classes. They explained that they use Kurdish because it helps them better understand and learn L2. This is also supported by one of their teachers who stated that some students use Kurdish because they think it helps them. This is in line with the reasons provided by students in the studies conducted by Brooks-Lewis (2009) and Hashemi and Sabet (2013). Moreover, Hamze's (2010) study indicated that students had many difficulties in understanding because of banning L1 use in English classes and Martínez and Olivera (2003) argued that L1 use guarantees that students understand the meaning.

More specifically, the students thought that using Kurdish often helps them comprehend and consequently remember vocabulary items more easily. They may put too much emphasis on vocabulary and do everything, including L1 use, to make vocabulary comprehension easier. They also stated that they use Kurdish in their classes because it often helps them understand difficult concepts and topics better. These two reasons coincide with the reasons put forward by the students in Tang (2002).

The students further explained that they use Kurdish because their English is not good enough to speak it. This is also supported by their teachers when they were

asked why their students use Kurdish. As a result, students may feel embarrassed to speak L2, as pointed out by Sipra (2007) stating that students, especially those who are less proficient in L2, feel embarrassed when using L2. This can also be explained by their potential fear of making mistakes in front of other students and being corrected by their teachers. They might be afraid of leaving negative impression on their peers and teachers. For example, students in Khati (2011) said that they use L1 because their friends usually make fun of them when they try to speak L2 and they are afraid of teachers' negative feedback when they make mistakes.

Additionally, the students explained that they use Kurdish because it is more comfortable. This is also mentioned by one of their teachers who claimed that due to their low level, using L1 is easier for students and it makes them feel more comfortable, confident, and secure. This is supported by Scrinever (2011) and Sipra (2007) who also argued that using L1 is easier and it can be because of their low proficiency level in L2, which prevents them from saying everything in L2. Furthermore, the students in some earlier studies (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Hashemi and Sabet, 2013; Schweers, 1999; Tang, 2002) provided similar justifications for using L1. They explained that they use L1 because it makes them feel more at ease, comfortable, and confident, and less stressed and lost.

Besides, the students believed that using Kurdish encourages/motivates them. Some students, as pointed out by one of the teachers, are not motivated and they do not like the lesson and as a result they prefer not to use English. Using L1 assists students in lowering the level of anxiety and increasing their motivation for L2 learning (Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001; El-dali, 2012; Ellis, 2012; Jones, 2010; Kelleher, 2013; Sipra, 2007).

Finally, another teacher added another reason for students' L1 use. He believed that his students use L1 because he allowed them to do so at the beginning of the academic year. The reason for this teacher's allowing his students to use L1 might be that he himself also used L1 in his classes and consequently he could not ask his students to avoid it. This is also mentioned by Khati (2011) who found that the teachers preferred to use L1 more than L2 and therefore they could not encourage L2 use.

Research Question 8: When and where and for what purposes is L1 used in EFL classes by the teachers and the students?

The results of classroom observations revealed that Kurdish was used extensively by teachers and students in different situations and for a variety of purposes. Regarding teachers' use of Kurdish, it was found out that L1 was overused, except for T2 who used more English and less Kurdish in comparison with the other teachers. This can be because the teachers might have negative beliefs about students' proficiency level and their ability to understand English. Pan and Pan (2010) mentioned that the amount of teachers' use of L1 is affected by students' level of proficiency and teaching purposes. It can also be explained by teachers' habits of L1 use in their classes. Overusing L1 contradicts the interactionist perspective which is supported by Krashen's Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982) as well as Krashen's Natural Approach (Krashen and Terrell, 1995) which call for learning L2 through maximized L2 input.

It was obtained that L1 was overused by teachers for classroom management. In the literature, some scholars (Cameron, 2001; Cook, 2001, 2008; Jones, 2010; Sabb, 2011; Voicu, 2012) have suggested L1 use for this purpose. Moreover, many studies (Grim, 2010; Hamze, 2010; Hoff, 2013; Jingxia, 2010; Kafes, 2011; Macaro, 1997;

Polio & Duff, 1994; Salah, 2012; Taşkın, 2011; Thompson, 2006; White & Storch, 2012) have shown that teachers used L1 to manage their classes.

The second highest frequent use of Kurdish by teachers was for explaining the meaning of new words. Besides, many sentence translations occurred in the classes. The rationale behind this can be that it might be difficult for teachers to convey meaning without the use of L1, as reported by teachers in a study conducted by Hamze (2010). This use of L1 is also suggested by some other researchers and scholars (Cameron, 2001; Cook, 2001, 2008; Jones, 2010; Juárez & Oxbrow, 2008; Mahmutoğlu & Kıcır, 2013; Martínez & Olivera, 2003; Sabb, 2011; Voicu, 2012; Willis & Willis, 2007). Besides, many other studies have shown that teachers used L1 to explain the meaning of new words (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Hamze, 2010; Hoff, 2013; Grim, 2010; Jingxia, 2010; Khati, 2011; Polio & Duff, 1994; Salah, 2012; Sipra, 2007; Tang, 2002; Taşkın, 2011; Thompson, 2006; White & Storch, 2012) and to translate English sentences into L1 (Kalanzadeh et al., 2013; Salah, 2012) in their L2 classes.

It was also found out that Kurdish was used extensively by teachers for the purpose of giving instructions for activities, tasks, homework, etc. Some researchers and scholars in the field of ELT (Cameron, 2001; Cook, 2001, 2008; Martínez & Olivera, 2003; Prodromou, 2002; Sabb, 2011; Schweers, 1999) have also suggested the use of L1 for this purpose. Likewise, many studies (Grim, 2010; Hoff, 2013; Khati, 2011; Macaro, 1997; Salah, 2012; Sipra, 2007; Tang, 2002) focused on teachers' actual use of L1 and reached similar results.

Another purpose for teachers' use of Kurdish was to check for comprehension. The use of L1 for this purpose was also supported by Cameron (2001), Juárez and Oxbrow (2008), Prodromou, (2002), and Schweers, (1999). This is similar to what teachers have actually used L1 for in some other studies (Kafes, 2011; Macaro, 1997; Salah, 2012).

Giving feedback to students was another occasion where L1 was used in the present study. Cameron, (2001), Juárez and Oxbrow (2008), Prodromou (2002), and Schweers (1999) also believe that L1 use can be beneficial when giving feedback. Macaro (1997) and Taşkın (2011) also found out that teachers made use of L1 in their classes when giving feedback to students.

Another noteworthy function of L1 use included explaining grammar (18 times). Nearly all the instruction on grammar topics was done in Kurdish during the observations. The use of L1 for teaching grammar is also suggested by many researchers (Cook, 2001, 2008; Damra & Al Qudah, 2012; Jones, 2010; Mahmutoğlu & Kıcır, 2013; Sabb, 2011; Voicu, 2012). Similarly, teachers in many studies (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Grim, 2010; Hoff, 2013; Jingxia, 2010; Kalanzadeh et al., 2013; Khati, 2011; Sipra, 2007; Taşkın, 2011; Thompson, 2006; White & Storch, 2012) have reported to be using L1 in their classes when explaining grammar.

On the other hand, the results of classroom observations showed that students made use of lots of Kurdish and they rarely used English, except for some very basic words and expressions or when they were reading or doing an activity. This might be due to their lack of speaking ability or communication strategies in L2 as the analysis of student questionnaire showed that they preferred their teachers to use lots of Kurdish

in order to give them suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively. The students' extensive use of Kurdish might be linked to their teachers' overuse of it. Thompson (2006) found out that the more L2 was used by teachers, the more it was used by students. However, in the 7th grade female class, students comparatively used more English and less Kurdish. This can be linked to their teacher who was observed to actually use more English than the other teachers.

The most frequent use of Kurdish by students was for dealing with classroom routines and management. This can be because of the fact that their teachers had allowed them to use Kurdish at the beginning of the class and it may have become a habit for them to resort to L1 for classroom routines. Similarly, students in Eldridge's (1996) and Thompson's (2006) studies were found to have actually used L1 in their L2 classes for this purpose.

The second most common purpose of Kurdish use by the students was related to translating English words. This can be explained by their giving too much importance to vocabulary. This might also be due to their highly positive attitudes toward students' use of L1 for translating English words. Willis and Willis (2007) explained that L1 can be used appropriately by students when translating new words into L1 to check comprehension. Likewise, students in many studies (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Eldridge, 1996; Kalanzadeh et al., 2013; Thompson, 2006) were found to have used L1 for translating unknown words.

Students also resorted to Kurdish many times to ask their teachers questions about the content and topic of the lesson. It might have been difficult for them to ask questions in English because of their low level of proficiency. Scrinever (2011)

explained that it is difficult for students to say in L2 what they want to say. This use of L1 is also suggested by Duff and Polio (1990). Similarly, Al-Nofaie (2010) found out that students made use of L1 when they wanted to ask questions. Answering teachers' questions was another situation where students resorted to Kurdish in the present study. This is in harmony with the suggestions made by Cameron (2001) about appropriate uses of L1.

Research Question 9: Does the actual use of Kurdish in English classes change across different levels of study?

The results of the classroom observations analysis indicated great differences in L1 use between 7th grade and 11th grade students. It was found out that 11th grade students used nearly three times more Kurdish than 7th grade students for the purpose of dealing with classroom routines and management. They also made use of Kurdish much more than 7th grade students for translating English words to show their understanding, and asking and answering questions.

Generally, grade 11 students used much more Kurdish than 7th grade students and the difference between them was great. This finding is in contradiction with what Cameron (2001) and Thompson (2006) stated: the higher the level of the class is, the more L2 and less L1 is employed. It also disagrees with Bhooth, Azman, and Ismail (2014) and Mouhanna (2009) who believe that when students' L2 proficiency increases, they must decrease their dependence on L1. Their behaviors may have been affected by their attitudes toward L1 use as 11th grade students were more positive than 7th grade students. However, this finding is supported by Eldridge (1996) who claimed that the assumption that the more proficient the students are in L2, the less L1 they will use might not be correct. He came to this conclusion because the results of his study in a Turkish secondary school demonstrated that

162

students with high and low levels of proficiency were similar in the use of L1 in their L2 classes.

Research Question 10: Does the actual use of Kurdish in English classes change across gender?

The results of classroom observations showed that male and female students differ in the use of Kurdish in English classes. Male students used Kurdish to some extent more than female students did in translating English words to show their understanding, asking questions, and talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments. There were also some other small differences in the use of Kurdish between male and female students.

Overall, male students used more Kurdish than female students, and because the differences between them were not as much considerable as the differences obtained between 7th and 11th grade students, it can be inferred that gender may have very little impact on the use of L1 in L2 classes. Male students' slightly more use of Kurdish can be connected to male dominance in almost all social contexts, including schools. Hence, female students may tend to remain more silent than male students and not to participate in classroom discussions as much as male students do.

