163144

L1 USE IN BEGINNER LEVEL EFL SPEAKING CLASSES AND ITS EFFECT ON ELEMENTARY LEVEL STUDENTS' ORAL PERFORMANCES

G. MÜGE KANATLAR

PH.D. THESIS
Department of Foreign Languages
English Language Teaching
Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. HANDAN YAVUZ

Eskişehir
Anadolu University, Institution of Social Sciences
February,2005

L1 USE IN BEGINNER LEVEL EFL SPEAKING CLASSES AND ITS EFFECT ON ELEMENTARY LEVEL STUDENTS' ORAL PERFORMANCES

G. Müge KANATLAR

(Doktora Tezi)

Eskişehir-2005

DOKTORA TEZ ÖZÜ

DÜŞÜK DÜZEY KONUŞMA DERSLERİNDE ANA DİL KULLANIMI VE ANA DİL KULLANIMININ ÖĞRENCİLERİN KONUŞMA PERFORMANSLARINA ETKİSİ

G. Müge KANATLAR
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2004
Danışman: Doç. Dr. Handan Yavuz

İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği sınıflarda ana dil kullanımı bir çok araştırmacının dikkatini çekmektedir. Bu konuyla ilgili çalışmalar genellikle ana dil kullanımına karşı olan tavırlar, ana dilin kullanıldığı yerler ve nedenleri üzerine odaklanmıştır.

Bu çalışma üç temel soruyu araştırmıştır: a) başlangıç düzeyindeki konuşma derslerinde, öğretmenler ve öğrenciler ana dili ne zaman ve neden kullanıyor? b) konuşma derslerinde, önerilen yerlerde ana dil kullanılması başlangıç-üstü düzeydeki öğrencilerin konuşma performanslarını etkiliyor mu? ve c) konuşma derslerinin tamamen İngilizce yapılması başlangıç-üstü düzeydeki öğrencilerin konuşma performanslarını etkiliyor mu?

Araştırma iki aşamada yürütülmüştür. İlk aşamada, veriler gözlemler, anketler ve yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmelerle toplanmıştır. 7 konuşma dersi okutmanına ve 266 başlangıç düzeyindeki öğrenciye, konuşma derslerinde Türkçe kullandıkları yerler ve nedenleriyle ilgili anketler verilmiştir. İlk aşamanın sonuçları okutmanlarla öğrencilerin farklı yerlerde Türkçe kullandıklarını göstermiştir. Hem okutmanların hem öğrencilerin Türkçe kullanmasını etkileyen en önemli faktörün öğrencilerin İngilizce'deki sınırlı bilgisi olduğu da bulunmuştur.

İkinci aşamada, öğrencilerin konuşma performanslarını, önerilen yerlerde ana dilin kullanıldığı konuşma derslerinin mi yoksa derslerin tamamen İngilizce yapıldığı konuşma derslerinin mi etkilediğini bulmak için, 65 öğrenci, 9 haftalık bir uygulamanın öncesi ve sonrasında sözlü mülakatlara alınmıştır. Her iki gurubun da konuşma performanslarında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark olmadığı bulunmuştur.

ABSTRACT

Use of native language (L1) in English as a foreign language (EFL) classes has attracted the attention of many researchers. The related studies usually focused on attitudes towards L1 use, occasions of and reasons for L1 use.

This study investigated three main questions: a) when and why is L1 used in beginner level speaking classes?, b) Do 'suggested L1 use' speaking classes affect elementary level students' oral performances? and c) Do 'English-only' speaking classes affect elementary level students' oral performances?

The investigation was conducted in two phases. In Phase 1, the data were collected through observations, questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. 7 instructors and 266 students were given questionnaires about the occasions of and reasons for their use of Turkish in speaking classes. The results showed that instructors and students used Turkish on different occasions. It was also found that students' limited knowledge in English was the most influential factor that affected both instructors and students to use Turkish.

In Phase 2, to determine whether 'suggested L1 use' or 'English-only' speaking classes affect students' oral performances before and after the nine-week treatment, 65 students were taken pre- and post-test interviews. The oral performances of neither group showed any significant difference.

JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI

Gülsüm Müge KANATLAR'ın "L1 Use in Beginner Level Efl Speaking Classes and its Effect on Elementary Level Students' Oral Performances" başlıklı tezi **21 Şubat 2005** tarihinde, aşağıdaki jüri tarafından Lisansüstü Eğitim Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliğinin ilgili maddeleri uyarınca, **İngiliz Dili Eğitimi** Anabilim Dalında Doktora tezi olarak değerlendirilerek kabul edilmiştir.

			İmza
Üye (Tez Danışmanı)	:	**Doç.Dr.Handan YAVUZ**	.....
Üye	:	**Prof.Dr.Zülal BALPINAR**	.....
Üye	:	**Prof.Dr.Aydan ERSÖZ**	.....
Üye	:	**Prof.Dr.İlknur KEÇİK**	.....
Üye	:	**Prof.Dr.Gürhan CAN**	.....

Prof.Dr.Nurhan AYDIN
Anadolu Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürü

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank many people without whom this thesis would have never existed; I will always be indebted to them all my life long.

First, I would like to express my deepest and sincere gratitude to my advisor, Assoc. Prof. Handan Yavuz, not only for her professional constructive suggestions but also for her motivating and trusting attitude all through five years. I would extend my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Ayşe Akyel and Prof. Dr. Zülal Balpınar, for their guidance and support, without which I would never have had a thesis that I will always be proud of. I am also grateful to Prof. Dr. Aydan Ersöz, who kindly accepted to be the committee member, for her warm-hearted attitude and for her constructive feedback.

I am deeply indebted to my dear husband, Ahmet and my son, Barkan, for their invaluable support through their patience and understanding during the writing of my thesis. I also owe special thanks to my mother, Ülkü Ahıska, my father, Sabri Ahıska and my brother, M. Veysel Ahıska for their warm-hearted support.

I am also grateful to my dear friends, Aslı Büyükerşen, Aynur Yürekli, Hülya İpek and Zuhal Kıylık for their invaluable assistance, effort, support and encouragement they have never given up throughout my study.

I would like to express my special thanks to my colleague friends, Abdülkadir Durmuş, Aliye Evin Kasapoğlu, Ayşe D. Keser, Deniz Atacan, Ece Küçükoğlu, Emel Şentuna, Funda Gerçek, Gaye Şenbağ, Handan Girginer, İlkay Gökçe, İlknur İstifçi, Nesrin Oruç, Sevil Karabağ and Tuğba Yürür for their time, effort and professional assistance at many steps along the way in collecting data. I would like to extend my thanks to the seven colleagues of mine who kindly accepted to be the observees in my work.

My very special thanks go to Prof. Dr. Gürhan Can, Prof. Dr. Embiya Ağaoğlu, Prof. Dr. İlknur Keçik, Prof. Dr. Gül Köse, Assoc. Prof. Hülya Özcan, Assoc. Prof. Esmahan Ağaoğlu, Assoc. Prof. Ayşen Namlu, Assoc. Prof. Sibel Türküm, Asst. Prof. Bena Gül Peker, Asst. Prof. Gülriz İmer, Tom Miller, Chris Taylor, Gülfem Aslan, Bill Snyder and İlhan Usta for their feedback, stimulation and suggestions on the interpretation of the statistical analyses of the data.

I also wish to thank Sörf Video, Erdem Çetintaş, Zuhal Danyıldız and Murat Demirci and Harun for their help on the technical issues.

Finally, I am grateful to all the students at Anadolu University, The School of Foreign Languages, English Department who participated in my study by allocating time and effort on the interviews and questionnaires and for their patience and understanding during the observations.

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

G. Müge KANATLAR

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
Doktora

Eğitim

Y. Ls.	1995	Bilkent Üniversitesi
Ls.	1991	Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Bölümü, İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
Lise	1987	Kütahya Atatürk Lisesi

İş

1999-	Okutman, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu
1995-1999	Okutman, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Turizm ve Otel İşletmeciliği Yüksek Okulu
1991-1994	Okutman, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Mühendislik Mimarlık Fakültesi

Sunu

Kanatlar, M. & Ross, J. (2002). "They're going to be teachers, so ..." 7. Uluslararası ODTU ELT Konferansı: Evaluation and Assessment: Innovations in Action

Kişisel Bilgiler

Doğum yeri ve yılı: Ankara, 14 Mart 1970 Cinsiyet: Kadın Yabancı Dil: İngilizce, İtalyanca.

CONTENTS

Page

ÖZ ii
ABSTRACT iii
JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v
ÖZGEÇMİŞ vi
LIST OF TABLES xi
LIST OF FIGURES xii

1. INTRODUCTION 1
1.1. Background to the Study 1
1.2. Statement of the Problem 3
1.3. Purpose of the Study 5
1.3.1 Research Questions 5
1.4. Operational Definitions 6
1.4.1. 'Suggested L1 Use' Speaking Classes 6
1.4.2. 'English-Only' Speaking Classes 6
1.5. Significance of the Study 7
1.6. Organization of Chapters 7

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1. L1 Use in English Language Teaching (ELT) History 8
2.2. L1 Use in Bilingual Education 9
2.3. Advantages of L2-Only Classes 11
2.4. Advantages of L1 Use 12
2.5. L1 Use in Communicative Language Teaching 13
2.6. Occasions of, Reasons for and Attitudes towards L1 Use 14
2.7. Conclusion 19

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. PHASE 1 21
3.1.1. Participants 22
3.1.1.1. Students 22
3.1.1.2. Instructors 22
3.1.1.3. Observers 23
3.1.2. Instruments 23
3.1.2.1. Observation checklist 23
3.1.2.2. Questionnaires 25
3.1.2.3. Semi-structured interviews 26
3.1.3. Data Collection Procedure 27
3.1.3.1. Observations 27
3.1.3.2. Administration of questionnaires 29
3.1.3.3. Semi-structured interviews with volunteer students 29
3.1.4. Data Analysis 29
3.1.4.1. Analysis of observations 29
3.1.4.2. Analysis of questionnaires 30
3.1.4.3. Analysis of semi-structured interviews 31
3.2. PHASE 2 31
3.2.1. Participants 31
3.2.1.1. Students 31
3.2.1.2. Instructors 32
3.2.1.3. Moderators 32
3.2.2. Treatments 32
3.2.2.1. Suggested L1 use classes 33
3.2.2.2. English-only classes 33
3.2.2.3. Control group classes 33
3.2.3. Data Collection Procedure 34
3.2.3.1. Pre-test and post-test interviews 34
3.2.3.2. Tasks 35
3.2.4. Assessment Procedure 35
3.2.4.1. Assessment checklist 35

3.2.4.2. Assessment 36
3.2.5. Data Analysis 37

4. RESULTS

4.1. PHASE 1 38
4.1.1. L1 Use Occasions: Instructors 39
4.1.2. L1 Use Occasions: Students 43
4.1.3. Reasons for L1 Use: Instructors 47
4.1.4. Reasons for L1 Use: Students 50
4.1.5. Suggested L1 Use Occasions: Instructors 52
4.1.6. Suggested L1 Use Occasions: Students 53
4.1.7. Suggestions for English-Only Classes: Instructors 54
4.1.8. Suggestions for English-Only Classes: Students 54
4.2. PHASE 2 56
4.2.1. L1 Use Occasions in Treatment Groups 56
4.2.1.1. L1 use occasions in the suggested L1 use group 56
4.2.1.2. L1 use occasions in the control group 57
4.2.2. Results within Groups 59
4.2.2.1. 'Suggested L1 Use' group 59
4.2.2.2. 'English-Only' group 61
4.2.2.3. 'Control' group 63
4.2.3. Results between Groups 64
4.2.3.1. Grammar 64
4.2.3.2. Vocabulary 65
4.2.3.3. Vocabulary variety 65
4.2.3.4. Intelligibility 66
4.2.3.5. Fluency 66

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1. Summary of the Study 67
5.2. Discussion, Conclusion and Implications 69
5.3. Suggestions for Further Research 74

APPENDICES 76
Appendix A Observation Checklist 77
Appendix B Instructor Questionnaire 82
Appendix C Student Questionnaire 88
Appendix D Manual: How to Fill in the Observation Checklist 94
Appendix E Grading Scale 99
Appendix F Consent Form 100
Appendix G Interview Procedure 101
Appendix H Picture 103
Appendix I Assessment Checklist 104

REFERENCES 105

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	L1 Use Occasion Frequencies – Instructors' Replies	40
Table 2	Instructors' L1 Use Occasion Occurrences– Observation Findings	42
Table 3	L1 use Occasion Frequencies – Students' Replies	44
Table 4	Students' L1 Use Occurrences – Observation Findings	46
Table 5	Instructors' Reasons for L1 Use – Questionnaire Findings	48
Table 6	Instructors' Reasons for L1 Use – Semi-Structured Interview Findings	49
Table 7	Students' Reasons for L1 Use – Questionnaire Findings	50
Table 8	Students' Reasons for L1 Use – Semi-Structured Interview Finding	51
Table 9	When Turkish Should Be Used: Instructors' Suggestions	52
Table 10	When Turkish Should Be Used: Students' Suggestions	53
Table 11	Instructors' Suggestions for English-Only Speaking Classes	54
Table 12	Students' Suggestions for English-Only Speaking Classes	55
Table 13	L1 Use Occasions, Frequencies and Samples in the 'Suggested L1 Use' Classes	57
Table 14	L1 Use Occasions, Frequencies and Samples in the 'Control Group' Classes	58
Table 15	Pre-Test Results of Suggested L1 Use Group	59
Table 16	Post-Test Results of Suggested L1 Use Group	60
Table 17	Results of Paired T-Test Statistics for Suggested L1 Use Group	60
Table 18	Pre-Test Results of English-Only Group	61
Table 19	Post-Test Results of English-Only Group	61
Table 20	Results of Paired T-Test Statistics for English-Only Group	62
Table 21	Pre-Test Results of Control Group	63
Table 22	Post-Test Results of Control Group	63

Table 23	Results of Paired T-Test Statistics for Control Group	64
Table 24	Post-Test Results of Covariance Analysis of Groups for Grammar	65
Table 25	Post-Test Results of Covariance Analysis of Groups for Vocabulary	65
Table 26	Post-Test Results of Covariance Analysis of Groups for Vocabulary Variety	65
Table 27	Post-Test Results of Covariance Analysis of Groups for Intelligibility	66
Table 28	Post-Test Results of Covariance Analysis of Groups for Fluency	66

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Suggested Occasions for L1 use	11
Figure 2	The Evaluation Scale of the Placement Test	22
Figure 3	Suggested Occasions for L1 Use	24
Figure 4	Subject Students' Reasons for the Result	69

1. INTRODUCTION

The use of native language (L1) in English language teaching (ELT) methodology has been an on-going debate since the development of language teaching methods. L1 use in ELT has usually been regarded as a kind of sin, evil or skeleton in the cupboard. Although no concrete reasons as to why L1 use in both English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL) classes has been considered a taboo, some language instructors avoid using L1 in their classes. Yet, there are others who believe that there are advantages of using L1 in ELT classes (Prodromou, 2000). There are, however, no emprical evidence as to the advantages or disadvantages of L1 use in ESL/EFL classrooms.

Some studies have been focused on L1 use in monolingual EFL settings. In a monolingual EFL setting, all the learners and teacher share the same native language. English is taught as a foreign language and outside the classroom, learners have little or no opportunity to speak English. In relation to L1 use in monolingual EFL classrooms, there are different assumptions and suggestions. However, it is hardly possible to find empirical findings or bases behind these assumptions and suggestions (Piasecka, 1988). This lack of empirical evidence on L1 use in monolingual EFL classsrooms suggests that more studies on L1 use should be carried out so that classroom implementations can have empirical bases related to the issue. This current study, thus, aims to investigate the effect of L1 use on elementary level students' oral performances in a monolingual EFL setting.

1.1. Background to the Study

Recently, two different views have been discussed with regard to L1 use in EFL classrooms. On the one side, it is believed that L1 should be used especially in low-level adult EFL classes with the assumption that L1 use reduces anxiety which in turn helps students learn better (Auerbach, 1993; Reis, 1996; Cole, 2001; Buckmaster, 2000; Toyama, Viney, Helgesen, Barnard & Edge, 2000; and *Need help urgently, 2001*). On the other side, the benefits of teaching English through English are emphasised and L1 use is restricted (Ellis, 1984; Chaudron, 1988; and Takahashi, 1996). Within the latter view, it has been believed that the more students are exposed to the target language, the better their performance in the target language would be.

With regard to the relation between the input students receive in the target language and the outcome, Chaudron (1988) argues that:

> "... in the typical foreign language classroom, the common belief is that the fullest competence in the TL (target language) is achieved by means of the teacher providing a rich TL environment, in which not only instruction and drill are executed in the TL, but also disciplinary and management operations." (p. 1)

Ellis (1984) states, as Chaudron argued, that if language teachers use L1 for regular classroom management then foreign language learners would be deprived of valuable second language (L2) input.

Exposure to L2 and input in the L2 are claimed to be more important in EFL settings as EFL learners are generally not exposed to English outside the classroom in their daily lives unless they try to find opportunities for themselves (Ellis, 1994 and Murhey & Sasaki, 1998). Thus, EFL teachers are seen as a valuable L2 source for learners. Moskowitz (1970, cited in van Lier, 2000) argued that the more L2 was used in the classroom by both teachers and students, the better the foreign language teacher was. Martin (2000), on the other hand, declared that an effective EFL teacher should use L1 when necessary in monolingual classroom to loosen up the students.

Frequent L2 use and less or no L1 use is suggested in communication-based monolingual EFL classes. However, it is argued that it is impossible to avoid L1 use in monolingual EFL classes (Ho Fong Wan Kam 1985; Atkinson, 1993; Auerbach, 1993; and Zhang, 2000). Moreover, Atkinson (1993) points out that there is "no theoretical evidence to support any case for a methodology involving 100% TL" (p. 2). Thus, based on the argument of the impossibility of avoiding L1 use in monolingual EFL classes, it can be inferred that conducting English-only classes is hardly possible for monolingual EFL settings unless an English native speaker teacher who does not know the learners' native language is on the stage.

Recently there has been a growing interest in the use of native language in monolingual low-level adult EFL learner classrooms (Reis, 1996; Cole, 2001; Buckmaster, 2000; Hawks, 2001; and Toyama et al, 2000). This interest has been based on pedagogical reasons (Ho Fong Wan Kam, 1985; Jr. Schweers, 1999; Martin, 2000; and Prodromou, 2000). That is, it is believed that use of learners' native language in the classroom may be helpful in providing students with a more secure learning

environment. In relation to the pedagogical benefits of L1 use in language classes, Auerbach (1993) states:

> "its [L1] use reduces anxiety and enhances the affective environment for learning, takes into account sociocultural factors, facilitates incorporation of learners' life experiences, and allows for learner-centered curriculum development." (p. 20)

Although it is assumed that L1 use reduces anxiety in monolingual language classrooms (Allwright & Bailey, 1991), the situation could be different in advanced level monolingual EFL classes. For example, the findings of the study by Aydın (2001) revealed that some advanced level students showed annoyance about L1 use.

The potential advantages of L1 use are discussed in terms of grammar instruction, classroom management, explanations of vocabulary, cross-cultural differences and methodological issues in EFL classrooms. L1 use is not suggested for speaking activities (Cole, 2001). L1 use is not appreciated in EFL classes in which learners are expected to communicate in the target language by using appropriate structures and vocabulary in various activities. As Atkinson (1993) and Galloway (1993) argue, Communicative Language Teaching Approach seems to avoid addressing L1 use.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

L1 use in monolingual EFL classrooms has been the focus of recent studies. These studies usually focused on either the attitudes towards L1 use or the occasions and reasons for L1 use rather than the effect of L1 use on students' performances. Despite the imposing need, there have been very few empirical findings with regard to L1 use in communication-based EFL speaking classes, which primarily follow a combination of notional-functional and task-based syllabus.

At the School of Foreign Languages, English Department, Anadolu University, the program was designed considering the needs of the students from various departments (Departments of English Language Teaching, Faculty of Engineering, Faculty of Communication, Faculty of Management, Faculty of Science, School of Tourism and Hotel Management, Faculty of Fine Arts, School of Industrial Design and Department of Turkish Language and Literature). The curriculum of the Foreign Language School consisted of a combination of integrated and separated skills. That is, reading, writing, speaking, listening and grammar were taught as separate courses as well

as a core course which functioned as an integrated-skills course including grammar, reading, writing, speaking and listening activities and tasks. The reason for developing a language program including both separated and integrated courses is primarily based on the ongoing debate about whether an integrated-skill or separated-skill-based curriculum is more effective. In order to overcome potential drawbacks that might appear in the case of conducting either of the language curriculum, a mixture of both integrated and separated skill-based courses had been offered in the school.

To determine the concerns of the instructors and students related to the speaking course, the two speaking-course coordinators had been collecting informal evaluation of the course from the students for two years. The students were asked to write their thoughts and concerns about the course. The speaking course instructors were also asked to state their concerns related to the speaking course in the weekly skill meetings. In the student and instructor evaluations, the following issues were raised:

1. Students used their native language (Turkish) during pair-work and group work activities especially in the beginner, elementary and lower-intermediate levels; they mostly achieved the tasks in Turkish although they were supposed to use English. (speaking instructors' reports)
2. Students felt free to use Turkish whenever they liked in speaking classes because their instructor also used Turkish. Although some students prefered using Turkish in the speaking classes, others stated they did not like to use or hear Turkish. Interestingly, both groups believed that L1 use has an effect on their oral performance. (students' reports)
3. Speaking instructors often used Turkish particularly in beginner and elementary level classes. However they felt guilty every time they used Turkish in their classes because they believed that if they spoke only English in the speaking classes that would help students improve their oral expression skills. (speaking instructors' reports)

Based on the written and oral reports by the speaking instructors and the students, it appeared quite obvious that both instructors and students used the shared native language-Turkish in the beginner and elementary level speaking classes. However, both learners and instructors had concerns about using L1 in their speaking classes although

there was no empirical evidence as to the advantages or disadvantages of L1 use in lower level speaking classes.

Those informal reports showed the necessity of a systematic study investigating when and why instructors and students use Turkish and the effect of L1 use on students' oral performances in low level speaking classes.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

There were two purposes of the current study. First, this study aimed at determining when and why learners and their instructors use Turkish in speaking classes. The second purpose was to investigate whether use of L1 in speaking classes affects elementary level EFL learners' oral performances in terms of their grammar/structure, vocabulary, intelligibility and fluency. These two issues were investigated in two phases; descriptive phase and experimental phase.

In the descriptive phase, a questionnaire, an observation checklist and semi-structured interviews were used to collect data from the beginner level EFL learners and their speaking course instructors. The data of the experimental phase came from the elementary level EFL learners. Their oral performances in pre-test and post-test interviews were video-recorded. A grading checklist was used to assess these students' performances.

1.3.1. Research Questions

Phase 1:

1. When do beginner level speaking instructors use the native language, Turkish in speaking classes?
2. When do beginner level EFL learners use Turkish in speaking classes?
3. Why do beginner level speaking instructors use Turkish in speaking classes?
4. Why do beginner level EFL learners use Turkish in speaking classes?
5. When do instructors think that they should use Turkish in speaking classes?
6. When do beginner level EFL learners think that an instructor should use Turkish in speaking classes?
7. What are beginner level speaking course instructors' suggestions for reducing L1 use and maximizing L2 use in speaking classes?
8. What are beginner level EFL learners' suggestions for reducing L1 use and maximizing L2 use in speaking classes?

