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ABSTRACT

The study is intended to investigate thoughts and preferences of the use of the first language of the learners in an EFL/ESL classroom, and also to study if the level of the learners is affected by the amount of L1 used by the teachers. What discerns this study from the existing literature is a consideration of the diversity of thoughts, cultures and nationalities. A total number of 40 English language teachers from 12 countries with different cultural perceptions and backgrounds were selected as participants for the study. A structured questionnaire was prepared to address thoughts and experiences of the participant groups. The questionnaire focused on helping the participants recall their own teaching experiences and explore their reasons for using L1 in the EFL/ESL classroom. The participants were random respondents to the questionnaire from among those practicing teachers. Two considerations of the quantitative data: the amount of L1 use, and why the teachers preferred using it were analyzed to assess the extent to which L1 is used in an EFL/ESL class besides the reasons for using it. The findings of the study suggested that there was a strong eagerness to use L1 by the teacher participants. Further, it was found out that L1 use was prioritized for the following purposes: translation and explanation of the content, managing the class, and to accomplish the affective and social functions of the language use. Findings also suggested that there was a correlation between L1 use and the language competence level of the learners.
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1. Introduction

Grammar Translation Method, once, used to be one of the most popular teaching methods for language teachers. Use of learners’ first language (L1) was highlighted as an asset for the teachers to teach a foreign language (L2) and to some, teaching L2 was impossible without the help of the L1. CLT, which is in practice today, has a different view on the use of L1. CLT holds that through communication and real practice of the language, one can best learn the language. Krashen, Rinnovucci, and others are of the opinion that L1 is likely to have a larger negative impact compared to the favourable results it can yield. Proponents of the method believe that through communication and real practice of the language, one can best learn the language. Krashen (1985) with his input theory and affective filter hypothesis concludes that L1 use in the classroom hinders learners from getting a great deal of the right input. Further, monolingual teaching is still the red line for some scholars too. Deller and Rinvolucri (2002) warn English teachers of the use of L1 and the possible consequences. For them, exposure to L1 in the class results in negative effects; so let the positive ones remain. In reality, however, there still remains a great deal of both claims and counter claims in respect to the use of learners’ L1 in teaching L2.

In the domain of language teaching research, surprisingly, there again rises an interest in use of L1 in teaching L2. The more recent researches in language teaching do not dismiss the use of L1 in the second language classroom. A teacher who has the knowledge of learners’ mother tongue is said to be at an advantage. (Butzkamm, 2003; Copland & Neokeous, 2011). But this
does not dismiss the need to provide practice in L2 use in the classroom. The main reason in favour of this preference emerges from the varied environments we have in second/foreign language teaching situations. There are certain pockets where the use of English is restricted to the four walls of the classroom as the world outside does not provide any exposure to the language. In other words, some learners may not have exposure to L2 outside the classroom. Keeping this in mind, teachers need to encourage the use of the target language to the extent possible in the classroom (Littlewood & Yu, 2011).

The existence of L1 cannot be denied in an L2 classroom either. Teachers have their own purpose for using learners’ L1 in the class. For some teachers, these reasons may be well defined while for others, the need may arise in specified contexts of teaching. Learners’ understanding of the reasons behind the teachers’ use of L1 in an L2 classroom may be different from their perceptions.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

It has become a matter of great debate in the field of ELT whether learners’ L1 should be used in an EFL class or not. As a result of the excessive use of L1, grammar translation method lost its popularity, and was precipitously replaced by what is known as the direct method which led to the beginning of the immersion schools. There were a number of other methods like such as Audio Lingual Method, Total Physical Response, Suggestopedia, Silent Way, Community Language Learning and finally the Communicative Language Teaching by the mid-1970s. This new method apparently denied the use of L1 in an EFL context at the beginning. With the passage of time, though, theories supported use of L1 in an EFL classroom and so did the debates in the field of ELT. Contradictions of thought still exist whether or not L1 should be used in an EFL classroom.

The idea of not using L1 in an EFL classroom is now critically questioned. For some, taking out the L1 from an EFL class rather seems political and “commercially-grounded” (Turnbull, 2018, p.2), not really a result of pedagogical necessity. Mahboob and Lin (2016) too believe that exclusion of L1 from an EFL class is a result of the environment and the context in which the act of teaching takes place. For them, the idea does not come from scholarly research in the field.