5.2 Conclusion

The present study attempted to identify attitudes of basic and high school teachers and students toward the use of L1 (Kurdish) in L2 (English) classes in the city of Erbil in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. It also tried to find out if there was any difference between the attitudes of teachers and students. Besides, it looked into the students' and the teachers' perceived needs for Kurdish in their English classes. Further, it investigated the effect of level of study and gender on students' attitudes.

Additionally, the study attempted to explore the purposes for which the teachers and the students actually used Kurdish in English classes and the effect of level of study and gender on their L1 use.

The participants were 4 teachers and 98 students in four different classes in four schools: Class 1 (7th grade male students), Class 2 (7th grade female students), Class 3 (11th grade male students), Class 4 (11th grade female students). Triangulation method was used to collect the data, including both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative data was collected through two questionnaires – student questionnaire and teacher questionnaire – while qualitative data was collected through teacher interviews and classroom observations.

The results of the data analysis showed that, except for one teacher who showed some negative attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes, the other three teachers were positive toward it. However, they were against overusing Kurdish and they preferred *moderate* and *sometimes* use of Kurdish. They also believed that it, to a large extent, facilitates learning and, to some extent, makes teaching easier. Hence, they showed very positive attitudes toward using Kurdish for the purposes of translating English texts, discussing teaching methods used in the class, giving suggestions on how to learn more effectively, and giving administrative information. As for students' use of Kurdish in English classes, the teachers were highly positive when students discuss teaching methods used in class, translate English words to show their understanding, do brainstorming prior to an activity, and talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments.

Similar to the teachers, the students were also positive toward the use of Kurdish in English classes. Their positive attitudes were relatively higher; they believed that Kurdish can *often* be used in English classes. The students also believed that using Kurdish can sometimes assist learning English. Yet, they were slightly more positive to teachers' use of Kurdish than students' use of it. The students show strong preferences for teachers' use of Kurdish for giving suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively, explaining difficult concepts and topics, making students feel more comfortable and confident, and teaching a new topic for the first time. Similarly, they tended to use Kurdish in their classes to translate English words and texts into Kurdish to show their understanding and whenever it is difficult for them to speak in English or to tell the teacher that they do not understand.

When the teachers' and students' attitudes were compared, it was seen that the students were generally more positive than the teachers regarding Kurdish use in English classes. It was also found out that the students preferred more Kurdish use by teachers and less Kurdish use by students while the teachers were in favor of more Kurdish use by students and less Kurdish use by teachers.

The results of the study also showed that 11th grade students were more positive toward the use of Kurdish in English classes than 7th grade students; this was found to be statistically significant. Similarly, some differences were found between the attitudes of female and male students, with female students being more positive. However, the differences between the two genders were not statistically significant.

The teachers reported that they use Kurdish in their English classes because students' level of proficiency is low to understand English-only classes and using Kurdish helps students understand and learn better. They also use Kurdish in their classes because it saves time, and it helps them teach the language. For example, they believed that it is easier for them to teach new vocabulary and difficult concepts and topics through the use of L1.

The students, on the other hand, explained that they use Kurdish in their English classes because they are not proficient enough in English to speak it and therefore they feel more comfortable when speaking in Kurdish. They also tended to use Kurdish because they thought it helps them understand and learn L2 better, and consequently using Kurdish encourages them.

Finally, the results of classroom observations showed that Kurdish was used extensively by teachers and students in different situations and for a variety of purposes. Teachers used the least English and the most Kurdish for the purposes of managing classes, explaining the meaning of new words, giving instructions for activities, tasks, and homework, checking for comprehension, giving feedback, and explaining grammar. On the other hand, students used English only for some very basic words and expressions, except for students in 7th grade female class who used more English than the other classes did. The students overused Kurdish for the purposes of classroom routines and management, translating English words, asking and answering questions about the content and topic of the lessons.

The findings also showed great differences in L1 use between 7th and 11th grade students, with 11th grade students using much more Kurdish than 7th grade students.

It was also found that male students used more Kurdish than female students did in their classes. However, these differences were not very considerable. Therefore, it can be inferred that while level of study may have an impact on students' use of L1 in L2 classes, gender does not seem to be an important factor.

5.3 Implications of the Study

5.3.1 Pedagogical Implications

Based on the findings of the study, the following pedagogical implications are suggested for English language teaching and learning. Since the results of the study identified extensive use of Kurdish, the amount of Kurdish used by teachers and students is suggested to be minimized. To begin with, teachers' use of Kurdish can partly be minimized by organizing in-service training courses by the Ministry of Education to inform the teachers about the disadvantages of extensive reliance on L1 and about the most recent belief that judicious and moderate use of L1 can facilitate the processes of learning and teaching L2 (Anh, 2010; Bhooth, Azman, & Ismail, 2014; Çelik, 2008; Dujmović, 2007; El-dali, 2012; Hamze, 2010; Juárez & Oxbrow, 2008; Kafes, 2011; Kelleher, 2013; Mart, 2013; Miles, 2004; Nazary, 2008; Pan & Pan, 2010; Salah, 2012; ; Schweers, 1999; Sipra, 2007; Tang, 2002; Voicu, 2012). Consequently, teachers would be aware of how, when, where, and for what purposes L1 can be beneficially used. Additionally, supervisors should pay frequent visits to classrooms to observe the use of Kurdish so that they can check if teachers have commitment to the advice they receive from training courses. They should also give teachers feedback about their actual uses of Kurdish. The more often their classes are observed, the less amount of L1 they may use. As a result, they will get used to employ L2 in their classes after some time, even when less frequent observations are

carried out by supervisors, and they will seek ways to increase the quantity of L2 they use in their classes.

On the other hand, teachers can minimize L1 use in their classes, especially with lower level students, by using L2 in simpler words and avoiding using language which is beyond students' actual level. Teachers can also support their L2 input by using visual aids such as realia, pictures, flash cards, and gestures to make their input comprehensible. Furthermore, since teachers reported that they use Kurdish mostly because students' proficiency level is not high enough to understand instruction in English, they should be aware of the fact that their belief about students' level may not always reflect students' actual level and they might be proficient enough to understand English, at least when simpler words are employed. However, to minimize students' demands for teachers' use of L1, teachers can inform students about the importance of exposure to L2 input in language learning so that they will not oppose to teachers' use of L2 or complain about it.

On the other hand, students' use of L1 should be limited, too. This can be achieved in many ways. First, teachers need to provide students with suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively and teach them the communication strategies. Second, students need to be provided with more chances and opportunities to use L2 and to actively engage in classroom communication tasks. This can be reached by incorporating more role-play activities and presentations into teaching to help students get used to L2 use. Teachers should also encourage and motivate students to speak L2 as much as possible and tell them about the importance of using L2. Third, teachers need to be aware of the factors that can affect students' use of L1, such as age, gender, level of motivation, level of proficiency, attitudes toward L1

use, as well as their own actual use of L1, and take them into consideration when teaching. For example, teachers' use of L1 might affect students' use of L1, and accordingly the less L1 teachers use, the less L1 may students use. Last, but not least, teachers should not allow students to always make use of L1 and this may necessitate changing students' attitudes toward L1 use because attitudes can have powerful effect on classroom behaviors. As the results of this study showed, the students believed that L1 use to a large extent assists L2 learning; yet, they also need to be informed about the disadvantages of too much reliance on L1.

5.3.2 Implications for Further Research

The findings of the present study suggest several implications for further research. First, it is revealed in the literature that a lot of investigation has been done in the area and the results obtained have not been quite consistent; therefore, it is recommended that larger scale descriptive studies be conducted in the same context of this study to verify if similar results can be obtained. Second, as this study was restricted in its scope, it is hoped that further studies expand the boundaries of this study. For example, it is recommended that student interviews be carried out along with the data collection methods used in this study, especially to elicit students' perceived needs for the use of L1. If a replica study is conducted, it is also suggested that larger number of teachers participate in order to be able to investigate if the differences between teachers' and students' attitudes are statistically significant. It is also suggested that teachers' proficiency level in L2 be taken into consideration as it might be a good independent variable. Furthermore, It is recommended that the same study be implemented with other levels of study in order to identify if similar results are achieved. This can also allow generalization of the results to other levels. It

would also be interesting to observe the same teachers at different levels to see whether the teachers change their use of Kurdish with higher or lower level students.

Furthermore, future studies can expand the scope of this study in many ways. First, it is suggested that future studies compare teachers' use of L1 and their students' use of it, that is, investigating the effect that teachers' use of L1 has on students' use of L1, and vice versa. It would also be interesting to look into the effect of teachers' and students' attitudes toward L1 use on their actual uses of L1 in their classes. Besides, in addition to gender and level of study, some other factors, such as, learners' age, their level of motivation, and their learning styles, and teachers' teaching experience and their L2 proficiency level, can be investigated in further studies.

Finally, it is recommended that the role of L1 in L2 classes be evaluated in order to accordingly develop a systematic way of using L1. This may necessitate conducting some experimental studies.

5.4 Summary

This chapter first presented a thorough discussion of the findings in the light of the relevant literature. Then, it provided a conclusion, i.e. a summary of the findings. Next, based on the findings of the study, it suggested some pedagogical implications and some implications. Finally, it presented some suggestions for further research.

REFERENCES

A bright new look at English Sunrise curriculum: Criteria and mapping. (2010). Oxford: Macmillan Publisher.

Al Sharaeai, W. A. (2012). *Students' perspectives on the use of L1 in English classrooms* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from Digital Repository @ Iowa State University, Graduate Theses and Dissertatinos. (12898)

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. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/

Anh, K. H. (2010). Use of Vietnamese in English language teaching in Vietnam: Attitudes of Vietnamese university teachers. *English Language Teaching, 3*(2), 119-128. Retrieved from http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/index

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 9-32. Retrieved from http://www.tesol.org/read-and-publish/journals/tesol-quarterly

Bhooth, A., Azman, H., & Ismail, K. (2014). The role of the L1 as a scaffolding tool in the EFL reading classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 118*, 76-84. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.011

171

Brooks-Lewis, K. A. (2009). Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning. *Applied Linguistics, 30*(2), 216-235. doi:10.1093/applin/amn051

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principle. An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Břenková, R. (2007). *Teacher's usage of the mother tongue versus English at the level of young learners* (Unpublished master's thesis). Masaryk University, Brno, Czech.

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

Chavez, M. (2003). The diglossic foreign-language classroom: Learners' views on L1 and L2 functions. In C. S. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native, and the non-native speaker* (pp. 163-208). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Oxon: Routledge.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(3), 402-423. Retrieved from

http://www.utpjournals.com/Canadian-Modern-Language-Review.html

Cook, V. (2008). *Second language learning and language teaching* (4th ed.). London: Hodder Education.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). California: SAGE Publications.

Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *The Modern Language Journal , 89* (4), 585-592. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1540-4781

Çelik, S. (2008). Opening the door: An examination of mother tongue use in foreign language classrooms. *H. U. Journal of Education , 34*, 75-85. Retrieved from http://www.efdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/index_eng.html

Damra, H. M., & Al Qudah, M. (2012). The effect of using native language on grammar achievement and attitudes toward learning of basic stages EFL students in Jordan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(1), 300-306. Retrieved from http://ijbssnet.com/index.php/home

Demir, H. (2012). The role of native language in the teaching of the FL grammar. *Journal of Education, 1*(2), 21-27. Retrieved from

http://journal.ibsu.edu.ge/index.php/sje/index

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Duff, P. A., & Polio, C. G. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal, 74*(2), 154-166. Retrieved from

http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1540-4781

Dujmović, M. (2007). The use of Croatian in the EFL classroom. *Metodički Obzori, 2*(1), 91-101. Retrieved from http://hrcak.srce.hr/metodicki-obzori

El-dali, H. M. (2012). Re-examining the influence of native language and culture on L2 learning: A multidisciplinary perspective. *English Linguistics Research, 1*(1), 60-77. doi:10.5430/elr.v1n1p60

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal, 50*(4), 303-311. doi:10.1093/elt/50.4.303

Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *System, 33*(2), 209-224. doi:10.1016/j.system.2004.12.006

Ellis, R. R. (2012). *Language teaching research & language pedagogy*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.

Forman, R. (2005). *Teaching EFL in Thailand: A bilingual study* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia). Retrieved from http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/research/bitstream/handle/10453/20082/02whole.pdf?sequence=2.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gabrielatos, C. (2001). L1 use in ELT: Not a skeleton, but a bone of contention. A response to Prodromou. *TESOL Greece Newsletter, 70*, 6-9. Retrieved from http://tesolgreece.org/

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation.* London: Edward Arnold.

Grim, F. (2010). L1 in the L2 classroom at the secondary and college levels: A comparison of functions and use by teachers. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 7*(2), 193-209. Retrieved from http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/main.htm

Hamze, R. K. (2010). *Teachers' and students' perceptions towards the use of Arabic in secondary level English language classrooms* (Unpublished master's thesis). American University of Sharjah, Sharjah, UAE.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Essex: Pearson Education.

Hashemi, S. M., & Sabet, M. K. (2013). The Iranian EFL students' and teachers'
perception of using Persian in General English classes. *International Journal
of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 2*(2), 142-152.
doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.2p.142

Hidayati, I. N. (2012). Evaluating the role of L1 in teaching receptive skills and
grammar in EFL classes. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 17-
32. Retrieved from http://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/IJAL/index

Hoff, M. S. (2013). *L1 use in EFL instruction: A comparison of teachers' L1 use in
EFL classrooms at lower and upper secondary levels: What explains
variation in L1 use?* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Oslo, Oslo,
Norway)

Hopkins, D. (2008). *A teacher's guide to classroom research* (4th ed.). Berkshire:
Open University Press.

Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' Code-Switching to the L1 in EFL Classroom. *The Open
Applied Linguistic Journal, 3*, 10-23. Retrieved from
http://benthamopen.com/toalj/

Jones, H. (2010). *First language communication in the second language classroom:
A valuable or damaging resource?* (Unpublished master's thesis). Memorial
University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador,
Canada.

Juárez, C. R., & Oxbrow, G. (2008). L1 in the EFL classroom: more a help than a hindrance? *Porta Linguarum, 9*, 93-109. Retrieved from http://www.ugr.es/~portalin/

Kafes, H. (2011). A neglected resource or an overused illusion: L1 use in the foreign language classroom. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications, 2*(2), 128-140. Retrieved from http://www.ijonte.org/

Kalanzadeh, G. A., Hemati, F., Shahivand, Z., & Bakhtiarvand, M. (2013). The use of EFL students' L1 in English classes. *The International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World , 2* (2), 33-42. Retrieved from http://www.ijllalw.org/index.html

Karim, K. (2003). First language (L1) influence on second language (L2) reading: The role of transfer. *Working Papers of the Linguistic Circle (WPLC), University of Victoria, 17*, 49-54. Retrieved from http://journals.uvic.ca/index.php/WPLC/index

Kelleher, M. (2013). Overcoming the first language taboo to enhance learning a foreign language. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences , 93*, 2037-2042. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.161

Khati, A. R. (2011). When and why of mother tongue use in English classrooms. *Nepal English Language Teachers' Association, 16*(12), 42-51. Retrieved from http://www.nelta.org.np/

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1995). *The Natural Approach: Language acquisition in the classroom.* Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall Europe.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Lavan, C. (2001). Help! They're using too much English! The problem of L1 vs. L2 in the Immersion Classroom. *ACIE Newsletter, 4*(2), 1-4. Retrieved from http://www.carla.umn.edu/immersion/acie/index.html

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

Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(4), 531-548. doi:10.1111/0026-7902.00124

Mahmutoğlu, H., & Kıcır, Z. (2013). The use of mother tongue in EFL classrooms. *EUL Journal of Social Sciences, 4*(1), 49-72. Retrieved from http://en.lau.edu.tr/euljss

Mart, Ç. T. (2013). The facilitating role of L1 in ESL classes. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 3*(1), 9-14. Retrieved from http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/IJARBSS

Martínez, S. G., & Olivera, P. A. (2003). A revision of the role of L1 plays in second language learning. In P. A. García, & J. R. Suárez (Eds.), *Estudios de Filología Inglesa* (pp. 193-205). Valladolid: Servicio de publicaciones de la Universidad de Valladolid.

McDonough, J., & McDonough, S. (1997). *Research methods for English language teachers.* London: Hodder Education.

Miles, R. (2004). *Evaluating the use of L1 in the English language classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

Mohammad, R. I. (2013). *Teachers' and students' attitudes towards the use of L1 (Kurdish) in EFL classrooms in Computer Institutes in Northern Iraq* (Unpublished master's thesis). Near East University, Nicosia, Cyprus.

Mouhanna, M. (2009). Re-examining the role of L1 in the EFL classroom. *UGRU Journal, 8*, 1-19. Retrieved from http://www.ugru.uaeu.ac.ae/UGRUJournal/UGRUJournal.htm

Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *The Asian EFL Journal, 5*(2), 1-8. Retrieved from http://asian-efl-journal.com/

Nazary, M. (2008). The role of L1 in L2 acquisition: Attitudes of Iranian university students. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 2*(2), 138-153. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pan, Y.-C., & Pan, Y.-C. (2010). The use of L1 in the foreign language classroom. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 12*(2), 87-96. Retrieved from http://caljjournal.wordpress.com/

Polio, C. G., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alteration. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 313-326. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1540-4781

Prodromou, L. (2002). From mother tongue to other tongue. *Teaching English*. Retrieved from http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/mother-tongue-other-tongue

Qadri, T. A.-r. (2006). *Teachers' and students' practices and attitudes toward Arabic (L1) use in ELT* (Unpublished master's thesis). American University of Sharjah, Sharjah, UAE.

Qadumi, H. A. (2007). Determining English language teachers' attitudes toward using the mother tongue in the EFL classroom. *Al-Quds University Journal for Research and Studies, 10*, 9-39. Retrieved from http://www.qou.edu/arabic/index.jsp?pageId=206

Sabb, J. E. (2011). *Use of the first language in the adult English language learner classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.

Salah, N. M. (2012). Examining the use of Arabic in English classes at the Primary Stage in Hebron Government schools: Teachers' perspective. *Arab World English Journal, 3*(2), 400-436. Retrieved from http://www.awej.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=122&Itemid=101

Sarandi, H. (2013). The use of Turkish in English preparatory schools: Where is the Balance? *Anthropologist, 16*(1-2), 325-335. Retrieved from http://www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/T-Anth/Anth-00-0-000-000-1999-Web/Anth-00-0-000-000-1999-1-Cover.htm

Schweers, C. W. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 37*(2), 6-13. Retrieved from http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/usia/E-USIA/forum/acrobat/P6.pdf

Scrivener, J. (2011). *Learning teaching: The essential guide to English language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Macmillan Publishers.

Sipra, M. A. (2007). *Bilingualism as teaching aid in a language class: L1 as a facilitator in teaching/learning process of L2 at intermediate/certificate level* (Doctoral dissertation, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan). Retrieved from Pakistan Research Repository. (5976)

Stapa, S. H., & Majid, A. H. (2012). The use of first language in developing ideas in second language writing. *American Journal of Social Issues & Humanities, 2*(3), 148-151. Retrieved from http://www.ajsih.org/index.php/ajsih

Tang, J. (2002). Using L1 in the English classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 40* (1), 36-43. Retrieved from http://americanenglish.state.gov/english-teaching-forum

Taşkın, A. (2011). *Perceptions on using L1 in language classrooms: A case study in a Turkish private university* (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Thompson, G. L. (2006). *Teacher and student first language and target language use in the foreign language classroom: A qualitative and quantitative study of language choice* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/bitstream/10150/194958/1/azu_etd_1705_sip1_m.pdf

Timor, T. (2012). Use of mother tongue in teaching a foreign language. *Language Education in Asia, 3*(1), 7-17. Retrieved from http://www.camtesol.org/publication/leia-background

Voicu, C. G. (2012). Overusing mother tongue in English language teaching. *International Journal of Communication Research, 2*(3), 212-218. Retrieved from http://www.ijcr.eu/index.php?link=home

White, E., & Storch, N. (2012). En français s'il vous plaît: A longitudinal study of the first language (L1) in French foreign language (FL) classes. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*(2), 183-202. Retrieved from http://www.nla.gov.au/openpublish/index.php/aral

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

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Student Questionnaire (English Version)

Dear Students,

I am a master student and I am currently doing my thesis on the use of Kurdish in English classes. This questionnaire aims to identify your attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes and reasons behind using it. It is very important that you express your opinions realistically. Your identity and individual responses will be kept confidential and will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sangar Khoshnaw

MA student

Eastern Mediterranean University, Cyprus

Faculty of Education

English Language Teaching Department

sangar2006@hotmail.com

CONSENT FORM

I have read and understood the purpose of this study and how my responses will be used. Therefore, I agree to participate in this study.

Name – Surname: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

PART ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please, put a tick (☑) in the appropriate box.