Phase 2:

1. Does L1 use on suggested occasions in speaking classes affect elementary level EFL learners' oral performances in terms of their grammar/structure, vocabulary, intelligibility and fluency?
2. Do English-only speaking classes affect elementary level EFL learners' oral performances in terms of their grammar/structure, vocabulary, intelligibility and fluency?

1.4. Operational Definitions

1.4.1. 'Suggested L1 use' speaking classes

Atkinson (1987), Piasecka (1988) and Collingham (1988) suggest several occasions in which L1 use is beneficial (see Figure 1 on page 11 in Chapter 2). However, these occasions are not limited to a specific language classroom such as grammar, speaking, listening, reading and writing. Rather, they refer to a general/ integrated language teaching/learning setting.

In this study, both students and instructors were asked to report the occasions in which L1 use could be beneficial and useful in speaking classes. Suggested L1 use occasions were determined based on the suggestions of the majority of the students. Thus, in the suggested L1 use speaking classes, Turkish was used only in the occasions students suggested.

1.4.2. 'English-Only' speaking classes

In the current study, the speaking instructor of the English-only class was not to use Turkish at all in the class. Moreover, the elementary level students of the English-only class were encouraged to use English and not to use Turkish in their speaking classes. In order to prevent the students' L1 use in the classroom, a way suggested in phase 1 was implemented. Accordingly, the speaking instructor in this English-only class never spoke Turkish; and the students who spoke Turkish paid a small amount of fine. At the end of the treatment, those students who spoke no or a very little Turkish were rewarded with gifts purchased with the money collected as fines.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The common focus of the studies on L1 use has been on occasions, reasons and attitudes toward using L1. Although it has been assumed that L1 use may be advantageous in monolingual EFL classes, there is no empirical base for the advantages of L1 use in communication-based language classrooms. For this reason, this study primarily aimed at investigating whether or not L1 use in speaking classes affects students' oral performance. The findings provide empirical evidence about advantages or disadvantages of L1 use in speaking classes. In addition, this evidence could be beneficial to the ongoing concern among the speaking instructors about L1 use.

The results of the current study also provide evidence about when and why elementary level EFL students and their instructors use L1 in speaking classes. Although Atkinson (1987) found that both students and instructors used L1 in monolingual EFL classes, there is no empirical evidence about when and why students with low proficiency level use L1 in speaking classes (Hawks, 2001; and Levine, 2003).

The findings of the current study also show whether L1 use occasions and reasons for L1 use in speaking classes match the occasions and reasons suggested in the literature (Atkinson, 1987; Murhey & Sasaki, 1998; and Jr. Schweers, 1999).

1.6 Organization of Chapters

The current research consists of five chapters. Chapter One is an introduction to the study which includes the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose, operational definitions, significance of the study and organization of chapters. Chapter Two reviews the related literature. The studies conducted abroad and in Turkey that are related to the problem under study are discussed, pointing out not only the limitations but also the strong points of these studies. Chapter Three is the methodology of the study. It gives information about the participants, procedures of data collection and analyses.

In Chapter Four, the results of the study are presented and the findings are discussed. In Chapter Five, the current study is summarized and conclusions drawn from the study and implications based on the findings are discussed. Limitations of the study and suggestions for further research are presented.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. L1 Use in English Language Teaching (ELT) History

When the literature on L1 use in language classrooms is explored, there seems to be political/ideological reasons rather than pedagogical reasons behind the challenging debate on L1 use (Auerbach, 1993; and Hawks, 2001). These ideological/political reasons date back to the Americanization movement in the 19th century. While this movement promoted the spread of ESL instruction, ELT methodology advocated the use of English-Only instruction, for example as in Direct Method, in contrast to the earlier ones in which the use of learners' native language had been allowed, as in Grammar-Translation (Celce-Murcia, 1991; Auerbach, 1993; and Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

With the World War I, the number of immigrants increased in America. This immigration movement made ESL instruction become more important than ever because those immigrants were working at different jobs and expected to speak 'good' English. In other words, the measure of being a 'good' American was to speak 'good' English. This Americanization movement consequently influenced ELT methodology. For example, Direct Method, which emphasizes using English only with no native language of learners became more favourable over other methods in which learners' native language was allowed (Auerbach, 1993).

L1 use in ELT methodology was not only affected by the Americanization movement but it was also affected by British neocolonial policies. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, English language was regarded as a means for spreading the British neocolonial control. Therefore, L1 use had no place in ELT. In a conference at Makere University, Uganda in 1961, ELT experts came up with the following five basic tenets:

1. English is best taught monolingually.
2. The ideal teacher of English is a native speaker.
3. The earlier English is taught, the better the results.
4. The more English is taught, the better the results.
5. If other languages are used too much, standards of English will drop (Phillipson, 1992, p. 185).

According to Phillipson (1992), the tenets above empowered the cornerstones of hegemony of English worldwide. These five principles suggest that there is no place for L1 in ELT.

The reason for regarding use of L1 in ELT as a taboo is based on the ideological and political reasons. Spreading English was such a strong purpose in America and Britain that using learners' native language was excluded in ESL instruction during Americanization movement.

2.2. L1 Use in Bilingual Education

Empirical research in ELT methodology showed that learners' native language can be a very important source. The belief that L1 use might play a facilitating role to improve the second language has received great attention in bilingual education (Collingham, 1988; and Piasecka, 1988). Collingham (1988) lists the advantages of using learners' L1 in ESL classrooms as follows:

1. Valuing and building on the knowledge that learners already have and bring to the classroom.
2. Raising the status of the languages used by ethnic minorities in Britain, which in turn raises the self-esteem of the speakers of those languages, making them more confident and effective learners.
3. Raising language awareness. Learners already have some linguistic skills and knowledge; by thinking about their own and other languages, a class will learn more about language and languages in general. This can speed up aspects of learning and increase learners' tolerance of one another's difficulties. In this way classroom cooperation is fostered and classroom dynamics are improved.
4. Using learners' first language improves the pace of learning.
5. There is less likelihood of the lesson content being trivial, patronizing or childish where the contributions students can make in their own languages are recognized as significant and valued.
6. Fostering cooperative and independent learning.
7. Reducing learner anxiety and therefore increasing confidence and motivation.
8. Enabling every learner, no matter how limited their knowledge of English, to contribute to the lesson in a variety of ways, depending on their previous experience (p.82).

With the list above, Collingham (1988) emphasizes the significance of L1 use in bilingual education. With respect to monolingual ESL classes, she points out:

> "Monolingual teachers will have to be prepared to allow the use of other languages in the ESL classroom, and not feel threatened by this as they often do at present." (p. 85)

Collingham's argument above counts for ESL settings, in which learners are exposed to English outside the classroom as well. However, in an EFL setting, learners have little or almost no opportunity to use English outside the classroom.

Atkinson (1987) classifies nine principal occasions and activities for which L1 use is useful with regard to teaching/learning process and environment. These nine occasions and activities are eliciting language (at all levels), checking comprehension (at all levels), giving complex instructions (at early levels), co-operation among learners (at early levels), discussions of classroom methodology (at early levels), presentation and reinforcement of language (at mainly early levels), checking for sense, testing, development of useful learning strategies (up to quite advanced levels). However, he argues that care should be taken not to overuse L1 in monolingual classes.

Piasecka (1988) also suggests possible occasions in which L1 should be used. These occasions are negotiation of the syllabus and lesson, setting the scene at the beginning of class, profiling and record-keeping, resolving individual areas of difficulty, classroom management, personal contact, language analysis, instructions or prompts, explanations of errors, assessment of comprehension, presentation of rules, governing grammar/phonology/morphology and spelling, discussion of cross-cultural issues, assessment and evaluation of lesson. In relation to these occasions suggested, she argues that not only learners' proficiency level in English but also the format and content of the lesson would determine the use of L1 and its frequency.

Piasecka (1988) discusses the value of L1 use in ESL classrooms. She points out that learners' levels of proficiency in English should be based on deciding on the amount of L1 use. At the initial stages, learners' knowledge in English is limited. Therefore, their L1 knowledge could be used to help them improve their English. As learners' proficiency level increases, the amount of L1 use should decrease.

Based on her observations and experience, Collingham (1988) also suggests nine occasions in which L1 use might be helpful in ESL classrooms; to discuss/negotiate of the syllabus, to develop ideas as a precursor to expressing them in the L2, to reduce inhibitions or affective blocks to L2 production, to elicit language and discourse strategies, to teach vocabulary, to teach phonology, to provide explanations of grammar and language functions, to facilitate comprehension through comprehension questions, to provide essential information to minimize the chance of misinterpretation.

The occasions for which L1 use is suggested by the three researchers are summarized in Figure 1.

ATKINSON (1987)	PIASECKA (1988)	COLLINGHAM (1988)
1. eliciting language 2. checking comprehension 3. giving complex instructions 4. co-operation among learners 5. discussion of classroom methodology 6. presentation and reinforcement of language 7. checking for sense 8. testing 9. development of useful learning strategies	1. negotiation of the syllabus and the lesson 2. setting the scene at the beginning of class 3. profiling and record-keeping 4. resolving individual areas of difficulty 5. classroom management 6. personal contact 7. language analysis 8. instructions or prompts 9. explanations of errors 10. assessment of comprehension 11. presentation of rules governing grammar, phonology, morphology and spelling 12. discussion of cross-cultural issues 13. assessment and evaluation of lesson	1. to discuss/negotiate of the syllabus 2. to develop ideas as a precursor to expressing them in the L2 3. to reduce inhibitions or affective blocks to L2 production 4. to elicit language and discourse strategies 5. to teach vocabulary 6. to teach phonology 7. to provide explanations of grammar and language functions 8. to facilitate comprehension through comprehension questions 9. to provide essential information to minimize the chance of misinterpretation

Figure 1. Suggested Occasions for L1 Use (Atkinson, 1987, Collingham, 1988 and Piasecka, 1988)

As seen in Figure 1, although the number of occasions in which L1 could be used is different across the three lists, the occasions in which L1 could be used are similar. However, these suggested L1 occasions are context- specific. In addition, there is no empirical support for the validity of these occasions. These occasions could vary in different EFL classroom contexts. The source of the suggestions on L1 use occasions in Figure 1 come from the observations and experience of those researchers rather than the findings of any systematic investigation.

2.3. Advantages of L2-Only Classes

In ELT, teacher talk has been considered to be a valuable source of input for learners because teacher talk plays a vital role in second language acquisition (Cullen, 1998). It has been believed that learners' fullest competence of the target language might only be achieved by providing the learners with a rich target language environment (Chaudron, 1988; and Ellis, 1994). Turnbull (2001), for example, states that the learners whose teachers spoke the target language most frequently did better in general proficiency and achievement tests when compared to the learners in the other classes in which the native language was used more than the target language. However,

as Turnbull (2001) also points out, this positive relation between teacher's language use and students' test scores has no statistical support.

One of the findings in a survey conducted with ESL educators in USA also revealed that educators strongly believed that

> "The more students are exposed to English, the more quickly they will learn; as they hear and use English, they will internalize it and begin to think in English." (Auerbach, 1993, p.14)

Although educators' belief above reflects the opinions of many other language teachers, Ellis (1994) and Gass (1988) point out that there is little research, which consistently supports this view (Ellis 1994; and Gass, 1988).

In relation to L1 use in monolingual EFL settings, various discussions have been introduced. One of these discussions has focused on the relation between L1 use and input/intake issue. Some researchers argue that EFL teachers should use L1 at a minimum level because learners have little or almost no L2 exposure outside the classroom. Consequently, EFL classrooms and teachers are the only sources of input for EFL learners (Polio & Duff, 1994; and Turnbull, 2001). Others, however, argue that exposure to L2 does not guarantee that L2 input would result in intake (Chaudron, 1985; Ellis 1994; and Gass, 1988).

2.4. Advantages of L1 Use

With regard to advantages and/or disadvantages of L1 use, it has been suggested that the use of L1 might help reduce learners' anxiety, which facilitates the learning process (Krashen, 1982; Reis, 1996; Cole, 2001; and Auerbach, 1993).

The advantage of L1 use with respect to reducing anxiety reminds us of Krashen's affective filter hypothesis. In his affective filter hypothesis, Krashen (1982) states that allowing students to use L1 helps them lower their affective filter. In the study by Levine (2003), one of the instructors believes the hypothesis. She offers that not to frustrate beginning level students and to make them feel comfortable in learning a foreign language, instructors should allow students to use L1. She adds that it is certain that there may be students who would feel comfortable when they use L1.

Reis (1996) reports that when teaching English through English to teenage beginning level Portuguese students, he observed that his students were not content with his teaching English through English. He tried to convince them about the advantages of maximum use of English in the classroom, but he was not successful. As a result, he

negotiated with the students and together they decided to allow five minutes of Portuguese in each class session. This five minutes of Portuguese was called "The Portuguese Break" (PB). As Reis (1996) puts it, the PB appeared to have impressive effect both on him and his students in terms of lowering students' affective filter, establishing a very friendly class atmosphere, stimulating a self-evaluation of teacher and students and students' improvement in their social skills and performance evaluation.

Cole (2001) also supports the belief that L1 is most useful at beginning and low levels because it can provide students with a more secure and easy-to-learn atmosphere in class. However, the situation would be different in advanced level monolingual EFL classes. Aydın (2001) investigated the sources of EFL classroom anxiety in advanced level speaking and writing classes at the Faculty of ELT Department. The results showed that L1 use was one of the anxiety sources. Some students reported annoyance about L1 use whereas others found L1 use helpful.

On the other hand, it has been believed that frequent L2 use would make students feel anxious. Levine (2003) conducted an investigation to test this belief. In her study, she investigated the hypothesis that L2 use by instructors and students correlated positively with students' sense of anxiety about L2 use. The results of the Correlational Analysis, however, revealed a negative relationship between reported amounts of L2 use and reported L2-use anxiety. This result suggests that

> "... greater L2 use may not translate into greater anxiety for many learners and that many students feel comfortable with more L2 use when that is what they are used to." (Levine, 2003, 355)

In summary, it is not possible to conclude that L1 reduces anxiety and, thus helps better learning. Similarly, it cannot be suggested that L2 use is more beneficial in term of lowering anxiety. As Levine (2003) pointed out, more studies are needed to provide empirical evidence about the issue.

2.5. L1 Use in Communicative Language Teaching

Despite the assumption that the use of L1 might reduce learners' anxiety and consequently facilitate their learning process, L1 use has not been advocated in communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based learning methods (Duff & Polio, 1990; Polio & Duff, 1994; Cook, 2001; and Rolin-Ianziti, 2002). Although

scholars argue that CLT has referred to neither the advantages nor disadvantages of L1 use, it has been believed that L1 use should not have a place in communicative classes (Piasecka, 1988 and Cook, 2001). Cook (2001), for example, pointed out:

> "Communicative language teaching and task-based learning methods have no necessary relationship with the L1, yet, as we shall see, the only times that the L1 is mentioned is when advice is given on how to minimize its use" (p. 2).

Although the discussion about the L1 use in EFL classes is as old as the history of foreign language methodology, as Piasecka (1988) points out, there are no empirical bases showing the disadvantages of L1 use or supporting the use of L1. Related studies focus on the occasions in which L1 is used or the reasons for using L1 rather than investigating the effect of L1 use on learners' performances, which could in fact provide a pragmatic solution to the problem.

2.6. Occasions of, Reasons for and Attitudes towards L1 Use

The debate on whether or not to use L1 in EFL classes has led researchers to investigate issues related to L1 use in the classroom. The studies related to L1 use have focused mainly on teachers' - rather than learners' use of L1 and their reasons for L1 use and attitudes towards L1 use. From the learners' point of view, only learners' attitudes towards L1 use have been investigated.

Duff and Polio (1990) conducted a study addressing L1 use frequency, reasons for using L1, perception of L1 use and attitudes towards L1 use in foreign language (FL) setting at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). They investigated three issues related to L1 use in a FL classroom. First, the ratio of English use (L1) by teachers in EFL classroom was examined. Second issue was the factors related to the use of L1 and L2. The third focus of the study was on teachers' and students' perceptions and attitudes towards the use of L1 in the FL classrooms. 13 different foreign language classes and their teachers were the participants of the study. The data were collected through audio-recordings, classroom observations, student questionnaires and teacher interviews. The results showed that teachers' L1 use range from 10% to 100% in 26 hours of sampled classroom discourse. This wide range in the percentages was explained in terms of the factors related to the use of L1 and L2. The analysis of the audio-recordings, classroom observations and teacher interviews suggested that teachers' English proficiency, language type taught, departmental

policy/guide-lines, lesson content, materials used and teachers' formal teacher training might have had an effect on the amount of L1 and L2 use in classes. On the other hand, the findings suggested that there were no relation between teaching experience and L1/L2 usage. With respect to the perceptions and attitudes towards L1 use, it was reported that several teachers in the study believed that trying to explain a point in L2 was a waste of time. Instead, L1 would be more functional and save time. Some teacher participants stated that using L2 most of the time put a kind of pressure on students although frequent use of L2 could facilitate their learning process. Other teacher participants, on the other hand, reported that they used L1 rather than L2 because students knowledge of L2 was limited.

In a different study, Polio and Duff (1994) examined when or for what function FL teachers used L1. The thirteen teachers in the study were teaching all four skills in monolingual classes in which the students' native language was English. The native language of the teachers, on the other hand, was the target language (TL). As in the previous study, the researchers made use of audio-recordings, observations and teacher interviews to collect the data. In the interviews, the teachers were asked to state how, when and the extent to which they would usually use English, L1 in their classrooms. Later, the classes were observed and at the same time recorded. When the teachers were asked their reasons for L1 use in their FL classrooms, they stated that they used L1 to get the students' attention about important issues such as exams and quizzes, to save time and to create solidarity or empathy. Teachers used L1 to give grammar instruction, for classroom management, to build empathy/solidarity, to practise English, to explain unknown vocabulary/translation, and when there was lack of comprehension. However, in the interviews, some teachers reported different occasions than those observed in their classes. The inconsistency between observed and reported occasions for L1 use suggest that teachers were not aware of the extend of their L1 use. Referred to this finding, Polio and Duff (1994) state "speakers in social settings are often simply unaware of their language use in a given situation" (p. 323). For further research, they suggest that the effects of L1 use on language acquisition should be investigated in an experimental setting.

Murhey and Sasaki (1998) investigated Japanese English teachers' use of English in the classroom in three phases. The participants were junior high school and

senior high school teachers attending in-service training camps organised by the Ministry of Education in Japan. First, teacher participants were asked to estimate their use of English in the classroom. Secondly, the teachers provided reasons for not speaking more English. Finally, teachers' facilitative beliefs and strategies they used to increase the amount of English use in the classroom were determined. The findings revealed that these teachers' use of more English in their classes depended on their experience in their careers. In the informal talks, the teachers declared seven reasons for speaking Japanese rather than English in their classrooms. The seven reasons teachers stated were as follows: 1. Using Japanese is more comfortable, 2. To get through the information faster, 3. Using Japanese feels more natural (as they were all Japanese), 4. Principals, parents, and students want the teachers to teach for the entrance exams which is in Japanese, 5. Getting through the book is possible when Japanese is also used, 6. The entrance exams does not test English listening and speaking, therefore there is no need to study them, 7. The textbook is difficult therefore needed to be translated into Japanese so the students could understand it.

Murhey and Sasaki (1998) question their study in terms of the reliability of the interview data. They suggest that valid estimates of the English/L2 use in the classroom should be determined by means of various methods or by recording (video or audio) of the classes, and by increasing the number of teacher and student interviews.

Jr. Schweers (1999) conducted a study on the use of native language in English classes at the University of Puerto Rico. The aim of the study was to determine the frequency and the reasons of L1 (Spanish) use and attitudes of teachers and students towards L1 use in the English classroom. Four teachers participated in this study. The data of this study came from two sources: Audio-recordings of 35-minute samples from three classes at the beginning, middle and end of the semester and a short questionnaire about the attitudes towards the use of L1. The attitude questionnaire was given not only to the four teacher participants but also to 19 other professors in the department. In addition, a similar questionnaire about the attitudes towards L1 use in the English classes was given to the students of all the professors who filled out the questionnaire. The students' answers to the attitude questionnaire suggested that Spanish should be used to some extent in English classes because a majority of the students believed that the use of Spanish helps them learn English better. The teachers' responses to the

question 'If you use Spanish in your classroom, why do you think this may be more effective than using English exclusively?' entailed the reasons of L1 use in the classroom. The reasons reported by the four teachers were as follows:

> Teacher 1: "Sometimes it is more important for students to understand a concept than it is for that concept to be explained exclusively in English."
>
> Teacher 2:: "In my writing courses, I use some Spanish because it helps students write better reports. It also serves as an additional input to ensure that they achieve the main objective of the course, which is the production of higher quality written work in English."
>
> Teacher 3: " First of all, I use Spanish to establish rapport with my students, and secondly, to serve as a model person who speaks both languages and uses each one whenever necessary or convenient."
>
> Teacher 4: " I think students can identify better with a teacher who speaks to them in their own language, thereby letting them know that you respect and value their native language." (Jr Schweers, 1999, p. 6).

Although the analysis of the recordings indicated the occasions where the four professors used Spanish, a statistical and descriptive report was not provided in the article.

Turnbull (2000) also carried out an investigation to determine the reasons of four teachers' use of French (L2) and English (L1) or a mixture of both languages in their core French classes in Canada. All the teacher participants were native speakers of English and experienced in the profession. The data were based on the observations which took place approximately 8 weeks---an average of 10 class hours for each teacher, or an average of 400 minutes per class. In the classes, the same multidimensional project-based teaching unit was taught. Although the data analysis was mainly based on the teacher talk analysis method used by Polio and Duff (1994), many of the classifications came out from the data. The transcripts were divided into functional units and each functional unit was assigned to one of the three macro categories: social, academic or management. Each functional unit was coded as L1 (English), L2 (French) or mix (both languages). The findings revealed that the majority of the reasons for L1 and L2 use was academic-based rather than social or management.

Like Murhey and Sasaki (1998), Turnbull also discusses the limitations of his study. He points out that semi-structured interviews with the teachers about their uses of French and English would have enhanced the reliability of the data analysis. It is

suggested that video-recordings followed by semi-structured interviews should be used to determine EFL teachers' use of L1 and L2 in the classroom.

In relation to attitudes towards L1 use, Al-Busaidi (1998) investigated teachers' and students' attitudes towards the use of L1 in EFL classrooms in Oman. The results revealed that students' level is the most influential factors that affected a teacher's decision to use L1 in the classroom. Moreover, these teachers preferred L1 when explaining the similarities or differences between L1 and L2 in terms of grammar and vocabulary. The students' use of L1, on the other hand, was most frequent in 'group work' activities in which students were to use the target language to communicate and practice. The findings also showed that the teachers' attitude towards L1 use in the classroom was negative whereas the students exhibited positive attitudes. Students in lower level classes were more positive about L1 use compared to higher level students. This finding supports the assumption that there is a correlation between EFL learners' proficiency level and L1 use in the classroom (Reis, 1996; Cole, 2001; and Hawks, 2001).