It is now abundantly clear that L1 has made its reentry into EFL classroom. A lot of research has gone in to find out if L1 use should be supported or denied (see for example De La Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Turnbull, 2018; Salah & Farrah, 2012; Tajgozari, 2017; Ostovar-Namaghi & Norouzi, 2015; Shabir, 2017). Teachers’, learners’ and administrators’ perceptions are researched on. Context related factors have shaped the findings of such studies. However, less attention is paid to global perceptions on the teachers’ use of L1 as well as to why they use it in their L2 classes.

1.2 Research Objectives and Questions

As stated, the existing literature is dedicated to finding out if L1 should be used in the ESL/EFL classroom or not, and it is found out that L1 cannot be neglected in EFL/ ESL classroom. Nhan and Lai (2012) still see a place for grammar translation method and believe that at different levels learners implicitly translate the target language in their head and this act helps in learning the target language better with the help of their L1. As per the advocates of this theory, L1 is always there in an EFL classroom and thus a lot of attention is paid to support the claim. However, a few scholars have tried to find out, at the national level, why teachers need to use L1 in their classes.

This study aimed at finding out global perspectives on the use of L1 in EFL/ESL classroom by collecting the perceptions of the teachers belonging to twelve different countries. Besides, it investigates if graduate level teachers and high school teachers use L1 in the same way for different functionalities and with different frequency. The aim of this study is to find out multinational teachers’ thoughts and perceptions as well as the functionality for use of L1, with a distinction of class level being taught, is studied here.

Hence, the study intends to answer the following research questions:

a) Do teachers, around the world, use learners’ L1 in their EFL classroom? If yes, is it for the same purpose?
b) What functions do these teachers use learners’ L1 for?
c) Does the level of the learners’ affect the way teachers use L1 in the EFL class?

2. Literature Review

Teachers’ use of the first language of the learners to teach EFL has made the debate re-emerge whether or not the first language could be used in the EFL classroom. Some researchers suggest a
complete exclusion of L1, while others support its use. Proponents of exclusion follow the footsteps of Krashen (1985) who believes that the use of L1 in a classroom stops learners from getting a valuable input. To add to this, Phillipson (1992) articulated two similar philosophies by stating, "English is best taught monolingually", adding, “The ideal teacher of English is a native English speaker" (Pp. 185). A native speaker teacher, as of these opinions spell out, is the one who can facilitate learning better than a non-native one. L1 exposure is excluded here, and it is completely denied just the way Krashen (1985) proposed. Cook (2001) also supports the claim for the exclusion of L1 from an L2 classroom. Further, Deller and Rinvolucri (2002) warned teachers of the consequences of L1 use in learners’ learning. Apparently, this consequence is what Turnbull (2018) finds about in his study where he faces claims that challenge the use of L1 in classroom. He claims that L1 use in the L2 classroom limits the amount of exposure to L2. Further, he also comes up with the idea that L1 will make learners lazy and over-reliant. There are other proponents who believe that the more the L2 exposure, the better is the learning. These two claims emerged during the study of Deller and Rinvolucri (2002) refer to as the negative effects of use of L1 in the process of learning L2 on the L2 learners. With a support for monolingual approach to teaching language, claims that it is only L2 that facilitates learning, especially when the learners get to know that the more exposure they get to the target language the better will be their capabilities.