1. Class: □ 7   □ 11

2. School Name: _____ (Please specify)

3. Gender: □ Male   □ Female

4. Age: □ 13 □ 14 □ 15 □ 16 □ 17 □ 18 □ Other, please specify: _____

5. How many years have you been studying English?

   □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9 □ 10 □ 11 □ 12 □ Other, please specify: _____

6. Nationality: □ Kurd   □ Arab   □ Other, please specify: _____

7. First Language: □Kurdish □Arabic □Other, please specify: _____

PART TWO: THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please, put a tick (☑) in the appropriate box.

1. **Should the teacher use Kurdish in English classes?**
   □ Always   □ Often   □ Sometimes   □ Rarely   □ Never

2. **Should the students use Kurdish in English classes?**
   □ Always   □ Often   □ Sometimes   □ Rarely   □ Never

3. **To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you learn this language?**
   □ Always   □ Often   □ Sometimes   □ Rarely   □ Never

4. **How often do you think Kurdish should be used in your English classes?**
   □ Always   □ Often   □ Sometimes   □ Rarely   □ Never

5. **English <u>teachers</u> can use Kurdish in their classes to:**
   A. Explain new words
   □ Always   □ Often   □ Sometimes   □ Rarely   □ Never
   B. Explain grammar
   □ Always   □ Often   □ Sometimes   □ Rarely   □ Never
   C. Explain the similarities and differences between Kurdish and English
   □ Always   □ Often   □ Sometimes   □ Rarely   □ Never
   D. Give instructions for activities, tasks, homework, etc.
   □ Always   □ Often   □ Sometimes   □ Rarely   □ Never

E. Check for comprehension (e.g. reading, listening, or grammar comprehension)

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

F. Discuss the teaching methods used in class

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

G. Explain difficult concepts or topics

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

H. Summarize material already covered

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

I. Assess students' performance

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

J. Joke around with students

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

K. Help students feel more comfortable and confident

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

L. Give suggestions on how to learn more effectively

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

M. Give suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

N. Give feedback to students

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

O. Manage the class

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

P. Give administrative information (course policies, announcements, deadlines, attendance, etc.)

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

Q. Talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

R. Do brainstorming prior to an activity, e.g. writing or reading

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

S. Translate a text from English to Kurdish

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

In what other situations do you think _teachers_ can use Kurdish in English classes?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____ .

6. **<u>Students</u> can use Kurdish in English classes to:**

   A. Talk during pair-work or group-work activities

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

   B. Ask "how do we say '…' in English?"

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

   C. Translate an English word into Kurdish to show they understand it

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

   D. Translate a text from English to Kurdish to show they understand it

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

   E. Do brainstorming prior to an activity (e.g. writing or reading)

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

   F. Talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

   G. Discuss the teaching methods used in class

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

   H. Check for comprehension (e.g. reading, listening, or grammar comprehension)

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

   In what other situations do you think <u>students</u> can use Kurdish in English classes?

   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____ .

7. **<u>I</u> prefer to use Kurdish in <u>my</u> English classes because:**

   A. It's more comfortable

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

   B. I am less tense

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

   C. I feel less lost

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

   D. It makes me feel more confident and secure

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

E. It encourages/motivates me

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

F. It saves time

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

G. It helps me understand difficult concepts and topics better

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

H. It helps me understand new vocabulary better

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

I. It helps me remember vocabulary items more easily

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

For what other reasons do <u>you</u> use Kurdish in your English classes?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____.

Appendix B: Student Questionnaire (Kurdish Version)

قوتابی ئازیز،

من خوێندکاری ماستەرم و ئێستا خەریکی نوسینی ماستەرنامەکەمم دەربارەی بەکارهێنانی زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزیدا. مەبەست لەم راپرسیە دیاریکردنی هەڵوێستی ئێوەیە بەرامبەر بەکارهێنانی زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزی وە هەروەها هۆکارەکانی بەکارهێنانی زمانی کوردی. زۆر گرنگە کە راوبۆچوونی راستەقینەی خۆت دەرببری. ناوی تۆ وەهەروەها وەڵامە تایبەتیەکانت بە نهێنی دەپارێزرێن و تەنها بۆ مەبەستی توێژینەوە بەکاردەهێنرێت.

سوپاس بۆ هاوکاری کردنت.

سەنگەر اسماعیل حمد

قوتابی ماستەر

زانکۆی (ئیسترن میدیتێرینیەن)، قوبرس.

کۆلیژی پەروەردە

بەشی فێرکردنی زمانی ئینگلیزی

sangar2006@hotmail.com

<u>فۆرمی رازیبوون</u>

من مەبەستی ئەم توێژینەوەیەم خوێندەوە و لێی تێگەیشتم وە زانیم کە وەڵامەکانم چۆن بەکاردەهێنرێن. بۆیە رازیم کە بەشداری لەم توێژینەوەیە بکەم.

ناوی سیانی: ....

ئیمزا : ....

بەروار : ....

<div dir="rtl">

ڕاپرسی قوتابی

بەشی یەکەم: زانیاری کەسی

تکایە نیشانەی ڕاست (☑) لەناو چوارگۆشەی گونجاو دابنێ.

١. پۆل: □ ٧   □ ١١ی زانستی   □ ١١ی وێژەیی

٢. ناوی قوتابخانە: .... (تکایە دیاری بکە)

٣. ڕەگەز: □ نێر   □ مێ

٤. تەمەن: □١٢   □١٣   □١٤   □١٥   □١٦   □١٧   □١٨   □ هی تر: .... (تکایە دیاری بکە)

٥. چەند ساڵە تۆ زمانی ئینگلیزی دەخوێنیت؟

□ ٦   □ ٧   □ ٨   □ ٩   □ ١٠   □ ١١   □ ١٢   □ هی تر: .... (تکایە دیاری بکە)

٦. نەتەوە: □ کورد   □ عەرەب   □ هی تر: .... (تکایە دیاری بکە)

٧. زمانی دایک: □ کوردی   □ عەرەبی   □ هی تر .... (تکایە دیاری بکە)

بەشی دووەم: ڕاپرسیەکە

تکایە نیشانەی ڕاست (☑) لەناو چوارگۆشەی گونجاو دابنێ.

١. ئایا پێویستە مامۆستا زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزی بەکاربهێنێت؟
□ هەمیشە   □ زۆرجار   □ هەندێک جار   □ بەکەمی   □ هەرگیز

٢. ئایا پێویستە قوتابی زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزی بەکاربهێنێت؟
□ هەمیشە   □ زۆرجار   □ هەندێک جار   □ بەکەمی   □ هەرگیز

٣. تا چ ڕادەیەک بەکارهێنانی زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزیدا یارمەتیت دەدات بۆ فێربوونی ئەو زمانە؟
□ هەمیشە   □ زۆرجار   □ هەندێک جار   □ بەکەمی   □ هەرگیز

٤. پێت وایە تا چ ڕاددەیەك زمانی کوردی پێویستە بەکاربهێنریت لە وانەی ئینگلیزیەکەتدا؟
□ هەمیشە   □ زۆرجار   □ هەندێک جار   □ بەکەمی   □ هەرگیز

٥. مامۆستایانی ئینگلیزی دەتوانن زمانی کوردی بەکاربێنن لە وانەکانیان بۆ مەبەستی:

أ. ڕوون کردنەوەی وشەی نوێ
□ هەمیشە   □ زۆرجار   □ هەندێک جار   □ بەکەمی   □ هەرگیز

ب. ڕوون کردنەوەی ڕێزمان
□ هەمیشە   □ زۆرجار   □ هەندێک جار   □ بەکەمی   □ هەرگیز

ج. ڕوون کردنەوەی لێکچوون و جیاوازیەکانی نێوان زمانی کوردی و زمانی ئینگلیزی
□ هەمیشە   □ زۆرجار   □ هەندێک جار   □ بەکەمی   □ هەرگیز

د. پێدانی ڕێنمایی بۆ ڕاهێنان، ئەرک، وە ئەرکی ماڵەوە..........هتد
□ هەمیشە   □ زۆرجار   □ هەندێک جار   □ بەکەمی   □ هەرگیز

هـ. پشکنین و دڵنیابوون لە تێگەیشتنی قوتابیان (بۆ نمونە: تێگەیشتن لە خوێندنەوە، گوێگرتن یان ڕێزمان)
□ هەمیشە   □ زۆرجار   □ هەندێک جار   □ بەکەمی   □ هەرگیز

و. گفتوگۆکردن دەربارەی ڕێگاکانی وانەوتنەوە کە لە پۆلدا بەکاردەهێنریت
□ هەمیشە   □ زۆرجار   □ هەندێک جار   □ بەکەمی   □ هەرگیز

</div>

ز. ڕوون کردنەوەی چەمك وبابەتە زەحمەتەکان

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ح. پوختەکردن و کورتکردنەوەی ئەو بابەتانەی کە پێشتر باسکراون

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

گ. هەڵسەنگاندنی قوتابیان

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ی. گاڵتەکردن لەگەڵ قوتابیان

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ک. یارمەتیدانی قوتابیان تا زیاتر هەست بە ئاسودەیی و دڵنیایی بکەن

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ل. پێدانی پێشنیار دەربارەی ئەوەی چۆن بە شێوەیەکی کاریگەرترو باشتر فێرین

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

م. پێدانی پێشنیار دەربارەی ئەوەی چۆن بە شێوەیەکی کاریگەرترو باشتر بە ئینگلیزی قسە
بکەن

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ن. پێدانی تێبینی و ڕەخنە و پێشنیار (feedback) بۆ قوتابیان

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

س. بەڕێوەبردنی پۆل

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ع. پێدانی زانیاری کارگێری (وەکو ڕێنمایی وانە، ئاگاداری، کاتی تاقیکردنەوەکان و دواموڵەت
بۆ گەڕاندنەوەی واجبەکان، ئامادەبوون لە قوتابخانە، هتد)

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ف. قسەکردن دەربارەی تاقیکردنەوەکان و واجبی ماڵەوە

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ص. بۆ ئاڵ و گۆڕکردن و پێشنیارکردنی زانیاری پێش ڕاهێنانەکان، وەکو نوسین یان
خوێندنەوە

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ق. وەرگێڕانی دەقێک لە ئینگلیزیەوە بۆ زمانی کوردی

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

لە چ حاڵەتێکی تردا پێت وایە پێت وایە **مامۆستایان** دەتوانن زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزیدا
بەکاربێنن؟

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

.   _____

٦. **قوتابیان** دەتوانن زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزی بەکاربهێنن بۆ مەبەستی:

أ. قسە کردن لە کاتی چالاکیەکانی کاری دوو کەسی یان بە کۆمەڵ

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ب. پرسیارکردنی (چۆن بە ئینگلیزی بڵێین'........؟')

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ج. وەرگێڕانی وشەیەکی ئینگلیزی بۆ کوردی بۆ ئەوەی پیشانی بدەن کە لێی تێدەگەن

☐ هەمیشە   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

د. وەرگێڕانی دەقێکی ئینگلیزی بۆ کوردی بۆ ئەوەی پیشانی بدەن کە لێی تێدەگەن

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ه. بۆ ئاڵ و گۆڕکردن و پێشنیارکردنی زانیاری پێش ڕاهێنانەکان، وەکو نوسین یان خوێندنەوه

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

و. قسەکردن دەربارەی تاقیکردنەوەکان و واجبی ماڵەوه

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ز. گفتوگۆکردن دەربارەی ڕێگاکانی وانەوتنەوەی که له پۆلدا بەکاردەهێنرێت

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ح. پشکنین و دڵنیابوون له تێگەیشتن (بۆ نمونه: تێگەیشتن له خوێندنەوه، گوێگرتن یان ڕێزمان)

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

له چ حاڵەتێکی تردا پێت وایه قوتابییان دەتوانن زمانی کوردی له وانەی ئینگلیزیدا بەکاربێنێنیت؟

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____ .