Takahashi (1996) also conducted a study on Japanese teachers' L1 use in the classroom and its influence on the students. This study aimed at investigating a) the percentage of English and L1 used in the classrooms, b) whether or not the teachers and students are satisfied with the percentage of English and L1 use, c) when both the students and teachers think the teacher should use L1 in class, and d) how much the amount of the teacher's English influences the students. A questionnaire that investigated the four issues reported above was developed for students and teachers. The students of freshman English classes and their teachers at the English department of Nagoya College completed this questionnaire. In addition to the questionnaires, eight Japanese teachers' 'reading comprehension' and 'dialogue' classes of freshman English were tape recorded and semi-structured interviews with both the teachers and students were conducted. The results revealed that English was used from 10% and 100% range. Most of the teachers stated that they were satisfied with the amount of English they used in the classroom whereas they were not satisfied with the amount of L1 use. All the teachers believed that L1 should be used when explaining grammar. The students in the study reported that English rather than Japanese should be used in many occasions.

As a very recent study, Rolin-Ianziti (2002) conducted a study to determine when French teachers used English, L1 in the FL context at the University of Queensland. Four teachers teaching French at beginner level participated in the study. These teachers' classes were audio-recorded for about six hours within a week. During the recordings, all the teachers used the same materials and did the same activities in their classes. The teachers were informed that their classes were being recorded for the use of L1 in their speech. The analyses of transcriptions showed that the four teachers used L1 for the following purposes: a) translation, b) metalinguistic uses, and c) communicative uses. Based on the findings, it was pointed out that there was a need to conduct experimental studies investigating whether translation has an effect on learning L2 vocabulary and grammar.

2.7. Conclusion

As the literature suggests, there are factors influencing L1 use in a language classroom. Some of these factors are, learners' level of TL, teaching/learning context, materials, content and type of the lesson. The same conclusion can be drawn for the reasons for L1 use and attitudes towards L1 use. The literature also suggests that the findings of one study investigating occasions of, reasons for and attitudes towards L1 use in an EFL setting might be different from those of other studies because these issues are context-specific. Consequently, the findings of one study cannot be generalized. Thus, when occasions of and reasons for L1 use are of interest in a specific teaching/learning context, a new investigation should be carried out. The data of such an investigation should be collected through various methods or ways so that reliability of the data should not be questioned as Murhey and Sasaki (1998) and Turnbull (2000) point out. In this study, therefore, the data related to occasions of and reasons for were collected through triangulation method. Observations, questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were used to increase the reliability of the data.

It is also quite clear that more research is needed to fill in the gap about the effect of L1 use in EFL setting because the literature provides no empirical bases about the effect of L1 use. Thus, the current study primarily aimed at finding out the effect of L1 use in EFL speaking classes on students' oral performances. Moreover, it investigated the occasions of and reasons for L1 use in this specific EFL context in a

systematic way. The shortcomings and suggestions in the previous related studies were regarded as a guide to design the research.

3. METHODOLOGY

The present study aimed at investigating basically two issues on L1 use in lower level speaking classes. The investigation consists of two phases. In Phase 1, the occasions of and reasons for L1 use in EFL beginner level speaking classes were investigated. In this phase, both beginner level students and their speaking course instructors were also asked to state their suggestions about when Turkish should be used in the speaking classes and their suggestions for English-only speaking classes. In Phase 2, it was examined whether L1 use in speaking classes had an effect on the students' oral performances. Each phase is described separately.

3.1. PHASE 1

The purpose of Phase 1 was to determine when and why L1 is used in beginner level speaking classes. Moreover, it aimed at finding out when L1 should be used and what should be done to have English-only speaking classes. Thus, the following questions were investigated in this phase:

1. When do beginner level speaking instructors use the native language, Turkish in speaking classes?
2. When do beginner level EFL learners use Turkish in speaking classes?
3. Why do beginner level speaking instructors use Turkish in speaking classes?
4. Why do beginner level EFL learners use Turkish in speaking classes?
5. When do instructors think that they should use Turkish in speaking classes?
6. When do beginner level EFL learners think that an instructor should use Turkish in speaking classes?
7. What are beginner level speaking course instructors' suggestions for reducing L1 use and maximizing L2 use in speaking classes?
8. What are beginner level EFL learners' suggestions for reducing L1 use and maximizing L2 use in speaking classes?

3.1.1. Participants

There were three groups of participants in Phase 1: Beginner level EFL learners, speaking instructors of those beginner level EFL students, and observers.

3.1.1.1. Students

At the School of Foreign Languages, English preparatory classes were formed based on the scores of a standard placement test in the Academic Year of 2002-2003. The scores and their corresponding levels are shown in Figure 2.

SCORES	LEVEL
0-15	Beginner
16-30	Elementary
31-45	Lower-Intermediate
46-60	Intermediate
61-75	Upper-Intermediate
76-100	Advanced

Figure 2. The Evaluation Scale of the Placement Test

In the 2002-2003 Academic Year, 14 beginner level classes were formed based on the placement test scores. There were, on the average, 31 students in each class, totalling 434 students. 13 of the beginner level classes with a total of 266 students participated in Phase 1. The reason for not including one of the beginner level classes was that the instructor of that class was a native speaker of English. Thus, the use of L1 would be minimized.

In this study, beginner level students rather than higher level students were chosen, because it is reported that in lower level monolingual classes, L1 is used more frequently as students with low-proficiency level have limited vocabulary and grammatical knowledge and have difficulties communicating in the target language (Ho Fong Wan Kam, 1985; and Reis, 1996). As stated in Chapter 1, the informal evaluation reports of the speaking course also support the argument that both students and instructors used Turkish to some extent in beginner and elementary level classes rather than in intermediate or upper-intermediate level classes.

3.1.1.2. Instructors

In this study, 7 instructors taught 13 beginner level speaking course. All the instructors were observed. Of the 7 instructors, two were male and five were female.

Two of the instructors had no previous teaching experience, two had one year, two had three years and the other had 7 years of teaching experience.

3.1.1.3. Observers

There were 15 observers including the researcher. Fourteen instructors were asked to observe the occasions in which L1 was used. The criteria in choosing the observers were as follows. All the observers had experience in classroom observation and all had completed MA classes in TEFL. The observers were asked not to talk about the purpose of the study to avoid the possibility of the observees being affected thus avoiding or overusing L1 in their speaking classes.

The observers were paired according to their teaching timetable. The researcher was paired with two different observers due to scheduling problems.

3.1.2. Instruments

In Phase 1, four instruments were used to collect the data: an observation checklist, a student questionnaire, an instructor questionnaire and semi-structured interviews.

3.1.2.1. Observation checklist

To determine when instructors and students use L1 in beginner level speaking classes, an observation checklist was developed. Literature on L1 use suggests possible situations in which L1 could be used. The situations shown in Figure 3 helped develop the observation checklist in this study.

ATKINSON (1987)	*PIASECKA* (1988)	COLLINGHAM (1988)
1. eliciting language 2. checking comprehension 3. giving complex instructions 4. co-operation among learners 5. discussion of classroom methodology 6. presentation and reinforcement of language 7. checking for sense 8. testing 9. development of useful learning strategies	1. negotiation of the syllabus and the lesson 2. setting the scene at the beginning of class 3. profiling and record-keeping 4. resolving individual areas of difficulty 5. classroom management 6. personal contact 7. language analysis 8. instructions or prompts 9. explanations of errors 10. assessment of comprehension 11. presentation of rules governing grammar, phonology, morphology and spelling 12. discussion of cross-cultural issues 13. assessment and evaluation of lesson	1. to discuss/negotiate of the syllabus 2. to develop ideas as a precursor to expressing them in the L2 3. to reduce inhibitions or affective blocks to L2 production 4. to elicit language and discourse strategies 5. to teach vocabulary 6. to teach phonology 7. to provide explanations of grammar and language functions 8. to facilitate comprehension through comprehension questions 9. to provide essential information to minimize the chance of misinterpretation

Figure 3. Suggested Occasions for L1 Use (Atkinson, 1987, Collingham, 1988 and Piasecka, 1988)

The literature on L1 use almost always discusses when teachers use or should use L1. There is little empirical evidence as to when students use L1 or when they need to use L1. The occasions in which L1 could be used are basically teacher-induced (Atkinson, 1993). Therefore, before constructing the observation checklist, a pilot study investigating when instructors and students used L1 was conducted. In this study, 2 beginner and 3 elementary level speaking classes were observed and the occasions in which L1 was used by instructors and students were recorded. For example, instructors asked questions in Turkish as in 'çocuk niye koşuyor?' (Why is the boy running?); or students used Turkish as in 'ben burayı anlamadım' (I didn't understand this part). The researcher first categorized each occasion, then a colleague was asked to categorize to assure the reliability of the categorization. A draft of the observation checklist which included the occasions instructors and students used L1 was constructed. Three faculty members who were experienced in classroom observations were asked to comment on the content validity of the checklist. The checklist was revised based on the feedback received with respect to both the content and wording. The checklist was then piloted in one of the beginner level speaking classes, which was not included in the study (see Appendix A).

3.1.2.2. Questionnaires

In Phase 1, two questionnaires were used. One was given to beginner level speaking instructors while the other one was given to beginner level students. Both instructor and student questionnaires aimed at investigating the following issues:

1. When and why instructors and students in beginner level speaking classes use L1.
2. The occasions in which L1 should be used in beginner level speaking classes according to the instructors and students.
3. Instructors' and students' suggestions about the ways that would enforce students to speak only English throughout their speaking classes.

The following steps were taken to produce the final versions of both the instructor and student questionnaires:

1. The L1 use occasions section in the questionnaires is based on the observation checklist in this study. While developing the section on the reasons for L1 use, the Belinda Ho Fong Wan Kam's (1998) questionnaire was consulted. In addition, Atkinson's (1987), Piasecka's (1988) and Collingam's (1988) suggestions on L1 use (see Figure 3 on page 24) helped in developing the items in the questionnaires. After constructing the sections and writing up the items in the questionnaires, six experts were asked to give feedback in relation to content validity. All the experts had experience in designing and analyzing questionnaires. Based on the feedback received from these experts, both questionnaires were revised.
2. In order to verify the translation validity and reliability of the student questionnaire, 3 beginner level and 7 elementary level students were first asked to complete the student questionnaire. Later, these students were asked to paraphrase the items based on their interpretation. Based on their feedback, items 5 and 7 in Part 1 and the wording of Part 3 were revised. It was realized that while completing the questionnaire, students thought of all the classes they were taking rather than just speaking classes. Thus, the wording of the items was revised either by adding reminder to the respondents to think about only their speaking classes or by introducing the items with 'in your beginner level speaking classes.'
3. Before the questionnaires were administered, both questionnaires were piloted. 7 elementary level students completed the revised questionnaire and commented on each item. Moreover, 5 instructors, who would not participate in the study, were

asked to complete the instructor questionnaire and to comment on each item. All relevant comments were taken into consideration and the questionnaires were revised accordingly.

Both the instructor and student questionnaires were in Turkish. The student questionnaire was prepared in Turkish as beginner level students have limited vocabulary and grammatical knowledge in English with the assumption that they would have had difficulties in understanding the items clearly. Consequently, their replies to the questionnaire would have distorted the data. Instructor questionnaires were also prepared in Turkish so that a parallelism would be achieved between the student and instructor questionnaires.

Both the instructor and student questionnaires consist of 3 parts (see Appendix B for the instructor questionnaire and Appendix C for the student questionnaire). Part 1 is divided into two sections. First, respondents are asked to check how frequently they used L1 in each occasion in their speaking classes. Second, respondents are asked to indicate their reasons for using L1. In Part 2, occasions when L1 should be used are listed and respondents are asked to check their opinions about whether L1 should be used or not. The last part asks respondents to write down applicable way(s) to encourage students to use English all the time in speaking classes.

3.1.2.3. Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews aimed at verifying the data about reasons for L1 use in speaking classes. Therefore, in those interviews, participant instructors and volunteer students were asked their reasons for using Turkish in speaking classes. As soon as interviewees' report became unclear or shifted the topic towards irrelevant issues, they were asked to clarify what they meant with respect to their reasons for L1 use. Finally, they were asked to summarize or generalize their reasons.

3.1.3. Data Collection Procedure

The data in Phase 1 of the current study came from three sources: observations, questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. Each is explained in detail below.

3.1.3.1. Observations

During the Fall Term of the 2002-2003 Academic Year, 2 observers observed each beginner level class every two weeks. Observations were done in pairs to verify the reliability of data. The first three weeks of the observations was considered as the adaptation period for both students and instructors. As Allright and Bailey (1991) state, participants may behave differently when there is an outsider in the classroom and this could affect the reliability of the data. It was assumed that the adaptation period would help students and the course instructor get accustomed to having observers in their speaking classes.

A workshop with the observers was conducted to introduce the observation checklist. In this workshop, first the timetable of the observations was delivered and then the following issues were explained:

a) A very brief explanation of the thesis topic,
b) How the observation checklist was developed,
c) Why they were selected as observers,
d) Why the observations needed to be done in pairs,
e) The observees' possible concerns and attitudes towards the observation,
f) How important it was to disguise the purpose of the observations to ensure that the observees teach their classes as always,
g) How to introduce themselves when they first go into the classroom as an observer,
h) How important it was for observers to be familiar with the categories in the observation checklist,
i) How to use the observation checklist (a manual explaining what to write in each category was given)

The observers were then asked to listen to a sample portion of a beginner level speaking lesson (only a 5-minute part), which was audio-recorded earlier, and to use the observation checklist. All the observers were asked to sign the consent form.

The observation checklist was 4 pages. One of the observers suggested that all the categories be on a single page. Therefore, instead of having 4 pages, all the categories were photocopied on A3 paper. This one-page observation checklist was delivered to each observer. However, the observers were told that they could use either of the observation checklists. The first workshop lasted two and a half hours.

After the first adaptation week of the observation, a second workshop was held with the observers. In this meeting, the following issues were discussed and/or decided:

a) How to fill in the group work and pair work parts,
b) To add a category about correcting mistakes,
c) Categorization of several L1 use occasions.

The observers asked whether they could consult the researcher when they were not sure about the category of an L1 use occasion. They were told that the researcher would hold a post observation meeting with them at the end of each observation. Based on the issues raised in the meetings, filling in the observation checklist was clarified and all the observers were informed about these issues with a written document (see Appendix D).

After the three adaptation weeks, a post observation meeting with each observer pair was held. In these meetings, the observer pairs reported L1 use occasions and the flow of the observed class and the researcher kept an original observation data record. The observers' concerns about L1 use categories were also solved through negotiations.

A meeting with the observees was also conducted. The observees were not told that the observers would be observing L1 use because this could result in the instructors' being self-conscious about L1 use and therefore distort the findings. In this meeting, the observation timetable was delivered and then the observees were informed about the following issues:

a) The current investigation aimed at examining ways to improve beginner level students' speaking performance,
b) The observations would be done in pairs to verify reliability,
c) Who the observers were,
d) How important it was to ignore the presence of the observers,
e) How to introduce the observers when they first went into the classroom with an observer,

f) When they had any reservations and/or concerns about the observation procedure, they could ask the researcher for clarification or explanation.

3.1.3.2. Administration of questionnaires

After observations were completed, the instructor and student questionnaires were administered. First, each participant speaking instructor was asked for an individual appointment before the semester ended. In these meetings with the instructors, first, they completed the instructor questionnaire, then they were interviewed about their reasons for using L1 in beginner level speaking classes. These semi-structured interviews with the instructors were audio-recorded. After all seven participant instructors filled in the questionnaire and were interviewed about their reasons for using L1, they were asked to arrange a speaking class hour for the administration of the student questionnaire.

In the last week of the first term, student questionnaire was administered in 13 beginner level classes to 266 students.

3.1.3.3. Semi-structured interviews with volunteer students

While administering student questionnaires, the students who agreed to reply to the questionnaire were asked for an interview about L1 use. The participation in the interviews was voluntary. One week after the administration of the student questionnaire, during the semester break, individual interviews with volunteer students were conducted. 21 students were interviewed and the interviews were audio-recorded.

During the semi-structured interviews, students were asked to talk about their reasons for using Turkish in their speaking classes. Students were free to look at their completed questionnaires if they wanted to be reminded of their responses.

3.1.4. Data Analysis

3.1.4.1. Analysis of observations

As mentioned in 3.1.3.1. Post observation meetings with each pair of observers were held. In these meetings, each L1 use occasion stated by each of the observer pair was recorded. This original checklist recorded by the researcher was used to determine when the speaking course instructors and the students in the beginner level speaking classes used L1.

In the observation checklist, there were two parts; instructor part and student(s) part. Instructor part consisted of 25 categories while student part included 21. The occurrences of L1 use occasions were counted for each category separately. Later, the frequencies of L1 use for each category for each speaking instructor were calculated separately.

3.1.4.2. Analysis of the questionnaires

There were three main parts in both instructor and student questionnaires. In Part 1, both the instructors and students were asked about the frequency of their L1 use occasions. This part also included a sub-section, which had items on the reasons for L1 use. The respondents were asked to indicate their reasons for using L1 in their speaking classes. In Part 2, the respondents were asked to state their opinions about whether L1 should be used in the given occasions. Part 3 asked for suggestions which would encourage students to use English only in speaking classes.

Each part of the instructor and student questionnaires was analyzed separately. The first section of Part 1 consisted of Likert-Scale type questions, in which a value was assigned to each choice as follows; 5: Always, 4: Usually, 3: Sometimes, 2: Rarely, 1: Never. In case of blank choices the choice was assumed to be "3" for statistical purposes. The frequency of each L1 use occasion was calculated.

In the sub-section of Part 1 which included the reasons for L1 use there were 'Yes' or 'No' choices for each reason. In this section, only the 'yes' responses were counted because this study aimed at investigating the reasons for L1 use. Then the frequency of each 'yes' answer for each reason was calculated.

Part 2, in which the respondents were asked when Turkish should be used in speaking classes, also included statements with 'Yes' or 'No' choices. In the analysis of this part, only the 'yes' responses were calculated as the focus of this study is on the suggested L1 use in EFL classes.

Part 3 consists of one 'open-ended' question. The number of students who answered this part was very low; of the 266 respondents, only 56 answered. In the analysis of Part 3, suggestions for using only English in speaking classes were categorized. There were also suggestions which were irrelevant or were not feasible (ie. course book should be changed, the activities and their aims should be explained, there should be instructor-student discussions, in-class participation should be graded,

students should read aloud 50-word paragraphs; the one who laughs at the pronunciation of a student should pay a fine, only native-speaker instructors should teach speaking course, debates between/among groups should be held, every student should be forced to speak English for a while). Such irrelevant and unfeasible suggestions were not taken into consideration in the analysis of Part 3.

3.1.4.3. Analysis of the semi-structured interviews

The reasons given by the instructors for using L1 were first categorized, then were compared with the categories in the instructor questionnaire, the sub-section of Part 1. All the reported reasons were related to the categories in the questionnaire.

The volunteer students' replies with respect to reasons for L1 use in the semi-structured interviews were also analyzed and categorized.

3.2. PHASE 2

The primary purpose of Phase 2 was to investigate the effect of L1 use on students' oral performances. The following questions were investigated in this phase:

1. Does use of L1 in suggested occasions in speaking classes affect elementary level EFL learners' oral performances in terms of grammar/structure, vocabulary, intelligibility and fluency?
2. Do English-only speaking classes affect elementary level EFL learners' oral performances in terms of their use of grammar/structure, vocabulary, intelligibility and fluency?

3.2.1. Participants

There were three groups of participants in Phase 2: elementary level students, their speaking course instructors and moderators.

3.2.1.1. Students

Students whose classes were observed and who completed the student questionnaire in Phase 1 served as the subjects of this phase.180 beginner level students whose end-of-term (mid-term) speaking exam grades were between 60-80 were randomly assigned to 6 elementary level classes in the second term. In each experimental section, there were 30 students.

At the School of Foreign Languages, English Language Department, students are given speaking exams 3 times in one academic year: one mid-term exam each term

and a final interview exam at the end of the year. There are two graders for all the exams and the students are interviewed either in pairs or in groups of three. Student and grader pairs are arranged and announced by the speaking course coordinators one week before the exam date. During the exams, students are given different tasks or topics based on the topics done in speaking classes. The mid-term speaking exams are, thus, achievement exams while the function of final speaking exam is to determine the proficiency level of students. A grading scale whose grader reliability was statistically investigated in an MA thesis (Karslı, 2002) was used to assess the students' performances (see Appendix E).

3.2.1.2. Instructors

Three instructors taught the treatment and control groups. The researcher herself taught 'suggested L1 use' group while the other speaking coordinator taught 'English-Only' group. The third instructor taught the control group. She was not informed about the details of the research. All three instructors were female, Ph.D. students in the same teaching EFL graduate program and have 12-14 years of experience in the profession.

3.2.1.3. Moderators

There were six female moderators in the pre-test interviews, 4 of who participated in the post-test interviews. All had been previously involved in speaking exams as graders and moderators many times. As a moderator, they were expected to follow the interview procedure: they gave the instructions and the tasks. They were not responsible for giving grades as a grader also does.

3.2.2. Treatments

In the current study, there were 3 treatment groups: In suggested L1 use group, L1 was used only on the suggested occasions. In English-only group, L1 was never used. The third group was the control group where the instructor was free to use Turkish whenever s/he thought necessary. Each treatment group consisted of two sections with each section having 30 students. Thus, there were 60 students in each treatment group. Treatments for all 3 groups lasted 9 weeks, 30 hours. All the class hours for all the groups were audio-recorded to ensure that the treatments were followed as planned.

3.2.2.1. Suggested L1 use classes

Based on the replies in the student questionnaires, the occasions when Turkish should be used were determined. It was important that the majority of students agreed on the occasions in which Turkish should be used because one of the aims of this study was to investigate whether students' oral performances were effected when Turkish was used. Majority was considered to be 70% of the total. Thus, L1 use occasions suggested by over 70% of the total number of students were taken into consideration. Therefore, in the 'suggested L1 use' classes, the occasions in which L1 was used was based on students' suggestions.

The analysis of the student questionnaires showed when a speaking instructor should use Turkish while the analysis of audio-recordings in Phase 2 showed when the instructor of the suggested L1 use group used Turkish. The results of student questionnaire and the L1 use occasions in suggested L1 use classes are discussed in Chapter 4.

3.2.2.2. English-only classes

In the English-only speaking classes, neither students nor the speaking instructor was allowed to use Turkish. As suggested in the literature it is difficult to have English-only classes in low-level EFL classes. To be able to have English-only speaking classes, students were asked to suggest methods, which would encourage them to use English and no Turkish. The analysis of the students' replies offered several alternative implementations for English-only speaking classes. These suggestions are discussed in Chapter 4.

3.2.2.3. Control Group Classes

The instructor of the control group was not informed about the purpose of the study. She only knew that two of her speaking classes were included in this study. She was asked to audio-record the classes every time the class met.

In the 'control group' as in the 'suggested L1 use classes', students were not forced in any specific way to use English all the time. Nevertheless, instructors of both 'control group' and 'suggested L1 use classes' often warned students to speak English. However, the audio-recordings revealed that students in the 'suggested L1 use' and 'control group' used Turkish whenever they wanted.