On the other hand, there are also studies that support L1 use in an ESL classroom, beginning with Dodson (1967) who promoted bilingual method for about five decades ago. In their study, De La Campa & Nassaji (2009) concluded that using L1 can facilitate learning an L2. They end up suggesting the use of L1 as found in their study of two German teachers teaching German language in Canada, that L1 is a supportive tool for learning. According to the study, teachers use L1 for 14 different purposes. Now the question remains as to who uses L1 the most, the teacher or the learners? Cummins (2007), however, states that L1 is not the “enemy” of learners’ progress towards proficiency. Jadallah & Hasan (2011) suggest a careful use of the L1. Here, L1 use is not neglected, whereas, it is suggested that precautions must be taken before using it. L1 use, according to them, should be appropriate, purposeful and strategic. Not every piece of L1 used in classroom facilitates learning. Sometimes this use may lead to nothing if attention is not paid to why L1 is used. Turnbull (2018), on the other hand, comes to conclude that most of the teachers who deny L1 use are the teachers who do not have experience of learning a foreign language. The study suggests that teachers and learners can equally use L1 in class, specifically at lower levels. However, at advanced levels L1 may not be as beneficial as it can be in the lower levels. Thus, it is recommended that L1 use should be minimized to the extent possible in advanced levels. In addition, in a study Gaebler (2014) asserted that teachers teaching advanced learners can also employ translanguaging just to keep up with the flow of the interaction and make it clear for the listeners to comprehend the message being given, as well as to deal with a shortage of lexis. Adding to this, Centeno-Cortés & Jiménez (2004) believe that for higher level problems solving scenarios, advanced level learners can use L1.

Why is L1 used? A great deal of research has taken place to find out the effectiveness of L1 use. Interestingly, a lot of context-specific research has found out that there is always a place for L1 in language classes. Mohabbi & Alavi (2014) studied 72 Iranian EFL teachers and found out that these teachers use learners’ native language – Persian – to provide feedback, teach new vocabulary, explain grammar, build rapport, manage class, give individual help and manage time. This study concluded that L1 exists in a classroom, and stated the functions of the use. Inal and Turhanli (2019) support the use of L1 with low-proficiency level students particularly when making students aware of the differences and similarities between L1 and L2. Likewise, there are a lot of other context-specific studies that prove the use and functionality of L1 in a classroom (see for example, De La Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Salah & Farrah, 2012; Tajgozari, 2017; Ostovar-Namaghi & Norouzi, 2015; Shabir, 2017). In different studies, different researchers have found that normally teachers use L1 to teach/explain/translate vocabulary (see for example, Bhooth, et.al., 2014; Ching-Wen, Bo-Jian & Chen-Chiang, 2014; Kelleher, 2013; Yavuz, 2012; Calis & Dikilitas, 2012; Storch & Aldosari, 2010). Additionally, it is also believed that L1

functions as a scaffolding tool for learning and thus it may help in developing a cognitive awareness in the learners (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Mouhanna, 2009). Setting up a more student-friendly learning environment is another factor behind L1 use by the teachers (Yavuz, 2012; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Ebrar Yenice, 2018). Wolthuis et.al (2020) supports the use of L1 in L2 classes when the focus is on complex content.

In continuation with the studies that support use of L1 in the process of learning L2, this study takes the stance that L1 use fosters L2 learning. However, the context that best suits the use of L1 that promotes L2/Target Language learning is yet to be established. Hence, the study reaches out to ESL and ESL teachers of different nationalities that reflect different contexts of language teaching.

3. Methodology

3.1 Context and Participant

The study was conducted in Hyderabad, India. The data was collected from a total number of 40 teachers from 12 countries, that include Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Columbia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, India, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Palestine, Syria, Turkmenistan, Yemen. They volunteered to respond to the questionnaire when given an option to participate in the study. All of them were visitors from other countries to Hyderabad, who were pursuing different academic and skill based programmes such as a proficiency course in English or research programmes at various institutions. All the participants (10 male and 30 female) had some teaching experience. They had a minimum of 3 years to a maximum of up to 21 years of teaching experience. Only one of the participants had taught for just one-year. The participants’ age ranged from 28 years to 45 years. These participants taught either at high school or college level in their respective countries. 14 of the participants held a BA degree along with a Bachelor’s degree in Education, 16 of them were Post graduates, and 10 were PhD degree holders. Except the Indians Indian for whom English is a second language. For the others who participated in the study, English was considered to be a foreign language (EFL).

3.2 Data Collection Instrument and Procedures

The participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire (appended to this paper) designed in two sections. The first section asked them about their demographic details and teaching experience as well as the level of their education. The second section consisted of 15 statements put in a five-point Likert scale. The participants were supposed to indicate the extent to which they agreed with each of the statements ranging from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1).

