

**University of Portsmouth  
School of Languages and Applied Linguistics**

**Teachers' and students' language use in foreign language  
classroom: an analysis of the role of L1 in target language  
learning.**

**Lilian Rospel**

**September 2019**

**Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment for the requirements of the MA  
in Applied Linguistics and TESOL degree**

**Word count: 16 317**

**School of Languages and Applied Linguistics****MA Applied Linguistics and TESOL degree****Dissertation submitted as partial requirement for the award of MA in  
Applied Linguistics and TESOL**

**Title:** Teachers' and students' language use in foreign language classroom: an analysis of the role of L1 in target language learning.

**Submitted by:** Lilian Rospel

**Declaration:**

- I hereby declare that this dissertation is substantially my own work;
- I do (please delete as appropriate) consent to my dissertation in this attributed format (not anonymous), subject to final approval by the Board of Examiners, being made available electronically in the Library Dissertation Repository and/or Department/School/Subject Group digital repositories. Dissertations will normally be kept for a maximum of ten years;
- I understand that if I consent, this dissertation will be accessible only to staff and students for reference only;
- This permission may be revoked at any time by e-mailing data-protection@port.ac.uk .

**Signed**      **Lilian Rospel**

**Date**        **5 September 2019**

## **Abstract**

The role of the first language (L1) in second language (L2) or foreign language (FL) learning and teaching has been a controversial issue over many years. Despite the fact that no research has proven that using the L1 in second language learning actually interferes with L2 acquisition, many FL classrooms aim at total exclusion of the L1 and insist on L2-only approach (Macaro, 2001; Levine, 2011). However, often students' first and target language are still used in FL classroom by both students and teachers even if no real pedagogical value is seen in the L1 use. This dissertation examines the L1 use in FL classroom in Estonian basic school. It investigates the beliefs and perceptions of English FL teachers and students about the use of their L1 in FL classroom. It examines the ways L1 is used and whether it is done out of convenience or done purposefully, thus contributing to language learning. It looks at the relationship between the use of L1, L2 and foreign language anxiety (Horwitz, 2001) as an affective variable in L2 learning. The findings of this study indicate that teachers' perceptions and practices of L1 use are generally in line with relevant research in the field, however, some interesting differences emerged regarding students' collaborative interaction, task instructions and classroom management. Findings also showed no positive correlation between the use of L2 and language learning anxiety. Analysis of the data revealed that students acquiring L2 are in favour of L1 use in L2 classroom and benefit most from pre-planned and judicious use of L1, especially at lower levels of proficiency.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Ms Rebecca Hamlet, for her insights, guidance, encouragement and advice she has provided throughout the entire process, responding to my questions and queries so promptly.

Completing this work would have been all the more difficult without the encouragement provided by colleagues and the principal of Haabneeme School. I am indebted to them for their support and for helping me keep things in perspective.

Finally, I would like to thank my children, Lenna-Lee and Mikk, for their understanding and patience in witnessing all of the ups and downs during my research and throughout of my studies. And for keeping things going. This dissertation is dedicated to them.

## Table of contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	3
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	4
<b>Table of contents</b> .....	5
<b>Appendices</b> .....	7
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	8
The research focus.....	8
Definition of key terminology .....	8
Overall aim and objectives.....	9
Research questions .....	10
Overview of methodology .....	10
Rationale.....	10
Role of the researcher .....	11
Organisation of the thesis.....	11
 <b>Chapter 2: Background literature review</b>	13
The debate over the target language and the first language use in EFL classroom .....	13
Beliefs and practices of the L1 – benefits and dangers .....	14
The bilingual approach in EFL .....	18
Language anxiety and its effects on L2 learners .....	21
Summary.....	23
 <b>Chapter 3: The study</b>	24
Subjects .....	24
Method .....	25
 <b>Chapter 4: Results and analysis</b>	26
Research question 1: “If the learners’ L1 is used in ELT, is it done out of convenience or done purposefully, thus contributing to or restricting the language learning?”.....	26

Research question 2: “How do teachers and students perceive the use of L1 in the classroom?” .....	27
Research question 3: Does L1 have an effect on affective variables in language learning; specifically, which is the correlation between using the L1, L2 and language anxiety? .....	36
Summary.....	38
<b>Chapter 5: Discussion</b> .....	39
<b>Chapter 6: Conclusion, recommendations and limitations</b> .....	44
<b>References</b> .....	48

## Appendices

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Summary of classroom observation – personal notes	56
<b>Appendix 2</b>	Students' questionnaire items and main outcomes in percentages	57
<b>Appendix 3</b>	Teachers' questionnaire items and main outcomes in percentages	61
<b>Appendix 4</b>	Group 1 and Group 3 mean scores and standard deviation	64
<b>Appendix 5</b>	Group 1 and Group 3 Independent Samples Test	67
<b>Appendix 6</b>	Group 1 and Group 2 mean scores and standard deviation	72
<b>Appendix 7</b>	Group 1 and Group 2 Independent Samples Test	75
<b>Appendix 8</b>	Group 2 and Group 3 mean scores and standard deviation	80
<b>Appendix 9</b>	Group 2 and Group 3 Independent Samples Test	83
<b>Appendix 10</b>	SLAL Research Ethics Checklist	88
<b>Appendix 11</b>	Ethics forms in English	93
<b>Appendix 12</b>	Ethics forms in Estonian	106

## **CHAPTER 1: Introduction**

Whatever benefits first language use may bring, it is clear that the ultimate goal of a second or foreign language classroom remains the learning of the target language. (Turnbull and Daley-O’Cain, 2009, p. 2)

### **The research focus**

This dissertation focuses on critical examination of existing literature and ideas and concepts that add further understanding of the role of learners’ first language (L1) in the second language (L2) acquisition, an increasingly important area in applied linguistics. Evidence suggests that the use of the L1 can be a powerful tool for learning the L2, however, often little value is seen in the L1 use. Thus, the main aim of this study is to investigate in mutually shared L1 setting whether the L1 is used and if it is used systematically and selectively and how do the language teachers make their decisions regarding their L1 use. It also seeks to examine the perceptions about the use the L1 in the classroom among the students. Therefore, it aims to obtain data which will help to address the use of the L1 in L2 or foreign language (FL) classroom and to provide knowledge that will improve methods and develop informed practice of using the L1 in a language classroom.

### **Definition of key terminology**

In this dissertation learners’ first language is defined as “a person’s mother tongue or the language acquired first. In multilingual communities, however, where a child may gradually shift from the main use of one language to the main use of another” (First language, 2010, p. 221). The term ‘foreign language (FL)’ refers here “a language which is not the native language of large numbers of people in a particular country or region, is not used as a medium of instruction in schools, and is not widely used as a medium of communication in government, media” (Foreign language, 2010, p. 224) and, in this study, L2 could be described as “in a broad sense, any language learned after one has learnt one’s native language” (Second language, 2010, p. 514). There is sometimes, however, a clear difference made between the L2 and FL, however, in the context of this study, English is a language of a major role in the

country, where, I would argue, English is necessary to be successful. Therefore, the term ‘L2’ and ‘FL’ will be used interchangeably in this study or will be indicated if a clear distinction is needed.

Language learning anxiety is a situation specific anxiety that occurs in specific language learning situations and therefore is unique to L2 learning, which means that a person does not have such anxiety while speaking in his or her L1 (MacIntyre & Gardner 1991, 1994; Horwitz, 2001; Woodrow, 2006; Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986). MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) define language anxiety as “the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language contexts, including speaking, listening, and learning” (p. 284).

### **Overall aim and objectives**

The dissertation looks at the academic progress in the field of applied linguistics to look for new insights in English Language Teaching (ELT) that may be incorporated into practice. It considers particular theories and authors whose work might contribute to a deeper understanding of second language acquisition (SLA). It seeks to challenge the exclusion of language learners’ first language in foreign language teaching and learning.

This research has the following aims:

- to review the evidence for L1 use in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom and compare the results to the current theories on using the L1 in L2 acquisition and develop further understanding of the effects of L1 in ELT;
- to contribute to existing understanding of the use of L1 in ELT classroom;
- to understand the attitudes towards the use of learners’ L1 in L2 language learning and teaching;
- to find out if and whether L1 is used systematically and selectively;
- to find out how language teachers make their decisions regarding their L1 use.

More specifically, this research looks at monolingual EFL learners from beginner to advanced levels, aged 12 to 16, and their teachers in Estonian basic school in Haabneeme. This study is partially initiated by parents’ feedback about the difficulty of English classes where only the

L2 is used and also my own experience as a practitioner aiming to raise awareness among the teachers, learners and their caretakers.

### **Research questions**

This research seeks to address the following questions:

1. If the learners' L1 is used in ELT, is it done out of convenience or done purposefully, thus contributing to or restricting the language learning?
2. How do teachers and students perceive the use of L1 in the FL classroom?
3. Does L1 have an effect on affective variables in language learning; specifically, which is the correlation between using the L1, L2 and language anxiety (MacIntyre, 1995)?

### **Overview of methodology**

The study was combined using two different approaches (Groom & Littlemore, 2011) including classroom observation and mapping down the use of L1 which was complemented by a questionnaire, that partially replicates those of Prodromou (2002), Horwitz et al. (1986), Shabir (2017) and Hashemi and Sabet (2013). The lessons of 6 EFL instructors teaching basic school learners at different levels of proficiency were observed and analysed. The classroom observation notes were used as a basis for further reflection and qualitative study (Riazi, 2016). Additionally, a questionnaire was carried out with students at different proficiency levels and with teachers after the class observation. The results were statistically analysed using analytical software *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS).

### **Rationale**

The use of the L1 in L2 learning and teaching is still a relatively under-researched area; little attention has been paid to the practical L1 use in literature and here the gap is most evident. On the one hand, if English is taught by the native speakers of English using the learners' L1 becomes a moot point, on the other hand, using the L1 of the learners by teachers who are non-native speakers of English and who share the L1 with their learners might hold valuable advantages for the teachers and learners alike. This research intends to examine sociocultural aspects and underpinning theories of psycholinguistics, among other objectives, to increase confidence and raise awareness among ELT practitioners and serve as a source of reference when dealing with parents and caregivers.

- Using observation will show whether L1 is used out of convenience or systematically and selectively. Comparing the observation findings and the questionnaire results will indicate whether the teachers' and students' perceptions are in line with the actual in-class situation.
- If we consider the EFL classroom a multilingual environment, then bilingual language learning approach would make a more appropriate classroom model (Levine, 2003). The teacher questionnaire will show which language teaching beliefs are held and whether there is a need to raise the awareness of the role of a mother tongue in ELT and to what extent changes are needed in the school I work in.
- My own observations suggest that using only the L2 often increases students' language anxiety (also Macaro, 1997) and therefore the students' questionnaire might help to reveal the relationship between the L2 use and language anxiety indicating whether the informed use of the L1 might alleviate the problem.

### **Role of the researcher**

For the quantitative part of the study, participants acted independently of the researcher, however, some subjectivity might have been present due to the researcher being a member of the same school and therefore familiar to the participants. For the observational part, the researcher's role was more emic in nature being observer-participant and also as a Head of the Foreign Language Department at the same institution, however, the participants were unaware of the research topic and they probably performed best to their knowledge of how an EFL classroom should look like, which might add to the study's accuracy seeking to answers the research question number 2.

### **Organization of the thesis**

This dissertation is divided into six chapters. Current chapter provides the background to this study, defines the terms and explains the aims, objectives and rationale for the research.

Chapter 2 reviews existing literature in ELT and SLA in general with its debates and controversies and offers insights into the progression of the issues about the L1 use in ELT. It also highlights the main ideas underpinning the bilingual language learning approach (Levine, 2003; Brooks-Lewis, 2009) and the key arguments over the use of L1 in L2 education. It

explains the relationship between language learning anxiety as an affective variable and language acquisition.

Chapter 3 details the methodology used to carry out the study including participants, procedures, measures and data analysis.

Chapter 4 reports the study's main findings. It offers a representation of the data emerged from the study.

Chapter 5 discusses the findings considering research questions and relevant literature offering some practical and theoretical implications and useful applications of L1 suggested by L2 research.

Chapter 6 summarises the main points of this dissertation drawing conclusions from the study and relevant literature. Also, limitations to the study and suggestions for further research are considered.

## CHAPTER 2: Background literature review

At worst, we stigmatize the use of the L1. At best, we often see little pedagogical value in its use (Macaro, 2001, cited by Levine, 2011, p. 5)

### **The debate over the target language and the first language use in EFL classroom**

Over the past decades, there has been a widespread belief that only English should be used in the English language classroom. Advocates of the English-only approach (Krashen, 1982; Chaudron, 1988; Macdonald, 1993) assert that maximum exposure to TL is the key to L2 acquisition and see no place for learners' L1 in L2 learning. There are countries, especially in Asia where the pressure to use only English by the English instructors in language learning classroom is high (Weschler, 1997; Butzkamm, 2008; Kelleher, 2013). The recent debate on the use of the learners' L1 in second language learning has not led to a unified view on this topic, however, it has resulted in a relatively vast body of literature.

Indeed, Krashen's (1982) Input hypothesis largely excludes the use of the L1 in L2 acquisition claiming that with the use of L1 opportunities to learn English are lost. Similarly, policy makers and language materials producers around the world have imposed the English-only approach for decades (Lee & Macaro, 2013; Weschler, 1997). Thus, the past century has attributed no real value to the use of the L1 in L2 learning. Especially since the Direct Method and Communicative Language Teaching approach, it is believed that L2 can most effectively be learned through L2 use only and maximum exposure to the target language (discussion in Cummins, 1996). Therefore, if for centuries, L2 learning through translation and bilingual teaching methods had been the norm (Auerbach, 1993), now language teaching took a turn implementing English-only methods "which so conveniently rose to fill the tub when the baby was thrown out with the bath water" (Weschler, 1997, p. 90).

According to some surveys, no pedagogical value to the learners' first language in L2 or EFL teaching exists (in Macaro, 1997; Auerbach, 1993), however, research literature reveals the lack of clear evidence that L2 is more effectively acquired monolingually using only target language than with the use of L1 (Macaro, 2001). One of the reasons behind English-only policy might be the fear of overusing L1, even so, while the overuse of the first language might

constitute a clear hindrance to the L2 acquisition (Voicu, 2012), a total ban on L1 might not only be unnecessary but often unrealistic and it is advocated that “if the mother tongue cannot be eliminated, it should be used in a positive, albeit limited way in order to benefit the learning process” (Kelleher, 2013, p. 2038).

As pointed out above, no research has proven that using the L1 in L2 learning actually interferes with L2 acquisition, moreover, a growing number of researchers (e.g. Atkinson, 1997; Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Turnbull and Dailey-O’Cain, 2009; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Weschler, 1997; Macaro, 2009; Littlewood & Yu, 2011) agree that the use of the L1 can be a resource in L2 or FL classroom. Macaro (2009) examining codeswitching in language classroom noted that “banning the first language from the communicative language classroom may in fact be reducing the cognitive and metacognitive opportunities to learners” (p. 49). Codeswitching, by its simplest form, can be defined as “a change by a speaker (or writer) from one language or language variety to another one” (Code switching, 2010, p. 89). The switch can occur “within a single discourse, sentence or constituent” (Poplack, 2000, p. 224). It is widespread in bilingual language communities and, similarly, the L2 learner having already acquired one language is thus also able to codeswitch while learning another language. Furthermore, if we are to mirror the outside world in ELT classrooms, why not see codeswitching as a part of L2 classroom discourse, where L1 is used as a social tool for communication, as sometimes the linguistic objectives need to be achieved at the expense of codeswitching, for example, in task-based oral activities when students lack necessary L2 linguistic resources (Macaro, 2005).

Therefore, it must be stated that L2-only policy probably works best in a classroom where there is no shared language between the students or the teacher is a native L2 speaker, but has no sound theoretical base in case of EFL classroom where the teacher and the students all share the same L1. Furthermore, Auerbach (1993) suggests that even in ESL setting “there is increasing evidence that L1 and/or bilingual options are not only effective but necessary for adult ESL students with limited L1 and schooling backgrounds” (p. 29).

### **Beliefs and practices of the L1 – benefits and dangers**

Although there is no empirical proof for using only English in the EFL classroom, it is still viewed as common-sense practice and is a widely-held belief. In 1993, Auerbach in her article that re-examined the English-only policy in the ESL classrooms states that “the rationale used to justify English only in the classroom is neither conclusive nor pedagogically sound” (p. 9),

suggesting that it's time to open the doors to rich linguistic resources that using the native language in an English classroom offers us and thus give students greater control over their learning.

While existing research on SLA does attribute some benefit to L1 in L2 learning and teaching, often not because L1 is believed to have some value but because it is simply unavoidable (Macaro, 2005), there are studies over the past decades that have provided significant information on L1 use and what it is used for in L2 language classroom. Starting with more recent research, Hlas (2016) conducted a study where secondary Spanish teachers' beliefs about and the use of L1 were investigated. The study revealed that the teachers agreed that the target language (TL) should be used 90% or more of the classroom time, however, they did not agree on the purpose of the remaining 10 percent of L1 use in language classroom. Nevertheless, she reports that the main uses of the L1 are regarding grammar, culture, classroom management, classroom flow, student comprehension, student connection, vocabulary, activity explanation, student anxiety alleviation, time saver, student motivation, and student feedback. Many of these aspects are also echoed in current study.

Hlas (2016) further suggests minimizing the use of L1 in the classroom and notes that “[t]he real question may not be not how to get to 90% but what happens during the 10% where L1 could be appropriate” (p. 315). She proposes some specific guidelines and instances when to use the L1 within that 10 percent including cases when the teacher has tried to communicate in vain in the L2, in certain emergency situations, in a one-on-one situation with emotionally upset student, when signalling L1 use to the class, comparing L1 and L2 for intentional reason, to help students to notice linguistic forms, and to capture attention.

An area that has received a scant attention in L2 research literature is teacher competency (Bateman, 2008). His study showed that teachers used L1 to avoid using the target language because of linguistic limitations reporting that “one overriding issue for many student teachers is lack of confidence in their ability to conduct class in the target language” (p. 26). Teachers felt confident in TL following routines and giving instructions, however, TL was less used when there were discipline problems, a need to save time, clarify confusing situations, or build a rapport with students. Bateman also explored fatigue as a factor that affected TL use in the classroom. The study showed that when teachers felt tired or the working conditions were otherwise demanding then using target language required extra effort and the L1 was used instead. Similarly, Hlas (2016) reported fatigue as a contributing factor for L1 use “[s]taying

in the TL can be exhausting because FL teachers need to work to make the language comprehensible. Exhaustion may certainly play a role in the language used in the classroom” (p. 314). Therefore, the affective factors and limitations should also be considered when talking about using the L1 in L2 classroom as sometimes there really are limitations to what teachers can handle in intense situations or conditions and they might want to switch to what is familiar and what works best at given moment.

Contrary to some perspectives which argue that the use of L1 deprives learners of valuable TL input (Krashen, 1982) some researchers suggest that L1 and TL could be used simultaneously (Turnbull, 2001; Stern, 1992). Stern (1992) suggests that the use of L1 and TL can be seen as complementary depending on the stages of learning process. To reach the goals of L2 or FL learning both L1 and TL could be effective during the learning procedures. It must be made clear that there is a principled use of L1 that could benefit the learning process and there is an extensive use of L1 that should be avoided. While it may be tempting to use L1 to save time or when the students have serious discipline problems taking the ‘L1 way out’ could become habitual and lead to an overuse of the L1 (Turnbull, 2001).

Thompson and Harrison (2014) analysed the lessons of Spanish teachers in intermediate and beginning university courses. They reported that teachers used the L1 for classroom administration, to explain grammar, to establish relationships, to explain new topic or assignment, to translate, to check comprehension and to maintain flow. These findings complement those of Hlas’ (2016) post-secondary research and suggest that the L1 seems to serve important functions in EFL classroom in regard to grammar, administration, and translation. Similarly, Macaro (2001) investigated the use of L1 in secondary school setting and found that teachers use learners’ L1 mainly for general classroom management and procedural instructions. The study included the teachers’ reflection on their L1 use and Macaro brings out one important implication that teachers who are able to reflect on their L1 use are using it purposefully.

In EFL context, a language teacher might be the only source and linguistic model of TL (Turnbull, 2001). Research has shown (e.g. Gass, 1997; Chaudron, 1988; Ellis, 1984; Lightbown, 1991) that TL input plays an important role in learners’ language acquisition. Wong-Fillmore (1985) suggests that learners who are used to hear their teacher speak in their L1 lose out on valuable TL input. And so the argument goes that the greater the exposure to TL the better students learn. However, extensive exposure to TL might not necessarily mean

increased TL intake as Macaro (1997) and Dickson (1992) reason. Similarly, a lot of controversy has been over using translation into L1 as a learning tool. However, Weschler (1997) argues that “unless you can rephrase a statement in your own first language such that the essence of the meaning is maintained, you really don't understand it. And understanding of meaning is the key to true communication” (p. 93). Thus, if students cannot infer meaning, there is no comprehensible input and therefore intake (Macaro, 2005). With this end in view, Turnbull (2001) suggest that it might be the judicious use of L1 that could help turn TL input into intake.

Having discussed the main purposes that the L1 is used in L2 classroom, this section will discuss the use of the L1 through sociocultural perspective. It might be argued that how L1 and L2 are used in the classroom depends on how cognition and language are theorised. In light of Vygotskian sociocultural theory learner's L1 is seen as helpful in learning L2 or FL. This is also supported by cognitive psychology research and how people learn (Bransford, Brown and Cocking, 2000). The theory posits that there is a great importance of building on learners' prior knowledge which affects their ability to acquire new knowledge. Furthermore, if the prior knowledge is in L1 then this automatically becomes a mediator for building new knowledge in L2 (Cummins, 2007). Therefore, the bilingual approach to language teaching and classroom principle lends itself well to L2 teaching.

While there are no set rules about how much L1 use is ideal, using too much L1 in English classroom leaves us with the possibility of making the students comfortable to use their L1 and not making enough effort to use L2 which is often the only possibility to speak in the target language in case of EFL students. This raises a question about the optimal use of L1 in English classroom. From a psycholinguistic point of view the concern has been to what extent the L1 can impact our learning of the L2 and the level of interference (Levine, 2011), on the other hand, often “L2 users have a difficult time using the new language to mediate their cognitive activity” (Lantolf and Thorne, 2007, p. 219). To state that L2 learning follows exactly the same patterns as L1 acquisition is perhaps somewhat superficial as we have to be aware of the variations affecting and involved in L2 learning when the learners' already have mastered one language (Wells, 1999). However, “[i]f students' prior knowledge is encoded in their L1, then their L1 is clearly relevant to their learning even when instruction is through the medium of L2” (Cummins, 2007, p. 231). Yet, often the L1 use is expected to be non-existent as the learners' first language should not interfere with target language development. Therefore, there

has to be a middle ground regarding how much L1 use is appropriate and beneficial to students. In conclusion, Cummins (2007) posits that “students’ L1 is not the enemy in promoting high levels of L2 proficiency; rather, when students’ L1 is invoked as a cognitive and linguistic resource through bilingual instructional strategies, it can function as a stepping stone to scaffold more accomplished performance in the L2” (p. 238). This takes us to the bilingual approach in L2 learning and teaching.

### **The bilingual approach in EFL**

Neurological research suggests that bilinguals develop a homogenous language-specific lexicon, “one in which all closely related representations are activated by a given stimulus, regardless of whether they were originally created through one language or through another” (Macaro, 2005, p. 65), which lends itself well to the bilingual approach in language teaching.

The last few decades have seen a growing trend towards the bilingual approach in L2 teaching and considerable literature has grown up around the use of L1 in the L2 classroom. The monolingual approach has found significant criticism and many authors (Auerbach, 1993, 2016; Cook, 2001; Voicu, 2012; Nation, 2003; Butzkamm, 2003; Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009) agree that exploiting linguistic resources that are already there during L2 acquisition is a considerable asset, especially if the L2 users are seen as a bilingual language learners.

Indeed, in the ‘post-methods’ era, it might be a good idea to rethink what happens in the language learning classroom and proceed in ‘eclectic’ yet principled manner. Thus, L2 classroom could be seen as multilingual environment, where at least two languages are involved in L2 or FL learning process. Levine (2011) argues that “[f]or us to deny, in our pedagogy, a role for the cognitively and socially dominant language, is to ignore a large part of the L2 learning process and the individual learner’s personal experience” (p. 5) adopting a ‘multilingual approach’ to language learning. Levine introduces language learning “through code choice awareness and practices” (p. 8), contrarily to viewing L1 use as an impediment to acquisition and further proposes to study it as an individual phenomenon as language aptitude or anxiety.

Even if maximum L2 use in language learning classroom seems self-evident and taken-for-granted assumption, it is not what often happens in L2 or FL classrooms where the teacher aims to avoid the use of L1 and students try to seek the ways to use it and still accomplish their

goals (Levine, 2011). From the perspective of social theory “[o]ne can design work processes but not work practices; one can design a curriculum but not learning” (Wenger, 1998, p. 229). Levin further argues that even if the L2 was used majority of the time during the class it might not have been used optimally when the teacher was doing most of the talking, a weighty point to be considered. Therefore, there might be a more natural way to L2 acquisition, one that promotes learner autonomy “by allowing learners a say in the ways code choices are made” (Levine, 2011, p. 4) allowing for “a conceptual and experiential space - the space of the bilingual user - for the learner to grow into” (p. 33).