Students in control group asked instructor to force them to speak English all the time. They suggested that they could fine or punish those who spoke Turkish in some way. However, students could not agree on a specific suggestion; therefore, they kept on using Turkish in their speaking classes.

The analysis of audio-recordings showed when the instructor of control group used Turkish. These occasions are presented in Chapter 4.

3.2.3. Data Collection Procedure

3.2.3.1. Pre-test and post-test interviews

The pre-test interviews were conducted one week before the nine-week treatments. Two weeks before the interviews, the researcher told students about the procedure of the pre- and post-test interviews. Those who agreed to participate in the interviews signed a consent form (see Appendix F). Although 108 students signed the consent form, only 83 students participated in the pre-test interview. 25 students reported that they did not come to the interview either because they forgot about it or they shied away from video recording. Of the 83 students who participated in the pre-test interview, only 65 participated in the post-test interviews. The 18 students either left school due to their exceeded attendance or changed their minds about participating in the study.

One week before the pre-test interview, students were informed about their interview slots. A 'ten-minute slot' was allocated for each student. On the interview day, a classroom was arranged as a kind of waiting room for the students coming and going. The researcher asked and persuaded students not to talk about the interview with classmates.

Before the pre-test interviews, a 30-minute workshop was held with the moderators to explain and practice the procedure. The moderators were also given written instructions (see Appendix G). They were told that the researcher would be around to take the students in and out and that whenever they had questions or concerns, they could ask.

Six moderators in six different instructors' offices conducted the pre-test interviews on a Sunday afternoon. After the nine-week treatments, four moderators in four different instructors' offices did the post-test interviews on a Saturday afternoon. In

both pre- and post-test interviews, each student was interviewed by a single moderator. All interviews were video-recorded.

3.2.3.2. Tasks

In the interviews, students were asked to do two tasks. Students were first asked to describe a picture (see Appendix H). This picture was taken in a fast food restaurant on the campus, with which all students were familiar. The picture included all the issues students were taught in the first term (i.e. paintings on the wall, objects on the tables, people engaging in various activities).

In the second task, students were asked to talk about their last summer. Each student was then asked at least three questions about the details they had not mentioned. Upon the completion of this task, moderators also talked about their last summer. The purpose of this task was for the students to listen carefully and ask questions. Each student was expected to ask at least three questions about the details of the holiday. Each moderator told the same last summer, which was as follows:

> Last summer I went on holiday. Although my holiday wasn't long enough, I enjoyed it a lot. I visited different places and met a lot of interesting people. When the weather was hot, I swam because I like swimming in hot weather. I wrote to my friends about my holiday. After I came back, I finished my incomplete projects. Unfortunately, it was difficult for me to start working again at the end of such a beautiful summer.

Both tasks used in the interviews were chosen considering what students had been instructed up to the pre-interview time. Thus, at the time of the pre-test, the tasks would be familiar. The tasks and their contents were about something students had been instructed many times throughout their EFL education. If the students had been asked something they had not learned yet but would be instructed after the pre-test interview, the reliability of the findings would have been questionable.

3.2.4. Assessment Procedure

3.2.4.1. Assessment checklist

A data-driven checklist scale was used to assess students' speaking performances. To develop this checklist scale, two instructors who had been teaching speaking courses and doing speaking interviews for 9 years watched 20 students' pre-test interview video-recordings which were not included in the study. Later, five experts who had been teaching speaking skill and were knowledgeable about assessing speaking

skills were asked to check the content validity of this scale. The scale was revised based on the feedback received from those experts. This scale was developed to measure the oral performances of the students who participated in the current study in terms of grammar, use of accurate and appropriate vocabulary, vocabulary variety, intelligibility related to sound articulation and fluency (see Appendix I).

Considering the fact that the participants in the interviews were elementary level students, the descriptors in the grammar category were developed to measure only the use of basic structures taught in the classes. Similarly, in developing the descriptors for vocabulary and vocabulary variety categories, vocabulary taught in the classes was considered. In the video-recordings, it was often difficult to understand the students' speech due to sound deviations. Intelligibility category consisted of descriptors related to sound deviations only. In the fluency category, hesitation was a criterion to determine whether any of the treatments helped students speak without stopping too often and too long in search for words/phrases.

In the assessment scale, grammar, vocabulary, intelligibility and fluency categories have six (6) descriptors while vocabulary variety category has only three (3). Each descriptor was assigned a point/score. The highest score a student would receive was six (6) for grammar, vocabulary, intelligibility and fluency while the highest score for vocabulary variety was three (3).

3.2.4.2. Assessment

The researcher and a colleague who was experienced in teaching speaking courses and in doing speaking interviews at the School of Foreign Languages, English Language Department, did the assessments. There was also a mediating assessor, who had the same qualifications, as do the main two assessors. Before the assessment procedure, a norming session was held together. In the norming session, the assessment checklist was introduced in detail. The descriptors were defined clearly. For example, in the checklist, there are quantifiers such as few and occasional. It was decided that when the number of deviations was between 1-3, it would be regarded as 'few', when between 4-6, it would be regarded as 'occasional'. The researcher and the other grader watched the performances of 10 students who did not participate in the post-test interviews and assessed the students' performances based on the checklist.

After the norming session, the main assessors watched and assessed the student' performances in the pre- and post-test interviews separately. A record was made of the students whose scores showed discrepancy between the two assessors. Later, the mediating assessor was asked to watch and assess those students' performances. The three assessors then came together to decide and negotiate about the final assessment of those students. Of 65 students, there were discrepancies for 11 students in the pre-test interview and for 9 students in the post-test interview.

3.2.5. Data Analysis

To analyze the students' oral performances in terms of their use of grammar, use of appropriate and accurate vocabulary, vocabulary variety, intelligibility and fluency, paired t-test and covariance analysis were conducted. Within the statistical analyses, mean, standard deviation and standard error were calculated. Standard error was regarded as 0.05. The results are presented and discussed in the following chapter.

4. RESULTS

In this study, L1 (Turkish) use in beginner and elementary level speaking classes was examined in two phases. In Phase 1, when and why beginner level EFL (English as a foreign language) learners and their speaking course instructors used Turkish in the speaking classes were investigated. The same students and instructors were then asked to suggest when L1 should be used in speaking classes. Both the students and instructors also suggested alternatives to have English-only speaking classes. Their suggestions and offers were taken as basis for designing Phase 2. Phase 2 was designed to examine the effect of L1 use in the speaking classes on the elementary level learners' oral performances. There were three treatment groups. Of the three treatment groups, one was the 'suggested L1 use' group, one was the 'English-only' group and the other was the control group.

In Phase 1, the subject sample consisted of two groups: 266 students in 13 different beginner level sections and 7 speaking course instructors of those sections. To collect the data, a student questionnaire, an instructor questionnaire, observations and semi-structured interviews were used.

In Phase 2, the subject sample consisted of three groups. There were 65 elementary level students who took both the pre-test and post-test interviews. Three instructors taught the treatment groups. A grading checklist was used to assess those students' oral performances.

4.1. PHASE 1

The analysis procedure of Phase 1 was conducted to answer the following research questions:

1. When do beginner level speaking instructors use the native language, Turkish in speaking classes?
2. When do beginner level EFL learners use Turkish in speaking classes?
3. Why do beginner level speaking instructors use Turkish in speaking classes?
4. Why do beginner level EFL learners use Turkish in speaking classes?
5. When do instructors think that they should use Turkish in speaking classes?

6. When do beginner level EFL learners think that an instructor should use Turkish in speaking classes?
7. What are beginner level speaking course instructors' suggestions for reducing L1 use and maximizing L2 use in speaking classes?
8. What are beginner level EFL learners' suggestions for reducing L1 use and maximizing L2 use in speaking classes?

4.1.1. L1 Use Occasions: Instructors

To determine when beginner level speaking course instructors use L1 in speaking classes (research question 1), instructors were asked to indicate the frequency of L1 use for various occasions in speaking classes in Part 1 of the questionnaire. There were 5 choices: never= 1, rarely= 2, sometimes=3, usually=4, always=5. The questionnaire was in Turkish, they were translated into English to present the results.

Table 1 shows the frequencies of the 7 speaking course instructors' L1 use occasions obtained through instructor questionnaire.

Table 1

L1 Use Occasion Frequencies – Instructors' Replies

CATEGORIES	**f %**				
I USE TURKISH	1 never	2 rarely	3 sometimes	4 usually	5 always
1. to greet the students	4 (57.1%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	--	--
2. to warn the student who is late	2 (28.6 %)	2 (28.6%)	3 (42.9%)	--	--
3. to explain today's lesson/topic/activities -directly in Turkish	1 (14.3%)	5 (71.4%)	1 (14.3%)	--	--
4. to repeat today's lesson/topic/activities - given in English earlier	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	--
5. to explain the aim of today's lesson/topic/activities – directly in Turkish	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	4 (57.1%)	--	--
6. to repeat the aim of today's lesson/topic/activities – given in English earlier	--	2 (28.6%)	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	--
7. to explain new/unknown vocabulary items – directly in Turkish	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)
8. to repeat the explanation of a vocabulary item – given in English earlier	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	--	2 (28.6%)
9. to explain a new structure/grammar point (ie. would you like, etc) - directly in Turkish	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)
10. to repeat the instruction of a structure/grammar point – given in English earlier	1 (14.3%)	--	4 (57.1%)	--	2 (28.6%)
11. to correct students' mistakes (vocabulary, structure, grammar, etc)	--	4 (57.1%)	3 (42.9%)	--	--
12. to explain the cultural aspects in English (family names; vending machine, etc)	--	--	5 (71.4%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)
13. to explain how an activity will be done – directly in Turkish	--	2 (28.6%)	2 (8.6%)	3 (42.9%)	--
14. to repeat the instruction of an activity – given in English earlier	--	--	5 (71.4%)	2 (28.6%)	--
15. to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course	4 (57.1%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	--	--
16. to ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)	--
17. to answer a question relevant to the lesson/course	--	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	--
18. to answer a question irrelevant to the lesson/course	--	--	5 (71.4%)	2 (28.6%)	--
19. to praise (ie. aferin, güzel) or to make a compliment	3 (42.9%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)	--	--
20. to tell a joke/for humour	--	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	3 (42.9%)	--
21. to chat	--	3 (42.9%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)	--
22. to warn a student about his/her disturbing behaviour	--	2 (28.6%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	--
23. to draw the student(s)' attention to a certain point/issue	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)	--
24. to assign homework	--	2 (28.6%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	--
25. to end the lesson	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)	--	--	--
26. to say goodbye	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)	--	--	--
27. OTHERS	--	--	--	--	--

As shown in Table 1, the speaking instructors stated that they usually used Turkish to explain how an activity will be done (42.9%) and to tell a joke/for humour (42.9%). The reason for preferring Turkish to explain the instructions of an activity-without trying to explain them in English may be because the instructions for the activities in the speaking course book are believed to be too difficult for low-level EFL students to understand.

Five of the speaking course instructors (71.4%) stated that they sometimes used Turkish to explain cultural aspects in English, to repeat the instruction of an activity which was given in English earlier, and to answer a question irrelevant to the lesson/course. Four of the respondents (57.1%) stated that they sometimes used Turkish directly to explain the aim of today's lesson/topic/activities, to repeat the instruction of a structure/grammar point which was given in English earlier, to warn a student about his/her disturbing behaviour, and to assign homework. The findings revealed that Turkish was never used to greet students (57.1%), to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course (57.1%) and to praise (42.9%) by those 4 instructors.

The L1 use occasions in the observation checklist were the same as the items in the questionnaires. Only the item 3 'to explain today's lesson/topic/activities or the aim of one of these' in the observation checklist/instructor section was asked in two separate questions in the instructor questionnaire (item 3 and item 5). The order of the items is in the same order as in the original observation checklist (see Appendix A).

The L1 use occasion occurrences obtained through observation checklist can be seen in Table 2. The percentage of L1 use for each item was calculated based on the total number of L1 use in all the observation sessions.

Table 2
Instructors' L1 Use Occasion Occurrences – Observation Findings

CATEGORIES	**I(s)**
TURKISH WAS USED	n %
1. to greet the students	4 (0.4%)
2. to warn the student who is late	1 (0.1%)
3. to explain today's lesson/topic/activities or the aim of one of these – directly in Turkish	7 (0.8%)
4. to repeat today's lesson/topic/activities or the aim of one of these–given in English earlier	1 (0.1%)
5. to explain a new structure/grammar point (ie. would you like, etc) – directly in Turkish	25 (2.8%)
6. to repeat the instruction of a structure/grammar point – given in English earlier	1 (0.1%)
7. to explain new/unknown vocabulary items – directly in Turkish	97 (11.2%)
8. to repeat the explanation of a vocabulary item – given in English earlier	17 (1.9%)
9. to correct mistakes (vocabulary, structure, grammar, etc)	12 (1.3%)
10. to explain the cultural aspects in English (family names; vending machine, etc)	7 (0.8%)
11. to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course	208 (24.0%)
12. to ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course	13 (1.5%)
13. to answer a question relevant to the lesson/course	36 (4.1%)
14. to answer a question irrelevant to the lesson/course	4 (0.4%)
15. to explain how an activity will be done – directly in Turkish	23 (2.6%)
16. to repeat the instruction of an activity – given in English earlier	52 (6.0%)
17. to praise (ie. welldone-aferin, good-güzel) or to make a compliment	31 (3.5%)
18. to draw the student(s)' attention to a certain point/issue	123 (14.2%)
19. to warn a student about his/her disturbing behaviour	55 (6.3%)
20. to tell a joke/for humour	39 (4.5%)
21. to chat	16 (1.8%)
22. to assign homework	1 (0.1%)
23. to end the lesson	8 (0.9%)
24. to say goodbye	4 (0.4%)
25. **Others**	
a) Translation	26 (3.0%)
b) To talk to herself/himself	14 (1.6%)
c) To say 'come on'	25 (2.8%)
d) To ask a student to do something	1 (0.1%)
e) To say 'OK'	6 (0.6%)
f) To say 'let's look'	4 (0.4%)
g) To explain the reason for his/her behaviour	1 (0.1%)
h) To comment about herself/himself	1 (0.1%)
i) To thank	1 (0.1%)
TOTAL	864

As Table 2 shows, the instructors used Turkish in their speaking classes a total of 864 times for various purposes. They used Turkish 208 times (24.0%) to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course. They also used Turkish 123 times (14.2%) to draw the student(s) attention to a certain point/issue and 97 (11.2%) times to explain new/unknown vocabulary items – directly in Turkish.

The observation findings showed that the instructors hardly preferred Turkish for several purposes such as to warn a student who is late, to repeat today's lesson/topic/activities or the aim of one of these–given in English earlier, to repeat the

instruction of a structure/grammar point – given in English earlier, to assign homework, to ask a student to do something, to explain the reason for his/her behaviour, to comment about herself/himself, to thank (0.1%). These findings implied that the instructors did not tend to repeat the aim of the lesson and the instruction of a structure/grammar point, which was done in English earlier. On the other hand, they repeated the instruction of an activity – given in English earlier (6.0%).

4.1.2. L1 Use Occasions: Students

To determine when beginner level EFL learners use L1 in speaking classes (research question 2), students were asked to indicate the frequency of L1 use in the speaking classes. As in the instructor questionnaire, 1 referred to never, 2 rarely, 3 sometimes, 4 usually and 5 always. The results of the student questionnaire about L1 use occasion frequencies are shown in Table3.

Table 3

L1 Use Occasion Frequencies – Students' Replies

CATEGORIES	f %				
I USE TURKISH	1 never	2 rarely	3 sometimes	4 usually	5 always
1. to greet the speaking instructor	93 (35.0%)	74 (27.8%)	35 (13.2%)	40 (15.0%)	24 (9.0%)
2. to apologize for being late	63 (23.7%)	51 (19.2%)	67 (25.2%)	57 (21.4%)	28 (10.5%)
3. to ask the meaning of a vocabulary item to a classmate	23 (8.6%)	20 (7.5%)	24 (9.0%)	101 (38.0%)	98 (36.8%)
4. to ask the meaning of a vocabulary item to the speaking course instructor	18 (6.8%)	36 (13.5%)	60 (22.6%)	96 (36.1%)	56 (21.1%)
5. to check if I understood the meaning of a particular vocabulary item	25 (9.4%)	39 (14.7%)	62 (23.3%)	83 (31.2%)	57 (21.4%)
6. to ask a question on a structure/grammar point to a classmate	21 (7.9%)	17 (6.4%)	19 (7.1%)	89 (33.5%)	120 (45.1%)
7. to ask a question on a structure/grammar point to the speaking course instructor	19 (7.1%)	22 (8.3%)	33 (12.4%)	102 (38.3%)	90 (33.8%)
8. to check if I understood the meaning of a particular structure/grammar point	12 (4.5%)	26 (9.8%)	62 (23.3%)	102 (38.3%)	64 (24.1%)
9. to correct the mistakes (vocabulary, structure/grammar, etc)	15 (5.6%)	34 (12.8%)	72 (27.1%)	92 (34.6%)	53 (19.9%)
10. when I didn't understand the instruction(s) of an activity	12 (4.5%)	32 (12.0%)	56 (21.1%)	91 (34.2%)	75 (28.2%)
11. to check if I understood the instruction(s) of an activity (are we doing it in pairs?, etc)	16 (6.0%)	34 (12.8%)	66 (24.8%)	86 (32.3%)	64 (24.1%)
12. during pair works	45 (16.9%)	95 (35.7%)	72 (27.1%)	35 (13.2%)	19 (7.1%)
13. during group works	24 (9.0%)	73 (27.4%)	94 (35.3%)	60 (22.6%)	15 (5.6%)
14. to draw attention to a certain point/issue (somebody forgot to sign the sheet!, etc)	24 (9.0%)	20 (7.5%)	37 (13.9%)	92 (34.6%)	93 (35.0%)
15. to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course (except for vocabulary & structure/grammar- where are we now?, etc) to a classmate	21 (7.9%)	30 (11.3%)	43 (16.2%)	83 (31.2%)	89 (33.5%)
16. to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course (except for vocabulary & structure/grammar) to the speaking course instructor	15 (5.6%)	32 (12.0%)	71 (26.7%)	100 (37.6%)	48 (18.0%)
17. to answer a classmate's question relevant to the lesson/course (except for vocabulary & structure/grammar)	15 (5.6%)	33 (12.4%)	60 (22.6%)	93 (35.0%)	65 (24.4%)
18. to answer the speaking course instructor's question relevant to the lesson/course (except for vocabulary & structure/grammar)	22 (8.3%)	80 (30.1%)	100 (37.6%)	50 (18.8%)	14 (5.3%)
19. to ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course (what are you doing after class?, is your flu over?, etc) to a classmate	18 (6.8%)	17 (6.4%)	12 (4.5%)	64 (24.1%)	155 (58.3%)
20. to ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course (is this your pen?, etc) to the speaking course instructor	21 (7.9%)	13 (4.9%)	35 (13.2%)	84 (31.6%)	113 (42.5%)
21. to answer a classmate's question irrelevant to the lesson/course (except for vocabulary & structure/grammar)	13 (4.9%)	21 (7.9%)	20 (7.5%)	80 (30.1%)	132 (49.6%)
22. to answer the speaking course instructor's question irrelevant to the lesson/course (except for vocabulary & structure/grammar)	13 (4.9%)	27 (10.2%)	58 (21.8%)	94 (35.3%)	74 (27.8%)
23. to explain the reason(s) of my disturbing behaviour or to apologize for it	28 (10.5%)	28 (10.5%)	55 (20.7%)	85 (32.0%)	70 (26.3%)
24. to compliment a classmate/classmates	21 (7.9%)	24 (9.0%)	71 (26.7%)	79 (29.7%)	71 (26.7%)
25. to compliment the speaking course instructor	23 (8.6%)	41 (15.4%)	72 (27.1%)	72 (27.1%)	58 (21.8%)
26. to tell a joke/for humour	21 (7.9%)	10 (3.8%)	22 (8.3%)	66 (24.8%)	147 (55.3%)
27. to chat with a classmate/classmates	19 (7.1%)	17 (6.4%)	30 (11.3%)	71 (26.7%)	129 (48.5%)
28. to chat with the speaking course instructor	15 (5.6%)	29 (10.9%)	76 (28.6%)	86 (32.3%)	60 (22.6%)
29. to ask/talk about a homework	18 (6.8%)	29 (10.9%)	67 (25.2%)	98 (36.8%)	54 (20.3%)
30. to say goodbye at the end of the lesson	79 (29.7%)	74 (27.8%)	46 (17.3%)	42 (15.8%)	25 (9.4%)
31. OTHERS	--	--	--	--	--

As seen in Table 3, the results showed that the students indicated that they frequently used Turkish in their speaking classes. The occasions in which Turkish was always used by most of the students were: to ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course to a classmate -except for vocabulary & structure/grammar- (58.3%), to tell a joke/for humour (55.3%), to answer a classmate's question irrelevant to the lesson/course - except for vocabulary & structure/grammar- (49.6%), to chat with a classmate/classmates (48.5%), to ask a question on a structure/grammar point to a classmate (45.1%), and to ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course to the speaking course instructor (42.5%).

There were few occasions on which Turkish was not preferred. The results, for example, showed that 35.0% of the students never used Turkish to greet the speaking instructor and 29.7% of the total never said goodbye in Turkish at the end of the lesson.

The observations also provided data about when the students used Turkish in their speaking classes. The observation findings for the students are shown in Table 4. The items in the observation checklist were parallel to the items in the student's questionnaire. Considering that the students can communicate with both their speaking instructor and their classmates in their classrooms, most of the items in the observation checklist had both interlocutors (ie. to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course to the speaking course instructor, to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course to a classmate). Therefore, in Table 4, each item is shown separately.