In order to investigate the functionality of L1 use, these statements fit in four applicable categories though not explicitly stated in the questionnaire. The participants stated their opinions on the Likert scale with a clear understanding of the category of functions the statements referred to. The categories of functions of the statements fit in are: teaching functions (i.e. translation, lexical meanings); managerial functions (i.e. maintaining classroom discipline); affective functions (i.e. teacher-student rapport); and social functions (i.e. talking about off classroom topics).

To measure the overall opinions of the participants, the mean of each of the statements was calculated first. After prioritizing each aspect of every single functionality, the overall mean of each category was calculated so that functionality could be prioritized and participants’ preferences of L1 use in their classrooms could be measured.

3.3 Data Validity and Reliability

To ensure the validity of the data collection tool, the questionnaire was first piloted based on which changes were made in terms of instructions and clarity. Furthermore, to ensure the validity of the collected data, mean and median were calculated and the standard deviation was found out to measure the range of consistency in the data.

The Cronbach’s alpha suggests a coefficient of .70 or higher can be accepted by social science research. The higher the coefficient goes, the more consistent and reliable the data would be. After a calculation of the data for reliability, it was found out that the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for this study is 0.86 suggesting a higher level of consistency and reliability.

3.4 Data Analysis

To answer the research questions more explicitly, the data was analyzed at two different stages. First, it was analyzed to find out if the teachers used their learners’ L1 in their EFL classes. The amount of use, if any, was also studied in this section. The teachers who said they do not use L1 in their classes were not considered for this study. Secondly, it was analyzed to find out
teachers’ preference of the reasons for using L1 in their respective classes. After prioritizing the functionality behind the use of L1, individual groups (high school teachers and college teachers) were compared to see if the level of learners affected the way L1 was used in the classes.

3.4.1 Do teachers use learners’ L1 in their EFL classes?

First and foremost, the study intended to figure out if teachers used L1 in their classes. The questionnaire, before investigating the purposes, intended to get an answer to the question if L1 was used in the classes. Chart 1 provides a detailed description of the percentage of L1 use in EFL classes by the participants from 12 countries:

![Figure: 1 Frequency of L1 use in the classroom](image)

As per the findings of the data, 77.78% of the participants answered “sometimes” when asked if they used L1 in their EFL classes and made it the highest value for the percentage count. Second comes, “usually” with 11.11%, then comes “rarely” with 7.41% and finally comes “always” with only 3.70% of the answers. Interestingly, none of the participants neglected L1 use by selecting the option “never”. It is inferred that, regardless of the class level, experience of the teacher, teachers’ level of education, and the purpose L1 use, L1 was always there inside the classroom and none denied the fact.

3.4.2 Data analysis for teachers’ functionality preference

As stated before, the questionnaire consisted of 15 statements and participants were supposed to show to what extent they used L1 in their classes. Table 1 illustrates the statements and the participants’ responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Translating or explaining new vocabulary</td>
<td>3.6 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explaining grammar</td>
<td>3.0 (1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Giving feedback</td>
<td>2.9 (1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clarifying meaning</td>
<td>3.5 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Learners do not know the equivalent words/expressions in English</td>
<td>3.0 (1.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Giving instructions</td>
<td>2.3 (1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Maintaining classroom discipline</td>
<td>2.7 (1.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Drawing attention</td>
<td>2.6 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Increasing student participation</td>
<td>2.2 (1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Informing learners about the due-exam dates</td>
<td>3.2 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Enhancing classroom relationships</td>
<td>2.7 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Encouraging and motivating learners</td>
<td>2.8 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Trying to increase teacher-student interaction in the class</td>
<td>2.3 (1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Greeting learners</td>
<td>2.0 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Talking about off-classroom topics</td>
<td>3.1 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per the findings of the data, [3.4.2] the measures of mean and standard deviation indicate a closer spot for the tendency of teachers’ perceptions about the use of L1 in their classes. Participants have showed a stronger degree of agreement with each other and thus it can be inferred that teachers used L1 for some pre-specified situations stated. The same with the spread of thoughts, a range of 1.03 to 1.38 of the SD exhibits the closeness of thoughts to one domain.

In case of prioritizing the functionality, the statements were divided into four common categories without letting the participants know of such division. This aimed at investigating the functionality to accomplish which the L1 was used in the EFL classroom. Table-II showcases the prioritized reasons behind L1 use in the EFL classroom.