٧. من پێم باشه که زمانی کوردی بەکاربهێنم له وانەی ئینگلیزیم دا چونکه:
أ. زۆر ئاسودەتره

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ب. کەمتر هەست به شڵەژان دەکەم

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ج. کەمتر هەست به سەرلێشێواوی دەکەم

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

د. وام لێدەکات زیاتر هەست به دڵنیایی و متمانەیی بکەم

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ه. هانم دەدات

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

و. کاتم بۆ دەگەڕێنێتەوه

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ز. یارمەتیم دەدات له چەمك و بابەتی نوێ باشتر تێبگەم

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

ح. یارمەتیم دەدات له وشەی نوێ باشتر تێبگەم

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

گ. یارمەتیم دەدات ئاسانتر وشەکانم بەبیربێتەوه

☐ هەمیشه   ☐ زۆرجار   ☐ هەندێک جار   ☐ بەکەمی   ☐ هەرگیز

بۆ چ هۆکارێکی تر زمانی کوردی له وانەی ئینگلیزی بەکاردەهێنیت؟

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____ .

Appendix C: Teacher Questionnaire (English and Kurdish)

Dear Teachers,

I am a master student and I am currently doing my thesis on the use of Kurdish in English classes. This questionnaire aims to identify your attitudes toward the use of Kurdish in English classes and reasons behind using it. It is very important that you express your opinions realistically. Your identity and individual responses will be kept confidential and will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your cooperation.

مامۆستای ئازیز،

من خوێندکاری ماستەرم و ئێستا خەریکی نوسینی ماستەرنامەکەمم دەربارەی بەکارهێنانی زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزیدا. مەبەست لەم ڕاپرسیە دیاریکردنی هەڵوێستی ئێوەیە بەرامبەر بەکارهێنانی زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزی وە هەروەها هۆکارەکانی بەکارهێنانی زمانی کوردی. زۆر گرنگە کە ڕاوبۆچوونی ڕاستەقینەی خۆت دەربڕی. ناوی تۆ وەهەروەها وەڵامە تایبەتیەکانت بە نهێنی دەپارێزرێن و تەنها بۆ مەبەستی توێژینەوە بەکاردەهێنرێت.

سوپاس بۆ هاوکاری کردنت.

Sangar Khoshnaw

MA student

Eastern Mediterranean University, Cyprus

Faculty of Education

English Language Teaching Department

sangar2006@hotmail.com

0750 452 6477

CONSENT FORM

I have read and understood the purpose of this study and how my responses will be used. Therefore, I agree to participate in this study.

فۆرمی ڕازیبوون

من مەبەستی ئەم توێژینەوەیەم خوێندەوە و لێی تێگەیشتم وە زانیم کە وەڵامەکانم چۆن بەکاردەهێنرێن. بۆیە ڕازیم کە بەشداری لەم توێژینەوەیە بکەم.

Name – Surname: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

PART ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<div dir="rtl">

بەشی یەکەم: زانیاری کەسی

</div>

Please, put a tick (☑) in the appropriate box.

<div dir="rtl">

تکایە نیشانەی ڕاست (☑) لەناو چوارگۆشەی گونجاو دابنێ.

</div>

1. **Gender**: ☐ Male   ☐ Female

2. **Age**: _____ (Please specify)

3. **Nationality**: ☐ Kurd   ☐ Arab   ☐ Other, please specify: _____

4. **First Language**: ☐ Kurdish   ☐ Arabic   ☐ Other, please specify:
   _____

5. **How many years have you been teaching English?** _____
   (Please specify)

6. **Which grade(s) are you currently teaching?** _____ (Please specify)

7. **What is your last academic qualification?**

8. ☐ Diploma   ☐ Bachelor   ☐ Master   ☐   Other,   please   specify:
   _____

9. **What is your field of university study?** _____ (Please specify)

PART TWO: THE QUESTIONNAIRE

<div dir="rtl">

بەشی دووەم: ڕاپرسیەکە

</div>

Please, put a tick (☑) in the appropriate box.

<div dir="rtl">

تکایە نیشانەی ڕاست (☑) لەناو چوارگۆشەی گونجاو دابنێ.

</div>

1. **Should the teacher use Kurdish in English classes?**

<div dir="rtl">

١. ئایا پێویستە مامۆستا زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزی بەکاربهێنێت؟

</div>

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

2. **Should the students use Kurdish in English classes?**

<div dir="rtl">

٢. ئایا پێویستە قوتابی زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزی بەکاربهێنێت؟

</div>

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

3. **To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you teach this language?**

<div dir="rtl">

٣. تا چ ڕادەیەک بەکارهێنانی زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزیدا یارمەتیت دەدات بۆ ووتنەوەی زمانی ئینگلیزی؟

</div>

   ☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

4. **To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps your students learn this language?**

<div dir="rtl">

٤. تا چ ڕادەیەک بەکارهێنانی زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزیدا یارمەتی قوتابیەکانت دەدات بۆ فێربوونی زمانی ئینگلیزی؟

</div>

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

5. How often do you think Kurdish should be used in your English classes?

٥. پێت وایه تا چ ڕاددەیەك زمانی کوردی پێویسته بەکاربهێنرێت له وانەی ئینگلیزییەکەتدا؟

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

6. English <u>teachers</u> can use Kurdish in their classes to:

٦. <u>مامۆستایانی</u> ئینگلیزی دەتوانن زمانی کوردی بەکاربێنن له وانەکانیان بۆ مەبەستی:

A. Explain new words

أ. ڕوون کردنەوەی وشەی نوێ

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

B. Explain grammar

ب. ڕوون کردنەوەی ڕێزمان

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

C. Explain the similarities and differences between Kurdish and English

ج. ڕوون کردنەوەی لێکچوون و جیاوازییەکانی نێوان زمانی کوردی و زمانی ئینگلیزی

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

D. Give instructions for activities, tasks, homework, etc.

د. پێدانی ڕێنمایی بۆ ڕاهێنان، ئەرک، وه ئەرکی ماڵەوه.........هتد

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

E. Check for comprehension (e.g. reading, listening, or grammar comprehension)

ه. پشکنین و دڵنیابوون له تێگەیشتنی قوتابیان (بۆ نموونه: تێگەیشتن له خوێندنەوه، گوێگرتن یان ڕێزمان)

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

F. Discuss the teaching methods used in class

و. گفتوگۆکردن دەربارەی ڕێگاکانی وانەوتنەوەی که له پۆلدا بەکاردەهێنرێت

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

G. Explain difficult concepts or topics

ز. ڕوون کردنەوەی چەمك وبابەته زەحمەتەکان

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

H. Summarize material already covered

ح. پوختەکردن و کورتکردنەوەی ئەو بابەتانەی که پێشتر باسکراون

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

I. Assess students' performance

گ. هەڵسەنگاندنی قوتابیان

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

J. Joke around with students

ی. گاڵتەکردن لەگەڵ قوتابیان

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

K. Help students feel more comfortable and confident

ک. یارمەتیدانی قوتابیان تا زیاتر هەست به ئاسودەیی و دڵنیایی بکەن

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

L. Give suggestions on how to learn more effectively

ل. پێدانی پێشنیار دەربارەی ئەوەی چۆن به شێوەیەکی کاریگەرترو باشتر فێربن

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

M. Give suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively

م. پێدانی پێشنیار دەربارەی ئەوەی چۆن بە شێوەیەکی کاریگەرترو باشتر بە ئینگلیزی قسە بکەن

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

N. Give feedback to students

ن. پێدانی تێبینی و ڕەخنە و پێشنیار (feedback) بۆ قوتابیان

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

O. Manage the class

س. بەڕێوەبردنی پۆل

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

P. Give administrative information (course policies, announcements, deadlines, attendance, etc.)

ع. پێدانی زانیاری کارگێری (وەکو ڕێنمایی وانە، ئاگاداری، کاتی تاقیکردنەوەکان و دواموڵەت بۆ گەڕاندنەوەی واجبەکان، ئامادەبوون لە قوتابخانە، هتد)

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

Q. Talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments

ف. قسەکردن دەربارەی تاقیکردنەوەکان و واجبی ماڵەوە

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

R. Do brainstorming prior to an activity, e.g. writing or reading

ص. بۆ ناڵ و گۆڕکردن و پێشنیارکردنی زانیاری پێش ڕاهێنانەکان، وەکو نوسین یان خوێندنەوە

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

S. Translate a text from English to Kurdish

ق. وەرگێرانی دەقێک لە ئینگلیزیەوە بۆ زمانی کوردی

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

In what other situations do you think <u>teachers</u> can use Kurdish in English classes?

لە چ حاڵەتێکی تردا پێت وایە <u>مامۆستایان</u> دەتوانن زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزیدا بەکاربێنن؟

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____.