Table 4
Students' L1 Use Occasion Occurrences – Observation Findings

CATEGORIES	**S(s)**
TURKISH WAS USED	n %
1. to greet the speaking instructor	4 (0.3%)
2. to apologize for being late	1 (0.08%)
3. to ask a question on a structure/grammar point to the speaking course instructor	26 (2.1%)
4. to ask a question on a structure/grammar point to a classmate	--
5. to check if s/he understood the meaning of a particular structure/grammar point	10 ((0.8%)
6. to ask the meaning of a vocabulary item to the speaking course instructor	75 (6.1%)
7. to ask the meaning of a vocabulary item to a classmate	11 (0.9%)
8. to check if s/he understood the meaning of a particular vocabulary item	208 (17.1%)
9. to correct the mistakes (vocabulary, structure/grammar, etc)	2 (0.1%)
10. to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course to the speaking course instructor	133 (10.9%)
11. to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course to a classmate	21 (1.7%)
12. to ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course to the speaking course instructor	12 (0.9%)
13. to ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course to a classmate	24 (1.9%)
14. to answer the speaking course instructor's question relevant to the lesson/course	155 (12.7%)
15. to answer a classmate's question relevant to the lesson/course	27 (2.2%)
16. to answer the speaking course instructor's question irrelevant to the lesson/course	3 (0.2%)
17. to answer a classmate's question irrelevant to the lesson/course	10 (0.8%)
18. to check if s/he understood the instruction(s) of an activity	97 (7.9%)
19. when s/he didn't understand the instruction(s) of an activity	25 (2.0%)
20. to compliment the speaking course instructor	--
21. to compliment a classmate/classmates	4 (0.3%)
22. to draw the instructor's attention to a certain point/issue	74 (6.1%)
23. to draw a classmate's attention to a certain point/issue	36 (2.9%)
24. to explain the reason(s) of a disturbing behaviour or to apologize for it from the instructor	22 (1.8%)
25. to explain the reason(s) of a disturbing behaviour or to apologize for it from a classmate	2 (0.1%)
26. to tell a joke/for humour- to the instructor	76 (6.2%)
27. to tell a joke/for humour – to a classmate/classmates	64 (5.2%)
28. to chat with the instructor	26 (2.1%)
29. to chat with a classmate/classmates	33 (2.7%)
30. to ask/talk about a homework – with the instructor	2 (0.1%)
31. to ask/talk about a homework – with a classmate/classmates	--
32. to say goodbye	1 (0.08%)
33. **Others**	
a) Translation	21 (1.7%)
b) To express confusion about an issue/point	6 (0.4%)
c) To thank	1 (0.08%)
d) To express dissatisfaction	1 (0.08%)
TOTAL	1213

As shown in Table 4, based on the analysis of the observations, the students used Turkish a total of 1213 times during the 9 weeks. Students used Turkish 208 times (17.1%) to check if they understood the meaning of a vocabulary item, 155 times (12.7%) to answers the speaking course instructor's question relevant to the lesson/course, and 133 times (10.9%) to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course to the course instructor. The findings revealed that the students used Turkish more

frequently when they communicated with the instructor. When they communicated with their classmates about the topics irrelevant to the lesson/course such as to chat with classmates, to ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course, they preferred to use Turkish in their speaking classes.

The findings showed that the students never used Turkish to ask a question on a structure/grammar point to a classmate, to compliment the speaking course instructor and to ask/talk about homework with a classmate/classmates. However, the findings of student questionnaire revealed that 45.1% of the students always asked a question on a structure/grammar point to a classmate and 36.8% of the students usually asked/talked about homework in L1. Besides, only 8.6% of the students stated that they never complimented the speaking course instructor in Turkish.

4.1.3. Reasons for L1 Use: Instructors

To determine beginner level speaking course instructors' reason(s) for L1 use (research question 3), instructors were given a questionnaire and taken to a semi-structured interview.

In the subsection of Part 1 of the questionnaires, the instructors were asked to choose whether each given statement reflected their reason for using Turkish in their speaking classes or not.

To verify the findings of the questionnaires, semi-structured interviews were held with all the 7 instructors. After reminding them of their replies about how often they used Turkish, they were asked to state their reason(s) for using Turkish.

The findings related to the instructors' reasons for L1 use are presented in Table 5 and Table 6.

The subsection of Part 1 in the instructor questionnaire was about the reasons for L1 use and the respondents were asked to reply as 'yes' or 'no'. Because this research investigated the reasons, only the 'yes' answers were counted. Table 5 shows the 7 instructors' reasons for their use of Turkish in their speaking classes. As seen in Table 5, the instructors did not state other reasons not included in the list.

Table 5

Instructors' Reasons for L1 Use – Questionnaire Findings

REASONS	f %
1. In beginner level speaking classes, students' proficiency level is not high enough to understand every issue in English.	7 (100%)
2. In beginner level speaking classes, I don't want to waste time trying to explain an issue in English that can easily be done in Turkish.	4 (57.1%)
3. In beginner level speaking classes, to make sure that students do not misunderstand what I say, I repeat it in Turkish.	6 (85.7%)
4. In beginner level speaking classes, students are more ready to respond and participate in class activities when I use Turkish.	6 (85.7%)
5. In beginner level speaking classes, students ask me to use Turkish for some reason.	6 (85.7%)
6. In beginner level speaking classes, I can establish a good rapport with my students when I use (speak with them) in Turkish.	6 (85.7%)
7. In beginner level speaking classes, I can explain the new/unknown vocabulary item(s) in Turkish better than in English.	5 (71.4%)
8. In beginner level speaking classes, I can explain the new/unknown structures in Turkish better than in English.	6 (85.7%)
9. In beginner level speaking classes, I am supposed to catch up with the syllabus schedule.	4 (57.1%)
10. In beginner level speaking classes, I feel more comfortable using Turkish.	1 (14.2%)
11. Other (please specify)	0 (0%)

As Table 5 shows, all the instructors agreed that they used Turkish because beginner level students' proficiency level was not high enough to understand every issue in English (100%). 6 out of 7 instructors stated that they used Turkish because they did not want to be misunderstood, students responded and participated in class activities more, to achieve a good rapport with the students, and students asked for the use of Turkish. Only one of the instructors indicated that s/he felt more comfortable using Turkish.

Immediately after completing the questionnaire, the 7 instructors were taken into semi-structured interviews. In the interviews, they were asked to state their reasons for using Turkish in their beginner level speaking classes. Their answers were categorized based on the reasons in the questionnaire. The findings related to the use of Turkish are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Instructors' Reasons for L1 Use – Semi-Structured Interview Findings

REASONS	f %
1. In beginner level speaking classes, students' proficiency level is not high enough to understand every issue in English.	7 (100%)
2. In beginner level speaking classes, I don't want to waste time trying to explain an issue in English that can easily be done in Turkish.	6 (85.7%)
3. In beginner level speaking classes, to make sure that students do not misunderstand what I say, I repeat the same in Turkish.	6 (85.7%)
4. In beginner level speaking classes, students are more ready to respond and participate in class activities when I use Turkish.	1 (14.2%)
5. In beginner level speaking classes, students ask me to use Turkish for some reason.	0 (0%)
6. In beginner level speaking classes, I can establish a good rapport with my students when I use in Turkish.	5 (71.4%)
7. In beginner level speaking classes, I can explain the new/unknown vocabulary item(s) in Turkish better than I can in English.	4 (57.1%)
8. In beginner level speaking classes, I can explain the new/unknown structures in Turkish better than I can in English.	2 (28.5%)
9. In beginner level speaking classes, I am supposed to catch up with the syllabus schedule.	0 (0%)
10. In beginner level speaking classes, I feel more comfortable using Turkish.	0 (0%)
11. Other (please specify)	0 (0%)

As seen in Table 6, all the instructors (100%) pointed out that they used Turkish because of the students' proficiency level. 6 of the instructors (85.7%) reported that they used Turkish because they did not want to waste time trying to explain an issue in English that could easily be done in Turkish, and to make sure that the students did not misunderstand what they said. Only one of the instructors (14.2%) stated that the students were more ready to respond and participate in class activities when s/he used Turkish.

When compared to the questionnaire findings, the findings show similarities and differences. Both in the questionnaire and in the semi-structured interviews, 6 of the instructors (85.7%) stated that they used Turkish to make sure that students did not misunderstand what they said, they repeated the same in Turkish. Similarly, both in the questionnaire and in the semi-structured interviews, all the 7 instructors (100%) stated that they use Turkish because of students' low proficiency level. As a contradictory finding, it is interesting that in the questionnaire, 4 instructors (57.1%) stated that one of their reasons for using Turkish was to catch up with the syllabus. However, in the interviews, none of the instructors reported this as their reason for using L1.

4.1.4. Reasons for L1 Use: Students

To determine beginner level EFL learners' reason(s) for L1 use (research question 4), students were given a questionnaire and taken to a semi-structured interview.

The student questionnaire used in this study also included a part about reasons for students' use of Turkish. In the subsection of Part 1, the students were asked to reply as 'yes' or 'no' to the reasons for using Turkish in their speaking classes. Only 'yes' answers were counted. The frequencies of the students' replies related to L1 use reasons are shown in Table 7. Some of the students added reasons other than in the list. These reasons were also included in the analysis.

Table 7

Students' Reasons for L1 Use – Questionnaire Findings

REASONS	f %
1. In speaking classes, my proficiency level is not high enough to express every issue in English.	253 (95.1)
2. In speaking classes, I don't want to waste time trying to express something in English that I can easily do in Turkish.	81 (30.4)
3. In speaking classes, I want to make sure that I don't misunderstand what the instructor says/means.	225 (84.5)
4. In speaking classes, I'm more willing to respond or participate in class activities when I use Turkish	82 (30.8)
5. In speaking classes, I am afraid of making mistakes when I speak English.	123 (46.2)
6. In speaking classes, the activities do not encourage me to speak English.	71 (26.6)
7. In speaking classes, speaking English during the activities does not help improve my English.	42 (15.7)
8. In speaking classes, I feel more comfortable using Turkish.	85 (31.9)
9. **Others**	
a) I love Turkish	2 (0.7)
b) I am afraid of being misunderstood	1 (0.3)
c) To protest English	1 (0.3)
d) I am afraid that the instructor will not be proud of me any more	1 (0.3)

As Table 7 shows, of the 266 students, 253 (95.1%) pointed out that their proficiency level was not high enough to express every issue in English. 84.5% of the total indicated that they used Turkish because they wanted to make sure that they did not misunderstand what the instructor said/meant. The findings also showed that the students were afraid of making mistakes when they spoke English (46.2%), therefore they used Turkish.

Like the instructors, the students also showed the students' proficiency level as their reason for using Turkish. These findings reveal that both the instructors and the

students strongly believe that the beginner level students' proficiency level is not high enough to understand every issue in English, therefore, they use Turkish in their speaking classes. The study by Al-Busaidi (1998), which investigated teachers' and students' attitudes towards L1 use in an EFL setting in Oman, supports this finding. She also found that the students' L2 level affected the teachers' decision to use L1.

The 21 volunteer students who completed the student questionnaire were also interviewed to state their reasons for Turkish use in their speaking classes. Their replies with the frequencies are shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Students' Reasons for L1 Use – Semi-Structured Interview Findings

REASONS	f %
1. In speaking classes, my proficiency level is not high enough to express every issue in English.	21 (100%)
2. In speaking classes, I don't want to waste time trying to express something in English that I can easily do in Turkish.	3 (14.2%)
3. In speaking classes, I want to make sure that I don't misunderstand what the instructor says/means.	10 (47.6%)
4. In speaking classes, I'm more willing to respond or participate in class activities when I use Turkish	0 (0%)
5. In speaking classes, I am afraid of making mistakes when I speak English.	3 (14.2%)
6. In speaking classes, the activities do not encourage me to speak English.	0 (0%)
7. In speaking classes, speaking English during the activities does not help improve my English.	0 (0%)
8. In speaking classes, I feel more comfortable using Turkish.	10 (47.6%)

As seen in Table 8, all the 21 volunteer students (100%) stated that they used Turkish because their proficiency level was not high enough to express every issue in English. 10 (47.6%) of the students stated that they wanted to make sure that they did not misunderstand what the instructor said/meant therefore they used Turkish. Again, 10 (47.6%) of the 21 students reported that they felt more comfortable using Turkish.

When the interview findings are compared to the findings of the questionnaire, there are similarities and differences. Based on the student questionnaire findings, the most frequent reasons for using Turkish were 'my proficiency level is not high enough to express every issue in English' (253 students/ 95.1%) and 'I want to make sure that I don't misunderstand what the instructor says/means' (225 students/84.5%) (see Table 7). Similarly, in the semi-structured interviews, the volunteer students frequently stated the same two reasons (see Table 8). As a conflicting finding, in the questionnaire, the students stated their concerns about the activities done in speaking lessons. For

example, in the questionnaire, 71 students (26.6%) stated that the activities did not encourage them to speak English and 42 students (15.7%) stated speaking English during the activities did not help them improve their English (see Table 7). However, in the interviews none of the 21 students mentioned these as reasons (see Table 8).

The reason for these conflicting findings can be due to two reasons. First, the students might have felt more comfortable answering the questionnaire. In the semi-structured interviews, as the students were face to face with the researcher, they might have felt uneasy and therefore might have avoided to state what they really thought. Or, the volunteer students might not have been representing the total of the students who responded to the questionnaire. Only 21 of 266 students agreed to be interviewed.

4.1.5. Suggested L1 Use Occasions: Instructors

To determine when a speaking course instructor should use the native language, Turkish (research question 5), the instructors in the current study were asked to suggest occasions in the instructor questionnaire, Part 2.

Their answers are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

When Turkish Should Be Used: Instructors' Suggestions

SUGGESTIONS	Is' (n=7)
A SPEAKING COURSE INSTRUCTOR SHOULD USE TURKISH	f %
1. For classroom management	5 (71.4%)
2. To explain a word which is difficult to explain in English	6 (85.7%)
3. To explain today's lesson/topic/activities	1 (14.2%)
4. To explain the aim of today's lesson/topic/activities	2 (28.5%)
5. To explain a subject/issue/word when the explanation in English is not understood	6 (85.7%)
6. To explain how an activity should be done if the instruction of the activity is too long or too difficult to understand	7 (100%)
7. To repeat the instruction of an activity when the instruction in English is not understood	7 (100%)
8. To reduce students' English speaking anxiety	7 (100%)
9. To give feedback on students' mistakes	4 (57.1%)
10. To talk about his/her mistakes (misspelling on the board, slip of tongue, etc)	2 (28.5%)
11. To compare/contrast cultural issues	7 (100%)
12. To chat about something relevant to the lesson/course (about the activities done in the classroom, about students' grades, etc)	6 (85.7%)
13. To chat about something irrelevant to the lesson/course (about a student who had an operation, an interesting event yesterday, etc)	3 (42.8%)

As Table 9 shows, all of the 7 instructors agreed that a speaking course instructor should use Turkish to explain how an activity should be done if the instruction of the activity is too long or too difficult to understand (100%), to repeat the instruction of an activity when the instruction in English is not understood (100%), to reduce students' English speaking anxiety (100%) and to give feedback on students' mistakes (100%).

4.1.6. Suggested L1 Use Occasions: Students

To determine when beginner level EFL learners think that a speaking course instructor should use Turkish in speaking classes (research question 6), the students in the this study were also asked to suggest occasions in the student questionnaire, Part 2.

The students' answers are shown in Table 10.

Table 10

When Turkish Should Be Used: Students' Suggestions

SUGGESTIONS	Ss' (n=266)
A SPEAKING COURSE INSTRUCTOR SHOULD USE TURKISH	f %
3. For classroom management	128 (48.1%)
4. To explain a word which is difficult to explain in English	238 (89.4%)
10. To explain today's lesson/topic/activities	94 (35.3%)
11. To explain the aim of today's lesson/topic/activities	130 (48.8%)
12. To explain a subject/issue/word when the explanation in English is not understood	234 (87.9%)
13. To explain how an activity should be done if the instruction of the activity is too long or too difficult to understand	234 (87.9%)
14. To repeat the instruction of an activity when the instruction in English is not understood	197 (74.0%)
15. To reduce students' English speaking anxiety	182 (68.4%)
16. To give feedback on students' mistakes	164 (61.6%)
11. To talk about his/her mistakes (misspelling on the board, slip of tongue, etc)	128 (48.1%)
14. To compare/contrast cultural issues	139 (52.2%)
15. To chat about something relevant to the lesson/course (about the activities done in the classroom, about students' grades, etc)	110 (41.3%)
16. To chat about something irrelevant to the lesson/course (about a student who had an operation, an interesting event yesterday, etc)	170 (63.9%)
17. **Others**	
a) All through the speaking lesson	1 (0.3%)
b) To make the lesson enjoyable	1 (0.3%)
c) To make suggestions about being successful in speaking classes	1 (0.3%)

As seen in Table 10, like the instructors, majority of the students (87.9%) agreed that a speaking instructor should use Turkish to explain how an activity should be done if the instruction of the activity is too long or too difficult to understand. The majority of the

student respondents also suggested that a speaking course instructor should use Turkish to explain a subject/issue/word when the explanation in English is not understood (87.9%), to explain a word which is difficult to explain in English (89.4%) and to repeat the instruction of an activity when the instruction in English is not understood (74.0%).

4.1.7. Suggestions for English-Only Classes: Instructors

To determine beginner level speaking course instructors' suggestions for reducing L1 use and maximizing L2 use in speaking classes (research question 7), instructors were asked to suggest alternatives. In the instructor questionnaire, Part 3, there was only one open-ended question asking the respondents to suggest ways or methods for having English-only speaking classes. Some of the instructors' suggestions were irrelevant to the issue or unfeasible to implement (ie. the course book should be changed, the number of male and female students should be approximately the same in the classrooms, the conditions of the classrooms should be improved; classroom size should be neither too large nor too small and classrooms should get daylight or they should be lightened well). Instructors' relevant suggestions are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Instructors' Suggestions for English-Only Speaking Classes

SUGGESTIONS	f %
The ones who speak English should be given a high grade for in-class participation	1 (%14.2)
The ones who frequently speak or try to speak English should be rewarded somehow.	1 (%14.2)
The ones who speak Turkish should speak about something for a while in the next lesson	1 (%14.2)
Instructors should try to make students aware of the importance of speaking English.	1 (%14.2)

As shown in Table 11, only 4 of the 7 instructors offered relevant suggestions for English-only speaking classes. It is worth noting that each suggestion was offered by a different instructor.

4.1.8. Suggestions for English-Only Classes: Students

To determine beginner level learners' suggestions for reducing L1 use and maximizing L2 use in speaking classes (research question 8), in Part 3 of the student questionnaire, the students were asked to offer suggestions, which would motivate them to use English-only in their speaking classes. Although the student questionnaire was administered to 266 beginner level students, only 56 of them answered this part. The students' suggestions are shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Students' Suggestions for English-Only Speaking Classes

SUGGESTIONS	f %
The speaking course instructor should speak English all the time so that we try to speak English	30 (53.5%)
The students who speak Turkish should speak English for a while in the next lesson (telling a story/joke, etc)	22 (39.2%)
The students who speak Turkish should be fined	9 (16.0%)
The speaking course instructor should not answer any questions asked in Turkish	8 (14.2%)
The students who speak Turkish should memorize and/or learn certain amount of vocabulary and teach that vocabulary to the classmates in the next lesson, if not, these students should treat the classmates for tea/coffee	8 (14.2%)
The students who frequently speak Turkish should give a present to those who speak no or the least Turkish in the class	6 (10.7%)

As seen in Table 12, of the 56 students 30 (53.5%) suggested that speaking course instructor should speak English all the time so that students try to speak English. Based on this finding, students can be said to believe that when speaking course instructor spoke English all the time, students would be more motivated to speak English-only. It was also suggested that the students who spoke Turkish should speak English for a while in the next lesson (telling a story/joke, etc) (39.2%).

All these suggestions made by the students in Phase 1 were opened to discussion in Phase 2. In Phase 2, in the English-only treatment sections, the speaking course instructor asked the students to choose one of these suggestions to be implemented in the class. The reason for giving the students the opportunity to make a decision as a group is based on the assumption that such an opportunity would increase their motivation to follow up the procedure willingly. The students discussed and decided which one to implement in their speaking classes.

In both English-only treatment sections, students agreed on the same method. That is, the instructor was never to speak Turkish and when a student spoke Turkish with the instructor, the instructor would not respond or react to those students in any way. In addition, student who spoke Turkish should be fined 100.000 TL (a very small amount of money) each time they spoke Turkish. Students also suggested that at the end of the term, those students who spoke no or little Turkish should be given a present with the money collected from the fines. The instructor kept a record of students who spoke Turkish. At the end of each two weeks, the instructor collected fines from those students. By the end of 9 weeks, with the money collected, the 11 (out of 60) students who used no

or little Turkish were rewarded with a picture frame. At the end of the treatment, almost all the students commented that this method increased their motivation to try to speak English all the time.

4.2. PHASE 2

Phase 2 consisted of three treatment groups (suggested L1 use, English-only and control). The analysis procedure of Phase 2 was conducted to answer the following research questions.

1. Does L1 use on suggested occasions in speaking classes affect elementary level EFL learners' oral performances in terms of grammar/structure, vocabulary, intelligibility and fluency?
2. Do English-only speaking classes affect elementary level EFL learners' oral performances in terms of their use of grammar/structure, vocabulary and vocabulary variety, intelligibility and fluency?

4.2.1. L1 Use Occasions in Treatment Groups

The audio-recordings of nine treatment weeks were analyzed to determine when each of the speaking instructors used Turkish in the three treatment groups. The analysis revealed that the speaking course instructor never used Turkish in the English-only treatment group. In the other two treatment groups (suggested L1 use and control), the instructors used Turkish on several occasions. They are presented in the following sections separately.

4.2.1.1. L1 use occasions in the suggested L1 use group

The analysis of the audio-recordings revealed that the instructor of suggested L1 use group used Turkish only on the occasions which majority of the students (over 70%) suggested in the questionnaire. These occasions, their frequencies and samples are shown in Table 13.

Table 13

L1 Use Occasions, Frequencies and Samples in the 'Suggested L1 Use' Classes

Turkish was used	**n %**	**Samples**
to explain a subject, issue or word when the explanation in English is not understood	24 (48.9%)	How to argue; to give directions; order, etc
to explain a word which is difficult to explain in English	10 (20.4%)	Evidence, patient, permanent, overlap, etc
to repeat the instructions of an activity when the instructions in English is not understood	9 (18.3%)	TV project, helpline task, etc
to explain how an activity should be done, if the instruction of the activity is too long or too difficult to understand	6 (12.2%)	Bingo game in the book, etc

As shown in Table 13 the instructor of the suggested L1 use group used Turkish a total of 49 times. Most frequently (a total of 24 out of 49 times), she used Turkish to explain a subject, issue or word when the explanation in English was not understood.

4.2.1.2. L1 use occasions in the control group

The audio-recordings of the control group showed that the instructor used Turkish on the following occasions: a) to explain new/unknown vocabulary items – directly in Turkish, b) to repeat the explanation of a vocabulary item – given in English earlier, c) to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course, d) to answer a question relevant to the lesson/course, e) to repeat the instruction of an activity – given in English earlier, f) to draw the student(s)' attention to a certain point/issue and g) to warn a student about his/her disturbing behaviour. These L1 use occasions, their frequencies and samples are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

L1 Use Occasions, Frequencies and Samples in the 'Control Group' Classes

Turkish was used	**n %**	**Samples**
To warn a student about his/her disturbing behaviour	7 (30.4%)	Bakın! Çıkın dışarı! Konuşanlar çıksın da ders yapalım (Look! Go out! The ones who are talking should go out so that we can have our lesson), sabah sabah öğlen öğlen ne zaman yapacaksınız! (it's early in the morning, late in the afternoon; you always find an excuse not to do the activity), etc
To draw the student(s)' attention to a certain point/issue	6 (26.0%)	Örnek verin ama bilgi vermeyin (give examples but don't give information), Gördünüz mü onu? (Have you seen this?), etc
To explain new/unknown vocabulary items – directly in Turkish	4 (17.3%)	Shy, attendance, even though and experience
To repeat the instruction of an activity – given in English earlier	2 (8.6%)	Helpline task and an activity about giving directions in the book
To ask a question relevant to the lesson/course	2 (8.6%)	King Burger nerede biliyor musunuz? (Do you where King Burger is?), etc
To repeat the explanation of a vocabulary item – given in English earlier	1 (4.3%)	Object to
To answer a question relevant to the lesson/course	1 (4.3%)	Gerekmiyor, evet (it's not necessary, yes)

As seen in Table 14, the instructor of the control group used Turkish a total of 23 times during 9 weeks. When compared to suggested L1 use group, Turkish was used less in the control group. In the suggested L1 use group, the instructor used Turkish a total of 49 times. However, it should be pointed out that the audio-recordings of the control group were hardly audible when the instructor was in the back of the classroom talking with the student(s). Thus, it is possible that several L1 use occasions in these classes may not have been heard and consequently not transcribed.