Turning to the research literature supporting the bilingual approach, new studies have revealed that the planned use of the L1 serves as a scaffolding strategy enhancing learning (Swain, Kirkpatrick, & Cummins, 2011; Bhooth, Azman, & Ismail, 2014; Cook, 2001), especially, in meaning-based tasks carrying heavy cognitive load (Nation, 2003), and also learning the L2 vocabulary (Nation, 2003; Lee & Macaro, 2013; Tian & Macaro, 2012). Therefore, learners’ first language might be the most valuable resource that they bring to the classroom.

Storch and Wiggelsworth’s (2003) study revealed that students’ L1 helped them to “argue their case more quickly and clearly” (p. 766) and “students used their L1s mainly to clarify issues of meaning and vocabulary” (p. 765). Students also reported “slipping” into their L1 without noticing while arguing. However, students used the L1 reluctantly as they felt it was not allowed but still reported that “the L1 would have facilitated greater depth of discussion” (p. 767). It might be important to bear in mind that although the use of the L1 should not be encouraged while working on a task in pairs or groups “[r]ather, we suggest that teachers should not prohibit the use of some L1 altogether in group and pair work but should acknowledge that the use of the L1 may be a normal psychological process that allows learners to initiate and sustain verbal interaction” (Storch & Wiggelsworth, 2003, p. 768).

Similarly, Anton and DiCamilla (1999) studied the use of L1 from sociocultural perspective in the peer collaborative dialogue during a writing task among the students sharing the same L1 demonstrating that learners’ use of L1 is “a fairly obvious feature of their interaction, plays a strategic cognitive role both in scaffolding and in establishing intersubjectivity and externalizing their inner speech as is necessary to perform the task, achieve their goals, and thus realize their levels of potential development” (p. 236). This is also supported by theory of scaffolding (Vygotsky, 1978), according to which higher cognitive development occurs within the zone of proximal development (ZPD) where collaboration with (more capable) others leads

to development within one's self. Anton and DiCamilla conclude that if the students are not allowed to use their L1 in classroom in collaborative interaction it "removes, in effect, two powerful tools for learning: the L1 and effective collaboration, which depends, as our study shows, on students' freedom to deploy this critical psychological tool to meet the demands of the task of learning a second language" (p. 245).

Similarly, Villamil and de Guerrero (1996) studied the pair talk during a peer revision task where one strategy to achieve the task was using the L1 and found that the learners' L1 served three functions during completing the L2 task: L1 was used to comment on the L2 use thus taking control over the task discourse, discuss the task goals and jointly orient themselves within the task. Also, Swain and Lapkin (2000), studying the use of the L1 by grade 8 students, found that the use of L1 was helpful during different language tasks. They look at the L1 use from a sociocultural theory of mind and state that

The L1 serves as a tool that helps students as follows: to understand and make sense of the requirements and content of the task; to focus attention on language form, vocabulary use, and overall organization; and to establish the tone and nature of their collaboration. Without their L1 use, the task presented to them may not have been accomplished as effectively, or perhaps it might not have been accomplished at all. (p. 268)

They further suggest that different tasks (e.g. jigsaw, dictogloss) require different amount of L1 use among students at different proficiency level depending on the input type. Furthermore, they agree that in general lower level students require more help of their L1 than upper level students.

Lee and Macaro (2013) examined the effects of L1 on the vocabulary acquisition of elementary school children and adults at university. Their study results suggest that "young learners not only learn vocabulary better by being presented with L1 equivalents, relative to adults, but also that they prefer their own language to be used more frequently to facilitate learning" (p. 897). Also, their study showed that the young learners opposed to the English-only pedagogy more than adult learners, however, both groups benefitted from links with their L1.

In a study of Iranian EFL adult learners and teachers, Hashemi and Sabet (2013) found that the learners were willing to use their L1 more readily than their teachers who tended to favour English as the medium of instruction. Similarly, Shabir (2017) examined the perceptions of student-teachers in Australia, he found that a limited use of L1 was beneficial in L2 learning and had positive effects in certain language activities. Current study is a partial replication of these two studies.

In keeping with neurological research, L2 and any subsequent language learners develop very different psycholinguistic system due to their prior language experience (Cummins, 2007). He further posits that the bi- or multilingual instructional approach enhances two-way transfer across languages as bilingual mental functioning differs from monolingual. He also calls into question the rejection of translation as pedagogical strategy as his case study findings show that “translation from L1 to L2 and from L2 to L1 can be a powerful tool to develop language and literacy skills and increase metalinguistic awareness” (p. 237). In the same vein, Thompson and Harrison’s (2014) study showed that “even small codeswitches or the use of the first language for certain purposes by teachers influences their students’ opportunities to develop more sophisticated language skills” (p. 335).

In conclusion, if we are to suppress cognitively and socially dominant language in the L2 classroom, we might rob the learner opportunities to express and develop more profound ideas and excel at cognitively demanding tasks as the L1 can be used as scaffolding strategy. Furthermore, once the first language is acquired it is nearly impossible to switch it completely off during the L2 learning nor is it desirable as it might hinder collective collaboration needed for development within one’s self. The use of both languages might encourage lower level students to express themselves and engage more confidently. Empirical evidence strongly suggests that the use of L1 in L2 classroom should not be considered an impediment to L2 acquisition.

### **Language anxiety and its effects on L2 learners**

Along with exploring the attitudes towards the use of learners’ L1 in L2 language learning and teaching this study also considered foreign language use anxiety (Horwitz et al., 1986; MacIntyre, 1995) and its association to L1 and L2 use in language classroom, as this being the variable that has received relatively scant attention in research literature.

Turning now to the affective variables in SLA research, Horowitz et al. (1986) explaining the reasons for language anxiety have stated that “[b]ecause complex and nonspontaneous mental operations are required in order to communicate at all, any performance in the L2 is likely to challenge an individual’s self-concept as a competent communicator and lead to reticence, self-consciousness, fear, or even panic” (p. 128). They also state that the learner’s true self can differ from that of learner’s more limited self in a foreign language learning classroom, which attributes a specific self-concept or L2 identity to the L2 learner in a language learning classroom where they might feel limited or not being their usual self. Therefore, such L2 identity or sense of self has a significant role in L2 learning anxiety (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1991; Horwitz, 2001).

Similarly, research into the language anxiety indicates that anxiety inhibits language learning (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1991, 1994; Horwitz, 2001, Woodrow, 2006; Aida, 1994; Onwuegbuzie, Bailey, & Daley, 2000). Studies have revealed moderate negative relationship between anxiety and achievement (Horwitz, 2001), furthermore, it has been stated that learners with higher levels of anxiety study more than learners with lower levels of language anxiety but their achievements do not reflect their effort (Horwitz et al., 1986). Thus, despite their extended efforts, those who experience higher levels of anxiety may still perform poorly due to the deficits in cognitive processing (MacIntyre, 1995). The study of Liu and Chen (2013) conducted with elementary school students, revealed that foreign language anxiety is experienced already among young learners during L2 acquisition. Liao (2006) found that L1 as an affective strategy helped to reduce learning anxiety in language classroom. In addition, Levine’s (2003) study explored the relationship between L1, TL use and TL-use anxiety and interestingly found no positive correlation between the amount of TL use and target language anxiety.

Common manifestations of and reasons behind language anxiety include, among others, a mental block, state of nervousness, fear of losing face, fear of making errors, inferiority complex (Noormohamadi, 2009; Trang, Moni, & Baldaf, 2013), which could all prevent learners to reach their objectives. Additionally, it allows to reason that language anxiety is socially construed (in keeping with social constructionism, Berger & Luckmann, 1991) where reaction of others to learner’s insufficiencies in language production leads to anxiety. Furthermore, with the need to access prior knowledge, concentrate on fluency of utterance and on task itself, different cognitive processes are involved that might hinder the L2 speaker’s performance further as “the anxious person has his/her attention divided between task-related

cognition and self-related cognition, making cognitive performance less efficient” (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994, p. 285) and here the link between language anxiety and limited L2 sense of self becomes most evident. As the use of L1 is cognitively less demanding, especially in the case of limited L2 knowledge, it might allow learners to improve their performance and thus reduce language learning anxiety.

## **Summary**

In conclusion, while no practitioner would argue that the teachers of English as L2 or FL should maximize their use of TL during their language classes, there are sound reasons for using the L1 across the field of EFL or L2 teaching. Studies show that the most common purposes for the L1 use listed throughout research literature are to teach grammar, translate words or texts, aid comprehension and administration; but L1 is also used when the teacher is fatigued or lacks target language competence or as an affective strategy to reduce learning anxiety. Furthermore, in light of sociocultural theories and cognitive psychology research, if learners’ prior knowledge is an important foundation for building new knowledge, then learners’ L1 plays a fundamental role scaffolding more accomplished performance in L2, especially during collective collaboration and cognitively demanding tasks that offer opportunities to develop more sophisticated language skills. However, it must be borne in mind that the context of different schools and institutions where English or other second or foreign languages are taught varies from country to country or even within depending also on governmental policies, school system, and community, thus the L1 application in L2 learning and teaching is additionally influenced by these external factors. Therefore, it is of important value to examine the perceptions and practices of teachers and students in local settings to map existing assumptions and gain new insights on the effects of L1 use and cultivate useful strategies in ELT.

## CHAPTER 3: The study

The present study sought to extend the line of research of Prodromou (2002), Horwitz et al., (1986), Shabir (2017) and Hashemi and Sabet (2013) examining Estonian EFL learners from pre-intermediate to upper-intermediate or advanced levels (from A2 to C1 in terms of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, CEFR), aged 12 to 15, and their foreign language teachers at Haabneeme School in terms of their perceptions about using the L1 in foreign language classroom and in ELT in general. The study consisted of classroom observation and two different questionnaires, one for the students and another for FL teachers.

### Subjects

Participants in this study were 113 upper secondary students aged 12 to 15 from Haabneeme Basic School in Estonia. 108 of them were native Estonian speaking learners of English as a foreign language, two participants reported Russian as their first language, one reported German, two were bilingual Estonian and Russian, however all of the students have had their education in Estonian for 6 to 8 years, and possibly had exposure to Estonian even earlier, so they could be considered bilingual in that sense. All the participants had first been taught English around the age of 8 and thus quite comparable in terms of their prior exposure to English. Prior to commencing the study, ethical clearance was sought from the head of the school, from the teachers, and also parents and caregivers (see appendices 10 to 12). Among the students, in total 142 forms were handed out, however, 16 forms were not returned, 8 were declined and 4 forms were filled out inadequately. One respondent was eliminated from the study as only 5 questions were answered and no biographical information given.

There were 19 Year 6 students, 62 Year 7 students and 32 Year 8 students participating in this study, thus slightly over half of the respondents were from year 7 ( $n=62$ ) which is 54.9% of all the respondents. Students' general level of proficiency was assessed by their placement in language groups. The participants were divided into three groups according to their language group. Group 1 corresponds to the upper intermediate/advanced learners in either year 6, 7 or 8. Group 2 intermediate and group 3 elementary/pre-intermediate level. As there were only 2 placement groups in Year 6, these were treated as Group 1 upper intermediate/advanced and Group 3 as elementary/pre-intermediate.

Another set of participants were 6 English as a foreign language teachers at Haabneeme School. Teachers' experience in teaching English as FL ranged from 2 to 25 years. Their level of education was reported to be from high school and vocational school graduate to a master's degree.

## **Method**

As stated above, the current study was designed to investigate the use of the L1 commonly shared by the student and teachers in a foreign language classroom through a partial replication of Prodromou (2002); Horwitz et al. (1986); Shabir (2017); and Hashemi and Sabet (2013) studies.

The first part of the study consisted of English language classroom observation of 6 EFL teachers. The aim of the observation was to map the actual L1 use in EFL classroom. Observation included language lessons of students between 9 to 13 years of age. As not all the teachers agreed to being recorded, the results are drawn from notes taken during observation.

Secondly, all the participants in current study were presented with an online survey that consisted of a similar set of statements from these study questionnaires. The student questionnaire was translated to their first language for more accurate results and contained 11 sections for a total of 49 items including biographical information, all the statements in students' questionnaire are marked with additional 'S' in front of the item number for clarity. The teacher questionnaire contained 13 sections for total of 63 items, marked with 'T'.

Participants were instructed to read the statements at their own pace and give their answer indicating to which extent they agree or disagree with a particular statement. The respondents were offered a choice of 5 pre-coded responses ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree' in a Likert-type scale. Comparisons between Group 1 and Group 3 were made using two-tailed independent samples t-test, all analyses were carried out using SPSS software, version 25.

## CHAPTER 4: Results and analysis

As the aim of the current experiment was to investigate the attitudes and beliefs about the L1 use in L2 learning and teaching and how L2 learning and language learning anxiety are correlated, the results suggest that at the levels of proficiency examined in this study, Estonian learners and teachers of English seem to have a wide range of perceptions and not everyone agrees on the extent to which the target language should be used in their classes.

All the relevant data can be located in the appendices. The summary of classroom observation is presented in appendix 1. Teachers' questionnaire items and the results in percentages are listed in appendix 2. Students questionnaire items and results are presented in appendix 3. Statistics for mean and standard deviation for Group 1 and 3 are found in appendix 4, independent sample test results are listed in appendix 5; for Group 1 and 2 in appendix 6 and 7; and for Group 2 and 3 in appendix 8 and 9.

### **Research question 1: “If the learners’ L1 is used in ELT, is it done out of convenience or done purposefully, thus contributing to or restricting the language learning?”**

For research question 1, which was addressed to the teachers, English language classroom observation was used to map the L1 use during foreign language lessons and find out whether L1 is used out of convenience or systematically and selectively. Comparing the observation findings and the questionnaire results will indicate whether the teachers' and students' perceptions are in line with the actual in-class situation. The notes taken during class observation revealed that around 80% to 95% of the 45-minute class time English was used for all the activities. With younger and lower level learners L1 was used more than with students at upper level and older in age. The main purposes that the L1 was used for were to check the understanding of task instructions, for translation of terms, phrases and short texts to check the comprehension of meaning, explaining grammar, asking questions if the students did not understand them in English (see appendix 1). Students used their L1 in case of pair or group work, however, in the form of codeswitching while the teacher was encouraging the learners to use English instead.

In-class observation was complemented by an online questionnaire. There were 12 items in the teachers' questionnaire designed to elicit teachers' perceptions about everyday practice using

the students' L1 in the classroom (items T1 to 12). All the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they try to keep using L1 minimal and predictably 83.3% strongly agreed that they do so with students at more advanced level. Not all respondents agreed on using the L1 while disciplining the students, as 66.7% agreed, it might also stem from the fact that older students might perhaps need less disciplining.

Looking at the percentage of the answers a certain pattern emerges. All the respondents agreed on their use of L1 to check comprehension and disagreed using it for classroom management, however all the teachers were either neutral or agreed passing on important school information in L1. All the teachers admitted using L1 to explain grammar and for difficult terms and concepts. On the other hand, answering the question about using the L1 out of convenience and habit yielded different answers ranging from strongly disagree to agree. The item T11 "I use L1 in my classroom instinctively, I have no clear idea why or why not to use L1" was disagreed or strongly disagreed by 66.6% of the cases which might indicate some lack of informed use of the L1 among some teachers.

### **Research question 2: "How do teachers and students perceive the use of L1 in the classroom?"**

The second research question sought to gain an understanding of students' and teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards the L1 and L2 use, additionally, investigate learners' and teachers' perceptions about their own use of the target language in the classroom.

One of the main issues that surfaced among the students was concern about following the instructions, as the overall response to the item S20 "the teacher can use L1 to check understanding of instructions" was very positive, therefore students favouring the L1 use as over half of the sample (59.3%) agreed and around a quarter of the respondents (28.3%) strongly agreed which makes 87.6% in total. Similarly, 87.6% in total agreed or strongly agreed to item S17 that the teacher can use L1 to "help me form a question or state an opinion in L2". These results were only outscored by item S5 "It is useful if the teacher uses L1 when explaining grammar" as 90.3% respondents agreed to the statement and item S4 "It is useful if the teacher uses L1 when explaining new words" that received the highest agreement where 92.9% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed and S1 "In a foreign language classroom the teacher should know the students' L1" which was favoured by 89.4% of the students.

Both teachers (66.7%) and, as already mentioned, even more so students (89.4%) largely agreed that the language teacher should know the students' L1 (item T13 and S1) but, interestingly, differed in their response to whether the teacher should actually use it in the classroom as only 51.4% of students agreed or strongly agreed (item S2), whereas only 16.7% of teachers agreed (item T14). In comparison, the original study by Prodromou (2002) showed that around half of the respondents, beginner level students agreeing slightly more, agreed that the language teacher should know students' L1. The scores about teachers' using the L1 in the classroom yielded on average the same results, around 50% of the students agreed.

The question whether the students should use their L1 in foreign language classes it is noteworthy in that 50% of the teachers remained neutral (item T15), only one agreed and two respondents disagreed. Similarly, students' responses (item S3) were divided, however, quite equally between agree (29.2%), neutral (26.5%) and disagree (27.4%). Thus, there is no consensus of opinion about students' use of L1. In contrast, the response to the item concerning the use of L1 when explaining new words (item S4) was striking in two ways. Firstly, as already mentioned, 92.9% of students either agreed or strongly agreed and, secondly, only two teachers (33.3%) agreed and found the use of L1 useful in this case, three teachers remained neutral (item T20). The results for item S4 were also echoed by the students in Hashemi and Sabet's (2013) study as 80% favoured the L1 use.

Explaining grammar using the L1 was unanimously agreed to be useful by both students (item S5) and teachers (item T10), vast majority of respondents (90.3% of students and 100% of teachers) either agreed or strongly agreed. This supports the results of Shabir's (2017) study, where, from teachers' point of view, students (69.5%) favour the use of L1 in regard to explaining grammar rules. Similarly, in Hasemi and Sabet's (2013) study students (76.6%) and teachers (64%) favoured the use of the L1 in explaining grammar. From Prodromou's (2002) study, it appears that only beginners (31%) were in favour of the teacher to use L1 while explaining grammar, more advanced students tended to disagree to the statement. This might also be due to the age difference as in Prodromou's and in Hasemi and Sabet's study the respondents were young adolescents or adults and thus, in all probability, cognitively more advanced than the respondents in this study.

Some interesting results emerged related to giving task instructions in the L1 where the students found teachers giving instructions in the L1 helpful (item S8) as 38.1% agreed and 16.8% strongly agreed to the statement. Comparing the two groups of advanced ( $n=55$ ) and pre-

intermediate ( $n=27$ ) students then the independent-sample t-test showed statistical significance  $t(80) = -2.217$ ,  $p = .029$ , two-tailed; 95% CI [-.06, -1.06] for item S8 “it is useful when the teacher uses L1 to give instructions”, therefore the pre-intermediate group ( $M = 3.85$ ;  $SD = 1.134$ ) found the use of L1 more helpful while receiving instructions than the advanced group ( $M = 3.29$ ;  $SD = 1.048$ ). Looking at the results of the teachers (item T5) then a different pattern emerges where 83.4% of respondent disagreed or strongly disagreed and 1 response remained neutral, however, the statement does not indicate the difficulty level of the task as instructions for cognitively demanding tasks might be more complicated and some help of the L1 might prove useful. In contrast, in Hashemi and Sabet’s (2013) study, 64% of the teachers and 63.5% of the students agreed or strongly agreed to the same statement.

Items T16 to T19 in teachers’ questionnaire were replicated from Shabir’s (2017) study. Regarding English as the medium of communication (item T16), only 33.3% of respondents agreed to the statement that L1 should not be used because “it reduces the student’s amount of exposure to the target language”, however 50% remained neutral. In Shabir’s study, on the other hand, there was a clear divide between the beliefs as 52% disagreed and 48% agreed and 76% in Hasemi and Sabet’s (2013) study agreed to the same statement, however, both of the questionnaires did not allow for opinion neutrality as 4-point Likert scale was used. As for item T17 “the use of L1 should be minimized” was unanimously agreed or strongly agreed by all the teachers in current study. Shabir’s study showed the same tendency where 73.8% of respondents were in favour of minimizing the L1 use. To learn new vocabulary, item 18 “the only way to learn an English word completely is to know its meaning in L1” was agreed by 50% of the respondents of present study while 50% remained neutral, indicating that some teachers tend to teach new vocabulary through the use of L1 which might also be due to the fact that English language course books provide the translations in L1. Additionally, Lee and Macaro’s (2013) study found that with relation to vocabulary learning young learners benefited from the link with their L1. They state that “interaction research does not provide evidence that morphosyntax and vocabulary are more effectively acquired monolingually than through a comparison with the L1, merely that it can be acquired” (p. 888). In contrast, this statement (item T18) was disagreed by 91% of respondents in Shabir’s (2017) study.

Teachers’ response to item T19 “learners should be translating the English language into L1 when they read a text” was agreed by 33.3% and disagreed by one respondent, again 50% remained neutral, which might be due to the fact that the response might depend on the proficiency level of the learners and the statement should have perhaps been more clearly

formed in that respect. In comparison, in Shabir's (2017) study, majority of the teachers (87%) were against translating the text into the L1 for comprehension. In comparison, the teachers in current study all agreed to a similar item (T28) concerning comprehension check, also vast majority of students (86.7%) in current study were in favour of translating the text into their L1.

The next items in the questionnaires were concerned with students' use of the L1 in the classroom and to what extent it should be allowed. Perhaps the most striking finding is that the statement (item S9) "students should be allowed to use L1 when talking in pairs or groups" received unanimously disagree or strongly disagree from the teachers (item T25). Students, however, felt they should be allowed to use their L1 in 37.2% of the case, 30.1% responses remained neutral (which might indicate a conflict between what they think themselves and what they have been told) and 32.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Furthermore, comparing the answers of group 1 and 3, independent-sample t-test showed statistical significance  $t(80) = -2.222$ ,  $p = .029$ , two-tailed; 95% CI [-.06, -1.16], therefore the students at lower levels of proficiency ( $M = 3.59$ ;  $SD = 1.185$ ) feel that they should be allowed to use their L1 during group work, this perception was less supported by the advanced group ( $M = 2.98$ ;  $SD = 1.163$ ). Moreover, analysis of Group 2 ( $n = 31$ ;  $M = 2.97$ ;  $SD = .983$ ) and 3 ( $M = 3.59$ ;  $SD = 1.185$ ) also revealed statistical significance  $t(50.70) = -2.167$ ,  $p = .035$ , two-tailed, indicating that the need for L1 use is most strongly felt by lower level students. It might also indicate that the advanced level students have less need to use their L1 during pair or group work as they can manage better in L2.

Also, an acceptable use of the L1 in language classroom was when translating an L2 word, text or a test into L1 which was an acceptable to the majority of the teachers (items T27-29, over 80% agreed) and the majority of the students (items S11-12, over 80% agreed). In comparison, the percentages in Prodromou's (2002) study were much lower. For the procedural language in the classroom, items T30 to T32 and items S18 to S19, half of the teachers' responses remained neutral whereas students felt that their L1 should be used as procedural language, especially for item S19 "check reading comprehension" as 77% of the students agreed or strongly agreed unlike in Prodromou's study, supporting the views of Atkinson (1993) suggesting the use the L1 for checking comprehension.

Looking further at the perceptions about students' L1 in EFL classroom, then the teachers mainly agreed that the students can ask help in their L1 to form a question or state an opinion

in English (item T33) or pass on their ideas if they are stuck in English (item T35). Fewer respondents agreed that students can use their L1 to check if they have understood the task and instructions (item T34) and ask help from fellow students (item T36). The students also agreed (item S13) that it should be allowed to ask help in their L1 from the teacher who can aid a student to phrase a question or an opinion in L2 which is in line with Gill (2005) circumlocution strategy.

A difference emerged concerning again the instructions and whether the students should be allowed to check their understanding of instructions (item S14) in their L1 as 84% of the students either agreed or strongly agreed to given statement whereas the teachers remained neutral (50%) or agreed (50%). However, comparing Group 1 ( $M = 3.95$ ;  $SD = .78$ ) and 3 ( $M = 4.44$ ;  $SD = .577$ ), independent-sample t-test showed statistical significance  $t(80) = -2.948$ ,  $p = .004$ , two-tailed; 95% CI [-.16, -0.83], therefore the students at lower levels of proficiency felt that they should be allowed to check their understanding of instructions in L1, which was less felt by the advanced group and intermediate group ( $M = 3.90$ ;  $SD = .79$ );  $t(56) = -2.941$ ,  $p = .005$ , two-tailed.

Quite a substantial number of respondents (70.8%) among the students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they should be allowed to pass on their ideas or express opinions in L1 when stuck in English (item S15). Similarly, item S10 “students should be allowed to use L1 when asking e.g. how do we say ‘..’ in English” was agreed or strongly agreed by 77.8% of respondents among the students and 66.7% among the teachers (item T26). Having the opportunity to ask help from fellow students in the L1 (item S16) was seen less important as only 54% agreed or strongly agreed.

Turning to the responses that show the perceptions about the teachers’ use of the L1 during the language lessons, then a large majority of students (84.6%) agreed or strongly agreed that the teacher can help in their L1 if a student needs to form a question or state an opinion in the target language (item S17). The teachers, on the other hand, held opposing opinions as 50% of the teachers disagreed to this statement and 50% were in favour (item T37). Concerning the teacher’s use of the L1 to check listening comprehension, responses of both the students and the teachers were more spread across the range of the scale, but 77% of the students agreed or strongly agreed on using the L1 to check the reading task while only 33.3% of the teachers agreed. Again, students at lower level of proficiency ( $M = 4.22$ ;  $SD = .751$ ) agreed more to using their L1 while checking the reading task (item S19) than Group 1 ( $M = 3.84$ ;  $SD = .856$ )

as the result was statistically significant  $t(80) = -1.995$ ,  $p = .049$ , two-tailed; 95% CI [-.001, -.771], which indicates that lower level students might need more support by using their L1, which is in line with Prodromou's (2002) study.