7. **<u>Students</u> can use Kurdish in English classes to:**

٧. <u>قوتابیان</u> دەتوانن زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزی بەکاربهێنن بۆ مەبەستی:

A. Talk during pair-work or group-work activities

أ. قسە کردن لە کاتی چالاکیەکانی کاری دوو کەسی یان بە کۆمەڵ

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

B. Ask "how do we say '…' in English?"

ب. پرسیارکردنی (چۆن بە ئینگلیزی بڵێین'........'؟)

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

C. Translate an English word into Kurdish to show they understand it

ج. وەرگێرانی وشەیەکی ئینگلیزی بۆ کوردی بۆ ئەوەی پیشانی بدەن کە لێی تێدەگەن

☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

D. Translate a text from English to Kurdish to show they understand it

د. وەرگێرانی دەقێکی ئینگلیزی بۆ کوردی بۆ ئەوەی پیشانی بدەن کە لێی تێدەگەن

☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

E. Do brainstorming prior to an activity (e.g. writing or reading)

ه. بۆ ئاڵ و گۆڕکردن و پێشنیارکردنی زانیاری پێش ڕاهێنانەکان، وەکو نوسین یان خوێندنەوە

☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

F. Talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments

و. قسەکردن دەربارەی تاقیکردنەوەکان و واجبی ماڵەوە

☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

G. Discuss the teaching methods used in class

ز. گفتوگۆکردن دەربارەی ڕێگاکانی وانەوتنەوەی کە لە پۆلدا بەکاردەهێنرێت

☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

H. Check for comprehension   (e.g. reading, listening, or grammar comprehension)

ح. پشکنین و دڵنیابوون لە تێگەیشتن (بۆ نمونە: تێگەیشتن لە خوێندنەوە، گوێگرتن یان ڕێزمان)

☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

In what other situations do you think <u>students</u> can use Kurdish in English classes?

لە چ حاڵەتێکی تردا پێت وایە <u>قوتابیان</u> دەتوانن زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزیدا بەکاربێنێت؟

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____ .

8. **<u>I</u> prefer to use Kurdish in <u>my</u> English classes because:**

۸. <u>من</u> پێم باشە کە زمانی کوردی بەکاربهێنم لە وانەی ئینگلیزیم دا چونکە:

A. It's more comfortable

أ. زۆر ئاسودەترە

☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

B. I am less tense

ب. کەمتر هەست بە شڵەژان دەکەم

☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

C. I feel less lost

ج. کەمتر هەست بە سەرلێشێواوی دەکەم

☐ Always   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never

D. It makes me feel more confident and secure

د. وام لێدەکات زیاتر هەست بە دڵنیایی و متمانەیی بکەم

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

E. It encourages/motivates me

<div dir="rtl">

هـ. هانم دەدات

</div>

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

F. It saves time

<div dir="rtl">

و. کاتم بۆ دەگەڕێنێتەوە

</div>

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

G. It helps my students understand difficult concepts and topics better

<div dir="rtl">

ز. یارمەتی قوتابیەکانم دەدات لە چەمك و بابەتی نوێ باشتر تێبگەن

</div>

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

H. It helps me teach difficult concepts and topics better

<div dir="rtl">

ح. یارمەتیم دەدات باشتر چەمك و بابەتی نوێ بڵێمەوە

</div>

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

I. It helps my students understand new vocabulary better

<div dir="rtl">

گ. یارمەتی قوتابیەکانم دەدات لە وشەی نوێ باشتر تێبگەن

</div>

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

J. It helps me teach new vocabulary better

<div dir="rtl">

ی. یارمەتیم دەدات باشتر وشەی نوێ ڕوون بکەمەوە

</div>

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

K. It helps my students remember vocabulary items more easily

<div dir="rtl">

ک. یارمەتی قوتابیەکانم دەدات ئاسانتر وشەکانیان بەبیربێنێتەوە

</div>

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

For what other reasons do <u>you</u> use Kurdish in your English classes?

<div dir="rtl">

بۆ چ هۆکارێکی ترِ قۆ زمانی کوردی لە وانەی ئینگلیزی بەکاردەهێنیت؟

</div>

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____.

Appendix D: Interview Questions for Teachers

1. Should teachers use Kurdish in English classes? Why or why not?

2. Should students use Kurdish in English classes? Why or why not?

3. How often do you think Kurdish should be used in English classes?

4. When do you think English teachers can use Kurdish in their classes?

5. When do you think students can use Kurdish in English classes?

6. To what extent do you yourself use Kurdish in your English classes?

7. To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you teach this language?

8. To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps your students learn this language?

9. Why do you prefer to use Kurdish in your English classes?

10. For what reasons do you think your students use Kurdish in your class?

11. How would you feel if the Ministry of Education prohibited the use of Kurdish in English classes? More specifically, do you think it would create problems and difficulties in your teaching? And how would you deal with these problems and difficulties? What techniques would you use to deal with these problems?

12. Would you like to add or share with me further ideas or experiences about the use of Kurdish in English classes?

Appendix E: Classroom Observation Checklists

School Name:
Teacher's Name:
Gender:
Level:
Class:
Unit/Lesson:
Topic:
Date/Time:
Number of students:
Gender of students:

Checklist 1

Occasions of __teachers'__ use of Kurdish	1	2	3	4	5	6
Explaining new words						
Explaining grammar						
Explaining the similarities and differences between Kurdish and English						
Giving instructions for activities, tasks, homework, etc.						
Checking for comprehension						
Discussing the teaching methods used in class						
Explaining difficult concepts or topics						
Summarizing material already covered						
Assessing students' performance						
Joking around with students						
Helping students feel more comfortable and confident						
Giving suggestions on how to learn more effectively						
Giving suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively						
Giving feedback to students						
Managing the class						
Giving administrative information						

Talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments						
Doing brainstorming prior to an activity						
Translating a text from English to Kurdish						
Others occasions: _____ _____ _____ _____ _____						

Checklist 2

Occasions of <u>students'</u> use of Kurdish	1	2	3	4	5	6
Talking during pair-work or group-work activities						
Asking "how do we say '…' in English"						
Translating an English word into Kurdish to show they understand it						
Translating a text from English to Kurdish to show they understand it						
Doing brainstorming prior to an activity						
Talking about tests, quizzes, and other assignments						
Discussing the teaching methods used in class						
Checking for comprehension						
Others occasions: _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____						

202

Appendix F: Letter of Support from Ministry of Education

<table>
<tr>
<td>إقليم كوردستان - العراق
مجلــــس الـــوزراء
وزارة التـــــربية
المديرية العامة لتربية اربيل
مديرية تربية مركز اربيل
التخطيط</td>
<td>Kurdistan Regional Government
Council of Ministers
Ministry of Education</td>
<td>هەرێمی کوردستــــان - عێراق
ئـــەنجومـــەنی وەزیـــــران
وەزارەتـــــی پـــــەروەردە
بەرێوەبەرایەتی گشتی.پ.هەولێر
بەرێوەبەرایەتی پەروەردەی ناوەندی هەولێر
پلان دانان</td>
</tr>
</table>

No:

Date: /   /2014

ژمارە: ٧٧٥ ه

ریکەوت: ٧ / ٢ / ٢٠١٤   نەورۆز /٢٧١٤ کوردی

==

یۆ / گشت قوتابخانەکانی سنوری پەروەردەکەمان

بابەت / ئاسانکاری

هاوکاری و ئاسانکاری بکەن بۆ بەرێز { سەنگەر اسماعیل حمد } قوتـابی خوێنـدنی بـالا / لـه وولاتـی قـبرس بـۆ ئه نجامـدانی ماستەرنامەکەی بۆ وەرگرتنی زانیاری بەمەبەستی تۆیژینەوەکەی .

لەگەڵ ریزماندا ......

حمدامین احمد محمدامین

بەرێوەبەری پەروەردە

وێنەیەک بۆ //

* پلان دانان .

Kurdistan Region - Erbil
Phone :

E- mail :info@kurdistan-moe.org

ل . پلان دانان ...... علی عباس صالح

203

Appendix G: Detailed Results of Q1-Q6 in the Student

Questionnaire by Each Class

Questions	Class 1		Class 2		Class 3		Class 4	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Q1	2.69	0.76	2.97	0.93	3.12	0.99	3.27	1.20
Q2	2.48	1.06	2.63	1.07	2.88	1.05	3.14	0.99
Q3	2.62	1.32	3.60	1.13	3.53	1.13	3.64	1.05
Q4	2.83	0.97	2.83	1.18	3.18	1.13	3.09	0.87
Q5A	3.76	0.79	3.67	0.92	4.41	0.87	4.55	0.60
Q5B	3.41	0.95	3.67	1.06	4.06	1.03	3.91	0.81
Q5C	3.21	1.11	3.43	0.97	3.71	1.16	4.05	0.79
Q5D	3.83	1.14	3.73	1.29	4.00	1.32	4.14	0.89
Q5E	3.69	1.29	4.03	1.16	4.59	0.71	4.00	0.82
Q5F	3.28	1.10	3.93	1.08	3.76	1.35	3.45	0.80
Q5G	3.66	1.11	4.07	0.87	4.18	1.13	4.59	0.59
Q5H	3.10	0.94	3.27	1.20	3.65	1.22	3.95	0.90
Q5I	3.72	1.33	3.63	1.30	3.88	1.27	3.95	1.13
Q5J	2.83	1.34	2.57	0.90	2.71	1.31	3.09	0.87
Q5K	4.07	0.88	3.93	1.02	4.24	0.75	4.18	1.05
Q5L	4.10	1.15	3.67	1.06	4.24	0.83	4.18	0.80
Q5M	4.48	0.79	4.27	0.83	4.06	1.09	4.27	0.83
Q5N	3.55	1.27	3.17	1.02	3.71	1.05	3.55	1.01
Q5O	3.34	1.42	3.83	1.32	3.76	1.48	3.32	1.21
Q5P	3.76	1.19	4.33	0.80	4.24	0.83	3.91	1.07
Q5Q	4.00	1.00	4.10	0.96	4.00	1.00	3.91	0.92
Q5R	3.79	1.18	3.53	1.07	3.82	1.02	3.86	0.99
Q5S	3.86	1.06	3.23	1.19	4.12	0.99	4.41	0.67
Q5 Total	3.66	0.44	3.69	0.49	3.95	0.58	3.96	0.42
Q6A	3.48	1.15	3.13	1.43	3.41	1.06	3.77	0.97
Q6B	2.90	1.21	3.37	1.19	4.00	0.94	3.50	1.34
Q6C	3.48	1.09	4.17	0.83	4.65	0.70	4.36	1.00
Q6D	4.00	1.07	3.67	0.99	4.59	0.62	4.09	0.92
Q6E	3.52	1.06	3.33	1.21	4.12	0.78	3.18	1.01
Q6F	3.38	1.32	3.93	0.98	4.59	0.87	3.55	1.26
Q6G	2.97	1.35	3.57	0.86	3.94	1.20	3.55	0.91
Q6H	3.62	1.02	4.03	1.00	4.12	1.27	3.59	0.85
Q6 Total	3.42	0.60	3.65	0.64	4.18	0.58	3.70	0.63
TOTAL Q1-Q6	**3.46**	**0.41**	**3.59**	**0.48**	**3.91**	**0.51**	**3.81**	**0.43**

Note: M (Mean): 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

Appendix H: The Differences Between the Attitudes of Teachers and Students Toward the Use of Kurdish in English Classes.