4.2.2. Results within Groups

Three groups of students participated in phase 2 of this study. The students whose end-of-term speaking exam grades were between 60-80 were randomly assigned to 'suggested L1 use' group, 'English-only' group and control group. To determine whether there were differences between pre- and post-test means, statistical analysis of paired t-test was conducted for each group.

4.2.2.1. 'Suggested L1 Use' group

Table 15 presents the mean scores of the pre-test for the suggested L1 use group. For grammar, vocabulary, intelligibility and fluency the highest possible score was five (5) and the lowest possible score was one (1). Only for vocabulary variety, the highest possible score was three (3) and the lowest possible score was one (1).

Table 15

Pre-Test Results of Suggested L1 Use Group

CATEGORIES	N	MEAN
Grammar	22	2,864
Vocabulary	22	3,409
Vocabulary variety	22	1.818
Intelligibility	22	4,682
Fluency	22	3,909

N= Number of Cases (students)

As Table 15 shows, the mean for the intelligibility category was the highest (M= 4,682) whereas the mean for grammar was the lowest (M= 2,864). The mean for vocabulary variety was not considered the lowest as the highest possible score for that category is three (3).

Table 16 shows the mean scores of the post-test.

Table 16

Post-Test Results of Suggested L1 Use Group

CATEGORIES	N	MEAN
Grammar	22	2,773
Vocabulary	22	4,045
Vocabulary variety	22	2,045
Intelligibility	22	4,636
Fluency	22	4,136

N= Number of Cases (students)

As seen in Table 16, the mean score for intelligibility was the highest (M= 4,636) whereas the mean for grammar was the lowest (M= 2,773). The mean score for vocabulary variety increased in the post-test. On the other hand, for some categories such as grammar and intelligibility, means decreased.

Table 17 shows the results of the paired t-test for the suggested L1 use group.

Table 17

Results of Paired T-Test Statistics for Suggested L1 Use Group

CATEGORIES	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t	p
Grammar / pre-test	22	2,864	0.0909	0,358	0,724
Grammar / post-test	22	2,773			
Vocabulary / pre-test	22	3,409	-0,636	-2,000	0,054
Vocabulary / post-test	22	4,045			
Vocabulary Variety / pre-test	22	1.818	-0,227	-2,000	0,057
Vocabulary Variety / post-test	22	2,045			
Intelligibility / pre-test	22	4,682	0.0454	0,370	0,715
Intelligibility / post-test	22	4,636			
Fluency / pre-test	22	3,909	-0,227	-1,200	0,261
Fluency / post-test	22	4,136			

N= Number of Cases (students), P>0,05

As seen in Table 17, the results of paired t-tests show that the post-test results were not significantly different from the pre-test results in terms of grammar (p=0,724>0,05),

vocabulary (p=0,054>0,05), vocabulary variety (p=0,57>0,05), intelligibility (p= 0,715>0,05) and fluency (p=0,261>0,05). These results suggest that suggested L1 use in speaking classes had no significant effect on students' oral performance.

4.2.2.2. 'English-Only' Group

Table 18 presents the mean scores of the pre-test for the English-only group.

Table 18

Pre-Test Results of English-Only Group

CATEGORIES	N	MEAN
Grammar	21	3,143
Vocabulary	21	4,095
Vocabulary variety	21	2,048
Intelligibility	21	4,714
Fluency	21	4,048

N= Number of Cases (students)

As Table 18 shows, the mean for intelligibility category was the highest (M= 4,714) whereas the mean for grammar was the lowest (M= 3,143). As explained earlier, vocabulary variety consists of three descriptors therefore three (3) is the highest possible score. Thus, M= 2,048 should not be considered the lowest score, rather it refers to an average score.

Table 19 shows the mean scores of the post-test for the English-only group.

Table 19

Post-Test Results of English-Only Group

CATEGORIES	N	MEAN
Grammar	21	3,238
Vocabulary	21	3,905
Vocabulary variety	21	2,000
Intelligibility	21	4,714
Fluency	21	4,095

N= Number of Cases (students)

As seen in Table 19, the mean score for intelligibility was the highest (M= 4,714) whereas the mean for grammar was the lowest (M= 3,238). The highest and lowest means were the same as in the pre-test.

Table 20 shows the results of the paired t-test for the English-only group.

Table 20

Results of Paired T-Test Statistics for English-Only Group

CATEGORIES	N	Mean	Mean Difference	T	p
Grammar / pre-test	21	3,143	-0,0952	-0,462	0,649
Grammar / post-test	21	3,238			
Vocabulary / pre-test	21	4,095	0,190	0,594	0,559
Vocabulary / post-test	21	3,905			
Vocabulary Variety / pre-test	21	2,048	0,0476	0,370	0,715
Vocabulary Variety / post-test	21	2,000			
Intelligibility / pre-test	21	4,714	0,000	0,000	1,000
Intelligibility / post-test	21	4,714			
Fluency / pre-test	21	4,048	-0,0476	-0,195	0,847
Fluency / post-test	21	4,095			

N= Number of Cases (students), P>0,05

As seen in Table 20, the analysis of paired t-test revealed no significant difference within English-only group in terms of grammar (p=0,649>0,05), vocabulary (p=0,559>0,05), vocabulary variety (p=0,715>0,05), intelligibility (p= 1,000>0,05) and fluency (p=0,847>0,05). These results suggest that having English-only speaking classes had no significant effect on students' oral performance.

4.2.2.3. 'Control' group

Table 21 presents the mean scores of the pre-test for the control group.

Table 21

Pre-Test Results of Control Group

CATEGORIES	N	MEAN
Grammar	22	2,682
Vocabulary	22	3,909
Vocabulary variety	22	1,864
Intelligibility	22	4,364
Fluency	22	4,045

N= Number of Cases (students)

As seen in Table 21, the mean for the intelligibility category was the highest (M= 4,364) whereas the mean for grammar was the lowest (M= 2,682). As explained earlier, in vocabulary variety the highest score was three (3), thus M= 1,864 cannot be considered the lowest score, rather it refers to an average score.

Table 22 shows the means of the post-test for the control group.

Table 22

Post-Test Results of Control Group

CATEGORIES	N	MEAN
Grammar	22	3,000
Vocabulary	22	3,591
Vocabulary variety	22	1,909
Intelligibility	22	4,364
Fluency	22	4,000

N= Number of Cases (students)

As seen in Table 22, the mean score for intelligibility was the highest (M= 4,364) whereas the mean for grammar was the lowest (M= 3,000). The highest and lowest means are for the same categories as in the pre-test.

Table 23 presents the results of the paired t-test statistics for control group.

Table 23

Results of Paired T-Test Statistics for the Control Group

CATEGORIES	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t	p
Grammar / pre-test	22	2,682	-0,318	-1,374	0,184
Grammar / post-test	22	3,000			
Vocabulary / pre-test	22	3,909	0,318	1,195	0,246
Vocabulary / post-test	22	3,591			
Vocabulary Variety / pre-test	22	1,864	-0,0455	-0,326	0,747
Vocabulary Variety / post-test	22	1,909			
Intelligibility / pre-test	22	4,364	0,000	0,000	1,000
Intelligibility / post-test	22	4,364			
Fluency / pre-test	22	4,045	0,0454	0,224	0,825
Fluency / post-test	22	4,000			

N= Number of Cases (students), P>0,05

As seen in Table 23, means for grammar and vocabulary variety increased in the post-test whereas means for vocabulary and fluency showed slight decrease in the post-test. However, the results of the paired t-test revealed no significant difference within control group in terms of grammar (p=0,184>0,05), vocabulary (p=0,246>0,05), vocabulary variety (p=0,747>0,05), intelligibility (p= 1,000>0,05) and fluency (p=0,825>0,05). These results suggest that the treatment in the control group had no effect on students' oral performance in terms of their grammar use, vocabulary use, vocabulary variety, intelligibility and fluency.

4.2.3. Results between Groups

To determine whether treatments had an effect on students' oral performances, Covariance Analysis was conducted. The results of the Covariance Analysis for the three groups are reported separately for each category.

4.2.3.1. Grammar

The results of the Covariance Analysis for grammar are presented in Table 24.

Table 24

Post-Test Results of Covariance Analysis of Groups for Grammar

GROUP	N	Mean	F	p
Suggested L1 Use	21	2,864	2,628	0,080
English-Only	22	2,857		
Control	22	3.273		

p>0,05 N= Number of cases (students)

As seen in Table 24, there is no significant difference in terms of students' grammar use (p=0,08>0.05) among the three groups.

4.2.3.2. Vocabulary

The results for the vocabulary use category can be seen in Table 25.

Table 25

Post-Test Results of Covariance Analysis of Groups for Vocabulary

GROUP	N	Mean	F	p
Suggested L1 Use	21	4,182	1,507	0,230
English-Only	22	3,429		
Control	22	3,909		

p>0,05 N= Number of cases (students),

As Table 25 shows, there is no significant difference among the three groups (p=0.230>0.05). This suggests that the treatments had no significant effect on student subjects' vocabulary use.

4.2.3.3. Vocabulary variety

Table 26 shows the results in terms of vocabulary variety.

Table 26

Post-Test Results of Covariance Analysis of Groups for Vocabulary Variety

GROUP	N	Mean	F	P
Suggested L1 Use	21	1,955	1,285	0,284
English-Only	22	1,952		
Control	22	2,045		

p>0,05 N= Number of cases (students),

As seen in Table 26, the mean scores of vocabulary variety for the three groups were similar. The results show that there is no significant difference among the three groups in terms of vocabulary variety (p=0,284>0,05). This suggests that the treatments had no significant effect on students' vocabulary variety.

4.2.3.4. Intelligibility

Table 27 shows the results for intelligibility category.

Table 27

Post-Test Results of Covariance Analysis of Groups for Intelligibility

GROUP	N	Mean	F	P
Suggested L1 Use	21	4,773	2,393	0,100
English-Only	22	4,667		
Control	22	4,273		

p>0,05 N= Number of cases (students),

As seen in Table 27, the means of intelligibility for the three groups are close to each other. The mean score is 4,773 for suggested L1 use group, 4,667 for English-only group and 4,273 for control group. The results show that there is no significant difference among the three groups (p=0,1>0,05) in terms of intelligibility.

4.2.3.5. Fluency

Table 28 shows the results for fluency category.

Table 28

Post-Test Results of Covariance Analysis of Groups for Fluency

GROUP	N	Mean	F	P
Suggested L1 Use	21	4,091	0,691	0,505
English-Only	22	4.238		
Control	22	3,909		

p>0,05 N= Number of cases (students),

As seen in Table 28, the means for the three groups are similar. The mean for the English-only group is 4,238, for the control group 3,909 and for the suggested L1 use group 4,091. In terms of fluency, there is no significant difference among the three groups (p=0,505>0,05). This again suggests that students' fluency did not improve after the treatments.

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1. Summary of the Study

L1 use has long been discussed in ELT. Some researchers advocate the use of L1 in lower-level ELT classes based on the assumption that it reduces anxiety and therefore promotes better learning (Reis, 1996; Cole, 1998; Buckmaster, 2000; Toyama, Viney, Helgesen, Barnard & Edge, 2000; and Hawks, 2001). Others, on the other hand, believe that L1 use is disadvantageous because it prevents learners from exposing the target language (Ellis, 1984; Chaudron, 1988 and Takahashi, 1996). L1 use in EFL classroom is still a controversial issue. The present study, therefore, investigated the effect of L1 use on elementary level EFL learners' oral performances. The study also investigated when and why L1 was used in beginner level speaking classes.

This study investigated the issues related to L1 use in two phases. In Phase 1, when and why Turkish was used in beginner level EFL speaking classes was determined. In Phase 2, whether L1 use in elementary level EFL speaking classes had an effect on students' oral performances was investigated.

In Phase 1, the data were collected through questionnaires, observations and semi-structured interviews. To determine when Turkish was used, 13 beginner level speaking classes were observed during one academic term. At the end of the observations, 7 instructors and 266 students were given a questionnaire about the occasions of and reasons for L1 use in their speaking classes. In the questionnaire, both the instructors and students were also asked to state when a speaking course instructor should use L1 and what should be done to have English-only speaking classes. Students' suggestions on L1 use occasions and English-only classes were taken into account in the design of Phase 2. Moreover, semi-structured interviews were held with seven instructors and 21 volunteer beginner level students to determine the reasons for using Turkish in speaking classes.

To determine if 'suggested L1 use' or 'English-only' speaking classes had any effect on students' oral performances, an experiment was conducted. In one group, the speaking course instructor used Turkish only on the occasions frequently suggested by students whereas in the other treatment group, the speaking course instructor never used Turkish and the students in this group were encouraged to use English-only. In the control group, Turkish was used whenever the course instructor or students wanted. 65 elementary level volunteer EFL learners were given pre-test interviews. After a nine-week treatment, they were given post-test interviews. Each interview was video-recorded. Later, two graders separately assessed the students' performances in terms of their grammar use, vocabulary use, vocabulary variety, intelligibility and fluency.

The results of the questionnaires in Phase 1 revealed that instructors and students used Turkish on different occasions. Instructors stated that they usually used Turkish to explain how an activity would be done-directly in Turkish (42.9%), to tell a joke/for humour (42.9%) while students stated that they always used Turkish to ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course (58.3%), to tell a joke/for humour (55.3%). On the other hand, the findings of the observations showed that instructors frequently used Turkish to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course (208 times, 24.0%) and to draw student(s)' attention to a certain point/issue (123 times, 14.2%). Students frequently used Turkish to check whether they understood the meaning of a particular vocabulary item (208 times, 17.1%) and to answer the speaking course instructor's question relevant to the lesson/course (155 times, 12.7%).

With respect to the reasons for using Turkish in beginner level speaking classes, the findings of the questionnaire revealed that Turkish was used frequently (all the 7 instructors, 100% and 95.1% of the students) because both the instructors and students believed that the proficiency level of students in beginner level classes was not high enough to understand/express every issue in English. Based on the findings of the semi-structured interviews, all the 7 instructors (100%) again stated that students' proficiency level influenced them to use Turkish. Like the instructors, all the 21 volunteer students (100%) stated that they used Turkish because they believed that their proficiency level was not high enough to express every issue in English.

The results of the statistical analyses in Phase 2 showed that neither 'suggested L1 use' nor 'English-only' nor control group speaking classes had any effect on elementary level EFL students' oral performances.

5.2. Discussion, Conclusion and Implications

L1 use has been the concern of many EFL teachers. At the School of Foreign Languages, English Department, instructors also have concerns about using L1, Turkish in their speaking classes. It was often asked whether Turkish should be used in speaking classes. This study provided insights on such concerns related to L1 use in communication-based EFL classes.

The results of the paired t-tests showed no significant difference between pre- and post-tests for the three groups suggesting that there was no significant improvement after 9-week treatment. To investigate the reasons for this result, 9 volunteer students were interviewed individually in the following year of the study. First, the students were reminded of the pre and post-test interviews they did in the previous year, then they were told that based on the analysis, no significant difference was found between students' performances in the pre-test and post-test interviews. After that, they were asked to state if anything was different in the post-test in terms of their feelings, comfort or mood. The volunteer students were also asked to tell their opinions about the reasons for this result. Their answers are shown in Figure 4.

	REASONS	n
1.	"I was more stressful in the post-test; more comfortable in the pre-test."	2
2.	"I was willing in the pre-test but I didn't take the post-test seriously because of several reasons."	1
3.	"As the post-test was the same as the pre-test, I might not have taken the post-test seriously."	5
4.	"I wasn't comfortable in the either interviews."	3
5.	"English was seldom spoken in classes, therefore we had little chance to practise and this might have been reflected in the interviews."	1

Figure 4. Subject Students' Reasons for the Result

As stated in Figure 4, five of the students stated that as soon as they started the post-test interview, they realized that the questions were the same as in the pre-test interview. Therefore, they might not have taken the post-test as seriously as the pre-test.

The reasons stated suggest that students did not take the post-test interviews seriously. Thus, they might not have put as much effort in the post-test as they had in the pre-test interview because the tasks/questions were the same in both the pre-test and post-test. These reasons stated might explain why no significant differences were found within and between groups after the treatments.

These findings obtained from the nine students, brought a question on the stage: if the pre- and post-test interviews had been real exams which would have affected these students' grades at school, would the students have taken the interviews more seriously? If they had, the results may have been different.

Both the questionnaire and the observation findings suggest that students prefer to use L1 more often for irrelevant to lesson/course issues. Students usually used Turkish to ask/answer a question irrelevant to the lesson/course, to compliment, to chat, and to tell a joke/for humour. The results of observations and questionnaires also suggest that the questions asked in L1 are often answered in L1. Therefore, it can be implied that initiator of L1 use determines the language of his/her interlocutor. For example, instructors asked a question relevant to the lesson/course in Turkish 208 times (24.0%) and students used Turkish 155 times (12.7%) to answer the speaking course instructor's question relevant to the lesson/course (see Table 2 and Table 4).

The results also showed that students tend to use more L1 to check their understanding (ie. to check if they understood the meaning of a vocabulary item or particular structure/grammar point) or when they had a problem in understanding the instruction(s) of an activity. Similarly, instructors preferred to use Turkish especially when students had difficulties in understanding something in English; a word, instruction of an activity, or instruction of a structure/grammar point. Instructors felt that they needed to repeat the issues in Turkish when students did not understand them.

As an interesting finding, 95 students (35.7%) indicated that they rarely used Turkish during pair work activities. However, in their field notes, the observers emphasized how much Turkish they heard during the pair work and group work activities. Not only the observation field notes but the related literature also supports the fact that monolingual EFL learners tend to use their native language during pair-work activities often (Atkinson, 1993; Al-Busaidi, 1998). Similarly, in the student questionnaire, 45.1% of students indicated that they always used Turkish to ask a

question on a structure/grammar point to a classmate and 36.8% of students usually asked/talked about homework However, classroom observations showed that students never used Turkish to ask a question on a structure/grammar point to a classmate and to ask/talk about homework with a classmate(s).

The observation finding also revealed that instructors used Turkish on the occasions which were different from what they indicated in the questionnaire. For example, in the questionnaire, 4 (57.1%) of the instructors indicated that they never used Turkish to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course. The observations revealed that Turkish was used (by the instructors) 208 times (24.0%) – out of 864 - to ask a question relevant to the lesson/course (see Table 1 and Table 2). This finding suggest that instructors were not aware when they actually used L1 in their beginner level EFL speaking classes. Polio and Duff (1994) found the same contradictory result in one of their studies. Some of the participant instructors in their study stated in the interviews that they used L1 on several occasions but these occasions could not be observed in the observations.

There may be several reasons why some of the L1 use occasions indicated in the questionnaires were not observed. While completing the questionnaires, the respondents' beliefs and attitudes towards L1 use might have affected their answers. Instead of indicating how often they actually use Turkish on the given occasions, they may have chosen the frequency that they believed to be right for L1 use. Such respondent reliability problems can occur during questionnaire completion (Oppenheim, 1992). It is also possible that both the instructors and students were sincere in answering the questionnaires. The observations may not have reflected all the facts as only part of the classroom hours were observed due to time restrictions. Thus, it is also possible that if all the lessons had been observed, the results of the observations and questionnaires may have been compatible.

To make instructors more aware of their L1 use, instructors can hold meeting to discuss when and why they use L1 in their classes. Providing and discussing their reasons and purposes for using L1 would not only improve their perspective on L1 use but it would also build a more conscious and probably more beneficial learning/teaching environment.

When the findings of this study, in terms of L1 use occasions of the instructors, are compared with those of other studies, there are both similarities and differences. Polio and Duff (1994), for example, found that university instructors used L1 when giving grammar instruction, for classroom management, to build empathy/solidarity, to practise English, to explain unknown vocabulary/translation and when there was lack of comprehension. Of these occasions, two, 'when there was lack of comprehension' and 'for classroom management', are similar to the findings of the current study. The instructors in this study also indicated that they sometimes used Turkish to warn a student about his/her disturbing behaviour, to repeat the instruction of an activity or instruction of a structure/grammar point when the explanation in English was not understood. Furthermore, the findings of the current study showed that the instructors did not frequently prefer to use Turkish to explain vocabulary items.

With respect to reasons for L1 use, the findings of the current study showed that instructors believed that students' grammar and vocabulary knowledge was limited to understand every issue in English. As for using Turkish to tell a joke/for humour, one of the instructors, for instance, stated that the proficiency level of beginner students is not high enough to understand a joke/humour in English. Not only instructors but students also indicated that their linguistic knowledge was not enough to understand or express every issue in English. This result validates the belief that L1 is used in lower-level classes because of learners' limited knowledge in L2.

The findings of other studies investigating the reasons why university instructors use L1 are similar to those of the current study. Duff and Polio (1990), for example, found that university instructors used L1 because their students' knowledge of L2 was limited. Piasecka (1988) and Atkinson (1993) also found that one of the common reasons for L1 use is students' limited knowledge in vocabulary and grammar. In fact, as Piasecka (1988) points out, this finding suggests that learners' proficiency levels in L2 should be based on deciding on L1 use.

The differences between the findings of the current study and other studies support the assumption that L1 use occasions are context-specific. The content of the lesson/course, ELT setting, the dynamics of the class, learner profile, etc can affect the decision to use L1 (Piasecka, 1988). Both students and instructors strongly agreed that students' proficiency level was an important factor to use Turkish.

The findings related to the suggested L1 use occasions revealed that the least suggested occasion for Turkish both by the instructors and students was to explain today's lesson/topic/activities. Only one of the instructors (14.2%) and 94 students (35.3%) stated that Turkish should be used on this occasion. This suggests that both the instructors and students found use of Turkish unnecessary to explain the aim of the lesson/topic/activities.

In relation to use of L1, research has suggested various occasions of and reasons for L1 use (Atkinson, 1987; Collingham, 1988; and Piasecka, 1988). In this study, students were asked to state when they thought speaking instructors should use Turkish. The occasions suggested by students matched the occasions suggested in the literature. Based on students' suggestions, Phase 2 was designed and Turkish was used only on the occasions students suggested in 'suggested L1 use' group. Considering that students would be a valuable source while deciding when to use L1, students can be asked to state their opinions. Similarly, students can be asked to suggest ways for having English-only speaking classes. This would provide a more democratic learning/teaching environment.

Auerbach (1993) also states that students should be included in deciding L1 use in the classroom,

> "After considering the advantages and disadvantages of L1 versus L2 use and the functions of each in different contexts, students can establish their own rules for the classroom. Certainly, teachers can contribute their own knowledge and opinions in this exchange, but what is important is a shift toward shared authority. The teachers move from being a problem solver or arbiter of tensions to a problem poser or facilitator of critical reflection." (p. 24)

Involving students to decide when to use L1 does not mean teachers should stay behind and do whatever students would like. On the contrary, teachers would function as a guide who can show students the value of students' opinions. Consequently, teachers and students would work cooperatively to decide when to use L1 and/or L2.