Similarly, a difference emerged about the teacher using the L1 when checking students' comprehension of instructions (item S20) as students displayed a high percentage of agreement on the item (87.6%), whereas only half of the teachers agreed with the same statement (item T38). Using the L1 to discipline students (item S21) was agreed or strongly agreed by 46.9% of the students and 33.3% of the teachers (item T39), creating a friendly and relaxed atmosphere (item S22) by 65.4% of the students and only 16.7% of the teachers (item T40).

The questionnaires proceed with the different items for the students and teachers. The students were asked whether the teacher uses too much L1 in the classroom when explaining grammar (item S23), 69% were in favour, however, the difference between Group 3 ( $M = 2.67$ ;  $SD = 1.038$ ) and Group 1 ( $M = 1.89$ ;  $SD = .809$ ) was statistically significant  $t(80) = -3.710$ ,  $p < .001$ , two-tailed; 95% CI [-.360, -1.192]. Therefore, interestingly, Group 1 was more unanimous in disagreeing with the statement which might indicate that Group 3 remained more neutral in comparison to Group 1 (15%-23.9% in total remained neutral). Items S24 to S26 yielded also statistically significant results. Group 1 ( $M = 1.98$ ;  $SD = .933$ ) disagreed more strongly that the teacher uses too much L1 (item S24, in total 69% disagreed or strongly disagreed) when "giving instructions and organising activities" than did Group 3 ( $M = 2.78$ ;  $SD = 1.155$ ),  $t(80) = -3.353$ ,  $p = .001$ , two-tailed. Similarly, between Group 2 ( $M = 2.16$ ;  $SD = .898$ ) and Group 3 a statistically significant difference in perceptions appeared  $t(56) = -2.284$ ,  $p = .026$ , two-tailed, indicating that lower level students agree more that the teacher uses too much L1 which seems to be in contrast with Group 3 overall favour towards L1 use.

Turning to item S25, the teacher uses too much L1 when "disciplining the students" (63.7% in total disagreed or strongly disagreed) resulted in similar pattern as Group 1 disagreed more strongly ( $M = 2.15$ ;  $SD = 1.008$ ) than did Group 3 ( $M = 2.81$ ;  $SD = 1.178$ ),  $t(80) = -2.672$ ,  $p = .009$ . Similarly, the last item (S26) in this set eliciting perceptions about L1 use by the teacher and whether it is used too much while "giving the lesson" (77.9% in total disagreed or strongly disagreed) then Group 1 disagreed more strongly ( $M = 1.69$ ;  $SD = .814$ ) than did Group 3 ( $M = 2.56$ ;  $SD = 1.219$ ),  $t(80) = -3.815$ ,  $p < .001$ , two-tailed. Furthermore, there was also a difference of statistical significance in the perceptions of Group 2 ( $M = 1.90$ ;  $SD = .746$ ) and 3;  $t(41.87) = -2.414$ ,  $p = .020$ , two-tailed. Thus, a significant difference emerged between the

perceptions of advanced level and pre-intermediate level students, as well as pre-intermediate and intermediate level students where the pre-intermediate students, strikingly, agreed the most that the teacher uses too much L1. Furthermore, item S30 “I think that the teacher should use more L1 when giving the lesson” yielded significant result in perceptions between the Group 2 ( $M = 2.16$ ;  $SD = .820$ ) and 3 ( $M = 2.74$ ;  $SD = 1.095$ );  $t(56) = -2.298$ ,  $p = .025$ , two-tailed, Group 3 favouring the L1 use more than Group 2. This discrepancy could be attributed to the fact that the respondents had got used to a unidimensional pattern from previous sets of items and the statement got misinterpreted due to the negative connotation of a phrase “too much” and thus the items in this set were stated in the opposite direction (Swain, Weathers, and Niedrich, 2008). This would help to explain the fact that if the lower level students were otherwise supporting the use of the L1 now agreed more that the teacher uses too much L1 compared to Group 1.

Students opinions about whether the teacher should use even more L1 in these same cases, than less than half of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed (item S27 43.4 %, item S28 35.4%, item 29 17.7%, and item 30 13.3%). Comparing again Group 1 and 3, then item S27 “I think that the teacher should use more L1 when explaining grammar” was statistically significant  $t(80) = -2.675$ ,  $p = .009$ , Group 3 agreeing more ( $M = 3.48$ ;  $SD = .975$ ) than Group 1 ( $M = 2.84$ ;  $SD = 1.050$ ) and similarly for item S28 while “giving instructions and organising activities” there was significant difference in the perceptions of Group 3 ( $M = 3.44$ ;  $SD = 1.155$ ) and Group 1 ( $M = 2.75$ ;  $SD = 1.058$ );  $t(80) = -2.728$ ,  $p = .008$ , thus indicating that students at lower level wish to receive more help from the teacher in L1 than more advanced students. Item S27 was the only item in students’ questionnaire that yielded a statistically significant result  $t(84) = -2.469$ ,  $p = .016$ , two-tailed; 95% CI [-0.107, -0.994], when comparing groups 1 ( $n=55$ ,  $M = 2.84$ ;  $SD = 1.050$ ) and Group 2 ( $n=35$ ,  $M = 3.39$ ;  $SD = .882$ ). Therefore, students on both levels, pre-intermediate and intermediate, tend to benefit more from grammar explanation done in their L1 than the advanced learners.

The items that express the teachers’ conduct and attitudes during their in-class teaching, 83.4% of the respondents reported that they “do not like the use of L1 because it prevents students from thinking in English” (item T46). Similarly, Hasemi and Sabet’s (2013) study revealed that 68% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed, among the students the results were more spread. However, it is unlikely, perhaps with the exception of most advanced L2 learners, that the learners’ language of thought is anything other than their L1 (Macaro, 2005). Furthermore, Weschler (1997) posits an interesting question “Once having learned to think in one language,

is it even possible to not think in that language?” (p. 89), there will always be some kind of interference as “mental translation is virtually unavoidable (Cohen, 1996, in Weschler, 1997, p. 98). This calls for more research.

However, 100% of the teachers agreed that “I sometimes speak L1 to clarify my directions” (item T47). Similarly, in Shabir’s (2017) study, nearly 70% of the respondents agreed. So the L1 seems to be used as a strategy to make the task and input more comprehensible supporting the views stated by Turnbull (2001). The response concerning item T48 “giving individual comments in L1”, was more spread across the range of the scale. Half of the teachers favoured the English-only approach (item T50 “the medium of instruction should be only English in English classroom”), the rest remained neutral, which tends to support the English-only opinion held by many. Similarly, Hashemi and Sabet’s (2013) study showed that 80% of the teachers and 57.7% of students favoured English as a medium of instruction.

In regards to explaining “the differences and similarities between L1 and English in students’ L1” (item T51), slightly over half (66.7%) of respondents found it useful during their in-class teaching, which is in line with Cummins (2007) statement that “learning efficiencies can be achieved if teachers explicitly draw students’ attention to similarities and differences between their languages and reinforce effective learning strategies in a coordinated way across languages” (p. 233). Therefore, even if these similarities and differences are explained mostly in TL, it requires at least some use of codeswitching, examples of words or sentences in some cases even texts. In comparison, in Shabir’s (2013) study, slightly less than half of the respondents (48%) were in favour, whereas in Hasemi and Sabet’s (2013) study over half of the teachers (60%) and 74.9% of the students agreed or strongly agreed.

In line with Swain and Lapkin (2000), Turnbull (2001), Macaro (2005), all the respondents agreed that codeswitching should be allowed as a teaching tool (item T52) and 66.7% agreed to item 54 “if learners codeswitch they manage difficult tasks better” and to item T55 “L1 can be used by the students to lighten the cognitive load”. Only one respondent agreed to sometimes avoiding certain activities which are hard to perform in L2 (item T53). Interestingly, teachers did not tend to agree that “L1 can be used by the teachers to transfer the language input into more familiar terms” (item T56) as it yielded 83.3% neutral answers. Here the reason for remaining neutral might have also been that the teachers did not fully comprehend the meaning of the statement or were unfamiliar with the terms ‘input’ and ‘intake’ and association between the two.

In the final part of the teachers' survey, open-response items were used where respondents were asked to describe the benefits of using students' L1, teachers reported L1 to be useful in "explaining grammatical and connotative differences between L1 and L2 to pupils with lower language proficiency" which is also supported by Gill (2005). Similarly, it was stated that the use of L1 helps to connect new knowledge with previous, to reduce students' anxiety (which might occur when students do not understand the task and are stuck in English), which is in line with Cummins (2007) who states that "if prior knowledge is encoded in students' L1, then the engagement of prior knowledge is inevitably mediated through L1 [and refers] to the totality of the experiences that have shaped the learner's identity and cognitive functioning" (p. 232) this way prior knowledge will not be limited only to what students are able to express in their L2. One teacher also mentioned that the use of L1 helps also students with lower language learning aptitude who might struggle learning a new language in general, which is also connected to using prior knowledge.

There was a certain reluctance felt towards the L1 use, as one of the respondents stated that "with a fluent pupil I wouldn't use L1, because it makes things too easy" and further admitted that if it would be possible, they would not use L1 at all, however it does make learning new words and content much easier for the students, which echoes the results of Lee and Macaro's (2013) study where they found that not only did young learners benefit from L1 equivalent while learning new vocabulary but so did also adult learners. One respondent also suggested that "[t]he amount of L1 should be reduced step-by-step" which supports Wescher's (1997) view on L1 as "the necessary scaffolding to be gradually removed over time" (p. 89). Teachers also found that L1 can be a time-saving tool and it also help to prevent misunderstandings, reduce stress and confusion in case of task instructions and that the use of L1 "makes difficult tasks more manageable". Furthermore, teachers found it to be "a great tool when comparing languages (grammar, patterns, expressions, etc.)", a view also supported in Cummins (2007) who states that it helps students make cross-linguistic connections and might be beneficial to students to compare two languages to develop language awareness.

Turning to the perceived pitfalls of using the L1, teachers brought out some potential dangers that students might get used to instructions being explained in their L1 and would pay less attention to L2 explanations. Using L1 was also reported making students lazy as using only L2 would require more effort from students, similar statement supported also by 76% of the teachers in Hasemi and Sabet's (2013) study. There was also a belief that using the L1 does

not particularly widen students' vocabulary. One respondent found that using "English speaking environment helps to develop language awareness and encourages communication in English in the future". There was also a concern that given a chance to switch to their L1 some students do not practise their L2 sufficiently and L1 can become "a thing of convenience" and students might not learn to think in the L2, however, it is highly unlikely, as argued above, that such could be the case in practice at all (Macaro, 2005; Weschler, 1997).

**Research question 3: Does L1 have an effect on affective variables in language learning; specifically, which is the correlation between using the L1, L2 and language anxiety?**

Tuning to research question 3, there were five items in set 8 designed to elicit students' perceptions of L2 use and language learning anxiety, all the items were replicated from Horwitz et al.'s study (1986) representing items in the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). Turning to these items, statement S31 "I feel distressed when I do not understand what the teacher is saying in another language" was disagreed on by majority of the students (75.2%), whereas in Horwitz et al.'s (1986) study, 35% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed and interestingly, 36% disagreed or strongly disagreed, similar results were echoed in Hashemi and Sabet's (2013) study. Thus, it might indicate that the students in current study are less concerned that they do not understand all foreign language input.

Similarly, over half of the students (69.9%) disagreed or strongly disagreed to the statement S32 "the possibility that the teacher corrects me if I make a mistake in my foreign language use frightens me" which echoes the responses in Horwitz et al.'s (1986) study where 55% of the respondents disagreed to the statement. Similarly, 67.3% of the students disagreed also with the statement S33 "I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on" which is again slightly more than the respondents in Horwitz et al.'s study where 49% disagreed or strongly disagreed, which might suggest that the respondents in current study did not endorse the FLCAS items indicative of foreign language speech anxiety. Furthermore, even a greater percentage of students (77.8%) disagreed with item S34 "I feel more tense and nervous than in my other classes" and only 11.9% agreed compared to Horwitz et al.'s study where 38% agreed to the statement, indicating that foreign language anxiety might not be distinctive from other anxieties felt in classroom, contrary to Horwitz et al.'s study results.

The last FLCAS item eliciting the degree of anxiety felt during the foreign language lesson resulted also in 70.8% students disagreeing. Item S35 "I get nervous when I do not understand

every word the language teacher says” is also noteworthy here as there was a statistically significant difference in perceptions in Group 3 ( $M = 2.37$ ;  $SD = 1.334$ ) compared to Group 1 ( $M = 1.71$ ;  $SD = .916$ );  $t(38.44) = -2.320$ ,  $p = .026$ , thus indicating that respondents in pre-intermediate group tend to get more nervous and therefore might have anxiety associated to language learning than respondents on upper level of proficiency who might feel more confident during language classes.

There were three items in teachers’ questionnaire to elicit the perceptions about language learning anxiety. Statement T45 “using students’ L1 helps me make students more relaxed, confident and ready to learn” yielded mostly results that were spread across the range of the scale. The teachers seemed to reject the statement T49 “during my in-class teaching I find my students frightened when they do not understand what I am saying in English” as 50% disagreed and 33.3% remained neutral, whereas the respondents in Shabir’s study displayed a higher percentage (69,5) of agreement. The third statement (item T57) “L1 can be used to reduce anxiety in students” resulted in half of the respondents being neutral and half agreed. Therefore, using the L1 to reduce foreign language anxiety was perceived to be helpful by half of the respondents. Similar question in Shabir’s (2017) study was favoured slightly more, by 65% of the respondents and similarly in Hasemi and Sabet’s (2013) study, around 70% of the students and teachers were in favour.

Statements S36 to S39 are items in students’ questionnaire designed to elicit the perceptions about the L1 use as an affective strategy and how it might benefit the students during learning. These statements all investigated the help that the L1 might offer to students and resulted around the same percentage (46% to 57.6%) of students agreeing or strongly agreeing. Students (57.6%) reported that they receive most support from using their L1 in language lessons if they feel that when in difficult situation they can fall back on their L1 (item S39). Interestingly, 28.3% to 32.7% of respondents remained neutral in their choice of answer across all the statements. Results for the item S40 “using my L1 in language lessons helps me be more self-confident; is encouraging and supports my learning” was felt differently among Group 1 ( $M = 3.24$ ;  $SD = 1.122$ ) and Group 3 ( $M = 3.78$ ;  $SD = .801$ ) showing a significant difference in perceptions  $t(69.27) = -2.508$ ,  $p = .014$  indicating that the use of L1 has higher supportive effect on L2 learning among students at lower level of proficiency.

The last items of the students’ questionnaire were related to learner’s L2 identity, their self-confidence which is connected to language anxiety (Huang, 2014). The respondents tended to

disagree or strongly disagree (65.5% in total) that they feel “less confident” (item S41) in FL classroom, 73.5% did not agree to feeling “restricted and limited” (item S42). Interestingly, among Group 1 ( $M = 1.73$ ;  $SD = .891$ ) and 3 ( $M = 2.30$ ;  $SD = .993$ ) for item S42 a significant difference in perceptions occurred  $t(80) = -2.616$ ,  $p = .011$ , two-tailed; indicating that lower level students might feel more restricted and limited during FL classes than upper level students. Over half of respondents (61.9%) reported not feeling “inferior among my peers compared to the lessons in my L1” (item S43) and, again, these results differed significantly among Group 1 ( $M = 2.04$ ;  $SD = 1.088$ ) and 3 ( $M = 2.59$ ;  $SD = 1.338$ );  $t(80) = -2.015$ ,  $p = .047$ , two-tailed; indicating that respondents in pre-intermediate group tend to feel less confident during FL classes. Over half of the participants (64.7%) did not agree being “afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak in L2 and make mistakes” (item S44). However, the last item S45 “I am confident and comfortable, I feel like myself” was agreed to only by 48.7% therefore less than half of the respondents, however, despite difference in percentage, this difference was non-significant ( $t(80) = -.759$ ,  $p > 0.4$ , two-tailed).

## Summary

In conclusion, differences emerged between the pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups concerning 14 items out of 45 showing (see appendix 5) thus statistical significance between the perceptions among the two groups. Four of them were related to items reflective of foreign language anxiety, which indicates that the proficiency level might be an important variable and contributing factor to language learning anxiety. Overall, only one item was statistically significant comparing groups 1 and 2 (see appendix 7), and 5 items comparing groups 2 and 3 (see appendix 9), therefore there might have been not large enough difference in proficiency levels between these groups.

## CHAPTER 5: Discussion

This study investigated the existing use of L1 in ELT classroom and the teachers' and students' perceptions about using L1 in L2 language learning and teaching. It aimed to find out if and whether the L1 is used systematically and selectively and how the language teachers make their decisions regarding their L1 use. It also sought to examine which is the correlation between the use of L1, L2 and language learning anxiety.

The results suggest that there is no clear consensus on the extent to which the target language should be used in EFL classroom. There seems to be an agreement on whether the teacher should know the students' first language but the actual use of it is less favoured. Teachers tend to favour maximizing L2 use, however, still view the L1 use as necessary and valuable. This might be due to the fact that the relatively young learners do need and benefit from the support of their first language. All the teachers seem to agree to use L1 less with students at more advanced levels, which appears to be a common practise in ELT, however, there is some evidence that students at higher proficiency level might also benefit from judicious L1 use (Lee & Macaro, 2013). Therefore, depending on task difficulty, learning an L2 might be cognitively demanding at both levels, beginner and advanced, so the benefits of linking L2 learning to prior L1 knowledge are similar. Thus the proficiency level might be a contributing factor but not necessarily a deciding factor in the use of L1 in L2 learning.

It appears from this study that the students find the use of their L1 most helpful when the teacher is explaining new words and grammar which is in line with Shabir's (2017) and Hasemi and Sabet's (2013) study results. Similarly, teachers' experiences show that the students need support of their L1 when discussing more difficult terms and concepts, checking comprehension of meaning and also explaining grammar using the students' L1, especially considering that Estonian and English are quite distinct, Estonian language being part of the Finno-Ugric language group. Within the principle of Universal Grammar (UG; Chomsky, 1965, 1995), it is proposed that L2 learners set out with L1 parameter settings, at least initially, and these parameters determine how the learner approaches the target language (White, 1985, 2003). Therefore, there might be some L1 parameter transfer at play when learning the L2 resulting in transfer errors that might be best explained and avoided by the judicious use of L1 during the L2 teaching.

In addition, L1 offers an opportunity to check the comprehension of task instructions which the students in this study found useful, especially among the lower level learners. Similarly, in learners' view, studying new vocabulary with the help of the L1 was found useful which supports the findings of Lee and Macaro (2013) and Gill (2005). Another point to consider is the use of L1 when passing on important school information which might not be comprehensible to young learners at lower level of proficiency. From current study it also appears, that for some teachers, it is easier to discipline the students in their L1 rather than L2, again it might depend on the proficiency level and the age of the students, it might also depend on a seriousness of a situation. Therefore, Gill (2005) raises some interesting questions when discussing the use of L1 in the classroom wondering if the teacher will insist on L2 if a serious problem occurs or if something needs to be explained that is clearly above the learners' language level or in situations which require delicacy and empathy. Thus, L1 might have its advantages in certain situations, however these are more concerned with classroom management and not with L2 acquisition, however, the reality of a classroom proves that the two aspects are very difficult to keep apart in some learning environments. Moreover, oftentimes language lessons only last for 45 minutes and maybe we should seriously consider Weschler's (1997) statement that "[i]n fact, it could even be argued that time is the one independent variable on which all other factors are dependent, and that the lack of time makes any discussions on the merits of various methodologies entirely moot" (p. 94) and therefore teachers might find themselves under considerable time pressure to get ideas across, tasks completed and curriculum followed.

One of the aims of this study was to critically examine whether L1 is used systematically and selectively in L2 classroom and how language teachers make their decisions regarding their L1 use. It appears that the L1 use was minimized and the prevalent medium of instruction was the target language. Teachers used more L1 with younger and lower level learners than with advanced learners. The main purposes for L1 use were to check the understanding of task instructions, for translation of terms, phrases and short texts to check the comprehension of meaning, explaining grammar, repeating utterances if the students did not understand them in English, whereas students used their L1 mostly during collaborative interaction working in pairs or groups, also asking help from the teacher.

The findings reported here show that some discrepancies emerged where teachers agreed on using the L1 and its benefits in specific instances mention above, however, they also tend to disagree that the teacher should use the L1. On the one hand, they use it and find it useful, on

the other hand, they feel they shouldn't actually use it, which seems to be in line with Gill's (2005) observation that "teachers often feel guilty when using the first language, as there is often a taboo attached to any classroom use" (Kelleher, 2013, p. 2032). Therefore, L1 is perceived as having a negative influence on L2 learning, however, research has failed to demonstrate that L2-only approach has more enhancing effect on L2 learning process than allowing some L1 use might have (Macaro, 2001). What is more, the results of this study reveal that the students regard the use of their L1 by their teacher very useful and do not think that it is used too much or should be used more on any occasion enquired.

Teachers' unanimous disagreement concerning the use of the L1 during pair or group work was a striking finding as studies (Levine, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Storch & Wiggelsworth, 2003; Anton & DiCamilla, 1999) show that students actually benefit using their L1 during peer interaction, especially among the lower-achieving students and in the case of cognitively demanding tasks. Furthermore, the amount of the L1 required during different tasks depends on proficiency level (Swain & Lapkin, 2000). In line with Vygotskian sociocultural theory, the response in students' questionnaire, however, shows that one third of the students felt that they should be allowed to use their L1 during pair or group work. In keeping with the findings of Swain and Lapkin, the pre-intermediate level students' perception differed significantly from more advanced group. Therefore, even if the teachers see no value in using L1 during student interaction in pairs or groups, students themselves, especially at lower proficiency level, are in favour of using their L1. Interestingly, half of the teachers do agree to students' L1 use if asking help during pair or group work from their fellow students, so perhaps the distinction must be made between encouraging the L1 use during interaction in groups and asking for help if stuck in L2.

According to this study the majority of students do not specifically feel foreign language anxiety. Most of the statements reflective of foreign language anxiety were only supported by less than third of the students surveyed. It could be concluded that no positive correlation between L2 use and language learning anxiety was found, which is in accordance with Levine's (2003) findings. While there are always students who experience raised levels of anxiety in L2 classroom, there are also those who seldom do. In the case of students who feel more anxious, L1 might be the rescue tool taking the edge off, especially in case of young learners who might not have developed their own approach to language learning and also learners at lower proficiency levels. There was some evidence that respondents in pre-intermediate group tend to get more nervous compared to respondents on upper level of proficiency who might feel

more confident during language classes. It might also be that the teachers provide with enough support by L1 as over half of the students feel that when they face a difficult situation they can fall back on their L1, indicating a positive effect of L1 as an affective strategy to reduce language learning anxiety. Within current study, it was not possible to compare participants in L1 condition and no L1 condition as all the teachers knew and used, to greater or lesser extent, the students L1 in the classroom. Therefore, future research on foreign language anxiety and the use of L1 and L2-only would definitely contribute to this line of enquiry.

The study also revealed that there are some teachers who stated that they do not have a clear idea why or why not to use L1 and they do it out of convenience and habit, which supports the necessity of this study and shows that the aims of the study are achieved to this end, also it sheds some light in regard to the research question 1 that the L1 might be used out of habit which does not necessarily indicate a hindrance to L2 acquisition as often teachers use the L1 instinctively and according to the “what works” principle. However, the study revealed that EFL teachers’ overall perceptions and practices of the L1 use are generally in line with relevant research in the field.

Overall, there should be a good reason whenever English is not used in ELT classroom, however, learners who walk into the L2 classroom having one language already in their possession, it presents a powerful resource that should be used to a good effect (Gill, 2005). Therefore, we should consider why and for what purposes is the target language used in a classroom as Gill suggests that if there is a justified cause for the L1 use that is not achieved through L2 then it might indeed be necessary to use L1. On the other hand, if it is only used for instructions, is repetitive and limited in range and not for negotiation of meaning there might be little growth towards proficiency. Thus, in light of the insights in social theory, psycholinguistics and neurological research this study has also tried to contribute to the existing understanding of the use and practice of L1 in ELT classroom. The take-home message from this research might be that it is important to raise awareness among both students and more importantly teachers about the opportunities and possibilities that the use of the L1 might offer and make them reflect and rethink their language use in the classroom.

Still, these results should be regarded with caution as the teachers’ study sample was very small and in the case of students, respondents’ age might be a serious limitation to make generalisations. Classroom observation and the amount of lessons observed was very limited, however, it did present with a slight idea about what is going on in language classes, even if to

exclude the extreme situation described by Gill (2005) where a teacher went to observe a French L2 lesson and only seven words in the target language were used which is a good example of L1 overuse that, most probably, has a negative impact on L2 learning (Kelleher, 2013). Also, considering the possibility for and amount of 'neutral' responses, the question remains as to who chooses the middle option and is it really about true opinion neutrality or rather having no opinion or no adequate knowledge. Some neutral responses may also be due to shortfalls in the questionnaire.

## **CHAPTER 6: Conclusion, recommendations and limitations**

This dissertation set out to unravel some of the mysteries surrounding the use of learners' first language in the second language or foreign language classroom. It sought to review the evidence for L1 use in EFL classroom and compare the results to the current theories on using the L1 in L2 acquisition and develop further understanding of the effects of L1 in ELT. The use of learners' L1 is and has been a common practice in EFL learning and teaching and most probably will be (Gill, 2005), therefore an informed and judicious use of L1 is essential to exploit this linguistic resource that is present in every EFL classroom. However, it requires a principled use and decision making on teachers' part; and more profound knowledge in that area is needed that will improve methods and develop informed practice of using the L1 in a language classroom.