Questions	Mean	
	Teachers	Students
Should the teacher use Kurdish in English classes?	2.50	2.98
Should the students use Kurdish in English classes?	2.25	2.74
To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you teach this language?	3.50	N/A
To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps your students learn this language?	3.75	N/A
To what extent using Kurdish in your English classes helps you learn this language?	N/A	3.31
How often do you think Kurdish should be used in your English classes?	1.75	2.95
English teachers can use Kurdish in their classes to:		
A. Explain new words	2.75	4.02
B. Explain grammar	3.25	3.71
C. Explain the similarities and differences between Kurdish and English	2.75	3.55
D. Give instructions for activities, tasks, homework, etc.	2.75	3.90
E. Check for comprehension (e.g. reading, listening, or grammar comprehension)	3.00	4.02
F. Discuss the teaching methods used in class	4.00	3.60
G. Explain difficult concepts or topics	3.25	4.08
H. Summarize material already covered	3.00	3.44
I. Assess students' performance	2.25	3.78
J. Joke around with students	2.50	2.79
K. Help students feel more comfortable and confident	3.50	4.08
L. Give suggestions on how to learn more effectively	4.00	4.01
M. Give suggestions on how to communicate in English more effectively	3.50	4.30
N. Give feedback to students	3.00	3.46
O: Manage the class	2.75	3.56
P. Give administrative information (course policies, announcements, deadlines, attendance, etc.)	3.75	4.05
Q. Talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments	3.00	4.01
R. Do brainstorming prior to an activity, e.g. writing or reading	3.00	3.73
S. Translate a text from English to Kurdish	4.50	3.84
A-S (Total)	3.18	3.79

Note: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = Sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

Appendix H: (continued)

Questions	Mean	
	Teachers	Students
Students can use Kurdish in English classes to …		
A. Talk during pair-work or group-work activities	3.75	3.43
B. Ask "how do we say '…' in English?"	3.25	3.37
C. Translate an English word into Kurdish to show they understand it	4.00	4.09
D. Translate a text from English to Kurdish to show they understand it	3.75	4.02
E. Do brainstorming prior to an activity (e.g. writing or reading)	4.00	3.49
F. Talk about tests, quizzes, and other assignments	4.00	3.80
G. Discuss the teaching methods used in class	4.50	3.45
H. Check for comprehension (e.g. reading, listening, or grammar comprehension)	3.50	3.83
A-H (Total)	3.84	3.68
OVERALL TOTAL	**3.28**	**3.66**

Note: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = Sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

Appendix I: Detailed Results of Students' Attitudes Based on Level of Study

Questions	School Grade	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean
Q1	7	59	2.83	.85	.11
	11	39	3.21	1.11	.18
Q2	7	59	2.56	1.06	.14
	11	39	3.03	1.01	.16
Q3	7	59	3.12	1.31	.17
	11	39	3.59	1.07	.17
Q4	7	59	2.83	1.07	.14
	11	39	3.13	.98	.16
Q5A	7	59	3.71	.85	.11
	11	39	4.49	.72	.12
Q5B	7	59	3.54	1.01	.13
	11	39	3.97	.90	.14
Q5C	7	59	3.32	1.04	.14
	11	39	3.90	.97	.15
Q5D	7	59	3.78	1.20	.16
	11	39	4.08	1.09	.17
Q5E	7	59	3.86	1.22	.16
	11	39	4.26	.82	.13
Q5F	7	59	3.61	1.13	.15
	11	39	3.59	1.07	.17
Q5G	7	59	3.86	1.01	.13
	11	39	4.41	.88	.14
Q5H	7	59	3.19	1.07	.14
	11	39	3.82	1.05	.17
Q5I	7	59	3.68	1.31	.17
	11	39	3.92	1.18	.19
Q5J	7	59	2.69	1.13	.15
	11	39	2.92	1.09	.17
Q5K	7	59	4.00	.95	.12
	11	39	4.21	.92	.15
Q5L	7	59	3.88	1.12	.15
	11	39	4.21	.80	.13
Q5M	7	59	4.37	.81	.11
	11	39	4.18	.94	.15
Q5N	7	59	3.36	1.16	.15
	11	39	3.62	1.02	.16
Q5O	7	59	3.59	1.38	.18
	11	39	3.51	1.34	.21
Q5P	7	59	4.05	1.04	.14
	11	39	4.05	.97	.16

Note: Mean: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

Appendix I: (continued)

Questions	School Grade	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean
Q5Q	7	59	4.05	.97	.13
	11	39	3.95	.94	.15
Q5R	7	59	3.66	1.12	.15
	11	39	3.85	.99	.16
Q5S	7	59	3.54	1.16	.15
	11	39	4.28	0.83	.13
Q5 Total	7	59	3.67	.47	.06
	11	39	3.96	.49	.08
Q6A	7	59	3.31	1.30	.17
	11	39	3.62	1.02	.16
Q6B	7	59	3.14	1.21	.16
	11	39	3.72	1.19	.19
Q6C	7	59	3.83	1.02	.13
	11	39	4.49	.89	.14
Q6D	7	59	3.83	1.04	.13
	11	39	4.31	.83	.13
Q6E	7	59	3.42	1.13	.15
	11	39	3.59	1.02	.16
Q6F	7	59	3.66	1.18	.15
	11	39	4.00	1.21	.19
Q6G	7	59	3.27	1.16	.15
	11	39	3.72	1.05	.17
Q6H	7	59	3.83	1.02	.13
	11	39	3.82	1.07	.17
Q6 Total	7	59	3.54	.63	.08
	11	39	3.91	.65	.10
TOTAL Q1-Q6	**7**	**59**	**3.53**	**.45**	**.06**
	11	**39**	**3.85**	**.47**	**.07**

Note: Mean: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

Appendix J: Detailed Results of Independent T-Test for Students'

Attitudes Based on Level of Study

Questions		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-t)	MD	SED
Q1	Equal variances assumed	4.33	.040	-1.89	96.00	.062	-0.37	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.79	67.10	.077	-0.37	0.21
Q2	Equal variances assumed	1.40	.239	-2.18	96.00	.032	-0.47	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.19	83.81	.031	-0.47	0.21
Q3	Equal variances assumed	5.77	.018	-1.87	96.00	.065	-0.47	0.25
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.95	91.81	.055	-0.47	0.24
Q4	Equal variances assumed	0.31	.579	-1.40	96.00	.166	-0.30	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.42	86.41	.159	-0.30	0.21
Q5A	Equal variances assumed	1.56	.215	-4.68	96.00	.000	-0.78	0.17
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.84	90.20	.000	-0.78	0.16
Q5B	Equal variances assumed	3.31	.072	-2.17	96.00	.033	-0.43	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.22	87.38	.029	-0.43	0.20
Q5C	Equal variances assumed	1.39	.241	-2.75	96.00	.007	-0.58	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.80	85.58	.006	-0.58	0.21
Q5D	Equal variances assumed	1.41	.238	-1.24	96.00	.217	-0.30	0.24
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.27	87.19	.208	-0.30	0.23
Q5E	Equal variances assumed	5.06	.027	-1.76	96.00	.082	-0.39	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.90	95.98	.060	-0.39	0.21

Note: Sig. (2-t) = Sig. (2-tailed), MD = Mean Difference, SED = Std. Error Difference

Appendix J: (continued)

Questions		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-t)	MD	SED
Q5F	Equal variances assumed	0.17	.681	0.09	96.00	.929	0.02	0.23
	Equal variances not assumed			0.09	84.60	.928	0.02	0.23
Q5G	Equal variances assumed	0.77	.382	-2.76	96.00	.007	-0.55	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.84	88.74	.006	-0.55	0.19
Q5H	Equal variances assumed	0.00	.997	-2.89	96.00	.005	-0.63	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.90	82.91	.005	-0.63	0.22
Q5I	Equal variances assumed	0.75	.387	-0.95	96.00	.347	-0.25	0.26
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.97	87.11	.337	-0.25	0.25
Q5J	Equal variances assumed	1.25	.267	-0.99	96.00	.324	-0.23	0.23
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.00	83.95	.320	-0.23	0.23
Q5K	Equal variances assumed	0.62	.433	-1.06	96.00	.292	-0.21	0.19
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.07	82.97	.290	-0.21	0.19
Q5L	Equal variances assumed	3.13	.080	-1.57	96.00	.121	-0.32	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.67	95.29	.098	-0.32	0.19
Q5M	Equal variances assumed	0.02	.891	1.09	96.00	.280	0.19	0.18
	Equal variances not assumed			1.05	72.61	.296	0.19	0.18
Q5N	Equal variances assumed	1.60	.210	-1.14	96.00	.257	-0.26	0.23
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.17	88.44	.245	-0.26	0.22
Q5O	Equal variances assumed	0.08	.782	0.29	96.00	.775	0.08	0.28
	Equal variances not assumed			0.29	83.32	.774	0.08	0.28

Note: Sig. (2-t) = Sig. (2-tailed), MD = Mean Difference, SED = Std. Error Difference

Appendix J: (continued)

Questions		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-t)	MD	SED
Q5P	Equal variances assumed	0.32	.576	0.00	96.00	.998	0.00	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			0.00	85.33	.998	0.00	0.21
Q5Q	Equal variances assumed	0.08	.774	0.52	96.00	.608	0.10	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			0.52	83.16	.606	0.10	0.20
Q5R	Equal variances assumed	3.79	.055	-0.84	96.00	.405	-0.19	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.86	88.42	.392	-0.19	0.22
Q5S	Equal variances assumed	8.11	.005	-3.44	96.00	.001	-0.74	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.68	95.48	.000	-0.74	0.20
Q5 Total	Equal variances assumed	0.04	.844	-2.92	96.00	.004	-0.29	0.10
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.89	78.65	.005	-0.29	0.10
Q6A	Equal variances assumed	5.83	.018	-1.26	96.00	.212	-0.31	0.25
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.32	93.30	.190	-0.31	0.24
Q6B	Equal variances assumed	0.03	.859	-2.35	96.00	.021	-0.58	0.25
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.35	82.41	.021	-0.58	0.25
Q6C	Equal variances assumed	0.63	.428	-3.29	96.00	.001	-0.66	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.38	89.05	.001	-0.66	0.19
Q6D	Equal variances assumed	4.79	.031	-2.41	96.00	.018	-0.48	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.52	92.31	.014	-0.48	0.19
Q6E	Equal variances assumed	1.13	.291	-0.74	96.00	.462	-0.17	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.76	87.29	.452	-0.17	0.22

Note: Sig. (2-t) = Sig. (2-tailed), MD = Mean Difference, SED = Std. Error Difference

Appendix J: (continued)