In conclusion, although literature assumes that L1 use in communication-based classes can be disadvantageous, the results of the current investigation suggest that L1 use does not have a significant effect on students' oral performances. No change was found in the oral performances of the students in 'suggested L1 use' group. With regard to the effect of English-only speaking classes on students' oral performances, the results revealed that not using L1 does not have an effect on students' oral performances. This

suggests that English-only speaking classes are not advantageous, as believed (Ellis, 1994; and Murhey & Sasaki, 1998). Based on these results, it can be suggested that instructors should not be concerned about L1 use in their speaking classes as long as it is not overused, as Atkinson (1987) suggested. In addition, instructors who believe in the advantages of English-only speaking classes, and avoid using L1 can be more flexible about L1 use.

5.3. Suggestions for Further Research

Considering that the number of participants/subjects of this study affected the generalizability and external validity, in a further study a larger instructor participant and student subject sample should be taken. In this way, the results could be implied for larger population.

Only 21 students volunteered to participate in the semi-structured interviews in Phase 1 of the current study. This caused difficulties in comparing the findings of the questionnaire with the findings of the semi-structured interviews. In a further study, semi-structured interviews can be held with more students.

This study did not aim to compare the observation results with the questionnaire results of the same group of participants. The observation checklist used in the current study showed the occurrences of L1 use occasions whereas the questionnaires aimed at determining the frequencies of L1 use occasions. Therefore, the observation findings were not compared with the questionnaire findings. In a further study, instruments can be developed in such a way that instructors' and students' use of L1 can be compared.

Due to several reasons such as shying away from video recording or absenteeism, only 65 students volunteered to participate in the pre- and post-test interviews in Phase 2. Thus, this low number of participation could be considered as a limitation for the external validity and generalizability of the results. In a future study, the same study can be replicated with a larger population that would make the generalization of the results possible.

In Phase 2 of this study, Turkish was used only on the occasions students suggested. In further studies, course instructors can decide when to use Turkish and results of such a design can provide different implications.

The pre-test and post-test interviews were voluntary-based. In other words, these interviews did not affect the students' grades. If these interviews had been their real

speaking exams affecting their grades, the students might have taken them more seriously and consequently this could have affected the results. Therefore, in further studies, pre-test and post-test interviews can be students' mid-term exam which would affect their course grade.

In this study, due to methodological reasons, treatments lasted 9 weeks. Considering that language learning takes relatively quite a long time, in a further investigation, treatments can be extended for a year or more.

The subject students' attitudes towards L1 use could not be taken into consideration. The students were randomly assigned to the experimental groups according to their speaking exam grades without considering their attitudes towards Turkish use. This might have also affected the results. In a further study, research can be designed in a way that students are assigned to groups based on their attitudes towards L1 use. Moreover, further research investigating attitudes towards L1 use at a larger perspective would provide valuable insight in terms of classroom implications. For example, attitude difference between lower-level EFL classes and higher-level EFL classes can be compared. In addition, the reason(s) for the difference in attitude or similarity can be investigated.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

This observation checklist has been developed to identify where and how the native language (Turkish) is used in beginner and elementary level speaking classes.

Before using this observation checklist, make sure that you become familiar with each category. Please feel free to ask me any unclear points in the checklist so that you don't have any difficulties or concerns while using it in the classroom.

How to use the checklist

Before you go into the classroom, it is better to fill in the date, classroom, duration, observer and observee parts.

In the "INTERACTION" column (Only for the student section)

Circle **S-S** when any student speaks in Turkish to another student in the classroom.

Circle **S-T** when any student speaks in Turkish to the teacher.

In the "WHAT?" column

Follow the instructions in the "How to Fill in the Observation Sheet" manual.

In the "FIELD NOTE" part

You are expected to write your impressions about the classroom atmosphere reflecting students' attitudes towards observation and the effect of L1 use in the classroom, if any.

DATE:

CLASSROOM:

DURATION:

OBSERVER:

OBSERVEE:

TEACHER		STUDENT(S)		
CATEGORIES	**WHAT?** (in the native language)	**CATEGORIES**	**INTERACTION**	**WHAT?** (in the native language)
1. To greet the students		1. To greet the teacher	**S-T S-S**	
2. To warn the student who is late		2. To apologize for being late	**S-T S-S**	
3. To explain today's lesson/topic/activities or the aim of the lesson/topic/activities- directly in Turkish				
4. To repeat today's lesson/topic/activities or the aim of one of these- given in English earlier				
5. To explain a new structure/grammar point (ie. would you like, can I) - directly in Turkish		5. To ask a question on a structure/grammar point	**S-T S-S**	
6. To repeat the instruction of a structure/grammar point-given in English earlier		6. To check if s/he understood a particular structure/grammar point	**S-T S-S**	
7. To explain new/unknown vocabulary items - directly in Turkish		7. To ask the meaning of a vocabulary item	**S-T S-S**	

8. To repeat the explanation of a vocabulary item-given in English earlier		8. To check if s/he understood the meaning of a particular vocabulary item	**S-T** **S-S**	
9. To correct mistakes (vocabulary, structure, grammar, etc)		9. To correct mistakes (vocabulary, structure, grammar, etc)	**S-T** **S-S**	
10. To explain the cultural aspects in English (family names; vending machine, etc)				
11. To ask a question relevant to the lesson/course		11. To ask a question relevant to the lesson/course	**S-T** **S-S**	
12. To ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course		12. To ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course	**S-T** **S-S**	
13. To answer a question relevant to the lesson/course		13. To answer a question relevant to the lesson/course	**S-T** **S-S**	
14. To answer a question irrelevant to the lesson/course		14. To answer a question irrelevant to the lesson/course	**S-T** **S-S**	
15. To explain how an activity will be done-directly in Turkish		15. To check if s/he understood the instruction(s) of an activity	**S-T** **S-S**	

16. To repeat the instruction of an activity-given in English earlier		16. When s/he doesn't understand the instruction(s) of an activity	**S-T** **S-S**	
17. To praise (aferin, güzel gibi) or to make a compliment		17. To make a compliment	**S-T** **S-S**	
18. To draw the student(s)' attention to a certain point/issue		18. To draw one's attention to a certain point/issue	**S-T** **S-S**	
19. To warn a student about his/her disturbing behaviour		19. To explain the reason(s) of a disturbing behaviour or to apologize for it	**S-T** **S-S**	
20. To tell a joke / for humour		20. To tell a joke / for humour	**S-T** **S-S**	
21. To chat		21. To chat	**S-T** **S-S**	
22. To give homework		22. To ask/talk about homework	**S-T** **S-S**	
23. To end the lesson				
24. To say goodbye		24. To say goodbye	**S-T** **S-S**	
Other(s)		**Other(s)**		

FIELD NOTES

Please write down your impressions about

- the effect of your presence (as an observer) in the classroom on students,

……

……

……

……

……

- the effect of L1 use - if any – on students and/or classroom atmosphere,

……

……

……

……

……

- the other issues you would like to share.

……

……

……

……

……

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Değerli Meslektaşım,

Bu anket Beginner Level Speaking Dersleri'nde ana dil-Türkçe'nin kullanımıyla ilgili bazı noktaları belirlemek amacıyla hazırlanmıştır. Anket 2002-2003 Akademik yılının Güz Dönemi'nde Beginner Level Speaking Dersleri'ne giren bütün öğretim elemanlarına uygulanacaktır.

Anket 3 bölümden oluşmaktadır.

- ❖ Bölüm 1'deki sorular, Speaking Dersleri'nde Tükçe'yi kullanıyorsanız, hangi durumlarda ve niye kullandığınızla ilgilidir.
- ❖ Bölüm 2'deki sorular, Speaking Dersleri'nde Türkçe'nin genelde hangi durumlarda kullanılmasının uygun olduğu ile ilgili görüşlerinizi almak için hazırlanmıştır.
- ❖ Bölüm 3 ise, Speaking Dersleri'nde öğrencilerin sürekli İngilizce kullanmalarını sağlamak için ne tür uygulamalar yapılabileceği konusundaki önerilerinizi almak amacıyla konmuştur.

Bu ankette yer alan hiç bir sorunun "doğru" ya da "yanlış" cevabı yoktur. Sorulara verilecek cevaplar kişiden kişiye değişebilir.

Anketi cevaplarken bütün işaretlemeleriniz için lütfen (√) işaretini kullanın.

Bu anketle ilgili sormak istediğiniz herhangi bir şey olursa lütfen araştırmacı ile (MÜGE KANATLAR) temasa geçme konusunda tereddüt etmeyiniz.

LÜTFEN BU ANKETİ SADECE BEGINNER LEVEL SPEAKING DERSLERİNİZİ DÜŞÜNEREK CEVAPLANDIRINIZ!

ANKETE OLAN KATKINIZDAN DOLAYI ŞİMDİDEN TEŞEKKÜR EDERİM.

MÜGE KANATLAR
e-mail: gmkanatlar@anadolu.edu.tr
Tel: 0 222 3350580 2050/2052

BÖLÜM 1

Aşağıdaki durumları okuduktan sonra, **Beginner Level Speaking Derslerinde**, ne ölçüde Türkçe kullandığınızı belirten en uygun seçeneğe ait kutucuğun içine (√) işareti koyunuz.

	Herzaman	Çoğunlukla	Bazen	Nadiren	Hiçbir zaman
1. Beginner Level Speaking dersine girdiğimde öğrencileri selamlarken					
2. Beginner Level Speaking dersine geç kalan öğrencileri uyarırken					
3. O günkü Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, ne işleneceğini açıklarken					
4. *İlkini İngilizce* yaptığım o günkü Beginner Level Speaking dersinde ne işleneceği ile ilgili aynı açıklamayı tekrar yaparken					
5. O günkü Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, işlenecek konuların ve aktitivitelerin amaçlarını açıklarken					
6. *İlkini İngilizce* yaptığım o günkü Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, işlenecek konuların ve aktitivitelerin amaçları ile ilgili aynı açıklamayı tekrar yaparken					
7. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, yeni/bilinmeyen kelimeleri açıklarken					
8. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, *ilkini İngilizce* yaptığım yeni/bilinmeyen kelimeler ile ilgili açıklamayı (anlamı, kullanımı gibi) yeniden yaparken					
9. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısını öğretirken ('would you like', 'can', 'comparatives and superlatives' gibi)					
10. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısını öğretirken ('would you like', 'can', 'comparatives and superlatives' gibi) *ilkini İngilizce* yaptığım açıklamayı yeniden yaparken					
11. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, öğrencilerin yaptıkları hataları düzeltirken (kelime, yapı, dilbilgisi gibi)					
12. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, kültürel öğeleri açıklarken (vending machine, family names gibi)					
13. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, aktivitelerin nasıl yapılacağını anlatırken ya da açıklarken					
14. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, *ilkini İngilizce* yaptığım, aktivitelerin nasıl yapılacağı ile ilgili açıklamayı tekrar yaparken					
15. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, öğrencilere dersle ilgili soru sorarken (listening task'da kaç kişinin konuştuğu, kitaptaki resimde neler olduğu gibi)					
16. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, öğrencilere dersle ilgili olmayan soru sorarken (bir öğrencinin neden yorgun göründüğü, arkadaşının neden derse gelmediği gibi)					

Aşağıdaki durumları okuduktan sonra, **Beginner Level Speaking Derslerinde**, hangi sıklıkla Türkçe kullandığınızı belirten en uygun seçeneğe ait kutucuğun içine (√) işareti koyunuz.

	Herzaman	Çoğunlukla	Bazen	Nadiren	Hiçbir zaman
17. Beginner level Speaking dersinde, öğrencilerin dersle ilgili sorularını cevaplarken					
18. Beginner level Speaking dersinde, öğrencilerin dersle ilgili olmayan sorularını cevaplarken					
19. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, öğrenciye olumlu dönüt verirken (aferin, iyi gibi)					
20. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, espri yaparken ve/veya fıkra anlatırken					
21. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, öğrencilerle söyleşirken					
22. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, dersin düzenini bozan ya da rahatsız edici davranışlarda bulunan öğrencileri uyarırken					
23. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, belli bir noktaya dikkat çekmek istediğim zaman					
24. Beginner Speaking dersinde ödev verirken					
25. Beginner Level Speaking dersini bitirirken					
26. Beginner Level Speaking dersinin sonunda vedalaşırken					
27. Diğer (lütfen yazınız ve uygun kutucuğu işaretleyiniz)					

Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, Türkçe kullanımıyla ilgili aşağıdaki her bir sebep için EVET ya da HAYIR kutucuklarından birine (√) işareti koyunuz.
Bu bölümü cevaplarken her bir sebep için BAZEN olasılığını düşündüğünüz durumlarda da EVET kutucuğunu işaretleyiniz.

Beginner Level Speaking derslerimde Türkçe kullanıyorum çünkü;

	EVET	HAYIR
1. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, öğrenciler İngilizce söylenen veya anlatılan herşeyi anlayabilecek düzeyde değiller.		
2. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, Türkçe kullanarak daha rahat anlatabileceğim birşeyi İngilizce anlatarak zaman kaybetmek istemiyorum.		
3. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, öğrencilerin İngilizce söylediklerimi yanlış anlamadıklarından emin olmak için bir de Türkçe söylüyorum.		
4. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, Türkçe kullandığım zaman öğrenciler bana cevap verme ve derse katılma konusunda daha istekli oluyorlar.		
5. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, öğrenciler benden herhangi bir sebeple Türkçe kullanmamı istiyorlar.		
6. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, öğrencilerle sohbet ederken Türkçe kullandığım zaman öğrencilerle daha iyi iletişim kurabiliyorum.		
7. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, yeni/bilinmeyen kelimeleri Türkçe daha iyi açıklayabiliyorum.		
8. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, yeni/bilinmeyen yapıları Türkçe daha iyi anlatabiliyorum.		
9. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, programda yer alan konuları belirlenen süre içinde yetiştirmem gerekiyor.		
10. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, Türkçe kullandığım zaman kendimi daha rahat hissediyorum.		
11. Diğer (lütfen yazınız ve uygun kutucuğu işaretleyiniz)		

BÖLÜM 2

Bu bölümde beginner level speaking derslerinde, hangi durumlarda Türkçe kullanılmasının uygun olduğu ile ilgili görüşleriniz alınacaktır. Her bir durum için fikrinizi ifade eden kutucuğun içine (√) işaretini koyunuz.

Aşağıdaki her bir durum için sizce Türkçe kullanılması uygun mudur?

	EVET	HAYIR
1. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, öğretmenin sınıf içi disiplini sağlayabilmesi için (öğrencilerden biri ders harici bir şeyle ilgilendiğinde, gürültü yaparak dersin akışını bozduğunda vb)		
2. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, İngilizce açıklanması zor bir kelime açıklanırken		
3. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, o gün neler yapılacağı anlatılırken		
4. Beginner Level Speaking dersinde, o günkü speaking dersinin ya da konusunun işlenme amaçları anlatılırken		
5. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, İngilizce açıklanan konu ya da kelime anlaşılmadığında		
6. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, bir aktivitenin nasıl yapılacağı ile ilgili açıklamaların uzun ve anlaşılması zor olduğu durumlarda		
7. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, bir aktivitenin nasıl yapılacağı ile ilgili İngilizce açıklamalar anlaşılmadığında aynı açıklamalar tekrar verilirken		
8. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, öğrencilerin İngilizce konuşma konusundaki endişe ve tereddütlerini azaltmak gerektiğinde		
9. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, öğretmen öğrencilerin hataları ile ilgili açıklama yaparken		
10. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, öğretmen kendi hataları ile ilgili açıklama yaparken (konuşurken ya da tahtaya yazarken yaptığı herhangi bir hata)		
11. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, kültürel farklılıkları/benzerlikleri anlatırken		
12. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, dersle ilgili bir konu hakkında konuşurken (speaking dersinde yapılan aktivitelerin nasıl olduğu ile ilgili, speaking notları ile ilgili vb)		
13. Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, dersle ilgili olmayan bir konu hakkında konuşurken (ameliyat olan bir öğrenci ile ilgili, önceki gün yaşanan ilginç bir olay ile ilgili vb)		
14. Diğer (lütfen yazınız ve uygun kutucuğu işaretleyiniz)		

BÖLÜM 3

Beginner level speaking derslerinde öğrencilerin sürekli İngilizce kullanmalarını sağlamak için **uygulanabilecek** yöntem ya da yöntemler konusundaki önerilerinizi aşağıda ayrılan yerlere açık bir şekilde yazınız.

(Mesela her Türkçe konuşan öğrenciden önceden belirlenen miktarda para alınıp, bu paranın sınıf kumbarasına konması gibi)

1. ……

……

……

……

……

2. ……

……

……

……

……

3. ……

……

……

……

……

Ankete zaman ayırdığınız ve içtenlikle cevapladığınız için çok teşekkürler

APPENDIX C

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

ADI ve SOYADI: ..... **BEGINNER ....**

Sevgili Öğrenci,

Bu anket Beginner Level Speaking Dersleri'nde ana dil-Türkçe'nin kullanımı ile ilgili bazı noktaları belirlemek amacıyla hazırlanmıştır. Anket, 2002-2003 Akademik yılının Güz Dönemi'nde Beginner Level Speaking Dersleri'ne giren öğrencilere uygulanacaktır. Ankete katılımınız derslerinizin notlarını etkilemeyecektir. Ancak sizin speaking derslerine farklı bir açıdan bakmanıza yardımcı olacaktır.

Anket 3 bölümden oluşmaktadır:

- Bölüm 1'deki sorular, Speaking Dersleri'nde Türkçe'yi kullanıyorsanız hangi durumlarda, hangi sıklıkla ve niye kullandığınızla ilgilidir.
- Bölüm 2'deki sorular, Speaking Dersleri'nde Türkçe'nin genelde hangi durumlarda kullanılmasının uygun olduğu ile ilgili görüşlerinizi almak için hazırlanmıştır.
- Bölüm 3 ise, Speaking Dersleri'nde öğrencilerin sürekli İngilizce kullanmalarını sağlamak için ne tür uygulamalar yapılabileceği konusundaki önerilerinizi almak amacıyla konmuştur.

Bu ankette yer alan hiç bir sorunun "doğru" ya da "yanlış" cevabı yoktur. Sorulara verilecek cevaplar kişiden kişiye değişebilir.

Anketi cevaplarken bütün işaretlemeleriniz için lütfen (√) işaretini kullanın.

Daha sonra katılacağınız yüz yüze görüşmeler bu ankete vereceğiniz cevaplarla bağlantılı olduğundan bu sayfa üzerinde ayrılan yere adınızı, soyadınızı ve sınıfınızı yazmanızı rica ediyorum.

Anket sonuçları istediğiniz takdirde size açıklanacaktır.

Bu anketle ilgili sormak istediğiniz herhangi bir şey olursa lütfen araştırmacı ile (MÜGE KANATLAR) temasa geçme konusunda tereddüt etmeyiniz.

LÜTFEN BU ANKETİ SADECE SPEAKING DERSLERİNİZİ DÜŞÜNEREK CEVAPLANDIRINIZ

ANKETE OLAN KATKINIZDAN DOLAYI ŞİMDİDEN TEŞEKKÜR EDERİM.

MÜGE KANATLAR
e-mail: gmkanatlar@anadolu.edu.tr
Tel: 0 222 3350580 2050/2052

BÖLÜM 1

Aşağıdaki durumları okuduktan sonra, **Beginner Level Speaking Derslerinde**, hangi sıklıkla Türkçe kullandığınızı belirten en uygun seçeneğe ait kutucuğun içine (√) işareti koyunuz.

	Her zaman	Çoğunlukla	Bazen	Nadiren	Hiçbir zaman
1. Dersin başında speaking öğretmenimi selamlarken					
2. Speaking dersine geç kaldığımda özür dilerken					
3. Speaking dersinde, bir kelimenin anlamını arkadaşıma/arkadaşlarıma sorarken					
4. Speaking dersinde, bir kelimenin anlamını speaking öğretmenime sorarken					
5. Speaking dersinde, bir kelimenin anlamını doğru bildiğimden emin olmak için yüksek sesle söylerken					
6. Speaking dersiyle ilgili bir gramer konusunu ya da yapısını arkadaşıma sorarken					
7. Speaking dersiyle ilgili bir gramer konusunu ya da yapısını speaking öğretmenime sorarken					
8. Speaking dersinde anlatılan gramer konusunu ya da yapısını anlayıp anlamadığımı kontrol ederken					
9. Speaking dersinde, yapılan hataları düzeltirken (kelime, yapı, gramer gibi)					
10. Speaking dersinde, herhangi bir activitenin nasıl yapılacağını anlamadığım zaman					
11. Speaking dersinde, herhangi bir activitenin nasıl yapılacağı ile ilgili bazı noktaları anlayıp anlamadığımı kontrol ederken (ikili mi yapıyoruz?, bu mu sorulacak?gibi)					
12. Speaking dersinde, bir arkadaşım ile aktivite yaparken					
13. Speaking dersinde, üç ya da daha fazla kişi ile grup çalışması yaparken					
14. Speaking dersinde, herhangi bir konuya dikkat çekmek istediğim zaman (imza atmayı unutan arkadaşlarımın olduğu, arkadaşımın yanlış aktiviteyi yaptığı gibi)					

Aşağıdaki durumları okuduktan sonra, **Beginner Level Speaking Derslerinde**, hangi sıklıkla Türkçe kullandığınızı belirten en uygun seçeneğe ait kutucuğun içine (√) işareti koyunuz.

	Her zaman	Çoğunlukla	Bazen	Nadiren	Hiçbir zaman
15. Speaking dersinde, arkadaşlarıma dersle ilgili (kelime ve gramer/yapı hariç) soru sorarken (hangi sayfadayız?, sınav nasıl olacak? gibi)					
16. Speaking dersinde, öğretmenime dersle ilgili (kelime ve gramer/yapı hariç) soru sorarken					
17. Speaking dersiyle ilgili (kelime ve gramer/yapı hariç) arkadaşlarımın sorduğu soruya cevap verirken					
18. Speaking dersiyle ilgili (kelime ve gramer/yapı hariç) öğretmenimin sorduğu soruya cevap verirken					
19. Speaking dersinde, arkadaşlarıma dersle ilgili olmayan bir konu hakkında soru sorarken (Dersten sonra ne yapacaksın?, Gribin geçti mi? gibi)					
20. Speaking dersinde, öğretmenime dersle ilgili olmayan bir konu hakkında soru sorarken (Hocam, bu kalem sizin mi?, Dışarıdan gelen ses nedir? gibi)					
21. Speaking dersinde, arkadaşlarımın speaking dersiyle ilgili olmayan bir konu hakkında sordukları soruya cevap verirken					
22. Speaking öğretmenimin dersle ilgili olmayan bir konu hakkında sorduğu soruya cevap verirken					
23. Speaking dersinin düzenini bozan ya da rahatsız edici davranışlarımın nedenini açıklarken; bu davranışlarım için özür dilerken					
24. Speaking dersinde, arkadaşıma/arkadaşlarıma iltifat ederken					
25. Speaking dersinde, öğretmenime iltifat ederken					
26. Speaking dersinde, espri yaparken ve/veya fıkra anlatırken					
27. Speaking dersinde, arkadaşımla/arkadaşlarımla sohbet ederken					
28. Speaking dersinde, öğretmenle sohbet ederken					
29. Speaking dersi ile ilgili öğretmenin verdiği ödevle ilgili konuşurken/soru sorarken					
30. Speaking dersinin bitiminde vedalaşırken					
31. Diğer (lütfen yazınız ve uygun kutucuğu işaretleyiniz)					

Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde, Türkçe kullanımıyla ilgili aşağıdaki her bir sebep için EVET ya da HAYIR kutucuklarından birine (√) işareti koyunuz.