This dissertation began by looking at the attitudes and recent debates on using English-only approach in ELT. To infer that English-only method is the one and only way to teach EFL classes would be a rather simplistic approach to the issue, especially considering that every language teaching and learning setting is unique (Weschler, 1997). In second language learning situations, where the students do not share their L1, using it is not an option, however, in classrooms where the L1 is commonly shared there tends to be no sound reason why L1 should not be used taking "advantage of the students' shared knowledge in bridging the gap to what they don't yet know" (Weschler, 1997, p. 93). Furthermore, research literature reveals the lack of clear evidence that L2 is more effectively acquired monolingually (Macaro, 2001) and that using L1 in L2 learning actually interferes with L2 acquisition. Moreover, a growing number of researchers (e.g. Atkinson, 1997; Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain, 2009; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Weschler, 1997; Macaro, 2009) agree that the use of the L1 can be a resource in L2 or FL classroom and using that resource gives students greater control over their learning.

Studies on the L1 use in L2 learning and teaching reveal that judicious use of L1 can be a scaffolding tool in collaborative interaction and lead to more accomplished performance in L2 (Cummins, 2007; Swain et al., 2011; Bhooth et al., 2014; Cook, 2001), especially, in meaning-based tasks carrying heavy cognitive load (Nation, 2003), and also learning the L2 vocabulary (Nation, 2003; Lee & Macaro, 2013; Tian & Macaro, 2012). Furthermore, if we allow learners to use cognitively and socially dominant language in the L2 classroom, we offer them opportunities to express and develop more profound ideas and excel at cognitively demanding

tasks. The use of both languages might encourage lower level students to express themselves and engage more confidently. Empirical evidence strongly suggests that the use of L1 in L2 classroom should not be considered an impediment to L2 acquisition. Similarly, the overall findings of this study indicate that the L1 has an important role to play in L2 learning and teaching.

The study further revealed that relationship between the teachers' and students' perceptions was not one of congruency. The findings show that the students tend to oppose the English-only pedagogy while the teachers endorse the approach more. While EFL classroom is often the only instance to practise English for EFL students and using L1 or codeswitching "is believed to cut down on the amount of exposure that the learner has to the L2" (Macaro, 2005, p. 66), it might be that the quality of exposure to L2 is more critical than the quantity and the extensive input does not always equal to actual intake (Macaro 1997, 2005; Dickson 1992), especially if the meaning is not understood. Therefore, it might be argued that it is here where the opportunities to learn are lost. Thus, complicated concepts, terms and expressions that would otherwise require lengthy explanations in L2 by the teacher could be easily offered to learners by pre-planned use of L1.

Additionally, this dissertation sought to better understand the relationship between the L1 use, L2 use and foreign language anxiety which is a relatively unexplored area. Some empirical evidence (Liao, 2006) suggests that L1 as an affective strategy might help to reduce learning anxiety in language classroom as the use of L1 is cognitively less demanding, especially in the case of limited L2 knowledge, therefore it might allow learners to improve their performance and thus reduce language learning anxiety. Current study, however, indicated no positive correlation between L2 use and language learning anxiety. More studies are clearly needed to understand the correlation between L1 use, L2 use and language learning anxiety.

One of the reasons this study was conducted was the young learners' parental feedback about the difficulty of English classes if only L2 is used. The students in this study, albeit relatively young in age, were given a voice, furthermore, their beliefs and needs were mapped. In light of the learner-centred teaching approach, authentic language tasks given during the class might place higher cognitive demands on students where the L1 can bridge a gap facilitating an effective collaboration between the students serving thus as a scaffolding strategy enhancing learning (Swain et al., 2011; Bhooth et al., 2014; Cook, 2001; Anton & DiCamilla, 1999). Furthermore, for a learning process to be meaningful for the learners "engaging critically and

in a principled manner with code choice allows a large part of the language learning process to remain in the control of the learners” (Levine, 2011, p. 41).

Although the current study is based on a small sample of teacher participants, the findings suggest that overall, the teachers in the sample regarded L1 use in the EFL classroom unnecessary. There are teachers among the participants who use the L1 instinctively having no clear idea of why they are using it and there are more informed teachers who seem to use L1 purposefully and judiciously. In light of these findings, the present study has shed a contemporary light on the contentious issue of using the L1 in L2 classroom. It confirms previous findings and contributes additional evidence that suggests that L1 use is often undesired by the teachers yet not totally banned. Even if this study has only slightly scratched the surface with regard to the role of the L1 in SLA research and L2 pedagogy, the results indicate that if applying the principles of L1 use systematically and judiciously it might turn out to be a valuable addition to the teacher’s toolbox.

Often the use of the L1 in EFL settings is unwelcome, unfashionable, forbidden, avoided at all costs, feared even, which might be due to inadequate knowledge in the subject area. Thus, unfamiliar becomes avoided, unknown becomes feared which is not to say we should give a green light to the learners’ L1 use in the classroom. However, even if forbidden, the L1 of the students will most probably be used in the English language classroom, be it during pair work completing a language task or for small talk between the students, or even only in the head of the learners as a private speech (Vygotsky, 1978; Levine, 2011). Therefore, to prohibit the use of the L1 during language learning might prove an impossible endeavour (Kelleher, 2013) and an unnecessary one at that.

Therefore, the hoped-for outcome of current study was to indicate whether the use of the L1 restricts or enhances L2 acquisition. The prevailing contention is that the EFL teacher should not use L1 only as a last resort in order to explain difficult grammar concepts and vocabulary items, check comprehension, facilitate peer interaction, or reduce foreign language anxiety if need be, but exactly during those instances, in a pre-planned, judicious manner to enhance learning. Therefore, it can be concluded that in such a way, and not necessarily limited to these same instances, would the use of the L1 in L2 classroom enhance L2 acquisition.

As the use of the L1 in L2 learning and teaching is still a relatively under-researched area and oftentimes the SLA research focus has been on monolingual methods in L2 teaching, thus more in-depths research is needed on methodologies for bilingual FL classes where students and

teachers share the same L1, which globally constitutes the majority (Forman, 2010). Therefore, this research has brought about several questions in need of further investigation of pedagogical principles regarding the role of the learners' L1 within L2 acquisition and its most optimal use in L2 learning and teaching. Furthermore, research in the field might benefit from longitudinal studies comparing the students in similar settings in an L1 and English-only condition.

There are several limitations to this study. Namely, current research topic has been explored through the lens of a non-native speaker practitioner using both languages, L1 and L2, daily in EFL classroom, thus, the views expressed in this dissertation might include some personal bias hindering the findings. Similarly, researcher's personal involvement with the institution the data were gathered from and, to some extent, also with respondents might also affect study's legitimacy, on the other hand, it might have impacted the willingness to participate and contribute in terms of the sample size. However, the sample size of the teachers in current study is relatively small, although all the EFL teachers participated, which might not allow for generalizable conclusions. Also, the difference in students' proficiency levels across the groups, especially between groups 1 and 2, is fairly minor, which might have contributed to the results being statistically non-significant between the two groups. Additionally, if the questionnaire items were designed specifically for adolescent or adult learners, these might have not been the best sample items for basic school students.

## References

- Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's Construct of Foreign Language Anxiety: The Case of Students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(2), 155-168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02026.x>
- Antón, M. and Dicamilla, F. J. (1999). Socio-Cognitive Functions of L1 Collaborative Interaction in the L2 Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, 233-247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00018>
- Atkinson, D. 1993. *Teaching Monolingual Classes*. Harlow, UK: Pearson English Language Teaching
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 9-32.
- Auerbach, E. R. (2016). Reflections on Auerbach (1993), “Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom”. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(4), 936-939. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.310>
- Bateman, B. E. (2008), Student Teachers' Attitudes and Beliefs About Using the Target Language in the Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41, 11-28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2008.tb03277.x>
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Allen Lane.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.011>
- Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L. & Cocking, R.R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

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.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn051>

Butzkamm, W. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma. *Language Learning Journal*, 28, 29-39.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730385200181>

Butzkamm, W. (2008, April 1). The mother tongue taboo or taking the dogma out of foreign language methodology. [Blog post]. Retrieved from http

<https://juergenkurtz.wordpress.com/2008/04/01/the-mother-tongue-taboo-or-taking-the-dogma-out-of-foreign-language-methodology/>

Butzkamm, W., & Caldwell, J. (2009). *The bilingual reform: A paradigm shift in foreign language teaching*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language research: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Code switching. (2010). In J. C. Richards, & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed., p. 89). London: Routledge.

Cook, V. J. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 402–423. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>

Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221–240. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=27982695&site=eds-live>

Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon.

First language. (2010). In J. C. Richards, & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed., p. 221). London: Routledge.

Foreign language. (2010). In J. C. Richards, & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed., pp. 223-224). London: Routledge.

Forman, R. (2010). Ten Principles of Bilingual Pedagogy in EFL. In A. Mahboob (Ed.), *The NNEST Lens: Non Native English Speakers in TESOL* (pp. 54-86). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gill, S. (2005). The L1 in the L2 classroom. *Humanizing Language Teaching*, 7 (5). Retrieved from <https://old.hltnmag.co.uk> › sep05 › mart03

Groom, N., & Littlemore, J. (2011). *Doing applied linguistics: a guide for students*. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>

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 and English Literature*, 2(2), 142-152. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.2p.142>

Hlas, A. (2016). Secondary Teachers' Language Usage: Beliefs and Practices. *Hispania*, 99(2), 305-319. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44112864>

Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language Anxiety and Achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 112-126. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000071>

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125-132.

Huang, Y. (2014). Self and Language Anxiety. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 4(2), 66-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ells.v4n2p66>

Kelleher, M. (2013). Overcoming the First Language Taboo to Enhance Learning a Foreign Language. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 2037-2042.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.161>

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

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2007). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.). *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 201 - 224). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lee, J. H., & Macaro, E. (2013). Investigating Age in the Use of L1 or English-Only Instruction: Vocabulary Acquisition by Korean EFL Learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(4), 887-901. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12044.x>

Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *Modern Language Journal*, 87(3), 343- 364. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1192959>

Levine, G. S. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom*. Multilingual Matters. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com>

Lewis, M. (1999). *The Lexical Approach: The State of ELT and a Way Forward*. London: ITP Teacher Training

Liao, P. (2006). EFL Learners' Beliefs about and Strategy Use of Translation in English Learning. *RELC Journal*, 37(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206067428>

Lightbown, P. (1991). What have we here? Some observations of the influence of instruction on L2 learning. In R. Phillipson, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research* (pp. 197-212). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44(1), 64-77. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809990310>

Liu, H., & Chen, T. (2013). Foreign Language Anxiety in Young Learners: How It Relates to Multiple Intelligences, Learner Attitudes, and Perceived Competence. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(5), pp. 932-938. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.5.932-938>

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. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1193074>

Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: a communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda, (Ed.). *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 63-84). Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>

Macaro, E. (2009), Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (eds.). *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 35-49). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

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

MacIntyre, P. D. (1995). How Does Anxiety Affect Second Language Learning? A Reply to Sparks and Ganschow. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79 (1), 90-99.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The Subtle Effects of Language Anxiety on Cognitive Processing in the Second Language. *Language Learning* 44(2), 283-305.

MacIntyre, P.D., & Gardner, R.C. (1991). Methods and Results in the Study of Anxiety and Language Learning: A Review of the Literature. *Language Learning*, 41(1), 85-117.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1991.tb00677.x>

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

Noormohamadi, R. (2009). On the Relationship between Language Learning Strategies and Foreign Language Anxiety. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 39-52. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.4.637-646>

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bailey, P., & Daley, C. (2000). The validation of three scales measuring anxiety at different stages of the foreign language learning process: The input anxiety scale, the processing anxiety scale, and the output anxiety scale. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 87-117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00112>

Poplack, S. (2000). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. In Wei, L. (Ed.), *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 221–56). London: Routledge.

Prodromou L., 2002. From mother tongue to other tongue. Retrieved from <https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/>

Riazi, A. M. (2016). *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>

Second language. (2010). In J. C. Richards, & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed., p. 514). London: Routledge.

Shabir, M. (2017). Student-Teachers' Beliefs on the Use of L1 in EFL Classroom: A Global Perspective. *English Language Teaching*, 10(4), 45-51. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n4p45>

Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. P. Allen & B. Harley (Eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is There a Role for the Use of the L1 in an L2 Setting? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 760-769. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588224>

Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-Based Second Language Learning: The Uses of the First Language. *Language Teaching Research* 4(3):251-274.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688000400304>

Swain, M., Kirkpatrick, A., & Cummins, J. (2011). *How to Have a Guilt-free Life Using Cantonese in the English Class: A Handbook for the English Language Teacher in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Research Centre into Language Acquisition and Education in Multilingual Societies, Hong Kong Institute of Education. Retrieved from  
<https://www.eduhk.hk/rcleams/handbook/handbook.pdf>

Swain, S. D., Weathers, D., and Niedrich, R. W. (2008). Assessing Three Sources of Misresponse to Reversed Likert Items, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45(1), 116-131.

Thompson, G. L. and Harrison, K. (2014), Language Use in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47, 321-337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12079>

Tian, L., & Macaro, E. (2012). Comparing the effect of teacher codeswitching with English-only explanations on the vocabulary acquisition of Chinese university students: A lexical focus-on-form study. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(3), 367-391.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168812436909>

Trang, T. T., Moni, K., & Baldauf, R. B. (2013). Foreign Language Anxiety: Understanding Its Status and Insiders' Awareness and Attitudes. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(2), 95-131.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.85>

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 531-540. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.4.531>

Turnbull, M., & Dailey-O’Cain, J. (2009). Introduction. In M. Turnbull and J. Dailey-O’Cain (Eds.). *First language use in second and foreign learning* (pp. 1-14). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Villamil, O. and de Guerrero, M. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: social-cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5, 51–75. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(96\)90015-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(96)90015-6)

Voicu, C. G. (2012). Overusing mother tongue in English language teaching. *International Journal of Communication Research*, 2(3), 212-218.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wells, G. (1999). Using L1 to Master L2: A Response to Anton and DiCamilla's "Socio-Cognitive Functions of L1 Collaborative Interaction in the L2 Classroom". *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 248-254. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/330339>

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press.

Weschler, R. (1997). Uses of Japanese in the English Classroom: Introducing the Functional-Translation Method. *Kyoritsu Women's University Department of International Studies Journal*, 12, 87-110. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED422746>

White, L. (1985). The pro-drop parameter in adult second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 35(1), 47–62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1985.tb01014.x>

White, L. (2003). *Second Language Acquisition and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and Speaking English as a Second Language. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, 37(3), 308-328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206071315>

## Appendix 1

### Summary of classroom observation – personal notes

#### 6 EFL Teachers

**Students of 9 to 13 years of age, proficiency level from beginner to intermediate.**

Instances of L1 use:

- Teacher asks questions and explains instructions in L2 and repeats in L1
- Students at lower level of proficiency and younger learners respond mostly in L1, sometimes codeswitching is used
- Translating sentences to check meaning
- Teacher helps to translate specific words to help the student form a sentence or question
- Teacher explains directions and gives a short introduction to new topic
- Short individual feedback to a student
- Teacher repeats home assignment in L1
- Translating a short text into L1 for comprehension check
- Teacher elicits new vocabulary in L1
- Students interact in peer interaction mostly in L1
- Teacher checks comprehension of new vocabulary, individually explaining instructions
- Explaining grammar points, providing examples
- In case of no answer in L2, the teacher asks the same question in L1

Teacher explains, gives instructions, asks questions first in L2, L1 is used if the use of L2 does not yield results and is necessary to aid comprehension or elicit meaning.

Lower level students need extra support in L1. Student prefer L1 during pair work, help each other in L1 to explain instructions and complete the task.

## Appendix 2

### Teachers' questionnaire items and main outcomes in percentages

<b>The use of the learners' first language (L1) in second language (L2) classroom</b>	<b>strongly disagree</b>	<b>disagree</b>	<b>neutral</b>	<b>agree</b>	<b>strongly agree</b>
<b>I use L1 in my classroom:</b>					
T1: rarely and try to keep it minimal	0	0	0	83.3	16.7
T2: less with students at more advanced level	0	0	0	16.7	83.3
T3: to discipline the students	0	33.3	0	66.7	0
T4: to check comprehension	0	0	0	83.3	16.7
T5: to give task instructions	0	50	16.7	33.3	0
T6: for classroom management (absence, late comers, etc.)	0	100	0	0	0
T7: to pass on general and important school information	0	0	50	33.3	16.7
T8: to reduce students' language learning anxiety	0	16.7	16.7	66.7	0
T9: for more difficult terms and concepts	0	0	0	83.3	16.7
T10: explaining grammar	0	0	0	100	0
T11: instinctively, I have no clear idea why or why not to use L1	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	0
T12: out of convenience and habit	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	0
<b>In my personal opinion, in foreign language classroom:</b>					
T13: the teacher should know the students' L1?	0	0	33.3	50	16.7
T14: the teacher should use the students' L1?	0	50	33.3	16.7	0
T15: the students should use their L1?	0	33.3	50	16.7	0
T16: teachers should not use L1 because it reduces the amount of students' exposure to L2	0	16.7	50	33.3	0
T17: the use of L1 should be minimized	0	0	0	66.7	33.3
T18: the only way to learn an English word completely is to know its meaning in L1	0	0	50	50	0
T19: learners should be translating the English language into L1 when they read a text	0	16.7	50	33.3	0
<b>It is useful if I use L1 when:</b>					
T20: explaining new words	0	16.7	50	33.3	0
T21: explaining grammar	0	0	0	100	0
T22: explaining differences between L1 and L2 grammar	0	0	33.3	66.7	0
T23: explaining differences in the use of L1 and L2 rules	0	0	50	50	0

T24: giving instructions	16.7	66.7	16.7	0	0
<b>Students should be allowed to use L1 when:</b>					
T25: talking in pairs and groups	33.3	66.7	0	0	0
T26: asking how do we say '..' in English?	0	16.7	16.7	50	16.7
T27: translating an L2 word into L1 to show they understand it	0	0	16.7	83.3	0
T28: translating a text from L2 to L1 to show they understand it	0	0	0	100	0
T29: translating as a test	0	16.7	0	66.7	16.7
<b>The teacher and students can use L1 to:</b>					
T30: check listening comprehension	0	33.3	50	16.7	0
T31: check reading comprehension	0	16.7	50	33.3	0
T32: discuss the methods used in class	0	16.7	50	33.3	0
<b>The STUDENT can use their L1 to:</b>					
T33: ask teacher's help to form a question or state an opinion in English	0	0	16.7	83.3	0
T34: check if they have understood the task and instructions	0	0	50	50	0
T35: pass on their ideas if stuck using English	0	16.7	0	83.3	0
T36: ask help from fellow student during pair or group work	0	0	50	50	0
<b>The TEACHER can use their L1 to:</b>					
T37: help students to form a question or state an opinion in English	0	50	0	33.3	16.7
T38: check if students have understood the task and instructions	0	16.7	33.3	50	0
T39: discipline students	0	50	16.7	33.3	0
T40: create a friendly and relaxed atmosphere in the classroom	0	16.7	66.7	16.7	0
<b>Using students' L1 helps me:</b>					
T41: save time when explaining a task or activity	0	50	33.3	16.7	0
T42: save time when explaining the meaning or use of a new word	0	0	66.7	33.3	0
T43: better explain the aim of a lesson	0	16.7	50	33.3	0
T44: be more confident, especially when my own knowledge of L2 is insufficient	0	66.7	0	33.3	0
T45: make students more relaxed, confident and ready to learn	0	16.7	66.7	16.7	0
<b>During my in-class teaching:</b>					
T46: I do not like the use of L1 because it prevents students from thinking in English	0	0	16.7	66.7	16.7

T47: I sometimes speak L1 to clarify my directions	0	0	0	100	0
T48: I like to use L1 for giving individual comments	0	33.3	16.7	50	0
T49: I find my students frightened when they do not understand what I am saying in English in the English class	0	50	33.3	16.7	0
T50: I have observed that the medium of instruction should be only English in English classroom	0	0	50	33.3	16.7
T51: I find it necessary to explain the differences and similarities between L1 and English in students L1	0	16.7	16.7	50	16.7
<b>During my language teaching career, I have been in a classroom situations that make me think that:</b>					
T52: codeswitching (switching between two languages) should be allowed in the classroom as a teaching tool	0	0	0	83.3	16.7
T53: I sometimes avoid certain activities because it is difficult to perform them entirely in the L2	0	83.3	0	16.7	0
T54: if learners codeswitch they manage difficult tasks better	0	0	33.3	50	16.7
T55: L1 can be used by the students to lighten the cognitive load	0	0	33.3	66.7	0
T56: L1 can be used by the teachers to transfer the language input into more familiar terms	0	0	83.3	0	16.7
T57: L1 can be used to reduce anxiety in students	0	0	50	50	0
<b>T58: In your own words, describe the benefits of using students' L1 in a language classroom:</b>  <i>[Original text not edited]</i>  1) Using L1 can be useful in explaining grammatical and connotational differences between L1 and L2 to pupils with lower language proficiency. Using a student's L1 is also useful in situations where English is in fact a third language for the pupil and difficulties occur in connecting the new knowledge with previous. Upon these situations even the use of other pupils' L1 (L2 for the problematic student) might not be sufficient. 2) It very much depends on the child and which grade the student is in. If it is a pupil whose language abilities are not the best and it is very difficult for that person understand L2, using L1 might make the learning process a little bit easier for him/her. On the other hand, with a fluent pupil I wouldn't use L1, because it makes things too easy. If possible I would rather not use L1, but if so, it will make learning and understanding the meanings of words and content much easier for the pupils.					

3) It helps to introduce new words and their meanings, to explain more difficult grammar rules (only in case students didn't understand them so well in L2). It also helps to reduce students' anxiety (if their vocabulary is not so good, if weaker students don't understand the tasks, if they want to speak but can't use L2).

The use of L1 depends on the level of the class. The amount of L1 should be reduced step-by-step.

4) In some situations using L1 saves great deal of time and prevents misunderstanding. In some occasions the students are less confused or feel less stressed.

5) Using L1 can help students who have fallen behind and can't keep up with the rest of the group. It lessens confusion about instructions and can be a great tool when comparing languages (grammar, patterns, expressions etc). I tend to avoid using L1 but believe there are aspects of learning L2 that benefit from the use of L1.

6) To use the L1 with students can be more efficient and save time in the classroom.

Also similarities and differences between L1 and L2 are well known. Students may feel more comfortable.

**T59: In your own words, describe the pitfalls of using students' L1 in a language classroom:**

*[Original text not edited]*

1) The students' might not get used to hearing English or rather, they might not pay attention to the instructions in English at all, as they know it will be explained to them in L1 regardless.

2) It makes the students lazy, if you have a chance to always use your L1 why use L2 then. Using too much L1 in a classroom makes the learning process lazier, because if they have a word in English that they need to describe in English that takes much more effort than translating it into Estonian. Also, using L1 in a classroom does not widen the pupils' vocabulary that much.

3) Using L1 is more convenient for students, especially for weaker and shier students because it makes difficult tasks more manageable but in my opinion teachers should maximize their use of L2 depending on the students' level. English speaking environment helps to develop language awareness and encourages communication in English in the future.

4) Some students like to talk only in L1 and they do not practise their L2 as much as possible.

5) Using L1 can become a thing of convenience. It just comes easier and more natural to turn to L1 when there is an obstacle.

6) Students may expect that everything will be translated into L1. It can reduce students' opportunities to practice English. They will not learn to think in L2.

T60: Education

T61: How long have you been teaching English?

T62: Which year students do you teach or have taught?