Table 2: Prioritized functionality for L1 use in an EFL classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functionality categories</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Functional Use</td>
<td>Translating or explaining new vocabulary</td>
<td>3.08 (0.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explaining grammar</td>
<td>3.0 (1.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving feedback</td>
<td>2.9 (1.24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarifying meaning</td>
<td>3.5 (1.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learners do not know the equivalent words/expressions in English</td>
<td>3.0 (1.38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving instructions</td>
<td>2.3 (1.24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintaining classroom discipline</td>
<td>2.7 (1.32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drawing attention</td>
<td>2.6 (1.28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing student participation</td>
<td>2.2 (1.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informing learners about the due-exam dates</td>
<td>3.2 (1.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Functionality</td>
<td>Enhancing classroom relationships</td>
<td>2.7 (1.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trying to increase teacher-student interaction in the class</td>
<td>2.3 (1.24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging and motivating learners</td>
<td>2.8 (1.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greeting learners</td>
<td>2.0 (1.08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talking about off-classroom topics</td>
<td>3.1 (1.12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Functionality</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.63 (0.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.59 (0.59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 indicates a great deal of learners’ L1 use for the purposes of translation, explaining grammar points, giving feedback, clarifying meaning, giving synonyms, and giving instructions. One of the reasons why grammar translation method lost its popularity was due to the excessive use of L1 in the EFL classroom. However, the use of L1 for such purposes still exists amongst teachers around the world.

Teachers’ second preference of L1 use falls in the managerial functionality: to encourage participation, inform them of the due dates and for the discipline purposes. The distance between the first and the second preference is 0.37 indicating a somehow longer distance than that exists between the second and the third preference.

Participants’ third preference of using L1 in the class goes with the affective purposes. The mean for this functionality indicates a smaller distance with the managerial use. The range between the second and the third preference is 0.08 making the distance from the second preference to the third one much smaller than that of the distance between the second and the third preference.

Finally, the last functionality of L1 use is that of the social functions. Also, this functionality bears the smallest distance when compared to all the other preferences. With the mean of 2.59, this category makes up only 0.04 of difference between the third and the fourth preference.

Interestingly, a range of 0.21 to 0.59 of the standard deviation shows how close these participants are in terms of their preferences and choices of the frequency of L1 use. With the SD of 0.21, the affective functionality gets the closest of thoughts among all the other functionalities. On the other side, with the SD of 0.59 L1 use for social purposes gets a somehow spread and varied thoughts than the other three categories.

3.4.3 The role of learners’ level in choice of L1 use in the EFL classroom

Participants’ teaching experience ranged from 3 years to 21 years. They come from two different working contexts; 20 of them were college teachers and the rest were teaching at the high school level. One of the aspects of the data that emerged later was the effects of the level of the learners on the way L1 was used by the teacher in the classroom.

In Table 3 a comparison of high school and college teachers’ responses are presented in a one to one comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functionality Categories</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Teachers</td>
<td>College Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Functional Use</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Functionality</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Functionality</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Functionality</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 3, in all the situations the high school teachers used L1 slightly more than the college teachers. As per the table, college teachers used L1 more than the high school teachers for the purpose of greetings and providing equivalence for words and expressions which were unknown to the learners. As of the greeting purposes by the high school teachers (1.83) and that of the college teachers (2.13) the difference falls in a range of 0.30 by which it can be claimed that there is a difference between these two participant groups. However, in the rest of the cases high school teachers exhibited willingness to use L1 more.

To show the willingness of each participant groups, their responses differed from one another. Table 4 illustrates an average of willingness to use L1 in their classes as well as the spread of the agreement within these two participant groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functionality Categories</th>
<th>High School Teachers</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th>High School Teachers</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Functional Use</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Functionality</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Functionality</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Functionality</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown, the high school teachers used L1 more than that of the college teachers. A maximum range of 0.65 for all the functionalities illustrates a willingness and agreement of L1 use in general for these high school teachers. Similarly, the college teachers in general used L1 in their classrooms. The degree of agreement is even closer than that of the high school teachers as the range for these teachers gets to a maximum of 0.52.