Bu bölümü cevaplarken her bir sebep için BAZEN olasılığını düşündüğünüz durumlarda da EVET kutucuğunu işaretleyiniz.

Beginner Level Speaking derslerinde Türkçe kullanıyorum çünkü;

	EVET	HAYIR
1. speaking derslerinde, istediğim herşeyi İngilizce anlatabilecek düzeyde değilim.		
2. speaking derslerinde, Türkçe kullanarak daha rahat anlatabileceğim birşeyi İngilizce anlatmaya çalışarak zaman kaybetmek istemiyorum.		
3. speaking derslerinde, öğretmenin söylediklerini ya da anlattıklarını yanlış anlamadığımdan emin olmak istiyorum.		
4. speaking derslerinde, Türkçe kullandığım zaman derse katılma konusunda daha istekli oluyorum.		
5. speaking derslerinde, İngilizce konuştuğum zaman hata yapmaktan korkuyorum.		
6. speaking derslerinde yaptığımız aktivitelerin amaçları İngilizce konuşmamı anlamlı kılmıyor.		
7. speaking derslerinde, aktiviteleri yaparken İngilizce kullanmak İngilizcemi geliştirmiyor.		
8. speaking derslerinde,Türkçe kullandığım zaman kendimi daha rahat hissediyorum.		
9. Diğer (lütfen yazınız ve uygun kutucuğu işaretleyiniz)		

BÖLÜM 2

Bu bölümde beginner level speaking derslerinde, hangi durumlarda Türkçe kullanılmasının uygun olduğu ile ilgili görüşleriniz alınacaktır. Her bir durum için fikrinizi en iyi ifade eden kutucuğun içine (√) işaretini koyunuz.

Aşağıdaki her bir durum için sizce Türkçe kullanılması uygun mudur?

	EVET	HAYIR
1. Speaking derslerinde, öğretmenin sınıf içi disiplini sağlayabilmesi için (öğrencilerden biri ders harici bir şeyle ilgilendiğinde, gürültü yaparak dersin akışını bozduğunda, vs)		
2. Speaking derslerinde, İngilizce açıklanması zor bir kelime açıklanırken		
3. O günkü speaking dersinde neler yapılacağı anlatılırken		
4. O günkü speaking dersinin ya da konusunun işlenme amaçları anlatılırken		
5. Speaking derslerinde, İngilizce açıklanan konu ya da kelime anlaşılmadığında		
6. Speaking derslerinde, bir aktivitenin nasıl yapılacağı ile ilgili açıklamaların uzun ve anlaşılması zor olduğu durumlarda		
7. Speaking derslerinde, bir aktivitenin nasıl yapılacağı ile ilgili İngilizce açıklamalar anlaşılmadığında, aynı açıklamalar tekrar verilirken		
8. Speaking derslerinde, öğrencilerin İngilizce konuşma konusundaki endişe ve tereddütlerini azaltmak gerektiğinde		
9. Speaking derslerinde, öğretmen öğrencilerin hataları ile ilgili açıklama yaparken		
10. Speaking derslerinde, öğretmen kendi hataları ile ilgili açıklama yaparken (konuşurken ya da tahtaya yazarken yaptığı herhangi bir hata)		
11. Speaking derslerinde, kültürel farklılıkları/benzerlikleri anlatırken		
12. Speaking derslerinde, dersle ilgili bir konu hakkında konuşurken (speaking dersinde yapılan aktivitelerin nasıl olduğu ile ilgili, speaking notları ile ilgili vb)		
13. Speaking derslerinde, dersle ilgili olmayan bir konu hakkında konuşurken (ameliyat olan bir öğrenci ile ilgili, önceki gün yaşanan ilginç bir olay ile ilgili vb)		
14. Diğer (lütfen yazınız ve uygun kutucuğu işaretleyiniz)		

BÖLÜM 3

Beginner level speaking derslerinde siz öğrencilerin sürekli İngilizce kullanmalarını sağlamak için **uygulanabilecek** yöntem ya da yöntemler konusundaki önerilerinizi aşağıda ayrılan yerlere açık bir şekilde yazınız.

(Mesela her Türkçe konuşan öğrenciden önceden belirlenen miktarda para alınıp, bu paranın sınıf kumbarasına konması gibi)

1. ……

……

……

……

……

2. ……

……

……

……

……

3. ……

……

……

……

……

Ankete zaman ayırdığınız ve içtenlikle cevapladığınız için çok teşekkürler

APPENDIX D

MANUAL

HOW TO FILL IN THE OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

TEACHER		STUDENT(S)		
CATEGORIES	**WHAT?** (in the native language)	**CATEGORIES**	**INTERACTION**	**WHAT?** (in the native language)
1. To greet the students	**You can write single words or phrases such as 'Günaydın, nasılsınız' but if the greeting is too long, write as much as you can (first 4-5 words)**	1. To greet the teacher	**S-T S-S**	**You can write single words or phrases such as 'Günaydın, nasılsınız' but if the greeting is too long, write as much as you can (first 4-5 words)**
2. To warn the student who is late	**If it isn't too long write as much as you can.**	2. To apologize for being late	**S-T S-S**	**If it isn't too long write as much as you can.**
3. To explain today's lesson/topic/activities or the aim of the lesson/topic/activities- directly in Turkish	**Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**			
4. To repeat today's lesson/topic/activities or the aim of one of these- given in English earlier	**Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**			
5. To explain a new structure/grammar point (ie. would you like, can I) - directly in Turkish	Structure/grammar point - **Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**	5. To ask a question on a structure/grammar point	**S-T S-S**	Structure/grammar point - **Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**
6. To repeat the instruction of a structure/grammar point - given in English earlier	Structure/grammar point - **Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**	6. To check if s/he understood a particular structure/grammar point	**S-T S-S**	Structure/grammar point - **Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**
7. To explain new/unknown vocabulary items - directly in Turkish	Word - **Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**	7. To ask the meaning of a vocabulary item	**S-T S-S**	Word - **Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**
8. To repeat the explanation of a vocabulary item - given in English earlier	Word - **Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**	8. To check if s/he understood the meaning of a particular vocabulary item	**S-T S-S**	Word - **Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**

9. To correct mistakes (vocabulary, structure, grammar, etc)	Word – **Write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....** Structure/grammar - **Write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**	9. To correct mistakes (vocabulary, structure, grammar, etc)	**S-T S-S**	Word – **Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....** Structure/grammar - **Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**
10. To explain the cultural aspects in English (family names; vending machine, etc)	About – **Topic**			
11. To ask a question relevant to the lesson/course	**If it isn't too long write as much as you can. If it is too long write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**	11. To ask a question relevant to the lesson/course	**S-T S-S**	**Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**
12. To ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course	**If it isn't too long write as much as you can. If it is too long write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**	12. To ask a question irrelevant to the lesson/course	**S-T S-S**	**Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**
13. To answer a question relevant to the lesson/course	**If it isn't too long write as much as you can. If it is too long write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**	13. To answer a question relevant to the lesson/course	**S-T S-S**	**Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**
14. To answer a question irrelevant to the lesson/course	**If it isn't too long write as much as you can. If it is too long write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**	14. To answer a question irrelevant to the lesson/course	**S-T S-S**	**Write as much as you can then leave the rest with ....**
15. To explain how an activity will be done-directly in Turkish	**Activity/Exercise __ (in the book page: __)**	15. To check if s/he understood the instruction(s) of an activity	**S-T S-S**	**Activity __ (in the book page: __)**
16. To repeat the instruction of an activity-given in English earlier	**Activity __ (in the book page: __)**	16. When s/he doesn't understand the instruction(s) of an activity	**S-T S-S**	**Activity __ (in the book page: __)**
17. To praise (aferin, güzel gibi) or to make a compliment	**Write as much as you can**	17. To make a compliment	**S-T S-S**	**You can write as much as you can**

18. To draw the student(s)' attention to a certain point/issue	**If it isn't too long write as much as you can. If it is too long write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**	18. To draw one's attention to a certain point/issue	**S-T S-S**	**If it isn't too long write as much as you can. If it is too long write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**
19. To warn a student about his/her disturbing behaviour	**If it isn't too long write as much as you can. If it is too long write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**	19. To explain the reason(s) of a bad behaviour/attitude or to apologize for it	**S-T S-S**	**If it isn't too long write as much as you can. If it is too long write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**
20. To tell a joke / for humour	About – **Topic (It should be as clear as possible)**	20. To tell a joke / for humour	**S-T S-S**	About – **Topic (It should be as clear as possible)**
21. To chat	About – **Topic (It should be as clear as possible)**	21. To chat	**S-T S-S**	About – **Topic (It should be as clear as possible)**
22. To give homework	**Write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**	22. To ask/talk about homework	**S-T S-S**	**Write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**
23. To end the lesson	**Write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**			
24. To say goodbye	**If it isn't too long write as much as you can. If it is too long write as much as you can then leave the rest with .....**	24. To say goodbye	**S-T S-S**	**Çok uzun değilse aynen yazılacak. Çok uzunsa, yazabildiğiniz kadarını yazıp .... Şeklinde bırakabilirsiniz**
Other(s)	**If you can't put the Turkish use into any of the categories above, write such uses in this part.**	**Other(s)**	**If you can't put the Turkish use into any of the categories above, write such uses in this part.**	

FIELD NOTES

Please write down your impressions about

- the effect of your presence (as an observer) in the classroom on students,

……

……

……

……

……

- the effect of L1 use - if any – on students and/or classroom atmosphere,

……

……

……

……

……

- the other issues you would like to share.

……

……

……

……

……

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT

APPENDIX E

GRADING SCALE

GRAMMAR 30		
5. accurate and appropriate use of grammar with few noticeable errors which do not affect communication	**30**	
4. occasional use of grammar errors which do not, however, affect communication	**24**	
3. frequent use of grammar errors which occasionally may affect communication	**18**	
2. use of grammar errors which affect communication	**12**	
1. use of grammar errors (even in basic structures) result in disrupted communication	**6**	
VOCABULARY 30		
5. accurate and appropriate use of vocabulary with few noticeable wrong words which do not affect communication	**30**	
4. occasional use of wrong words which do not, however affect communication	**24**	
3. frequent use of wrong words which occasionally may affect communication	**18**	
2. use of wrong words and limited vocabulary which affect communication	**12**	
1. use of wrong words and vocabulary limitations (even in basic structures) result in disrupted communication	**6**	
INTELLIGIBILTY 20		
5. easily understandable	**20**	
4. little difficulty in being understood	**16**	
3. occasional difficulty in being understood	**12**	
2. frequent difficulty in being understood	**8**	
1. difficult to understand	**4**	
FLUENCY 10		
5. natural flow of speech with minimal hesitation	**10**	
4. occasional hesitation, which do not interfere with communication	**8**	
3. frequent hesitations, which occasionally may affect communication	**6**	
2. usually hesitant that affect communication	**4**	
1. no connected speech result in disrupted communication	**2**	
TASK ACHIEVEMENT 10		
5. tasks completed fully	**10**	
4. tasks completed adequately	**8**	
3. tasks completed almost adequately	**6**	
2. tasks completed inadequately	**4**	
1. tasks not completed	**2**	
TOTAL	**100**	

APPENDIX F

CONSENT FORM

I agree to participate in the investigation aiming at having more beneficial speaking lessons. My participation is VOLUNTARY. It has been made clear by the researcher that my participation in the present study will not prejudice my future exam results at Anadolu University, The School of Foreign Languages, English Department, which I attend. I have also been assured that my name will be kept anonymous and my video-recordings will be used only for academic purposes.

In this study conducted by Müge Kanatlar, I am expected to take two oral interviews which will be held in March and June.

Name & Surname:

Date:

Signature:

KABUL FORMU

Müge Kanatlar tarafından yürütülen ve speaking derslerinin daha verimli hale getirilmesini amaçlayan araştırma gereği 2002-2003 öğretim yılının Mart ve Haziran aylarında yapılacak olan sözlü mülakatlara katılmayı GÖNÜLLÜ olarak kabul ediyorum.

Bu katılımımın, halen okumakta olduğum Anadolu Üniversitesi İngilizce Hazırlık Okulu'ndaki notlarımı etkilemeyeceği, iznim olmaksızın adımın kullanılmayacağı ve mülakatlar sırasında yapılacak olan çekim kayıtlarının sadece bilimsel amaçlar için kullanılacağı araştırmacı tarafından bildirilmiştir.

İSİM VE SOYAD:

TARİH:

İMZA:

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW PROCEDURE

As soon as the student come into the room, please don't forget to ask the student's name, surname and class and then write them in the given list. The interview consists of two parts. In the next section, each part is explained in detail:

GREETING

First, ask the students to introduce themselves. Then you can introduce yourself briefly.

PART 1 PICTURE TALK

After asking and writing down the student's name, surname and class in the list, give the following instruction and the colorful picture:

Talk about this picture. Describe whatever you see in the picture.

- While the student is talking about the picture, do not interrupt the student in any way. Only if the student asks a question about a word, structure, etc., you can answer.
- If the student does not talk or want to talk, ask, "ok anything else?"

PART 2 TALKING AND ASKING/ANSWERING ABOUT LAST SUMMER

After the student finishes talking about the picture, give the student the slip that begins with *Last summer I …..*

And the following instruction:

Talk about what you did last summer. After you finish,
I will ask you questions about the details of your last
summer which you don't mention.

If the student doesn't understand the instruction, you can paraphrase the same instruction for once. However, if s/he doesn't still understand, you can repeat the instruction in Turkish.

When the student finishes talking about his/her last summer, ask at least three questions about the details the student has not talked about.

Later, give the following instruction.

Now, I will talk about my last summer. Listen to me carefully
and after I finish, ask me at least 3 questions about the details of my last summer which I don't mention.

If the student doesn't understand the instruction, you can paraphrase the same instruction for once. However, if s/he doesn't still understand, you can repeat the instruction in Turkish.

After talking about the last summer in your slip in a natural way, answer the student's questions.

In the following section, the possible occasions that you may confront during the interviews are listed. Moreover, what you are expected to do on such occasions are explained.

- The students may use inaccurate/inappropriate vocabulary, structure, etc. Please do not tend to correct their questions. If you don't understand the question, follow common and natural communication flow (you can say 'again please', 'sorry?' etc.).
- If the student doesn't talk/ask want to talk/ask, you can kindly ask "ok do you want to talk/ask/go on?"
- When the student talks or asks something in Turkish, please reply them in English. If still the student doesn't understand, then you can speak Turkish.
- If the student asks you about his/her performance after the interview, please give them encouraging answers such as 'quite good', 'I think it was ok'. Even if the student's performance is weak, never use discouraging comments such as 'not so good', 'it could have been better', and 'so so'. Do not go into detailed assessment about their performances such as 'you should have talked about physical appearances of the people in the picture', 'you don't know irregular verb forms'.
- Please do not forget to switch off the video camera as soon as the student goes out.
- If any other problems occur, I will be around.

APPENDIX H

APPENDIX I

ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Student's Name: **Moderator's Name:**
Grader's name:

AMMAR
of basic structures

6 Use of basic structures with no deviations
5 Use of basic structures with few deviations (e.g. plural form, s-v agreement, articles) which do not affect communication
4 Use of basic structures with occasional deviations (e.g. plural form, s-v agreement, articles) which do not affect communication
3 Use of basic structures with few deviations (e.g. genitives, incorrect tense or preposition, modals) which affect communication
2 Use of basic structures with occasional deviations (e.g. genitives, incorrect tense or prep, modals) which affect communication
1 Use of very few or incomplete basic structures which affects communication to the extent that the listener has to guess or infer meaning

CABULARY

Use of accurate and appropriate vocabulary with no deviations
Use of accurate and appropriate vocabulary with few deviations which do not affect communication
Use of accurate and appropriate vocabulary with occasional deviations which do not affect communication
Use of accurate and appropriate vocabulary with few deviations which affect communication
Use of accurate and appropriate vocabulary with occasional deviations which affect communication
Use of very few or limited vocabulary which affects communication & makes the listener guess or infer meaning

ty
Use of rich variety of vocabulary
Use of average variety of vocabulary
Use of limited variety of vocabulary

ELLIGIBILITY

Speech is fully intelligible with no sound deviations
Speech is fully intelligible; few sound deviations but do not seriously distract the listener
Speech is largely intelligible, occasional sound deviations occur but requires an amount of listener effort to understand the message
Speech is reasonably intelligible, but significant listener effort is required due to speaker's sound deviations
Speech is largely unintelligible; great listener effort is required
Speech is basically unintelligible; only occasional word/phrase can be recognized

ENCY

Natural flow of speech with no hesitations
Natural flow of speech with minimal hesitation
Occasional hesitations, which do not disturb the listener nor affect communication
Frequent hesitations, which occasionally disturb the listener and/or affect communication
Usually hesitant that demands unreasonable patience of the listener and substantially affects communication
No connected speech which results in severely disrupted communication

REFERENCES

Al-Busaidi, Suaad Bader. "An Investigation of Teachers' and Students' Attitudes Towards the Use of Mother Tongue in the English Foreign Language Classrooms in Oman." Unpublished MA Dissertation. The University of Reading, 1998.

Allwright, Dick. & Bailey, M. Kathleen. **Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Atkinson, David. "The Mother Tongue in the Classroom: A Neglected Resource?", **ELT Journal** 41: 241-247, 1987.

Atkinson, David. **Teaching Monolingual Classes.** London: Longman, 1993.

Auerbach, Elsa Roberts. "Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom", **TESOL Quarterly** 27: 9-32, 1993.

Aydın, Belgin. **A Study of Sources of Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety in Speaking and Writing Classes.** Eskişehir: Anadolu University, 2001.

Buckmaster, Robert. "Using L1: What Kind of Sin?" **http://www.iatefl.org.pl/nletter/nletter18/nletter18_2.html**, 2000.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne. **Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language**. Boston:Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 1991.

Chaudron, Craig. **Second Language Research: Research on Teaching and Learning**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Cole, Simon. "The Use of L1 in Communicative English Classrooms" **http://langue.hyper.chubu.ac.jp//jalt/pub/tlt/98/dec/cole.html**, 2001.

Collingham, Monica. **Making Use of Students' Linguistic Resources**. In S. Nicholls & E. Hoadley-Maidment (Eds.), Current Issues in Teaching English as a Second Language to Adults, (pp. 81-85). London: Edward Arnold, 1988.

Cook, Vivian. "Using the First Language in the Classroom" **http://www.utpjournals.com/product/cmlr/573/573-Cook.html**, 2001.

Duff, Patricia A. & Polio, Charlene G. "How Much Foreign Language is There in the Foreign Language Classroom?", **The Modern Language Journal** 74: 154-166, 1990.

Ellis, Rod. **Classroom Second Language Development**. Oxford: Pergamon, 1984.

Ellis, Rod. **The Study of Second Language Acquisition**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Galloway, Ann. "Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction and Sample Activities" **http://www.cal.org/ericcll/digest/gallow01.html**, 1993.

Gass, Susan. "Integrating Research Areas: A Framework for Second Language Studies", **Applied Linguistics** 9: 198-217, 1988.

Hawks, Phil. "A Discussion of the Use of Mother Tongue in the Foreign Language Classroom" **http://www.geocities.com/CollegePark/Classroom/1930/Journal/May2001/Hawks-Tongue.html**, 2001.

Ho Fong Wan Kam, Belinda. "A Diary Study of Teaching EFL through English and Chinese to Early Secondary School Students in Remedial English Classrooms" **http://ericir.syr.edu/ plweb-cgi/ fastweb?getdoc+ericdb2+ericdb+840104 +0+ wAAA+%2...** , 1985.

Jr. Schweers, C. William. "Using L1 in the L2 classroom" **http://www.pep.com.cn/yingyu/fmagazine/ET%20Forum/Using%20L1.htm**, 1999.

Karslı, Ece Selva. "The Inter-Rater Reliability of Two Alternative Analytic Grading Scales for the Evaluation of Oral Interviews at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages." Unpublished MA Thesis. Bilkent University, 2002.

Krashen, Stephen. **Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition**. New York: Pergamon, 1982.

Levine, Glenn S. "Student and Instructor Beliefs and Attitudes about Target Language Use, First Language Use, and Anxiety: Report of a Questionnaire Study", **The Modern Language Journal** 87: 343-364, 2003.

Martin, David. "How to Be an Effective EFL Teacher" **http://www.eflpress.com/ how_to_be_an_effective_efl.html**, 2000.

Murphey, Tim & Sasaki, Tsuyoshi. "Japanese English Teachers' Increasing Use of English" **http://langue.hyper.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/pub/tlt/98/oct/murpsasa.html**, 1998.

"Need Help Urgently" **http://teachers.net/mentors/esl_language/ topic1925/5.29.01. 07.23.16.html**, 29. 05. 2001.

Phillipson, Robert. **Linguistic Imperialism**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Piasecka, Krystyna. **The Bilingual Teacher in the ESL Classroom**. In S. Nicholls & E. Hoadley-Maidment (Eds.), Current Issues in Teaching English as a Second Language to Adults, (pp. 97-103). London: Edward Arnold, 1988.

Polio, Charlene G. & Duff, Patricia A. "Teachers' Language Use in University Foreign Language Classrooms: A Qualitative Analysis of English and Target Language Alternation", **The Modern Language Journal** 78: 313-326, 1994.

Prodromou, Luke. "From Mother Tongue to Other Tongue" **www.thrace-net.gr/bridges/bridges5/From%20Mother%20Tongue%20to%200ther%20Tonge.html**, 2000.

Reis, Luis Augusto V. P. "The Myths and the Practical Needs of Using L1 in EFL Classes", **FORUM** 34: 61-66, 1996.

Richards, Jack C. & Rodgers, Theodore S. (Eds.) **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Rolin-Ianziti, Jeanne. "Teacher Use of Learners' Native Language in the Foreign Language Classroom" **http://www.utpjournals.com/product/cmlr/583/583-Rolin.html**, 2002.

Takahashi, Taeko. "Teachers' L1 Use in the Classroom and Its Influence on the Students" **http://www.les.aston.ac.uk/lsu/diss/ttakahashi-1.html**, 1996.

Toyama, Setsuko, Viney, Peter, Helgesen, Marc, Barnard, Roger, & Edge, Julian. "To What Extent Should I Use the Students' Native Language in Class?" **http://www.eltnews.com/columns/ thinktank/June.shtml**, 2000.

Turnbull, Miles. "Analyses of Core French Teachers' Language Use: A Summary" **http://www.unb.ca/slec/Events/Actes/Turnbull.html**, 2000.

Turnbull, Miles. "There is a Role for the L1 in Second and Foreign Language Teaching, But ..." **http://www.utpjournals.com/product/cmlr/574/574-Turnbull.html**, 2001.

van Lier, Leo. "Programming Excellence: A Curriculum for Foreign Language Education" **http://www.epsb.edmonton.ab.ca/passport/Leo_van_Lier.htm**, 2000.

Zhang, L. Xia. "Rethinking the Role of Mandarin for EFL Instruction in Taiwan" **http://home.pchome.com.tw/education/wujf/EFL/mothertongue.html**, 2000.