T63: First language

Original online questionnaire results available: [www.connect.ee/uuring/415807105/](http://www.connect.ee/uuring/415807105/)

### Appendix 3

#### Students' questionnaire items and main outcomes in percentages

<b>The use of the learners' first language (L1) in second language (L2) classroom</b>	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
<b>In a foreign language classroom:</b>					
S1: the teacher should know the students' L1	0	2.7	8	35.4	54
S2: the teacher should use the students' L1	2.7	16.8	29.2	31.9	19.5
S3: the students should use their L1	5.3	27.4	26.5	29.2	11.5
<b>It is useful if the teacher uses L1 when:</b>					
S4: explaining new words	0	4.4	2.7	39.8	53.1
S5: explaining grammar	0	2.7	7.1	43.4	46.9
S6: explaining differences between L1 and L2 grammar	0	3.5	9.7	46.9	39.8
S7: explaining differences in the use of L1 and L2 rules	0	7.1	16.8	40.7	35.4
S8: giving instructions	0.9	24.8	19.5	38.1	16.8
<b>Students should be allowed to use L1 when:</b>					
S9: working in pairs and groups	6.2	26.5	30.1	23	14.2
S10: asking e.g. how do we say '!' in English?	1.8	8	12.4	45.1	32.7
S11: translating an L2 word into L1 to show they understand it	0	0	12.4	51.3	36.3
S12: translating a text from L2 to L1 to show they understand it	0.9	0	12.4	58.4	28.3
<b>The students can use L1 to:</b>					
S13: ask teacher's help to form a question or state an opinion in L2	0.9	6.2	10.6	54	28.3
S14: check if they have understood the instructions correctly	0	5.3	10.6	57.5	26.5

S15: express an idea if they cannot say it in L2	0	8	21.2	46	24.8
S16: ask classmates' help when doing group or pair work	1.8	15.9	28.3	31	23
<b>The teacher can use L1 to:</b>					
S17: help me form a question or state and opinion in L2	1.8	2.7	8	53.1	34.5
S18: check listening task	0.9	18.6	26.5	33.6	20.4
S19: check reading comprehension	0.9	4.4	17.7	52.5	24.8
S20: check understanding of instructions	0.9	1.8	9.7	59.3	28.3
S21: discipline the students	2.7	20.4	30.1	23.9	23
S22: create a pleasant and friendly atmosphere in the classroom	1.8	11.5	21.2	32.7	32.7
<b>I think that the teacher uses too much L1 when:</b>					
S23: explaining grammar	23.9	45.1	23.9	4.4	2.7
S24: giving instructions and organising activities	23.9	45.1	20.4	6.2	4.4
S25: disciplining the students	21.2	42.5	20.4	11.5	4.4
S26: giving the lesson	36.3	41.6	15	4.4	2.7
<b>I think that the teacher should use more L1 when:</b>					
S27: explaining grammar	6.2	22.1	28.3	38.1	5.3
S28: giving instructions and organising activities	8	27.4	29.2	29.2	6.2
S29: disciplining the students	12.4	41.6	28.3	14.2	3.5
S30: giving the lesson	18.6	38.9	29.2	11.5	1.8
<b>In foreign language lessons:</b>					
S31: I feel distressed when I do not understand what the teacher is saying in another language	45.1	30.1	10.6	13.3	0.9
S32: the possibility that the teacher corrects me if I make a mistake in my foreign language use frightens me	41.6	28.3	18.6	8.8	2.7

S33: I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on	46.9	20.4	15.9	13.3	3.5
S34: I feel more tense and nervous than in my other classes	56.6	21.2	9.7	9.7	2.7
S35: I get nervous when I do not understand every word the language teacher says	46	24.8	15	13.3	0.9
<b>Using my L1 in language lessons helps me:</b>					
S36: complete the tasks more easily	2.7	10.6	31.9	40.7	14.2
S37: manage the anxiety related to foreign language learning	7.1	16.8	30.1	37.2	8.8
S38: be more active and daring	3.5	17.7	32.7	36.3	9.7
S39: feel that when in difficult situation I can fall back on my L1 for support	2.7	11.5	28.3	43.4	14.2
S40: be more self-confident; is encouraging and supports my learning	4.4	15	31	39.8	9.7
<b>In foreign language lessons my sense of self is different from usual because I feel:</b>					
S41: less confident	38.1	27.4	16.8	15.9	1.8
S42: restricted and limited	42.5	31	19.5	7.1	0
S43: inferior among my peers compared to the lessons in my L1	35.4	26.5	21.2	13.3	3.5
S44: I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak in L2 and make mistakes	43.4	21.2	16.8	16.8	1.8
S45: I am confident and comfortable, I feel like myself	8	10.6	32.7	31.9	16.8

S46: Age

S47: Form

S48: Group

S49: First language

Original online questionnaire results available: [www.connect.ee/res/41409391325635/](http://www.connect.ee/res/41409391325635/)

## Appendix 4

### Group 1 and Group 3 mean scores and standard deviation

	Group 1 advanced Group 3 pre-intermediate	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
S1	Advanced	55	4.45	.765	.103
S1	pre-intermediate	27	4.26	.903	.174
S2	Advanced	55	3.42	1.134	.153
S2	pre-intermediate	27	3.63	1.115	.214
S3	Advanced	55	2.98	1.209	.163
S3	pre-intermediate	27	3.30	.993	.191
S4	Advanced	55	4.31	.920	.124
S4	pre-intermediate	27	4.48	.509	.098
S5	Advanced	55	4.35	.799	.108
S5	pre-intermediate	27	4.44	.641	.123
S6	Advanced	55	4.22	.809	.109
S6	pre-intermediate	27	4.30	.724	.139
S7	Advanced	55	3.95	1.008	.136
S7	pre-intermediate	27	4.15	.818	.157
S8	Advanced	55	3.29	1.048	.141
S8	pre-intermediate	27	3.85	1.134	.218
S9	Advanced	55	2.98	1.163	.157
S9	pre-intermediate	27	3.59	1.185	.228
S10	Advanced	55	3.85	1.044	.141
S10	pre-intermediate	27	4.07	.829	.159
S11	Advanced	55	4.29	.629	.085
S11	pre-intermediate	27	4.37	.688	.132
S12	Advanced	55	4.22	.567	.077
S12	pre-intermediate	27	4.15	.864	.166
S13	Advanced	55	4.04	.793	.107
S13	pre-intermediate	27	4.19	.834	.160
S14	Advanced	55	3.95	.780	.105
S14	pre-intermediate	27	4.44	.577	.111
S15	Advanced	55	3.89	.896	.121
S15	pre-intermediate	27	4.04	.980	.189
S16	Advanced	55	3.51	1.086	.147
S16	pre-intermediate	27	3.93	1.174	.226
S17	Advanced	55	4.18	.863	.116
S17	pre-intermediate	27	4.22	.751	.145
S18	Advanced	55	3.44	1.067	.144
S18	pre-intermediate	27	3.78	1.188	.229

S19	Advanced	55	3.84	.856	.115
S19	pre-intermediate	27	4.22	.751	.145
S20	Advanced	55	4.07	.813	.110
S20	pre-intermediate	27	4.26	.594	.114
S21	Advanced	55	3.35	1.142	.154
S21	pre-intermediate	27	3.59	1.217	.234
S22	Advanced	55	3.78	1.117	.151
S22	pre-intermediate	27	4.04	1.055	.203
S23	Advanced	55	1.89	.809	.109
S23	pre-intermediate	27	2.67	1.038	.200
S24	Advanced	55	1.98	.933	.126
S24	pre-intermediate	27	2.78	1.155	.222
S25	Advanced	55	2.15	1.008	.136
S25	pre-intermediate	27	2.81	1.178	.227
S26	Advanced	55	1.69	.814	.110
S26	pre-intermediate	27	2.56	1.219	.235
S27	Advanced	55	2.84	1.050	.142
S27	pre-intermediate	27	3.48	.975	.188
S28	Advanced	55	2.75	1.058	.143
S28	pre-intermediate	27	3.44	1.155	.222
S29	Advanced	55	2.36	.988	.133
S29	pre-intermediate	27	2.81	1.075	.207
S30	Advanced	55	2.35	.966	.130
S30	pre-intermediate	27	2.74	1.095	.211
S31	Advanced	55	1.78	.956	.129
S31	pre-intermediate	27	2.30	1.265	.244
S32	Advanced	55	1.93	1.168	.158
S32	pre-intermediate	27	2.15	.989	.190
S33	Advanced	55	2.00	1.202	.162
S33	pre-intermediate	27	2.30	1.353	.260
S34	Advanced	55	1.67	1.123	.151
S34	pre-intermediate	27	2.15	1.231	.237
S35	Advanced	55	1.71	.916	.124
S35	pre-intermediate	27	2.37	1.334	.257
S36	Advanced	55	3.40	1.065	.144
S36	pre-intermediate	27	3.74	.903	.174
S37	Advanced	55	3.27	1.079	.146
S37	pre-intermediate	27	3.48	1.014	.195
S38	Advanced	55	3.44	1.050	.142
S38	pre-intermediate	27	3.33	1.038	.200
S39	Advanced	55	3.49	.979	.132

S39	pre-intermediate	27	3.67	1.000	.192
S40	Advanced	55	3.24	1.122	.151
S40	pre-intermediate	27	3.78	.801	.154
S41	Advanced	55	1.95	1.061	.143
S41	pre-intermediate	27	2.44	1.219	.235
S42	Advanced	55	1.73	.891	.120
S42	pre-intermediate	27	2.30	.993	.191
S43	Advanced	55	2.04	1.088	.147
S43	pre-intermediate	27	2.59	1.338	.257
S44	Advanced	55	1.98	1.178	.159
S44	pre-intermediate	27	2.56	1.396	.269
S45	Advanced	55	3.27	1.269	.171
S45	pre-intermediate	27	3.48	.935	.180

**Appendix 5**  
**Group 1 and Group 3 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differenc e	Std. Error Differenc e	Lower	Upper
S1	Equal variances assumed	1.752	.189	1.023	80	.310	.195	.191	-.185	.575
S1	Equal variances not assumed			.966	44.900	.339	.195	.202	-.212	.602
S2	Equal variances assumed	.125	.725	-.798	80	.427	-.211	.265	-.739	.316
S2	Equal variances not assumed			-.803	52.581	.426	-.211	.263	-.740	.317
S3	Equal variances assumed	1.168	.283	-1.170	80	.245	-.314	.269	-.849	.220
S3	Equal variances not assumed			-1.252	61.867	.215	-.314	.251	-.817	.188
S4	Equal variances assumed	4.600	.035	-.906	80	.368	-.172	.190	-.551	.206
S4	Equal variances not assumed			-1.090	78.750	.279	-.172	.158	-.487	.142
S5	Equal variances assumed	.477	.492	-.561	80	.576	-.099	.176	-.450	.252
S5	Equal variances not assumed			-.605	63.122	.547	-.099	.164	-.426	.228
S6	Equal variances assumed	.211	.647	-.425	80	.672	-.078	.184	-.444	.288
S6	Equal variances not assumed			-.441	57.307	.661	-.078	.177	-.433	.276
S7	Equal variances assumed	.973	.327	-.908	80	.367	-.203	.223	-.647	.242
S7	Equal variances not assumed			-.975	62.460	.334	-.203	.208	-.618	.213
S8	Equal variances assumed	.045	.832	-2.217	80	.029	-.561	.253	-1.064	-.057
S8	Equal variances not assumed			-2.158	48.316	.036	-.561	.260	-1.084	-.038

S9	Equal variances assumed	.575	.451	-2.222	80	.029	-.611	.275	-1.158	-.064
S9	Equal variances not assumed			-2.207	50.897	.032	-.611	.277	-1.166	-.055
S10	Equal variances assumed	1.320	.254	-.954	80	.343	-.220	.230	-.677	.238
S10	Equal variances not assumed			-1.032	63.680	.306	-.220	.213	-.644	.205
S11	Equal variances assumed	.802	.373	-.521	80	.603	-.079	.152	-.383	.224
S11	Equal variances not assumed			-.506	47.836	.615	-.079	.157	-.396	.237
S12	Equal variances assumed	1.108	.296	.439	80	.661	.070	.159	-.247	.387
S12	Equal variances not assumed			.383	37.367	.704	.070	.183	-.301	.441
S13	Equal variances assumed	.326	.569	-.786	80	.434	-.149	.189	-.526	.228
S13	Equal variances not assumed			-.772	49.498	.444	-.149	.193	-.536	.239
S14	Equal variances assumed	.147	.702	-2.948	80	.004	-.499	.169	-.836	-.162
S14	Equal variances not assumed			-3.262	67.395	.002	-.499	.153	-.804	-.194
S15	Equal variances assumed	.100	.753	-.673	80	.503	-.146	.217	-.578	.286
S15	Equal variances not assumed			-.652	47.841	.517	-.146	.224	-.596	.304
S16	Equal variances assumed	.157	.693	-1.590	80	.116	-.417	.262	-.939	.105
S16	Equal variances not assumed			-1.548	48.335	.128	-.417	.269	-.958	.125
S17	Equal variances assumed	.141	.709	-.208	80	.836	-.040	.195	-.428	.347
S17	Equal variances not assumed			-.218	58.720	.828	-.040	.186	-.412	.331
S18	Equal variances assumed	.607	.438	-1.311	80	.193	-.341	.260	-.860	.177
S18	Equal variances not assumed			-1.264	47.144	.212	-.341	.270	-.885	.202
S19	Equal variances assumed	.058	.811	-1.995	80	.049	-.386	.193	-.771	-.001

S1 9	Equal variances not assumed			-2.086	58.287	.041	-.386	.185	-.756	-.016
S2 0	Equal variances assumed	.009	.927	-1.060	80	.292	-.187	.176	-.537	.164
S2 0	Equal variances not assumed			-1.177	68.065	.243	-.187	.158	-.503	.130
S2 1	Equal variances assumed	.217	.643	-.901	80	.370	-.247	.274	-.793	.299
S2 1	Equal variances not assumed			-.882	48.932	.382	-.247	.280	-.811	.316
S2 2	Equal variances assumed	.989	.323	-.990	80	.325	-.255	.258	-.768	.258
S2 2	Equal variances not assumed			-1.009	54.519	.317	-.255	.253	-.762	.252
S2 3	Equal variances assumed	2.341	.130	-3.710	80	.000	-.776	.209	-1.192	-.360
S2 3	Equal variances not assumed			-3.409	42.028	.001	-.776	.228	-1.235	-.317
S2 4	Equal variances assumed	3.488	.065	-3.353	80	.001	-.796	.237	-1.268	-.324
S2 4	Equal variances not assumed			-3.117	43.191	.003	-.796	.255	-1.311	-.281
S2 5	Equal variances assumed	2.096	.152	-2.672	80	.009	-.669	.250	-1.168	-.171
S2 5	Equal variances not assumed			-2.533	45.229	.015	-.669	.264	-1.202	-.137
S2 6	Equal variances assumed	6.088	.016	-3.815	80	.000	-.865	.227	-1.316	-.414
S2 6	Equal variances not assumed			-3.338	37.736	.002	-.865	.259	-1.389	-.340
S2 7	Equal variances assumed	.385	.537	-2.675	80	.009	-.645	.241	-1.125	-.165
S2 7	Equal variances not assumed			-2.744	55.361	.008	-.645	.235	-1.116	-.174
S2 8	Equal variances assumed	.099	.754	-2.728	80	.008	-.699	.256	-1.209	-.189
S2 8	Equal variances not assumed			-2.647	47.924	.011	-.699	.264	-1.230	-.168
S2 9	Equal variances assumed	1.181	.280	-1.887	80	.063	-.451	.239	-.927	.025
S2 9	Equal variances not assumed			-1.833	48.042	.073	-.451	.246	-.946	.044

S3 0	Equal variances assumed	1.287	.260	-1.665	80	.100	-.395	.237	-.868	.077
S3 0	Equal variances not assumed			-1.595	46.412	.117	-.395	.248	-.894	.103
S3 1	Equal variances assumed	6.918	.010	-2.053	80	.043	-.514	.251	-1.013	-.016
S3 1	Equal variances not assumed			-1.867	41.069	.069	-.514	.276	-1.071	.042
S3 2	Equal variances assumed	1.034	.312	-.844	80	.401	-.221	.262	-.741	.300
S3 2	Equal variances not assumed			-.894	60.244	.375	-.221	.247	-.715	.273
S3 3	Equal variances assumed	2.028	.158	-1.006	80	.317	-.296	.294	-.882	.290
S3 3	Equal variances not assumed			-.966	46.658	.339	-.296	.307	-.914	.321
S3 4	Equal variances assumed	.479	.491	-1.745	80	.085	-.475	.272	-1.018	.067
S3 4	Equal variances not assumed			-1.691	47.745	.097	-.475	.281	-1.041	.090
S3 5	Equal variances assumed	11.594	.001	-2.629	80	.010	-.661	.252	-1.162	-.161
S3 5	Equal variances not assumed			-2.320	38.440	.026	-.661	.285	-1.238	-.085
S3 6	Equal variances assumed	1.683	.198	-1.429	80	.157	-.341	.238	-.815	.134
S3 6	Equal variances not assumed			-1.512	60.130	.136	-.341	.225	-.791	.110
S3 7	Equal variances assumed	.190	.664	-.839	80	.404	-.209	.249	-.704	.286
S3 7	Equal variances not assumed			-.857	54.796	.395	-.209	.243	-.697	.279
S3 8	Equal variances assumed	.121	.729	.419	80	.676	.103	.246	-.386	.592
S3 8	Equal variances not assumed			.421	52.333	.676	.103	.245	-.388	.594
S3 9	Equal variances assumed	.023	.880	-.759	80	.450	-.176	.232	-.637	.285
S3 9	Equal variances not assumed			-.753	50.802	.455	-.176	.233	-.644	.293
S4 0	Equal variances assumed	5.613	.020	-2.241	80	.028	-.541	.242	-1.022	-.061

S4 0	Equal variances not assumed			-2.508	69.270	.014	-.541	.216	-.972	-.111
S4 1	Equal variances assumed	1.702	.196	-1.904	80	.061	-.499	.262	-1.021	.023
S4 1	Equal variances not assumed			-1.815	45.879	.076	-.499	.275	-1.052	.054
S4 2	Equal variances assumed	.205	.652	-2.616	80	.011	-.569	.218	-1.002	-.136
S4 2	Equal variances not assumed			-2.521	47.098	.015	-.569	.226	-1.023	-.115
S4 3	Equal variances assumed	2.246	.138	-2.015	80	.047	-.556	.276	-1.106	-.007
S4 3	Equal variances not assumed			-1.877	43.428	.067	-.556	.296	-1.154	.041
S4 4	Equal variances assumed	4.128	.045	-1.948	80	.055	-.574	.294	-1.160	.012
S4 4	Equal variances not assumed			-1.838	44.735	.073	-.574	.312	-1.202	.055
S4 5	Equal variances assumed	2.657	.107	-.759	80	.450	-.209	.275	-.756	.339
S4 5	Equal variances not assumed			-.841	67.621	.403	-.209	.248	-.704	.287

**Appendix 6**  
**Group 1 and Group 2 statistics**

	Group1 advanced Group 2 intermediate	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
S1	Advanced	55	4.45	.765	.103
S1	intermediate	31	4.45	.568	.102
S2	Advanced	55	3.42	1.134	.153
S2	intermediate	31	3.48	.926	.166
S3	Advanced	55	2.98	1.209	.163
S3	intermediate	31	3.29	1.006	.181
S4	Advanced	55	4.31	.920	.124
S4	intermediate	31	4.55	.568	.102
S5	Advanced	55	4.35	.799	.108
S5	intermediate	31	4.26	.682	.122
S6	Advanced	55	4.22	.809	.109
S6	intermediate	31	4.19	.749	.135
S7	Advanced	55	3.95	1.008	.136
S7	intermediate	31	4.13	.763	.137
S8	Advanced	55	3.29	1.048	.141
S8	intermediate	31	3.39	.989	.178
S9	Advanced	55	2.98	1.163	.157
S9	intermediate	31	2.97	.983	.176
S10	Advanced	55	3.85	1.044	.141
S10	intermediate	31	4.16	.934	.168
S11	Advanced	55	4.29	.629	.085
S11	intermediate	31	4.03	.657	.118
S12	Advanced	55	4.22	.567	.077
S12	intermediate	31	3.97	.706	.127
S13	Advanced	55	4.04	.793	.107
S13	intermediate	31	3.87	.957	.172
S14	Advanced	55	3.95	.780	.105
S14	intermediate	31	3.90	.790	.142
S15	Advanced	55	3.89	.896	.121
S15	intermediate	31	3.71	.739	.133
S16	Advanced	55	3.51	1.086	.147
S16	intermediate	31	3.39	.882	.158
S17	Advanced	55	4.18	.863	.116
S17	intermediate	31	4.06	.814	.146
S18	Advanced	55	3.44	1.067	.144
S18	intermediate	31	3.52	.851	.153

S19	Advanced	55	3.84	.856	.115
S19	intermediate	31	3.94	.814	.146
S20	Advanced	55	4.07	.813	.110
S20	intermediate	31	4.10	.651	.117
S21	Advanced	55	3.35	1.142	.154
S21	intermediate	31	3.48	1.061	.190
S22	Advanced	55	3.78	1.117	.151
S22	intermediate	31	3.74	.999	.179
S23	Advanced	55	1.89	.809	.109
S23	intermediate	31	2.23	.884	.159
S24	Advanced	55	1.98	.933	.126
S24	intermediate	31	2.16	.898	.161
S25	Advanced	55	2.15	1.008	.136
S25	intermediate	31	2.32	1.013	.182
S26	Advanced	55	1.69	.814	.110
S26	intermediate	31	1.90	.746	.134
S27	Advanced	55	2.84	1.050	.142
S27	intermediate	31	3.39	.882	.158
S28	Advanced	55	2.75	1.058	.143
S28	intermediate	31	3.00	.894	.161
S29	Advanced	55	2.36	.988	.133
S29	intermediate	31	2.65	.915	.164
S30	Advanced	55	2.35	.966	.130
S30	intermediate	31	2.16	.820	.147
S31	Advanced	55	1.78	.956	.129
S31	intermediate	31	1.94	1.093	.196
S32	Advanced	55	1.93	1.168	.158
S32	intermediate	31	2.10	1.076	.193
S33	Advanced	55	2.00	1.202	.162
S33	intermediate	31	1.97	1.140	.205
S34	Advanced	55	1.67	1.123	.151
S34	intermediate	31	1.74	.999	.179
S35	Advanced	55	1.71	.916	.124
S35	intermediate	31	2.13	1.118	.201
S36	Advanced	55	3.40	1.065	.144
S36	intermediate	31	3.58	.765	.137
S37	Advanced	55	3.27	1.079	.146
S37	intermediate	31	2.97	1.048	.188
S38	Advanced	55	3.44	1.050	.142
S38	intermediate	31	3.06	.814	.146
S39	Advanced	55	3.49	.979	.132

S39	intermediate	31	3.55	.925	.166
S40	Advanced	55	3.24	1.122	.151
S40	intermediate	31	3.19	.833	.150
S41	Advanced	55	1.95	1.061	.143
S41	intermediate	31	2.29	1.216	.218
S42	Advanced	55	1.73	.891	.120
S42	intermediate	31	1.90	.944	.169
S43	Advanced	55	2.04	1.088	.147
S43	intermediate	31	2.26	1.125	.202
S44	Advanced	55	1.98	1.178	.159
S44	intermediate	31	2.00	.966	.174
S45	Advanced	55	3.27	1.269	.171
S45	intermediate	31	3.52	1.029	.185

**Appendix 7**  
**Group 1 and Group 2 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differenc e	Std. Error Differenc e	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
S1	Equal variances assumed	1.728	.192	.019	84	.985	.003	.158	-.310	.316
S1	Equal variances not assumed			.020	77.651	.984	.003	.145	-.286	.292
S2	Equal variances assumed	2.536	.115	-.275	84	.784	-.066	.239	-.541	.410
S2	Equal variances not assumed			-.291	73.086	.772	-.066	.226	-.516	.385
S3	Equal variances assumed	1.456	.231	-1.204	84	.232	-.309	.256	-.818	.201
S3	Equal variances not assumed			-1.267	72.153	.209	-.309	.243	-.794	.177
S4	Equal variances assumed	3.921	.051	-1.312	84	.193	-.239	.182	-.602	.123
S4	Equal variances not assumed			-1.490	83.231	.140	-.239	.161	-.559	.080
S5	Equal variances assumed	.503	.480	.513	84	.609	.087	.170	-.252	.426
S5	Equal variances not assumed			.536	70.829	.594	.087	.163	-.238	.412
S6	Equal variances assumed	.000	.992	.139	84	.890	.025	.177	-.328	.377
S6	Equal variances not assumed			.142	66.477	.887	.025	.173	-.321	.371
S7	Equal variances assumed	1.384	.243	-.881	84	.381	-.184	.208	-.598	.231
S7	Equal variances not assumed			-.951	76.741	.345	-.184	.193	-.568	.201
S8	Equal variances assumed	.328	.568	-.417	84	.678	-.096	.231	-.555	.363
S8	Equal variances not assumed			-.424	65.436	.673	-.096	.227	-.550	.357

S9	Equal variances assumed	2.501	.118	.057	84	.955	.014	.247	-.478	.506
S9	Equal variances not assumed			.060	71.339	.953	.014	.236	-.457	.485
S10	Equal variances assumed	.270	.604	-1.358	84	.178	-.307	.226	-.756	.143
S10	Equal variances not assumed			-1.400	68.278	.166	-.307	.219	-.744	.130
S11	Equal variances assumed	1.481	.227	1.802	84	.075	.259	.144	-.027	.544
S11	Equal variances not assumed			1.779	60.035	.080	.259	.145	-.032	.549
S12	Equal variances assumed	.250	.618	1.797	84	.076	.250	.139	-.027	.528
S12	Equal variances not assumed			1.691	51.967	.097	.250	.148	-.047	.548
S13	Equal variances assumed	.797	.375	.861	84	.392	.165	.192	-.216	.547
S13	Equal variances not assumed			.817	53.254	.418	.165	.202	-.241	.571
S14	Equal variances assumed	.129	.721	.240	84	.811	.042	.176	-.308	.392
S14	Equal variances not assumed			.239	61.684	.812	.042	.177	-.311	.395
S15	Equal variances assumed	.205	.652	.957	84	.341	.181	.189	-.195	.558
S15	Equal variances not assumed			1.010	72.605	.316	.181	.179	-.177	.539
S16	Equal variances assumed	3.691	.058	.533	84	.595	.122	.229	-.333	.577
S16	Equal variances not assumed			.565	73.405	.574	.122	.216	-.308	.552
S17	Equal variances assumed	1.070	.304	.618	84	.538	.117	.190	-.260	.495
S17	Equal variances not assumed			.628	65.443	.532	.117	.187	-.256	.490
S18	Equal variances assumed	3.146	.080	-.357	84	.722	-.080	.224	-.524	.365
S18	Equal variances not assumed			-.380	74.308	.705	-.080	.210	-.498	.339
S19	Equal variances assumed	.000	.999	-.525	84	.601	-.099	.189	-.475	.276