Questions		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-t)	MD	SED
Q6F	Equal variances assumed	0.08	.775	-1.37	96.00	.173	-0.34	0.25
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.37	80.04	.176	-0.34	0.25
Q6G	Equal variances assumed	0.84	.363	-1.94	96.00	.055	-0.45	0.23
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.98	86.84	.051	-0.45	0.23
Q6H	Equal variances assumed	0.72	.398	0.05	96.00	.963	0.01	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			0.05	78.57	.963	0.01	0.22
Q6 Total	Equal variances assumed	0.29	.593	-2.84	96.00	.006	-0.37	0.13
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.82	79.58	.006	-0.37	0.13
TOTAL Q1-Q6	**Equal variances assumed**	**0.12**	**.727**	**-3.44**	**96.00**	**.001**	**-0.32**	**0.09**
	Equal variances not assumed			**-3.42**	**79.22**	**.001**	**-0.32**	**0.09**

Note: Sig. (2-t) = Sig. (2-tailed), MD = Mean Difference, SED = Std. Error Difference

Appendix K: Detailed Results of Students' Attitudes Based on

Gender

Questions	School Grade	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean
Q1	Male	46	2.85	0.87	0.13
	Female	52	3.10	1.05	0.15
Q2	Male	46	2.63	1.06	0.16
	Female	52	2.85	1.06	0.15
Q3	Male	46	2.96	1.32	0.19
	Female	52	3.62	1.09	0.15
Q4	Male	46	2.96	1.03	0.15
	Female	52	2.94	1.06	0.15
Q5A	Male	46	4.00	0.87	0.13
	Female	52	4.04	0.91	0.13
Q5B	Male	46	3.65	1.02	0.15
	Female	52	3.77	0.96	0.13
Q5C	Male	46	3.39	1.15	0.17
	Female	52	3.69	0.94	0.13
Q5D	Male	46	3.89	1.20	0.18
	Female	52	3.90	1.14	0.16
Q5E	Male	46	4.02	1.18	0.17
	Female	52	4.02	1.02	0.14
Q5F	Male	46	3.46	1.21	0.18
	Female	52	3.73	0.99	0.14
Q5G	Male	46	3.85	1.14	0.17
	Female	52	4.29	0.80	0.11
Q5H	Male	46	3.30	1.07	0.16
	Female	52	3.56	1.13	0.16
Q5I	Male	46	3.78	1.30	0.19
	Female	52	3.77	1.23	0.17
Q5J	Male	46	2.78	1.32	0.19
	Female	52	2.79	0.92	0.13
Q5K	Male	46	4.13	0.83	0.12
	Female	52	4.04	1.03	0.14
Q5L	Male	46	4.15	1.03	0.15
	Female	52	3.88	0.98	0.14
Q5M	Male	46	4.33	0.92	0.14
	Female	52	4.27	0.82	0.11
Q5N	Male	46	3.61	1.18	0.17
	Female	52	3.33	1.02	0.14
Q5O	Male	46	3.50	1.44	0.21
	Female	52	3.62	1.29	0.18
Q5P	Male	46	3.93	1.08	0.16
	Female	52	4.15	0.94	0.13

Note: Mean: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

Appendix K: (continued)

Questions	School Grade	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean
Q5Q	Male	46	4.00	0.99	0.15
	Female	52	4.02	0.94	0.13
Q5R	Male	46	3.80	1.11	0.16
	Female	52	3.67	1.04	0.14
Q5S	Male	46	3.96	1.03	0.15
	Female	52	3.73	1.16	0.16
Q5 Total	Male	46	3.77	0.51	0.08
	Female	52	3.80	0.48	0.07
Q6A	Male	46	3.46	1.11	0.16
	Female	52	3.40	1.29	0.18
Q6B	Male	46	3.30	1.23	0.18
	Female	52	3.42	1.24	0.17
Q6C	Male	46	3.91	1.11	0.16
	Female	52	4.25	0.91	0.13
Q6D	Male	46	4.22	0.96	0.14
	Female	52	3.85	0.98	0.14
Q6E	Male	46	3.74	1.00	0.15
	Female	52	3.27	1.12	0.16
Q6F	Male	46	3.83	1.31	0.19
	Female	52	3.77	1.11	0.15
Q6G	Male	46	3.33	1.37	0.20
	Female	52	3.56	0.87	0.12
Q6H	Male	46	3.80	1.13	0.17
	Female	52	3.85	0.96	0.13
Q6 Total	Male	46	3.70	0.69	0.10
	Female	52	3.67	0.63	0.09
TOTAL Q1-Q6	**Male**	**46**	**3.63**	**0.50**	**0.07**
	Female	**52**	**3.68**	**0.47**	**0.06**

Note: Mean: 1 = Never   2 = Rarely   3 = sometimes   4 = Often   5 = Always

Appendix L: Detailed Results of Independent T-Test for Students'

Attitudes Based on Level of Study

Questions		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-t)	MD	SED
Q1	Equal variances assumed	0.68	.413	-1.26	96.00	.209	-0.25	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.28	95.56	.204	-0.25	0.19
Q2	Equal variances assumed	0.07	.797	-1.01	96.00	.316	-0.22	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.01	94.40	.317	-0.22	0.21
Q3	Equal variances assumed	3.09	.082	-2.71	96.00	.008	-0.66	0.24
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.68	87.59	.009	-0.66	0.25
Q4	Equal variances assumed	0.88	.350	0.07	96.00	.947	0.01	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			0.07	95.03	.946	0.01	0.21
Q5A	Equal variances assumed	0.20	.660	-0.21	96.00	.831	-0.04	0.18
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.21	95.36	.831	-0.04	0.18
Q5B	Equal variances assumed	0.23	.633	-0.59	96.00	.560	-0.12	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.58	93.06	.561	-0.12	0.20
Q5C	Equal variances assumed	4.04	.047	-1.43	96.00	.156	-0.30	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.41	87.30	.162	-0.30	0.21
Q5D	Equal variances assumed	0.81	.371	-0.05	96.00	.958	-0.01	0.24
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.05	93.29	.958	-0.01	0.24
Q5E	Equal variances assumed	1.12	.292	0.01	96.00	.991	0.00	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			0.01	89.46	.991	0.00	0.22

Note: Sig. (2-t) = Sig. (2-tailed), MD = Mean Difference, SED = Std. Error Difference

Appendix L: (continued)

Questions		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-t)	MD	SED
Q5F	Equal variances assumed	3.28	.073	-1.23	96.00	.220	-0.27	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.22	87.40	.226	-0.27	0.22
Q5G	Equal variances assumed	13.05	.000	-2.24	96.00	.027	-0.44	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.20	79.71	.031	-0.44	0.20
Q5H	Equal variances assumed	0.93	.336	-1.14	96.00	.259	-0.25	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.14	95.48	.257	-0.25	0.22
Q5I	Equal variances assumed	0.46	.498	0.05	96.00	.958	0.01	0.26
	Equal variances not assumed			0.05	93.08	.959	0.01	0.26
Q5J	Equal variances assumed	7.87	.006	-0.03	96.00	.979	-0.01	0.23
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.03	78.99	.980	-0.01	0.23
Q5K	Equal variances assumed	2.16	.145	0.48	96.00	.631	0.09	0.19
	Equal variances not assumed			0.49	95.30	.626	0.09	0.19
Q5L	Equal variances assumed	0.00	.979	1.31	96.00	.192	0.27	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			1.31	93.24	.194	0.27	0.20
Q5M	Equal variances assumed	0.10	.759	0.32	96.00	.747	0.06	0.18
	Equal variances not assumed			0.32	90.83	.749	0.06	0.18
Q5N	Equal variances assumed	1.52	.220	1.26	96.00	.209	0.28	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			1.25	89.66	.213	0.28	0.22
Q5O	Equal variances assumed	1.07	.303	-0.42	96.00	.676	-0.12	0.28
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.42	90.90	.678	-0.12	0.28

Note: Sig. (2-t) = Sig. (2-tailed), MD = Mean Difference, SED = Std. Error Difference

Appendix L: (continued)

Questions		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-t)	MD	SED
Q5P	Equal variances assumed	1.55	.216	-1.07	96.00	.286	-0.22	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.06	89.63	.290	-0.22	0.21
Q5Q	Equal variances assumed	0.30	.586	-0.10	96.00	.922	-0.02	0.19
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.10	93.14	.922	-0.02	0.20
Q5R	Equal variances assumed	0.08	.775	0.60	96.00	.547	0.13	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			0.60	92.85	.549	0.13	0.22
Q5S	Equal variances assumed	0.47	.496	1.01	96.00	.313	0.23	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			1.02	95.99	.310	0.23	0.22
Q5 Total	Equal variances assumed	0.11	.743	-0.38	96.00	.704	-0.04	0.10
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.38	92.53	.706	-0.04	0.10
Q6A	Equal variances assumed	1.44	.233	0.22	96.00	.830	0.05	0.24
	Equal variances not assumed			0.22	95.94	.828	0.05	0.24
Q6B	Equal variances assumed	0.07	.786	-0.48	96.00	.636	-0.12	0.25
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.48	94.82	.636	-0.12	0.25
Q6C	Equal variances assumed	2.86	.094	-1.65	96.00	.102	-0.34	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.63	86.85	.106	-0.34	0.21
Q6D	Equal variances assumed	0.00	.969	1.89	96.00	.062	0.37	0.20
	Equal variances not assumed			1.89	94.86	.062	0.37	0.20
Q6E	Equal variances assumed	0.52	.473	2.18	96.00	.032	0.47	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			2.19	96.00	.031	0.47	0.21

Note: Sig. (2-t) = Sig. (2-tailed), MD = Mean Difference, SED = Std. Error Difference

Appendix L: (continued)

Questions		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-t)	MD	SED
Q6F	Equal variances assumed	3.10	.082	0.23	96.00	.816	0.06	0.24
	Equal variances not assumed			0.23	89.05	.818	0.06	0.25
Q6G	Equal variances assumed	14.95	.000	-1.01	96.00	.314	-0.23	0.23
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.99	74.71	.328	-0.23	0.24
Q6H	Equal variances assumed	1.65	.202	-0.20	96.00	.843	-0.04	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.20	88.82	.845	-0.04	0.21
Q6 Total	Equal variances assumed	0.92	.340	0.21	96.00	.836	0.03	0.13
	Equal variances not assumed			0.21	91.47	.837	0.03	0.13
TOTAL Q1-Q6	**Equal variances assumed**	**0.23**	**.634**	**-0.53**	**96.00**	**.595**	**-0.05**	**0.10**
	Equal variances not assumed			**-0.53**	**92.91**	**.596**	**-0.05**	**0.10**

Note: Sig. (2-t) = Sig. (2-tailed), MD = Mean Difference, SED = Std. Error Difference