For the use of L1 for social functions, both groups demonstrated an equal degree of 0.06. Both groups agreed on the exact amount of L1 used for social purposes. This is because the individuals come from contexts where English is not the first language of the learners. Thus, these teachers found it comfortable to socialize with their learners using their first language.

Interestingly, using L1 for affective functions i.e. encouraging and motivating, seems more pervasive among college teachers than the other group. For high school teachers, for example, this functionality ranged the highest of 0.05 whereas for the college teachers it is a merely 0.13. For socialization though, both groups demonstrated a similar amount of eagerness towards the first language use in their classes. 2.63 against 2.57 of willingness and 0.06 for unity of thought is a proof for the claim.

4. Findings

As noted earlier, the use of L1 in an EFL classroom is the center of the debate. The proponents of the idea believe that the more the learners are exposed to the target language, the more effective the learning is. For them, L1 does not have anything to do with learners’ learning and thus using L1 may dispossess learners’ input (Bouangeune, 2009). The study suggests that there is a noticeable eagerness for L1 use in EFL classes around the world. The extent to which L1 is being used depends largely on the level of the learners and the purpose for which it is used. Almost 78% of the participants admitted that they “sometimes” used their learners’ L1 in their classes. What is obvious amongst the researchers is the reality that the use of L1 cannot be neglected.

Furthermore, it was found that teachers used L1 for different purposes (De La Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Turnbull, 2018; Salah & Farrah, 2012; Tajgozari, 2017; Ostovar-Namaghi & Norouzi, 2015; Shabir, 2017).

1. First and the foremost, teachers used L1 to support the language teaching-learning purposes. Using L1 for the purposes of translating and explaining new vocabulary and grammar, clarifying meaning and providing synonyms and giving feedback came as the first preference for the participants.
2. The second preference of L1 use is the managerial functionality. In this functionality, teachers normally used L1 for discipline and management related issues, as well as participation and organizational issues in the class.
3. The third preference of use is for the purposes of motivating learners as well as enhancing relationships. This also means that the teacher becomes more approachable to the learners during classroom interactions if it takes place in L1 and helps influence the learners to increase their motivation levels.
4. Finally, using L1 for social functions comes last in the list of preference for the participants. These include informal discussions outside the classroom that do not include any learning purposes.
5. Lastly, but more importantly, as per the findings of the study, it can be claimed that the learning levels of the learners affected the way L1 was used by the teachers. As per the suggestions made by Jadallah & Hasan (2011) the participants expressed a sense of carefulness for L1 use in their respective classes. It is found that in lower level classes, L1 was used more than it was used in the L2 classes. There is a direct link between the level of the learners and the amount of L1 use in the classroom by the teacher.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

To start with, whether one approves it or not, L1 is always there in the English classroom. However, teachers need to be careful with regard to the amount and purpose for which L1 is used. The use of L1 should not jeopardize the objectives for which it is used (Turnbull, 2018; Ebrar Yenice, 2018). The participants clearly displayed eagerness towards L1 use in their English classes. However, for them the level also matters.

In terms of functions, the four major functions of L1 use that Ebrar Yenice (2018) proposed were applicable in the present study as well. The participants, with a consideration of the purpose and preference exhibited a set of pre-identified priorities. This study proves that teachers around the
world prioritized L1 use for certain functional purposes. It is clear that the participants used L1 for managerial functions, effective functions and finally to discharge social functions.

Finally, level of the student also matters for the amount of L1 used in an EFL classroom. As per the findings, L1 is mostly used in lower level classes rather than in the advanced or college level classes. The smallest difference between the level of the learners and amount of L1 use falls in the discharge of social functions. Apparently, in both higher and lower level classes; teachers used almost the same amount of L1 and L2 to meet the same purposes.
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Appendix: Questionnaire to the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Translating or explaining new vocabulary
2. Explaining grammar
3. Giving feedback
4. Clarifying meaning
5. Giving instructions
6. Maintaining classroom discipline
7. Revising content
8. Introducing student participation
9. Recording students’ homework
10. Enhancing classroom relationships
11. Encouraging and motivating students
12. Talking about classroom rules
13. Designing students
14. Encouraging and motivating students
15. I do not know the equivalent words or expressions in English
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