	Equal variances not assumed			-0.532	65.001	.596	-0.099	.186	-0.471	.273
S20	Equal variances S20 assumed	.095	.759	-0.141	84	.888	-0.024	.171	-0.363	.315
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.150	74.130	.881	-0.024	.160	-0.343	.295
S21	Equal variances S21 assumed	.296	.588	-0.553	84	.581	-0.138	.250	-0.636	.359
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.565	66.300	.574	-0.138	.245	-0.627	.351
S22	Equal variances S22 assumed	.591	.444	.165	84	.869	.040	.242	-0.441	.521
	Equal variances not assumed			.170	68.334	.865	.040	.234	-0.428	.507
S23	Equal variances S23 assumed	.050	.823	-1.783	84	.078	-0.335	.188	-0.708	.039
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.739	57.875	.087	-0.335	.193	-0.720	.051
S24	Equal variances S24 assumed	.133	.716	-0.868	84	.388	-0.179	.207	-0.591	.232
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.877	64.357	.383	-0.179	.205	-0.588	.229
S25	Equal variances S25 assumed	.022	.882	-0.781	84	.437	-0.177	.227	-0.628	.274
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.780	62.080	.438	-0.177	.227	-0.631	.277
S26	Equal variances S26 assumed	2.118	.149	-1.196	84	.235	-0.212	.177	-0.565	.141
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.226	66.960	.225	-0.212	.173	-0.558	.133
S27	Equal variances S27 assumed	1.758	.188	-2.469	84	.016	-0.551	.223	-0.994	-0.107
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.592	71.643	.012	-0.551	.212	-0.974	-0.127
S28	Equal variances S28 assumed	6.583	.012	-1.130	84	.262	-0.255	.225	-0.702	.193
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.185	71.326	.240	-0.255	.215	-0.683	.174
S29	Equal variances S29 assumed	.191	.663	-1.302	84	.196	-0.282	.216	-0.711	.148
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.331	66.473	.188	-0.282	.212	-0.704	.141

S30	Equal variances assumed	.607	.438	.894	84	.374	.184	.206	-.225	.594
	Equal variances not assumed			.936	71.111	.352	.184	.197	-.208	.576
S31	Equal variances assumed	.324	.570	-.679	84	.499	-.154	.226	-.604	.296
	Equal variances not assumed			-.654	55.690	.516	-.154	.235	-.624	.317
S32	Equal variances assumed	.475	.493	-.664	84	.508	-.170	.255	-.677	.338
	Equal variances not assumed			-.680	66.763	.499	-.170	.249	-.667	.328
S33	Equal variances assumed	1.797	.184	.122	84	.903	.032	.265	-.495	.559
	Equal variances not assumed			.124	65.169	.902	.032	.261	-.489	.554
S34	Equal variances assumed	.928	.338	-.285	84	.776	-.069	.243	-.552	.413
	Equal variances not assumed			-.295	68.623	.769	-.069	.235	-.538	.399
S35	Equal variances assumed	4.433	.038	-1.883	84	.063	-.420	.223	-.863	.024
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.781	52.822	.081	-.420	.236	-.893	.053
S36	Equal variances assumed	3.814	.054	-.831	84	.408	-.181	.217	-.613	.252
	Equal variances not assumed			-.909	78.976	.366	-.181	.199	-.576	.215
S37	Equal variances assumed	.964	.329	1.271	84	.207	.305	.240	-.172	.782
	Equal variances not assumed			1.282	63.889	.205	.305	.238	-.170	.780
S38	Equal variances assumed	6.054	.016	1.703	84	.092	.372	.218	-.062	.806
	Equal variances not assumed			1.827	75.683	.072	.372	.203	-.033	.777
S39	Equal variances assumed	.056	.814	-.267	84	.790	-.057	.216	-.486	.371
	Equal variances not assumed			-.271	65.351	.787	-.057	.212	-.481	.366
S40	Equal variances assumed	4.744	.032	.185	84	.853	.043	.231	-.416	.502

	Equal variances not assumed			.201	77.589	.841	.043	.213	-.381	.466
S41	Equal variances S41 assumed	1.908	.171	-1.372	84	.174	-.345	.251	-.845	.155
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.320	55.588	.192	-.345	.261	-.868	.178
S42	Equal variances S42 assumed	.008	.931	-.861	84	.392	-.176	.204	-.583	.231
	Equal variances not assumed			-.847	59.421	.400	-.176	.208	-.592	.240
S43	Equal variances S43 assumed	.003	.960	-.896	84	.373	-.222	.247	-.714	.270
	Equal variances not assumed			-.888	60.634	.378	-.222	.250	-.721	.278
S44	Equal variances S44 assumed	4.322	.041	-.073	84	.942	-.018	.249	-.513	.476
	Equal variances not assumed			-.077	72.921	.939	-.018	.235	-.487	.451
S45	Equal variances S45 assumed	1.585	.212	-.912	84	.364	-.243	.267	-.774	.287
	Equal variances not assumed			-.967	73.484	.337	-.243	.252	-.745	.258

**Appendix 8**  
**Group 2 and Group 3 statistics**

	Group 2 intermediate Group 3 pre-intermediate	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
S1	intermediate	31	4.45	.568	.102
S1	pre-intermediate	27	4.26	.903	.174
S2	intermediate	31	3.48	.926	.166
S2	pre-intermediate	27	3.63	1.115	.214
S3	intermediate	31	3.29	1.006	.181
S3	pre-intermediate	27	3.30	.993	.191
S4	intermediate	31	4.55	.568	.102
S4	pre-intermediate	27	4.48	.509	.098
S5	intermediate	31	4.26	.682	.122
S5	pre-intermediate	27	4.44	.641	.123
S6	intermediate	31	4.19	.749	.135
S6	pre-intermediate	27	4.30	.724	.139
S7	intermediate	31	4.13	.763	.137
S7	pre-intermediate	27	4.15	.818	.157
S8	intermediate	31	3.39	.989	.178
S8	pre-intermediate	27	3.85	1.134	.218
S9	intermediate	31	2.97	.983	.176
S9	pre-intermediate	27	3.59	1.185	.228
S10	intermediate	31	4.16	.934	.168
S10	pre-intermediate	27	4.07	.829	.159
S11	intermediate	31	4.03	.657	.118
S11	pre-intermediate	27	4.37	.688	.132
S12	intermediate	31	3.97	.706	.127
S12	pre-intermediate	27	4.15	.864	.166
S13	intermediate	31	3.87	.957	.172
S13	pre-intermediate	27	4.19	.834	.160
S14	intermediate	31	3.90	.790	.142
S14	pre-intermediate	27	4.44	.577	.111
S15	intermediate	31	3.71	.739	.133
S15	pre-intermediate	27	4.04	.980	.189
S16	intermediate	31	3.39	.882	.158
S16	pre-intermediate	27	3.93	1.174	.226
S17	intermediate	31	4.06	.814	.146
S17	pre-intermediate	27	4.22	.751	.145
S18	intermediate	31	3.52	.851	.153
S18	pre-intermediate	27	3.78	1.188	.229

S19	intermediate	31	3.94	.814	.146
S19	pre-intermediate	27	4.22	.751	.145
S20	intermediate	31	4.10	.651	.117
S20	pre-intermediate	27	4.26	.594	.114
S21	intermediate	31	3.48	1.061	.190
S21	pre-intermediate	27	3.59	1.217	.234
S22	intermediate	31	3.74	.999	.179
S22	pre-intermediate	27	4.04	1.055	.203
S23	intermediate	31	2.23	.884	.159
S23	pre-intermediate	27	2.67	1.038	.200
S24	intermediate	31	2.16	.898	.161
S24	pre-intermediate	27	2.78	1.155	.222
S25	intermediate	31	2.32	1.013	.182
S25	pre-intermediate	27	2.81	1.178	.227
S26	intermediate	31	1.90	.746	.134
S26	pre-intermediate	27	2.56	1.219	.235
S27	intermediate	31	3.39	.882	.158
S27	pre-intermediate	27	3.48	.975	.188
S28	intermediate	31	3.00	.894	.161
S28	pre-intermediate	27	3.44	1.155	.222
S29	intermediate	31	2.65	.915	.164
S29	pre-intermediate	27	2.81	1.075	.207
S30	intermediate	31	2.16	.820	.147
S30	pre-intermediate	27	2.74	1.095	.211
S31	intermediate	31	1.94	1.093	.196
S31	pre-intermediate	27	2.30	1.265	.244
S32	intermediate	31	2.10	1.076	.193
S32	pre-intermediate	27	2.15	.989	.190
S33	intermediate	31	1.97	1.140	.205
S33	pre-intermediate	27	2.30	1.353	.260
S34	intermediate	31	1.74	.999	.179
S34	pre-intermediate	27	2.15	1.231	.237
S35	intermediate	31	2.13	1.118	.201
S35	pre-intermediate	27	2.37	1.334	.257
S36	intermediate	31	3.58	.765	.137
S36	pre-intermediate	27	3.74	.903	.174
S37	intermediate	31	2.97	1.048	.188
S37	pre-intermediate	27	3.48	1.014	.195
S38	intermediate	31	3.06	.814	.146
S38	pre-intermediate	27	3.33	1.038	.200
S39	intermediate	31	3.55	.925	.166

S39	pre-intermediate	27	3.67	1.000	.192
S40	intermediate	31	3.19	.833	.150
S40	pre-intermediate	27	3.78	.801	.154
S41	intermediate	31	2.29	1.216	.218
S41	pre-intermediate	27	2.44	1.219	.235
S42	intermediate	31	1.90	.944	.169
S42	pre-intermediate	27	2.30	.993	.191
S43	intermediate	31	2.26	1.125	.202
S43	pre-intermediate	27	2.59	1.338	.257
S44	intermediate	31	2.00	.966	.174
S44	pre-intermediate	27	2.56	1.396	.269
S45	intermediate	31	3.52	1.029	.185
S45	pre-intermediate	27	3.48	.935	.180

**Appendix 9**  
**Group 2 and Group 3 Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differenc e	Std. Error Differenc e	Lower	Upper
S1	Equal variances assumed	7.352	.009	.984	56	.329	.192	.195	-.199	.584
S1	Equal variances not assumed			.955	42.629	.345	.192	.201	-.214	.599
S2	Equal variances assumed	1.048	.310	-.544	56	.589	-.146	.268	-.683	.391
S2	Equal variances not assumed			-.537	50.770	.594	-.146	.271	-.691	.399
S3	Equal variances assumed	.009	.923	-.023	56	.982	-.006	.263	-.533	.521
S3	Equal variances not assumed			-.023	55.109	.982	-.006	.263	-.533	.521
S4	Equal variances assumed	.440	.510	.469	56	.641	.067	.143	-.219	.352
S4	Equal variances not assumed			.473	55.945	.638	.067	.141	-.216	.350
S5	Equal variances assumed	.000	.983	-1.068	56	.290	-.186	.174	-.536	.163
S5	Equal variances not assumed			-1.073	55.656	.288	-.186	.174	-.534	.162
S6	Equal variances assumed	.221	.640	-.529	56	.599	-.103	.194	-.492	.286
S6	Equal variances not assumed			-.530	55.371	.598	-.103	.194	-.491	.285
S7	Equal variances assumed	.011	.917	-.092	56	.927	-.019	.208	-.435	.397
S7	Equal variances not assumed			-.092	53.645	.927	-.019	.209	-.438	.400
S8	Equal variances assumed	.052	.821	-1.668	56	.101	-.465	.279	-1.023	.094
S8	Equal variances not assumed			-1.652	52.074	.105	-.465	.281	-1.029	.100

S9	Equal variances assumed	4.825	.032	-2.195	56	.032	-.625	.285	-1.195	-.055
S9	Equal variances not assumed			-2.167	50.703	.035	-.625	.288	-1.204	-.046
S10	Equal variances assumed	3.606	.063	.374	56	.710	.087	.233	-.380	.555
S10	Equal variances not assumed			.377	55.977	.708	.087	.232	-.377	.551
S11	Equal variances assumed	2.459	.123	-1.912	56	.061	-.338	.177	-.692	.016
S11	Equal variances not assumed			-1.906	54.138	.062	-.338	.177	-.694	.017
S12	Equal variances assumed	.211	.648	-.875	56	.385	-.180	.206	-.594	.233
S12	Equal variances not assumed			-.863	50.308	.392	-.180	.209	-.600	.240
S13	Equal variances assumed	.082	.776	-1.323	56	.191	-.314	.237	-.790	.161
S13	Equal variances not assumed			-1.336	56.000	.187	-.314	.235	-.785	.157
S14	Equal variances assumed	.000	.986	-2.941	56	.005	-.541	.184	-.910	-.173
S14	Equal variances not assumed			-3.004	54.455	.004	-.541	.180	-.902	-.180
S15	Equal variances assumed	.501	.482	-1.447	56	.153	-.327	.226	-.780	.126
S15	Equal variances not assumed			-1.420	47.948	.162	-.327	.231	-.791	.136
S16	Equal variances assumed	3.654	.061	-1.991	56	.051	-.539	.271	-1.081	.003
S16	Equal variances not assumed			-1.952	47.833	.057	-.539	.276	-1.094	.016
S17	Equal variances assumed	.383	.538	-.763	56	.449	-.158	.207	-.572	.256
S17	Equal variances not assumed			-.767	55.797	.446	-.158	.206	-.570	.254
S18	Equal variances assumed	5.022	.029	-.973	56	.335	-.262	.269	-.800	.277
S18	Equal variances not assumed			-.952	46.423	.346	-.262	.275	-.815	.292
S19	Equal variances assumed	.057	.812	-1.387	56	.171	-.287	.207	-.701	.127

	Equal variances not assumed			-1.395	55.797	.169	-.287	.206	-.699	.125
S20	Equal variances S20 assumed	.072	.789	-.987	56	.328	-.162	.165	-.492	.167
	Equal variances not assumed			-.993	55.861	.325	-.162	.164	-.490	.165
S21	Equal variances S21 assumed	.809	.372	-.364	56	.718	-.109	.299	-.708	.490
	Equal variances not assumed			-.360	52.035	.720	-.109	.302	-.715	.497
S22	Equal variances S22 assumed	.089	.767	-1.093	56	.279	-.295	.270	-.836	.246
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.089	53.940	.281	-.295	.271	-.838	.248
S23	Equal variances S23 assumed	1.153	.288	-1.748	56	.086	-.441	.252	-.946	.064
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.728	51.428	.090	-.441	.255	-.953	.071
S24	Equal variances S24 assumed	3.944	.052	-2.284	56	.026	-.616	.270	-1.157	-.076
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.245	48.858	.029	-.616	.275	-1.168	-.065
S25	Equal variances S25 assumed	1.441	.235	-1.711	56	.093	-.492	.288	-1.068	.084
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.694	51.690	.096	-.492	.291	-1.076	.091
S26	Equal variances S26 assumed	8.453	.005	-2.492	56	.016	-.652	.262	-1.177	-.128
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.414	41.868	.020	-.652	.270	-1.198	-.107
S27	Equal variances S27 assumed	.345	.559	-.387	56	.700	-.094	.244	-.583	.394
	Equal variances not assumed			-.384	52.953	.702	-.094	.246	-.587	.398
S28	Equal variances S28 assumed	4.791	.033	-1.650	56	.105	-.444	.269	-.984	.095
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.621	48.739	.112	-.444	.274	-.996	.107
S29	Equal variances S29 assumed	2.122	.151	-.649	56	.519	-.170	.261	-.693	.354
	Equal variances not assumed			-.642	51.397	.524	-.170	.264	-.700	.361

S30 Equal variances S30 assumed	3.508	.066	-2.298	56	.025	-.579	.252	-1.085	-.074
Equal variances not assumed			-2.253	47.743	.029	-.579	.257	-1.097	-.062
S31 Equal variances S31 assumed	2.672	.108	-1.165	56	.249	-.361	.310	-.981	.260
Equal variances not assumed			-1.153	51.821	.254	-.361	.313	-.989	.267
S32 Equal variances S32 assumed	.097	.756	-.188	56	.851	-.051	.273	-.598	.495
Equal variances not assumed			-.189	55.824	.850	-.051	.271	-.595	.492
S33 Equal variances S33 assumed	5.113	.028	-1.004	56	.320	-.329	.327	-.984	.327
Equal variances not assumed			-.992	51.129	.326	-.329	.331	-.994	.336
S34 Equal variances S34 assumed	2.090	.154	-1.387	56	.171	-.406	.293	-.993	.181
Equal variances not assumed			-1.367	50.092	.178	-.406	.297	-1.003	.191
S35 Equal variances S35 assumed	1.856	.179	-.750	56	.457	-.241	.322	-.886	.404
Equal variances not assumed			-.740	50.987	.462	-.241	.326	-.896	.413
S36 Equal variances S36 assumed	.196	.660	-.731	56	.468	-.160	.219	-.599	.278
Equal variances not assumed			-.723	51.297	.473	-.160	.221	-.605	.284
S37 Equal variances S37 assumed	.231	.633	-1.890	56	.064	-.514	.272	-1.058	.031
Equal variances not assumed			-1.894	55.359	.063	-.514	.271	-1.057	.030
S38 Equal variances S38 assumed	6.754	.012	-1.104	56	.274	-.269	.243	-.756	.219
Equal variances not assumed			-1.086	49.105	.283	-.269	.247	-.766	.229
S39 Equal variances S39 assumed	.003	.957	-.468	56	.642	-.118	.253	-.625	.388
Equal variances not assumed			-.465	53.464	.644	-.118	.254	-.628	.392
S40 Equal variances S40 assumed	.091	.764	-2.712	56	.009	-.584	.215	-1.016	-.153

Equal variances not assumed			-2.720	55.439	.009	-.584	.215	-1.015	-.154
S41 Equal variances S41 assumed	.000	.992	-.481	56	.633	-.154	.321	-.796	.488
Equal variances not assumed			-.481	54.873	.633	-.154	.321	-.797	.488
S42 Equal variances S42 assumed	.176	.676	-1.545	56	.128	-.393	.254	-.903	.117
Equal variances not assumed			-1.539	54.022	.130	-.393	.255	-.905	.119
S43 Equal variances S43 assumed	1.627	.207	-1.035	56	.305	-.335	.323	-.982	.313
Equal variances not assumed			-1.022	51.085	.311	-.335	.327	-.991	.322
S44 Equal variances S44 assumed	13.548	.001	-1.781	56	.080	-.556	.312	-1.181	.069
Equal variances not assumed			-1.737	45.373	.089	-.556	.320	-1.200	.088
S45 Equal variances S45 assumed	.196	.660	.133	56	.894	.035	.260	-.485	.555
Equal variances not assumed			.134	55.885	.894	.035	.258	-.482	.551

## Appendix 10

### SLAL Research Ethics Checklist – Undergraduate and Postgraduate Dissertations

This form is to be completed by **all** students doing an undergraduate or taught master's dissertation.

Student Name: Lilian Rospel

Student No.: UP837942

Email address: up837942@myport.ac.uk

Dissertation title: Teachers' language use in foreign language classroom: an analysis of native and target language alteration.

I have read the Research Ethics section in the handbook and on the Moodle site for this unit.

YES

What are the objectives of your dissertation?

The main focus of the study is to find out whether in foreign language classroom learners' and teachers' L1 is used systematically and selectively and how do the language teachers make their decisions regarding the L1 use. The hoped-for outcome should indicate whether the use of the L1 restricts or enhances L2 acquisition.

This research has the following objectives:

- To find out whether the learners' L1, if used in ELT, is done out of convenience or done purposefully, thus contributing to or restricting the language learning.
- Examine the perceptions about the use of the L1 in the classroom among the students and teachers.
- To find out whether the L1 has an effect on affective variables, more specifically language anxiety, in language learning.

Do you intend to collect *primary data* from *human subjects* or data that would enable individuals to be identified? (This includes, for example, questionnaires and interviews.)

YES

- If YES, please respond to ALL questions 4-12.
- If NO, please go straight to question 13.
- If you think a question does not apply, then respond with 'N/A' (not applicable).

What is the research population(s)? In other words, what groups of people will be the focus of attention of your research?

Teachers of English as a Foreign Language

Learners of English as a Foreign Language (aged 11-15)

How many participants will be involved in your research (estimate only) and how will they be *recruited and selected*? In other words, how will you contact/approach these people?

(Please attach any relevant invitation letters and participant information sheets. Templates are to be found on the Moodle site)

There will be approximately 6 language teachers and around 150 language students involved.

What will be the procedure for *informed consent*?

(Please attach any relevant consent forms. Templates are to be found on the Moodle site)

Written consent will be sought from the Head of School, participants and their parents/caregivers.

7. How will you collect your data?

I will conduct teacher observations and an online questionnaire with teachers and students.

8. How will you safeguard the anonymity of the participants?

All the ethics forms will be stored in a locked depository and digital data in a password protected personal computer. Online questionnaires do not indicate the names of the participants.

9. Are there any *risks (emotional, physical or reputational) to participants* that may result from taking part in this research?

NO

If YES, please specify and state what measures are proposed to deal with these risks.

10. Are there any *risks (emotional, physical or reputational) to the researcher or to the University* that may result from conducting this research?

NO

If YES, please specify and state what measures are proposed to manage these risks.

11. Will any *data* be *obtained from any institution or organisation* (for example, information provided by a school/university, company or its employees)?

YES

If NO, then please go to question 15.

12. What steps are proposed to ensure that the requirements of *informed consent* will be met for that institution or organisation? How will *confidentiality* be assured such that unauthorised persons will be prevented from accessing the data? Does the institution/organisation have its own ethics procedure relating to research? (if so the University will require written evidence from the organisation that they have approved the research).

A consent from the Head of School will be sought in written form. All data concerning this research will be held in a locked depository and password protected personal computer.

Will the proposed research involve any of the following (please put a X next to 'yes' or 'no'; consult your supervisor if you are unsure):

- |   |     |                                     |    |                                     |
|---|-----|-------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------|
| • Vulnerable groups?                    | YES | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| • Particularly sensitive topics?        | YES | <input type="checkbox"/>            | NO | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Gatekeepers* to participants?         | YES | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| • Use of deception?                     | YES | <input type="checkbox"/>            | NO | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Access to confidential personal data? | YES | <input type="checkbox"/>            | NO | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

\* Gatekeeper = a person who helps you gain access to participants.

If answers to any of the above are "YES", how will the associated risks be minimised?

Parental consent will be sought from parents/caregivers. All the gatekeepers are within the same institution, consent will be sought from the Head of this institution.

How will your *data* be *stored* and what will happen to the data at the end of the research? What measures will be taken to prevent unauthorised persons gaining access to the data?

All data concerning this research will be held in a locked depository and digital data in a password protected personal computer. After the research is completed the data will be deleted.

Are there any other ethical issues that may arise from the proposed research? If there are, how do you propose to deal with them?

No other ethical issues are to be expected.

**I confirm that the information provided here is a complete and accurate record of my plans at present and that I shall resubmit an amended version of this form should my research alter significantly such that there is any significant variation of ethical risk.**

**Student (sign or type your name):** Lilian Rospel

**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> February 2019

**APPROVAL RECORD** (to be completed by dissertation supervisor)

**Approved** as INSIGNIFICANT risk

You can begin to collect your data

**Approved** as INSIGNIFICANT risk

You can begin to collect your data **subject to comments listed below**

**Not Yet Approved**

Address comments below and resubmit to your supervisor

**Supervisor signature:**

*K. Hamlet.*

**Date reviewed: 29.03.2019**

**Also reviewed by: Glenn Hadikin**

**Date: 13-5-19**

**Comments:**

**I changed** 'Written consent will be sought from the Head of School, participants and/or their parents/caregivers.' to 'Written consent will be sought from the Head of School, participants and their parents/caregivers.' I removed the word 'or'.

You must get permission from the Head of school, participants and parents/caregivers.

## Appendix 11

### Ethics forms in English



#### HEAD OF SCHOOL INFORMATION SHEET

**Title of Project:** An investigative study examining linguistic interaction in foreign language classroom, with the aim of detecting key aspects of language use and their effect on foreign language acquisition.

**Name and Contact Details of Researcher:** Lilian Rasper, email: Lilian.Rasper@myport.ac.uk, tel.: +372 6028963

**Name and Contact Details of Supervisor:** Ms Rebecca Hamlet, email: rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk, tel.: +44 023 9284 6095

#### Invitation

I am a postgraduate student of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) at the University of Portsmouth. I would like to invite the foreign language teachers and students of Haabneeme School to take part in my research study. Joining the study is entirely up to you, before you decide I would like you to understand why the research is being done and what it would involve for you. Please take time to read the following information carefully and to decide whether or not you would like to take part. Please feel free to talk to others about the study if you wish. Do contact me if anything is unclear.

#### Study Summary

This study is concerned with an examination of classroom language in teaching and learning English as a Foreign Language investigating the common uses of the first language in foreign language learning. I am seeking participants who are native speakers of Estonian and are working as foreign language teachers and students who are learning a foreign language. Participation in the research would involve the observation of the lessons and filling in an online questionnaire which would take approximately half an hour.

#### What is the purpose of the study?

I am undertaking this research study as part of my dissertation at the University of Portsmouth. The results of this research could provide some useful information for second language acquisition research and professionals, also give some additional insight on how languages are learned. After completing the study, I will write a summary of the findings and send to you if you are interested.

#### Do the personnel and students of Haabneeme School have to take part in this study?

Participation is voluntary. You can withdraw your consent for participation in this study at any time before 1<sup>st</sup> March 2019, without giving a reason if you do not wish to and this would not affect you in any way. If you do withdraw from a study the data collected can be destroyed and not included in the study. Once the research has been completed, and the data analysed, it will not be possible for them to withdraw their data from the study. There are no known or anticipated risks to the participants in this study.

If you agree to give your consent to have the language teachers and students of Haabneeme School take part, I will then ask you to sign the attached consent form, dated 08.02.2019, version number, 1.1. Additional consent will be sought from the parents or caretakers of the students and foreign language teachers of Haabneeme School.

#### **Will participants' taking part in the study be kept confidential?**

Yes. All the information that I collect about you, the personnel and students during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential. All the documents that identify them, and the questionnaire data, which will be anonymised, will be retained for the duration of this study in a locked depository. Only research members associated with this project will have access. Digital files will be stored on a password protected computer and when it is no longer required, the data will be disposed of securely. Permission to use data for further research will be then sought additionally.

The raw data, which would identify you, the employees and students, will not be passed to anyone without the written permission. The exception to this will be any regulatory authority which may have the legal right to access the data for the purposes of conducting an audit or enquiry, in exceptional cases. These agencies treat personal data in confidence.

#### **What if there is a problem?**

If you have a query, concern or complaint about any aspect of this study, in the first instance you should contact the researcher if appropriate. If there is a complaint and there is a supervisor listed, please contact the Supervisor with details of the complaint. The contact details for the researcher are detailed on page 1.

If your concern or complaint is not resolved by the researcher, you should contact the Head of School:

The Head of School	Mr Stephen Corbett
School of Languages and Applied Linguistics	+44 023 9284 6050
University of Portsmouth	stephen.corbett@port.ac.uk
Park Building, King Henry 1 Street	
Portsmouth PO1 2DZ, UK	

If the complaint remains unresolved, please contact:

The University Complaints Officer	
+44 (0) 2392 843103	<a href="mailto:complaintsadvise@port.ac.uk">complaintsadvise@port.ac.uk</a>

#### **Who has reviewed the study?**

Research involving human participants is reviewed by the student's supervisor and one other member of academic staff to ensure that the dignity and well-being of participants is respected.

#### **Thank you!**

Thank you for taking time to read this information sheet and for considering volunteering for this research. If you do agree to participate your consent will be sought; please see the accompanying consent form. You will then be given a copy of this information sheet and your signed consent form, to keep.



## CONSENT FORM

**Title of Project:** An investigative study examining linguistic interaction in foreign language classroom, with the aim of detecting key aspects of language use and their effect on foreign language acquisition.

**Name and Contact Details of Researcher:** Lilian Rospel, email: [Lilian.Rospel@myport.ac.uk](mailto:Lilian.Rospel@myport.ac.uk), tel.: +372 6028963

**Name and Contact Details of Supervisor:** Ms Rebecca Hamlet, email: [rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk](mailto:rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk), tel.: +44 023 9284 6095

**University Data Protection Officer:** Samantha Hill, email: [data-protection@port.ac.uk](mailto:data-protection@port.ac.uk), tel +44 023 9284 3642

Please  
initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet (dated 08.02.2019, version 1.1) for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information,  
ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.
2. I understand that the participation in this study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw  
up to 1<sup>st</sup> March 2019 without giving any reason.
3. I understand that data collected during this study will be retained in accordance with the  
University's data retention policy and could also be requested by UK regulatory authorities.  
Any promises of confidentiality provided by the researcher will be respected.
4. I agree to the data I contribute being submitted to the University of Portsmouth and viewed by them only.
5. I agree to the personnel and students of Haabneeme School take part in the above study.

**The Head of School:**

**Date:**

**Signature:**

**Name of Person taking Consent:**

**Date:**

**Signature:**



**Study Title:** An investigative study examining linguistic interaction in foreign language classroom, with the aim of detecting key aspects of language use and their effect on foreign language acquisition.

**Dear Potential Participant,**

I would like to invite you to participate in a research study.

My name is Lilian Raspel and I am a postgraduate student in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Portsmouth. I am conducting a research on language use in a foreign language classroom for the partial fulfilment of my dissertation in Applied Linguistics and TESOL and I would like to invite you to participate in this research.

If you decide to participate, I will ask you to fill in an online questionnaire, which will take approximately 30 minutes.

You have received this letter as a foreign language teacher at Haabneeme School and I have identified that you might be a suitable participant in my research. If you decide to take or not to take part in this research, your decision will not affect your relationship with Haabneeme School.

Participation is voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time until 15<sup>th</sup> April 2019 and this would not affect you in any way. All information you provide is considered completely confidential. Your name will not appear in any thesis or study report. There are no known or anticipated risks to you as a participant in this study.

The participant information sheet and consent form have been attached for your information. If you would like to take part, please complete and hand in the Consent form.

If you have any further questions about the research, please feel free to contact me via email at [Lilian.Raspel@myport.ac.uk](mailto:Lilian.Raspel@myport.ac.uk) or phone +372 6028963.

Thank you for taking time to read this invitation letter and considering your participation.



## **PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET**

**Title of Project:** An investigative study examining linguistic interaction in foreign language classroom, with the aim of detecting key aspects of language use and their effect on foreign language acquisition.

**Name and Contact Details of Supervisor:** Ms Rebecca Hamlet, email: rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk, tel.: +44 023 9284 6095

**Name and Contact Details of Researcher:** Lilian Rospel, email: Lilian.Rospel@myport.ac.uk, tel.: +372 6028963

### **Invitation**

I am a postgraduate student of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) at the University of Portsmouth. I would like to invite you to take part in my research study. Joining the study is entirely up to you, before you decide I would like you to understand why the research is being done and what it would involve for you. Please take time to read the following information carefully and to decide whether or not you would like to take part. Please feel free to talk to others about the study if you wish. Do contact me if anything is unclear.

### **Study Summary**

This study is concerned with an examination of classroom language in teaching and learning English as a Foreign Language investigating the use of language in foreign language lessons. I am seeking participants who are native speakers of Estonian and are currently teaching English as a Foreign Language. Participation in the research would include answering an online questionnaire that will take approximately half an hour.

### **What is the purpose of the study?**

I am undertaking this research study as part of my postgraduate dissertation at the University of Portsmouth. The results of this research could provide some useful information for second language acquisition research and professionals and about how languages are learned. Participants of this study are asked to carry out an online questionnaire where they have to choose and mark answers that are most relevant to them and optionally provide additional information. After completing the study, I will write a summary of the findings and send to you if you are interested.

### **Why have I been invited?**

You are being invited to participate in this study as you are a teacher of English as a Foreign Language.

### **Do I have to take part?**

No, taking part in this research is entirely voluntary. It is up to you to decide if you want to volunteer for the study. If you agree to take part, I will then ask you to sign the attached consent form, dated 12.03.2019, version number, 1.2.

### **What will happen to me if I take part?**

If you decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep and will be asked to sign a consent form. You will then be asked to fill in an online questionnaire that will take approximately half an hour.

Even if you have decided to take part, you are still free to stop your participation at any time during the questionnaire and to have research data/information relating to you withdrawn up to 1<sup>th</sup> May 2019 without giving any reason.

### **Expenses and payments**

Participants will not receive any monetary payments.

### **What are the possible advantages or benefits of taking part?**

I cannot promise that the study will help you but the information I get from the study could help to increase the understanding of how languages are learned.

### **Will my taking part in the study be kept confidential?**

Yes. All the information that I collect about you during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential. All the documents that identify you, and the questionnaire data, which will be anonymised, will be retained for the duration of this study in a locked depository. Only research members associated with this project will have access. Digital files will be stored on a password protected computer and when it is no longer required, the data will be disposed of securely. Permission to use data for further research in the future will be then sought additionally.

The raw data, which would identify you, will not be passed to anyone without your express written permission. The exception to this will be any regulatory authority which may have the legal right to access the data for the purposes of conducting an audit or enquiry, in exceptional cases. These agencies treat your personal data in confidence.

### **What will happen if I don't want to carry on with the study?**

As a volunteer you can stop your participation in this study at any time before 1<sup>st</sup> May 2019, without giving a reason if you do not wish to. If you do withdraw from the study the data collected can be destroyed and not included in the study. Once the research has been completed, and the data analysed, it will not be possible for you to withdraw your data from the study.

### **What if there is a problem?**

If you have a query, concern or complaint about any aspect of this study, in the first instance you should contact the researcher if appropriate. If there is a complaint and there is a supervisor listed, please contact the Supervisor with details of the complaint. The contact details for the researcher and the Supervisor are detailed on page 1.

If your concern or complaint is not resolved by the researcher or the Supervisor, you should contact the Head of School:

The Head of School	Mr Stephen Corbett
School of Languages and Applied Linguistics	+44 023 9284 6050
University of Portsmouth	stephen.corbett@port.ac.uk
Park Building, King Henry 1 Street	
Portsmouth PO1 2DZ, UK	

If the complaint remains unresolved, please contact:

The University Complaints Officer

+44 (0) 2392 843103      [complaintsadvic@port.ac.uk](mailto:complaintsadvic@port.ac.uk)

**Who has reviewed the study?**

Research involving human participants is reviewed by the student's supervisor and one other member of academic staff to ensure that the dignity and well-being of participants is respected.

**Thank you!**

Thank you for taking time to read this information sheet and for considering volunteering for this research. If you do agree to participate your consent will be sought; please see the accompanying consent form. You will then be given a copy of this information sheet and your signed consent form, to keep.



## CONSENT FORM

**Title of Project:** An investigative study examining linguistic interaction in foreign language classroom, with the aim of detecting key aspects of language use and their effect on foreign language acquisition.

**Name and Contact Details of Researcher:** Lilian Rospel, email: [Lilian.Rospel@myport.ac.uk](mailto:Lilian.Rospel@myport.ac.uk), tel.: +372 6028963

**Name and Contact Details of Supervisor:** Ms Rebecca Hamlet, email: [rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk](mailto:rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk), tel.: +44 023 9284 6095

**University Data Protection Officer:** Samantha Hill, email: [data-protection@port.ac.uk](mailto:data-protection@port.ac.uk), tel +44 023 9284 3642

Please  
initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet (dated 12.03.2019, version 1.2) for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.
2. I understand that the participation in this study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw up to 1<sup>st</sup> May 2019 without giving any reason.
3. I understand that data collected during this study will be retained in accordance with the University's data retention policy and could also be requested by UK regulatory authorities. Any promises of confidentiality provided by the researcher will be respected.
4. I agree to the data I contribute being submitted to the University of Portsmouth and viewed by them only.
5. I agree to take part in the above study.

**Name of Participant:**

**Date:**

**Signature:**

**Name of Person taking Consent:**

**Date:**

**Signature:**

**Title of Project:** An investigative study examining linguistic interaction in foreign language classroom, with the aim of detecting key aspects of language use and their effect on foreign language acquisition.

**Dear Potential Participant and their Parent/Caregiver,**

I would like to invite you to participate in a research study.

My name is Lilian Rospel and I am a postgraduate student in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Portsmouth. I am conducting a research on examining the use of language in foreign language classroom for the partial fulfilment of my dissertation and I would like to invite your child to participate in this research.

If you decide to give your consent, your child will be asked to complete an online questionnaire, which will take approximately 30 minutes.

You have received this letter as your child is a foreign language learner at Haabneeme School and I have identified that he or she might be a suitable participant in my research. If you agree to have your child take or not to take part in this research, your decision will not affect your relationship with Haabneeme School.

Participation is voluntary. Your child may withdraw from the study at any time until 1<sup>st</sup> May 2019 and this would not affect your child in any way. All information you or your child provide is considered completely confidential. Your or your child's name will not appear in any thesis or study report. There are no known or anticipated risks to you or your child as a participant in this study.

The participant information sheet and consent form have been attached for your information. If you give your consent to have your child take part, please complete and hand in the Consent form at school.

If you have any further questions about the research, please feel free to contact me via email at [Lilian.Rospel@myport.ac.uk](mailto:Lilian.Rospel@myport.ac.uk) or phone +372 6028963.

Thank you for taking time to read this invitation letter and considering your consent.

## **PARENTAL INFORMATION SHEET**

**Title of Project:** An investigative study examining linguistic interaction in foreign language classroom, with the aim of detecting key aspects of language use and their effect on foreign language acquisition.

**Name and Contact Details of Researcher:** Lilian Rospel, email: Lilian.Rospel@myport.ac.uk, tel.: +372 6028963

**Name and Contact Details of Supervisor:** Ms Rebecca Hamlet, email: rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk, tel.: +44 023 9284 6095

### **Invitation**

I am a postgraduate student of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) at the University of Portsmouth. I would like to invite your child to take part in my research study. Joining the study is entirely up to you and your child, before you decide I would like you to understand why the research is being done and what it would involve for your child. Please take time to read the following information carefully and to decide whether or not you would like to give your consent. Please feel free to talk to others about the study if you wish. Do contact me if anything is unclear.

### **Study Summary**

This study is concerned with an examination of classroom language in teaching and learning English as a Foreign Language investigating the common uses of the first language in foreign language learning. I am seeking participants who are native speakers of Estonian and are currently learning English as a foreign language. Participation in the research would take approximately half an hour.

### **What is the purpose of the study?**

I am undertaking this research study as part of my dissertation at the University of Portsmouth. The results of this research could provide some useful information for second language acquisition research and professionals and about how languages are learned. Participants of this study are asked to carry out an online questionnaire where they have to choose and mark the answers that are most relevant to them. After completing the study, I will write a summary of the findings and send to you if you are interested.

### **Why is your child been invited?**

Your child is being invited to participate in this study as a learner of English as a foreign language.

**Does my child have to take part?**

No, taking part in this research is entirely voluntary. It is up to you and your child to decide if you want to volunteer for the study. If you agree to take part, I will then ask you to sign the attached consent form, dated 18.02.2019, version number, 1.1.

**What will happen to my child if he or she takes part?**

If you decide to allow your child take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep and will be asked to sign a consent form. Your child will then be asked to fill in a questionnaire that will take approximately half an hour.

Even if you have decided to take part, you are still free to stop your child's participation at any time and to have research data/information relating to your child withdrawn up to 01.05.2019 without giving any reason.

**Expenses and payments**

Participants will not receive any monetary payments.

**What are the possible advantages or benefits of taking part?**

I cannot promise that the study will help you but the information I get from the study could help to increase the understanding of how languages are learned.

**Will my child's taking part in the study be kept confidential?**

Yes. All the information that I collect about your child during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential. All the documents that identify your child, and the questionnaire data, which will be anonymised, will be retained for the duration of this study in a locked depository. Only research members associated with this project will have access. Digital files will be stored on a password protected computer and when it is no longer required, the data will be disposed of securely. Permission to use data for further research in the future will be then sought additionally.

The raw data, which would identify you or your child, will not be passed to anyone without your express written permission. The exception to this will be any regulatory authority which may have the legal right to access the data for the purposes of conducting an audit or enquiry, in exceptional cases. These agencies treat your personal data in confidence.

**What will happen if my child doesn't want to carry on with the study?**

As a volunteer your child can stop his or her participation in this study at any time before 01.05.2019, without giving a reason. If your child does withdraw from the study the data collected can be destroyed and not included in the study. Once the research has been completed, and the data analysed, it will not be possible to withdraw the data from the study.

**What if there is a problem?**

If you have a query, concern or complaint about any aspect of this study, in the first instance you should contact the researcher if appropriate. If there is a complaint and there is a supervisor listed, please contact the Supervisor with details of the complaint. The contact details for the researcher are detailed on page 1.

If your concern or complaint is not resolved by the researcher or the Supervisor, you should contact the Head of School:

The Head of School	Mr Stephen Corbett
School of Languages and Applied Linguistics	+44 023 9284 6050
University of Portsmouth	<a href="mailto:stephen.corbett@port.ac.uk">stephen.corbett@port.ac.uk</a>

Park Building, King Henry 1 Street

Portsmouth PO1 2DZ, UK

If the complaint remains unresolved, please contact:

The University Complaints Officer

+44 (0) 2392 843103 [complaintsadvice@port.ac.uk](mailto:complaintsadvice@port.ac.uk)

### **Who has reviewed the study?**

Research involving human participants is reviewed by the student's supervisor and one other member of academic staff to ensure that the dignity and well-being of participants is respected.

### **Thank you!**

Thank you for taking time to read this information sheet and for considering your consent for this research. If you do agree to give your consent; please see the accompanying parental consent form. You will then be given a copy of this information sheet and your signed consent form, to keep.



## PARENTAL CONSENT FORM

**Title of Project:** An investigative study examining linguistic interaction in foreign language classroom, with the aim of detecting key aspects of language use and their effect on foreign language acquisition.

**Name and Contact Details of Researcher:** Lilian Rasper, email: [Lilian.Rasper@myport.ac.uk](mailto:Lilian.Rasper@myport.ac.uk), tel.: +372 6028963

**Name and Contact Details of Supervisor:** Ms Rebecca Hamlet, email: [rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk](mailto:rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk), tel.: +44 023 9284 6095

**University Data Protection Officer:** Samantha Hill, email: [data-protection@port.ac.uk](mailto:data-protection@port.ac.uk), tel +44 023 9284 3642

Please  
initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet (dated 18.02.2019, version 1.1) for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.
2. I understand that the participation in this study is voluntary and that my child is free to withdraw up to 01.05.2019 without giving any reason.
3. I understand that data collected during this study will be retained in accordance with the University's data retention policy and could also be requested by UK regulatory authorities. Any promises of confidentiality provided by the researcher will be respected.
4. I agree to the data I contribute being submitted to the University of Portsmouth and viewed by them only.
5. I give my consent to have my child \_\_\_\_\_ take part in the above study.   
*(child's name)*

**Name of Parent or Caregiver:**

**Date:**

**Signature:**

**Name of Person taking Consent:**

**Date:**

**Signature:**

## Appendix 12

### Ethics forms in Estonian



#### HAABNEEME KOOLI JUHI INFORMEERIMISE VORM

**Projekti nimetus:** Põhilised keelekasutuse viisid võõrkeele tundides ja nende mõju võõrkeele omandamisele.

**Uuringu teostaja kontaktandmed:** Lilian Rospel, email: Lilian.Rospel@myport.ac.uk, tel.: +372 6028963

**Uuringu juhendaja kontaktandmed:** Ms Rebecca Hamlet, email: rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk, tel.: +44 023 9284 6095

#### Kutse osalema uuringus

Olen Portsmouthi Ülikooli keeleõppe osakonna magistrant ning minu erialaks on rakenduslik keeleteadus ja inglise keele õpetamine teiste keelte kõnelejatele. Kutsun Haabneeme Kooli keeleõpetajaid ja -õpilasi osalema rakenduslingvistika magistritöö raames läbiviidavas uuringus.

Selles uuringus osalemiseks nõusoleku andmine sõltub Teie otsusest. Enne otsuse langetamist lugege palun hoolikalt läbi käesolev informeerimise ja teadliku nõusoleku leht, mis annab Teile teavet eespool nimetatud uuringu kohta, sealhulgas uurimistöö eesmärkidest ja kasust.

Osavõtt uuringust on vabatahtlik. Enne osalemise otsuse langetamist võite Te esitada uuringu kohta mistahes küsimusi. Tekkinud küsimuste osas palun Teil minuga ühendust võtta.

#### Uuringu lühiülevaade

Teise keele või võõrkeele omandajatel on tihti raskusi uue keele omandamisel, kuna emakeele õppimisel kinnistunud keelekasutus on erinev võõrkeeletundides kasutusel olevast keelest ning seega on oluline välja selgitada efektiivseimad keelekasutuse viisid võõrkeele tundides. Uurimuses oodatakse osalema Haabneeme Kooli võõrkeele õpetajaid ning 11-15-aastaseid õpilasi. Uurimuses osalejatelt õpetajatelt palutakse luba vaadelda võõrkeele tunde ning seejärel palutakse täita veebiküsimustik, kus vastajad peaksid valima enda kohta sobiva vastuse etteantud vastuste hulgast või täiendama omapoolsete kommentaaridega. Samalaadne küsimustik palutakse täita ka õpilastel. Küsimustik viiakse läbi ainult üks kord ning see ei peaks võtma aega rohkem kui 30 minutit. Seejärel tehakse ilma isikuandmeid kasutamata testide tulemustest kokkuvõtte ning saadetakse soovi korral uuringus osalejatele.

#### Mis on selle uuringu eesmärk?

Uuring viiakse läbi rakenduslingvistika magistritöö raames ning selle uuringu tulemused võivad anda olulist informatsiooni inglise keele kui võõrkeele omandamise uurimisvaldkonnas. Uuringu eesmärgiks on välja selgitada võõrkeele tunnis rakendatud keelekasutuse mõju võõrkeele õppimisele.

### **Kas uuringus osalemine on kohustuslik?**

Ei, antud uuringus osalemine on Teie vabatahtlik otsus. Kui Te otsustate, et Haabneeme Kooli töötajad ja õpilased võiks uuringus osaleda, paluksin Teil allkirjastada kaasasolev teadliku nõusoleku vorm, kuupäevaga 08.02.2019, versiooni number, 1.1. Õpilaste vanematelt või hooldajatelt ning võõrkeele õpetajatelt palutakse eraldi nõusolekut uuringus osalemiseks ning täiendavalt allkirjastada teadliku nõusoleku leht.

### **Kuidas tagatakse osalejate konfidentsiaalsus?**

Kogu uuringus saadud informatsiooni hoitakse konfidentsiaalsena. Dokumentidest, mis lubavad isiku kokku viia tema andmetega, ning testi tulemused hävitatakse pärast antud uurimistöö esitamist. Andmetele juurdepääsu omavad ainult uurimustööga seotud isikud. Võimalikud elektroonilised koopiad andmetest hoitakse salasõnaga kaitstud arvutis ning hävitatakse peale uurimistöö valmimist.

Uuringu lõppedes analüüsitakse tulemusi ilma isikuandmeid kasutamata ning tulemused esitatakse üldistatud kujul. Anonüümseid tulemusi, mis osalejaid ühelgi kombel ei tuvasta, edasistes uuringutes ilma täiendava nõusolekuta ei kasutata.

Andmeid, mis lubavad tuvastada osalejate isiku, ei edastata kolmandatele isikutele ilma nende poolt antud kirjaliku nõusolekuta. Erandiks on ametiasutused, kes on volitatud teostama erandkorras uuringu suhtes vastavat kontrolli. Antud ametiasutused käsitlevad osalejate andmeid konfidentsiaalsusega.

### **Mis juhtub, kui osalejad otsustavad uuringus osalemise katkestada või sellest loobuda?**

Kuna osalemine uuringus on vabatahtlik võite Te oma nõusolekust osalemiseks ilma põhjuseid esitamata loobuda kuni 1.märtsini 2019. Kui otsustate loobuda uuringu käigus, siis küsitakse Teie nõusolekut juba olemasolevate vastuste kaasamise kohta uurimistöös. Kui Te eelistate vastuste uurimistööst välja jätmist, siis arvestatakse Teie soovidega. Juhul, kui uurimistöö on valminud ja andmed analüüsitud, ei ole Teil enam võimalik uuringus osalemisest tagantjärele loobuda.

### **Kui Teil on tekkinud probleeme seoses uuringuga?**

Kui Teil on küsimusi, probleeme, muresid või kaebusi seoses uuringuga võite esimese meetmena võtta ühendust uurimistöö autoriga või juhendajaga. Kontaktandmed leiате esilehelt.

Kui uurimistöö autor ega juhendaja ei suuda Teie kaebusi lahendada, peaksite võtma ühendust osakonnajuhatajaga (inglise keeles):

The Head of School	Mr Stephen Corbett
School of Languages and Applied Linguistics	+44 023 9284 6050
University of Portsmouth	stephen.corbett@port.ac.uk
Park Building, King Henry 1 Street	
Portsmouth PO1 2DZ, UK	

Kui Teie kaebus jääb siiski lahenduseta, palun pöörduge all oleva ametniku poole (inglise keeles):

The University Complaints Officer  
 +44 (0) 2392 843103      [complaintsadvice@port.ac.uk](mailto:complaintsadvice@port.ac.uk)

**Kes kontrollivad uuringu nõuetekohast läbiviimist?**

Uuringu nõuetekohast läbiviimist, mis austavad osalejate väarikust ega riku nende heaolu, jälgivad magistrandi juhendaja ning lisaks üks ülikooli akadeemilise töötajaskonna liige.

**Aitäh!**

Täna Teid, et võtsite aega selle informeerimise vormi läbi lugemiseks ja kaalute selles uuringus osalemist! Kui Te nõustute osalema, tutvuge ning allkirjastage palun ka kaasasolev teadliku nõusoleku vorm. Mõlemad vormid jäävad Teie valdusesse.

## NÕUSOLEK UURINGUS OSALEMISEKS

**Projekti nimetus:** Põhilised keelekasutuse viisid võõrkeele tundides ja nende mõju võõrkeele omandamisele.

**Uuringu teostaja:** Lilian Rasper, email: [lilian.rasper@haabneeme.edu.ee](mailto:lilian.rasper@haabneeme.edu.ee), tel.: +372 6028963

**Uuringu juhendaja:** Ms Rebecca Hamlet, email: [rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk](mailto:rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk), tel.: +44 023 9284 6095

**Ülikooli andmekaitse ametnik:** Samantha Hill, email: [data-protection@port.ac.uk](mailto:data-protection@port.ac.uk), tel +44 023 9284 3642

Palun tehke kasti märges
-----------------------------

1. Teadlikule nõusoleku vormile alla kirjutades kinnitan, et olen tutvunud kooli juhi informeerimise vormiga (08.02.2019, versioon 1.1) ning kinnitan, et mind on informeeritud ülalnimetatud uuringust, selle eesmärkidest ja uuringu metoodikast.
2. Tean, et Haabneeme Kooli osalemine on vabatahtlik ning ma võin põhjusi avaldamata oma nõusoleku tagasi võtta kuni 1. märtsini 2019.
3. Mõistan, et andmeid, mis lubavad tuvastada kooli töötajate ja õpilaste isiku, võidakse edastada erandkorras ametiasutustele, kes on volitatud teostama uuringu suhtes vastavat kontrolli, mille kohta annan oma nõusoleku. Vastavas olukorras tagatakse minu ja osalejate konfidentsiaalsus.
4. Mõistan, et magistritöö, milles on kajastatud tunnivaatluste ja küsimustiku tulemused, esitatakse ning see kuulub edaspidi Portsmouthi Ülikoolile. Annan nõusoleku andmete töötlemiseks eelnevalt kirjeldatud tingimustel.
5. Nõustun, et Haabneeme Kooli võõrkeele õpetajad ja õpilased osalevad antud uuringus.

Uuringu läbiviimiseks nõusoleku andnud isik:

Kuupäev:

Allkiri:

Uuringu läbiviimiseks nõusoleku võtnud isik:

Kuupäev:

Allkiri:



**Projekti nimetus:** Põhilised keelekasutuse viisid võõrkeele tundides ja nende mõju võõrkeele omandamisele.

**Hea potentsiaalne uuringust osavõtja,**

Tahaksin Teid kutsuda osalema uuringus, mis vaatlleb keelekasutust võõrkeele tundides ning selle mõju võõrkeele õppimisele.

Olen Haabneeme Kooli inglise keele õpetaja ning Portsmouthi Ülikooli keeleõppe osakonna magistrant ning minu erialaks on rakenduslik keeleteadus ja inglise keele õpetamine teiste keelte kõnelejatele. Kutsun Teid osalema rakenduslingvistika magistritöö raames läbiviidavas uuringus.

Kui Te nõustute osalema, viiakse Teiega läbi veebipõhine küsimustik, mille täitmine võtab aega umbes pool tundi.

Kiri on Teile edastatud põhjusel, et Teid peetakse võimalikuks uuringus osalejaks, kuna olete Haabneeme Kooli võõrkeele õpetaja ning sobite uuringus osalema. Kui Te nõustute osalema või sellest keeldute, ei mõjuta see otsus mingil moel Teie edasisi suhteid Haabneeme Kooliga.

Uuringus osalemine on Teie vabatahtlik otsus ning Te võite ilma põhjuseid esitamata uuringus osalemisest loobuda kuni 15.aprillini 2019 ning see ei mõjuta Teid mingil viisil. Kogu Teid puudutav informatsioon on rangelt konfidentsiaalne. Teie nime uurimistöös ei avaldata. Uuringuga seoses Teile mingeid teadaolevaid riske ei ilmne.

Teile edasiseks informatsiooniks on kaasa pandud uuritava informeerimise vorm ning teadliku nõusoleku leht. Juhul, kui Te nõustute uuringus osalema, palun allkirjastage teadliku nõusoleku leht ning esitage see minule.

Kui Teil on tekkinud uuringuga seoses küsimusi, palun võtke ühendust e-posti teel [Lilian.Raspel@myport.ac.uk](mailto:Lilian.Raspel@myport.ac.uk) või helistage telefonil +372 6028963.

Tänan Teid, et võtsite aega selle kutse läbi lugemiseks ja kaalute antud uuringus osalemist!

## UURITAVA INFORMEERIMISE VORM

**Uurimistöö nimetus:** Põhilised keelekasutuse viisid võõrkeele tundides ja nende mõju võõrkeele omandamisele.

**Uuringu teostaja kontaktandmed:** Lilian Rospel, email: Lilian.Rospel@myport.ac.uk, tel.: +372 6028963

**Uuringu juhendaja kontaktandmed:** Ms Rebecca Hamlet, email: rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk, tel.: +44 023 9284 6095

### Kutse osalema uuringus

Olen Portsmouthi Ülikooli keeleõppe osakonna magistrant ning minu erialaks on rakenduslingvistika ja inglise keele õpetamine teiste keelte kõnelejatele. Kutsun Teid osalema rakenduslingvistika magistratöö raames läbiviidavas uuringus.

Selles uuringus osalemine sõltub Teie otsusest. Enne otsuse langetamist lugege palun hoolikalt läbi käesolev informeerimise ja teadliku nõusoleku leht, mis annab Teile teavet eespool nimetatud uuringu kohta, sealhulgas uurimustöö eesmärkidest ja kasust.

Osavõtt uuringust on vabatahtlik. Enne osalemise otsuse langetamist võite Te esitada uuringu kohta mistahes küsimusi. Tekkinud küsimuste osas palun Teil minuga ühendust võtta.

### Uuringu lühiülevaade

Teise keele või võõrkeele omandajatel on tihti raskusi uue keele omandamisel, kuna emakeele õppimisel kinnistunud keelekasutus on erinev võõrkeeletundides kasutusel olevast keelest ning seega on oluline välja selgitada efektiivseimad keelekasutuse viisid võõrkeele tundides. Uurimuses oodatakse osalema võõrkeele õpetajaid, kelle emakeeleks on eesti keel. Uurimuses osalejatel palutakse täita veebipõhine küsimustik, kus tuleb valida enda kohta sobivad vastused etteantud vastuste hulgast ning vajadusel lisada kommentaare. Küsimustik viiakse läbi ainult üks kord ning see ei peaks võtma aega rohkem kui 30 minutit. Seejärel tehakse ilma isikuandmeid kasutamata testide tulemustest kokkuvõtte ning saadetakse soovi korral uuringus osalejatele.

### Mis on selle uuringu eesmärk?

Uuring viiakse läbi rakenduslingvistika magistratöö raames ning selle uuringu tulemused võivad anda olulist informatsiooni inglise keele kui võõrkeele omandamise uurimisvaldkonnas. Uuringu eesmärgiks on välja selgitada võõrkeele tunnis rakendatud keelekasutuse võimalik mõju võõrkeele omandamisele.

### Miks Te võiksite uuringus osaleda?

Teid valiti võimalikuks uuringus osalejaks, kuna Te olete võõrkeele õpetaja.

**Kas uuringus osalemine on kohustuslik?**

Ei, antud uuringus osalemine on Teie vabatahtlik otsus. Kui Te otsustate osaleda, paluksin Teil allkirjastada kaasasolev teadliku nõusoleku vorm, kuupäevaga 18.02.2019, versiooni number, 1.1.

**Mis Teiega toimub, kui otsustate selles uuringus osaleda?**

Kui Te nõustute osalema, jäetakse Teile käesolev uuritava informeerimise vorm ning palutakse allkirjastada teadliku nõusoleku leht. Seejärel palutakse Teil vastata veebipõhisele küsimustikule, kus peate valima etteantud vastuste hulgast enda kohta sobiva variandi ning soovi korral lisama omapoolseid kommentaare. Küsimustiku täitmine võtab aega umbes pool tundi.

Isegi juhul, kui olete otsustanud uuringus osaleda võite siiski igal ajal kuni 15. aprillini 2019 põhjustest olenemata uuringus osalemisest loobuda ning Teie küsimustiku tulemusi uuringus ei arvestata.

**Milline on selles uuringus osalemisega kaasnev võimalik kasu?**

Teile uuringus osalemine otsest lisakasu kaasa ei too, kuid uuringust saadud informatsioon aitab süvendada teadmisi antud valdkonnas, seega aitate uuringus osalemisega kaasa võõrkeele omandamise uurimisele. Selleks, et Teie nägemus võiks esile tulla ja oma võimalikku mõju avaldada, palumegi Teil uuringust osa võtta.

**Kas uuringus osalemist tasustatakse?**

Ei. Uuringus osalemist ei tasustata.

**Kuidas tagatakse Teie konfidentsiaalsus?**

Kogu uuringus saadud informatsiooni hoitakse konfidentsiaalsena. Dokumentidest, mis lubavad Teie isiku kokku viia Teie andmetega, ning testi tulemused hävitatakse pärast antud uurimistöö esitamist. Andmetele juurdepääsu omavad ainult uurimustööga seotud isikud. Võimalikud elektroonilised koopiad andmetest hoitakse salasõnaga kaitstud sülearvutis ning hävitatakse peale uurimistöö valmimist.

Uuringu lõppedes analüüsitakse tulemusi ilma Teie isikuandmeid kasutamata ning tulemused esitatakse üldistatud kujul. Anonüümseid tulemusi, mis Teid ühelgi kombel ei tuvasta, edasistes uuringutes ilma Teie täiendava nõusolekuta ei kasutata.

Andmeid, mis lubavad tuvastada Teie isiku, ei edastata kolmandatele isikutele ilma Teie poolt antud kirjaliku nõusolekuta. Erandiks on ametiasutused, kes on volitatud teostama erandkorras uuringu suhtes vastavat kontrolli. Antud ametiasutused käsitlevad Teie andmeid konfidentsiaalsusega.

**Mis juhtub Teiega, kui te otsustate uuringus osalemise katkestada või sellest loobuda?**

Kuna Te osalete uuringus vabatahtlikult võite ilma põhjuseid esitamata uuringus osalemisest loobuda kuni 15.aprillini 2019. Kui Te otsustate loobuda uuringu käigus, siis küsitakse Teie nõusolekut juba olemasolevate vastuste kaasamise kohta uurimistöös. Kui eelistate vastuste uurimistööst välja jätmist, siis arvestatakse Teie soovidega. Juhul, kui uurimistöö on valminud ja andmed analüüsitud, ei ole Teil enam võimalik uuringus osalemisest tagantjäreli loobuda.

**Kui Teil on tekkinud probleeme seoses uuringuga?**

Kui Teil on küsimusi, probleeme, muresid või kaebusi seoses uuringuga võite esimese meetmena võtta ühendust uurimistöö autori või juhendajaga. Kontaktandmed leiate esilehelt.

Kui uurimistöö autor ega juhendaja ei suuda Teie kaebusi lahendada, peaksite võtma ühendust osakonnajuhatajaga (inglise keeles):

The Head of School	Mr Stephen Corbett
School of Languages and Applied Linguistics	+44 023 9284 6050
University of Portsmouth	stephen.corbett@port.ac.uk
Park Building, King Henry 1 Street	
Portsmouth PO1 2DZ, UK	

Kui Teie kaebus jääb siiski lahenduseta, palun pöörduge all oleva ametniku poole (inglise keeles):

The University Complaints Officer  
 +44 (0) 2392 843103 [complaintsadvice@port.ac.uk](mailto:complaintsadvice@port.ac.uk)

**Kes kontrollivad uuringu nõuetekohast läbiviimist?**

Uuringu nõuetekohast läbiviimist, mis austavad osalejate väarikust ega riku nende heaolu, jälgivad magistrandi juhendaja ning lisaks üks ülikooli akadeemilise töötajaskonna liige.

**Aitäh!**

Täna Teid, et võtsite aega selle informeerimise vormi läbi lugemiseks ja kaalute selles uuringus osalemist! Kui Te nõustute osalema, tutvuge ning allkirjastage palun ka kaasasolev teadliku nõusoleku vorm. Mõlemad vormid jäävad Teie valdusesse.



## NÕUSOLEK UURINGUS OSALEMISEKS

**Projekti nimetus:** Põhilised keelekasutuse viisid võõrkeele tundides ja nende mõju võõrkeele omandamisele.

**Uuringu teostaja kontaktandmed:** Lilian Rospel, email: Lilian.Rospel@myport.ac.uk, tel.: +372 6028963

**Uuringu juhendaja:** Ms Rebecca Hamlet, email: rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk, tel.: +44 023 9284 6095

**Ülikooli andmekaitse ametnik:** Samantha Hill, email: data-protection@port.ac.uk, tel +44 023 9284 3642

Palun tehke  
kasti märges

1. Teadlikule nõusoleku vormile alla kirjutades kinnitan, et olen tutvunud uuritava informeerimise vormiga (18.02.2019, versioon 1.1) ning kinnitan, et mind on informeeritud ülalnimetatud uuringust, selle eesmärkidest ja uuringu meetodikast.
2. Tean, et minu osalemine on vabatahtlik ning ma võin põhjusi avaldamata oma nõusoleku tagasi võtta kuni 15. aprillini 2019.
3. Mõistan, et andmeid, mis lubavad tuvastada minu isiku, võidakse edastada erandkorras ametiasutustele, kes on volitatud teostama uuringu suhtes vastavat kontrolli, mille kohta annan oma nõusoleku. Vastavas olukorras tagatakse minu ja osalejate konfidentsiaalsus.
4. Mõistan, et magistritöö, milles on kajastatud tunnivaatluste ja küsimustiku tulemused, esitatakse ning see kuulub edaspidi Portsmouthi Ülikoolile. Annan nõusoleku andmete töötlemiseks eelnevalt kirjeldatud tingimustel.
5. Nõustun osalema antud uuringus.

Nõusoleku andnud isik:

Kuupäev:

Allkiri:

Uuritavalt nõusoleku võtnud isik:

Kuupäev:

Allkiri:

**Projekti nimetus:** Põhilised keelekasutuse viisid võõrkeele tundides ja nende mõju võõrkeele omandamisele.

### **Hea potentsiaalne uuringust osavõtja vanem või eestkostja!**

Tahaksin Teie last või hoolealust kutsuda osalema uuringus, mis vaatleb keelekasutust võõrkeele tundides ning selle mõju võõrkeele õppimisele.

Olen Haabneeme Kooli inglise keele õpetaja ning Portsmouthi Ülikooli keeleõppe osakonna magistrant ning minu erialaks on rakenduslik keeleteadus ja inglise keele õpetamine teiste keelte kõnelejatele. Kutsun Teie last või hoolealust osalema rakenduslingvistika magistritöö raames läbiviidavas uuringus.

Kui Te nõustute oma lapse või hoolealuse osalemisega, palutakse tal täita küsimustik, mis võtab aega kuni pool tundi.

Kiri on Teile edastatud põhjusel, et Teie last või hoolealust peetakse võimalikuks uuringus osalejaks, kuna ta on Haabneeme Koolis inglise keele kui võõrkeele õppija ning sobib uuringus osalema. Minule ei ole eelnevalt edastatud Teie nime, aadressi ega muid isikuandmeid. Kui Te nõustute oma lapse või hoolealuse osalemisega või sellest keeldute, ei mõjuta see otsus mingil moel Teie edasisi suhteid Haabneeme Kooliga.

Uuringus osaleda lubamine on Teie vabatahtlik otsus ning Teie laps võib ilma põhjuseid esitamata uuringus osalemisest loobuda kuni 1.maini 2019 ning see ei mõjuta Teid ega Teie last mingil viisil. Kogu Teid ning Teie last puudutav informatsioon on rangelt konfidentsiaalne. Teie ega Teie lapse nime uurimistöös ei avaldata. Uuringuga seoses Teie ega lapsele mingeid teadaolevaid riske ei ilmne.

Teile edasiseks informatsiooniks on kaasa pandud uuritava informeerimise vorm ning paber kandjal ka teadliku nõusoleku leht. Juhul, kui Te lubate last uuringus osalema, palun allkirjastage teadliku nõusoleku leht ning esitage see tema klassiõpetajale või inglise keele õpetajale.

Kui Teil on tekkinud uuringuga seoses küsimusi, võtke palun ühendust e-posti teel [Lilian.Raspel@haabneeme.edu.ee](mailto:Lilian.Raspel@haabneeme.edu.ee) või helistage telefonil +372 6028963.

Tänan Teid, et võtsite aega selle kutse läbi lugemiseks ja kaalute antud uuringus osalemist!

## LAPSEVANEMA INFORMEERIMISE VORM

**Projekti nimetus:** Põhilised keelekasutuse viisid võõrkeele tundides ja nende mõju võõrkeele omandamisele.

**Uuringu teostaja kontaktandmed:** Lilian Rospel, email: Lilian.Rospel@haabneeme.edu.ee, tel.: +372 6028963

**Uuringu juhendaja kontaktandmed:** Ms Rebecca Hamlet, email: rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk, tel.: +44 023 9284 6095

### Kutse osalema uuringus

Olen Haabneeme Kooli inglise keele õpetaja ning Portsmouthi Ülikooli keeleõppe osakonna magistrant ning minu erialaks on rakenduslingvistika ja inglise keele õpetamine teiste keelte kõnelejatele. Kutsun Teie last/hoolealust osalema rakenduslingvistika magistritöö raames läbiviidavas uuringus.

Selles uuringus osalemine sõltub Teie ja Teie lapse otsusest. Enne otsuse langetamist lugege palun hoolikalt läbi käesolev informeerimise ja teadliku nõusoleku vorm, mis annab Teie teavet läbiviidava uuringu kohta, sealhulgas uurimistöö eesmärkidest ja kasust.

Osavõtt uuringust on vabatahtlik. Enne osalemise otsuse langetamist võite Te esitada uuringu kohta mistahes küsimusi. Tekkinud küsimuste osas palun Teil minuga ühendust võtta.

### Uuringu lühiülevaade

Teise keele või võõrkeele omandajatel on tihti raskusi uue keele omandamisel, kuna emakeele õppimisel kinnistunud keelekasutus on erinev võõrkeele tundides kasutusel olevast ning seega on oluline välja selgitada efektiivseimad keelekasutuse viisid võõrkeele tundides. Uurimuses oodatakse osalema 11-15-aastaseid lapsi, kes õpivad inglise keelt võõrkeelena. Uuringus osalejatel palutakse täita küsimustik, kus nad peaksid valima enda kohta sobiva vastuse etteantud vastuste hulgast. Küsimustik viiakse läbi ainult üks kord ning see ei peaks võtma aega rohkem kui 30 minutit. Seejärel tehakse ilma isikuandmeid kasutamata testide tulemustest kokkuvõtte ning saadetakse soovi korral uuringus osalejatele.

### Mis on selle uuringu eesmärk?

Uuring viiakse läbi rakenduslingvistika magistritöö raames ning selle uuringu tulemused võivad anda olulist informatsiooni inglise keele kui võõrkeele omandamise uurimisvaldkonnas. Uuringu eesmärgiks on välja selgitada võõrkeele tunnis rakendatud keelekasutuse mõju võõrkeele õppimisele.

### Miks võiks Teie laps uuringus osaleda?

Teie laps või hoolealune valiti võimalikuks uuringus osalejaks, kuna ta on inglise keele kui võõrkeele õppija.

### Kas uuringus osalemine on kohustuslik?

Ei, antud uuringus osalemine on vabatahtlik. Kui Te annate nõusoleku oma lapse osalemise kohta, paluksin Teil allkirjastada kaasasolev teadliku nõusoleku leht, kuupäevaga 18.03.2019, versiooni number, 1.2.

### **Mis toimub, kui otsustate, et Teie laps võib selles uuringus osaleda?**

Kui Te nõustute osalemisega, jäetakse Teile käesolev lapsevanema informeerimise vorm ning palutakse allkirjastada teadliku nõusoleku leht. Seejärel palutakse Teie lapsel vastata küsimustikule, kus ta peab valima etteantud vastuste hulgast enda kohta sobivad variandid. Küsimustiku täitmine võtab aega umbes pool tundi.

Isegi juhul, kui olete otsustanud, et Teie laps võiks uuringus osaleda võite siiski igal ajal kuni 1. maini 2019 põhjustest olenemata oma lapse uuringus osalemisest loobuda ning tema küsimustiku tulemusi uuringus ei arvestata.

### **Milline on selles uuringus osalemisega kaasnev võimalik kasu?**

Teie lapse uuringus osalemine Teile ega lapsele otsest lisakasu kaasa ei too, kuid uuringust saadud informatsioon aitab süvendada teadmisi antud valdkonnas, seega aitate uuringus osalemisega kaasa võõrkeele omandamise uurimisele. Selleks, et iga lapse nägemus võiks esile tulla ja oma võimalikku mõju avaldada, palumegi Teilt luba, et Teie laps võiks uuringust osa võtta.

### **Kas uuringus osalemist tasustatakse?**

Ei. Uuringus osalemist ei tasustata.

### **Kuidas tagatakse Teie ja Teie lapse konfidentsiaalsus?**

Kogu uuringus saadud informatsiooni hoitakse konfidentsiaalsena. Dokumentidest, mis lubavad Teie lapse isiku kokku viia tema andmetega, ning testi tulemused hävitatakse pärast antud uurimistöö esitamist. Andmete le juurdepääsu omavad ainult uurimustööga seotud isikud. Võimalikud elektroonilised koopiad andmetest hoitakse salasõnaga kaitstud arvutis ning hävitatakse peale uurimistöö valmimist.

Uuringu lõppedes analüüsitakse tulemusi ilma Teie lapse isikuandmeid kasutamata ning tulemused esitatakse üldistatud kujul. Anonüümseid tulemusi, mis Teid ega Teie last ühelgi kombel ei tuvasta, edasistes uuringutes ilma Teie täiendava nõusolekuta ei kasutata.

Andmeid, mis lubavad tuvastada Teie isiku, ei edastata kolmandatele isikutele ilma Teie poolt antud kirjaliku nõusolekuta. Erandiks on ametiasutused, kes on volitatud teostama erandkorras uuringu suhtes vastavat kontrolli. Antud ametiasutused käsitlevad Teie andmeid konfidentsiaalsusega.

### **Mis juhtub Teiega või Teie lapsega, kui te otsustate uuringus osalemise katkestada või sellest loobuda?**

Kuna Teie laps osaleb uuringus vabatahtlikult võite Teie või Teie laps ilma põhjuseid esitamata uuringus osalemisest loobuda kuni 1. maini 2019. Kui Te otsustate loobuda uuringu käigus, siis küsitakse Teie nõusolekut juba olemasolevate vastuste kaasamise kohta uurimistöös. Kui eelistate vastuste uurimistööst välja jätmist, siis arvestatakse Teie soovidega. Juhul, kui uurimistöö on valminud ja andmed analüüsitud, ei ole Teil enam võimalik uuringus osalemisest tagantjäreli loobuda.

### **Kui Teil on tekkinud probleeme seoses uuringuga?**

Kui Teil on küsimusi, probleeme, muresid või kaebusi seoses uuringuga võite esimese meetmena võtta ühendust uurimistöö autori või juhendajaga. Kontaktandmed leiate esilehelt.

Kui uurimistöö autor või juhendaja ei suuda Teie kaebusi lahendada, peaksite võtma ühendust osakonnajuhatajaga (inglise keeles):

The Head of School

Mr Stephen Corbett

School of Languages and Applied Linguistics +44 023 9284 6050  
University of Portsmouth stephen.corbett@port.ac.uk  
Park Building, King Henry 1 Street  
Portsmouth PO1 2DZ, UK

Kui Teie kaebus jääb siiski lahenduseta, palun pöörduge all oleva ametniku poole (inglise keeles):

The University Complaints Officer

+44 (0) 2392 843103 [complaintsAdvice@port.ac.uk](mailto:complaintsAdvice@port.ac.uk)

### **Kes kontrollivad uuringu nõuetekohast läbiviimist?**

Uuringu nõuetekohast läbiviimist, mis austavad osalejate väärkust ega riku nende heaolu, jälgivad magistrandi juhendaja ning lisaks üks ülikooli akadeemilise töötajaskonna liige.

### **Aitäh!**

Täna Teid, et võtsite aega selle informeerimise vormi läbi lugemiseks ja kaalute nõusoleku andmist selles uuringus osalemise kohta! Kui Te annate oma nõusoleku, tutvuge ning allkirjastage palun ka kaasasolev teadliku nõusoleku vorm. Mõlemad vormid jäävad Teie valdusesse.

**LAPSEVANEMA NÕUSOLEK UURINGUS OSALEMISEKS**

**Uurimustöö nimetus:** Põhilised keelekasutuse viisid võõrkeele tundides ja nende mõju võõrkeele omandamisele.

**Uuringu teostaja kontaktandmed:** Lilian Raspel, email: Lilian.Raspel@haabneeme.edu.ee, tel.: +372 6028963

**Uuringu juhendaja:** Ms Rebecca Hamlet, email: rebecca.hamlet@port.ac.uk, tel.: +44 023 9284 6095

**Ülikooli andmekaitse ametnik:** Samantha Hill, email: data-protection@port.ac.uk, tel +44 023 9284 3642

<b>Palun tehke kasti märges</b>
-------------------------------------

1. Uuritava teadlikule nõusoleku vormile alla kirjutades kinnitan, et olen tutvunud lapsevanema informeerimise vormiga (18.03.2019, versioon 1.2, saadetud Stuudiumi kaudu) ning kinnitan, et mind on informeeritud ülalnimetatud uuringust, selle eesmärkidest ja uuringu meetodikast.
2. Tean, et minu lapse/hoolealuse osalemine on vabatahtlik ning ma võin põhjusi avaldamata oma nõusoleku tagasi võtta kuni 1. maini 2019.
3. Mõistan, et andmeid, mis lubavad tuvastada minu või minu lapse isiku, võidakse edastada erandkorras ametiasutustele, kes on volitatud teostama uuringu suhtes vastavat kontrolli, mille kohta annan oma nõusoleku. Vastavas olukorras tagatakse minu konfidentsiaalsus.
4. Mõistan, et magistritöö, milles on kajastatud küsimustiku anonüümsed tulemused, esitatakse ning see kuulub edaspidi Portsmouthi Ülikoolile. Annan nõusoleku andmete töötlemiseks eelnevalt kirjeldatud tingimustel.
5. Nõustun, et minu laps/hoolealune \_\_\_\_\_ osaleb antud uuringus.   
 (lapse nimi)

**Uuritavale nõusoleku andnud isik:**

**Kuupäev:**

**Allkiri:**

**Uuritava vanemalt/eestkostjalt  
nõusoleku võtnud isik:**

**Kuupäev:**

**Allkiri:**