Teacher Trainees' Use Of Mother Tongue in EFL Classes: A Case Study

Perihan KORKUT[1], Sabriye ŞENER [2]

Abstract

There are different views about the use of native language of learners (L1) in second and foreign language (FL) classes depending on different theoretical frameworks. Some hold the view that maximum exposure to the target language is necessary but some others favour the use the L1. In the English language teaching (ELT) departments, trainees form a clearly established philosophy regarding the L1 issue by the end to their training and increase their consciousness during their practicum. However, since they have little practical experience, these philosophies might not always translate to effective classroom practices. This is a case study which aims to capture the degree of congruence between six teacher trainees' stated beliefs and intentions and their actual performances related to L1use in the FL classroom. The trainees' lessons during their practicum demo lessons were recorded and stimulated recall interviews were held. The findings indicate that the trainees who strictly believe that L1 should be kept to a minimum acted in line with this philosophy. On the other hand, trainees who advocate some certain functions to L1 in the classroom, acted differently from their stated philosophies.

Öğretmen Adaylarının Yabancı Dil Sınıfında Ana Dili Kullanma Biçimleri: Bir Vaka İncelemesi

Öz

Farklı teorik çerçevelere bağlı olarak, ikinci ve yabancı dil sınıflarında öğrencilerin ana dili kullanımı hakkında farklı görüşler vardır. Bazıları, hedef dile azami maruz kalmanın gerekli olduğu görüşünü savunurken bazıları da ana dilin (D1) kullanımı görüşünü kabul etmektedirler. İngiliz dili eğitimi (ELT) bölümlerinde, eğitimlerinin sonuna doğru öğrenciler, D1 meselesi ile ilgili ana dilin yabancı dil sınıflarında nasıl kullanılması gerektiği hakkında belirli bir felsefe oluştururlar ve uygulama okullarına devam ederken bilinçlerini arttırırlar. Vaka incelemesi türündeki bu çalışmada farklı görüşlerdeki altı öğretmen adayının ana dili kullanımına ilişkin ifade ettikleri inançları ve sınıfta yaptıkları uygulamaların ne kadar uyuştuğu incelenmiştir. Bunun için öğrencilerin 2016-2017 akademik yılı bahar döneminde öğretmenlik uygulaması dersi kapsamında yaptıkları dersler kaydedilmiş ve uyarılmış geri çağırma yöntemi ile görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Ana dilin kullanımının kesinlikle sınırlandırılması gerektiği görüşünde olan öğretmen adaylarının derslerinde bunu uygulamaya koydukları, ancak ana dilin yasaklanmaması gerektiğini düşünen grup içindeki öğrencilerin başlangıçtaki düşüncelerinden farklı davrandıkları belirlenmiştir.

[1]Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Türkiye, pkocaman@mu.edu.tr
[2]Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Türkiye, sabriyesener@mu.edu.tr

Introduction

There have been mixed tendencies regarding the issue of whether or not to allow students' mother tongue (L1) during the lessons throughout the history of language teaching. The followers of the grammar-translation method used L1 and believed that through the study of the grammar of the target language, learners would become more familiar with their own native language and write their native language better (Larsen-Freeman and Anderson, 2011). However, the direct method advocates in the early 20th century did not allow any translation, and believed that meaning should be conveyed directly in the target language through the use of demonstration and visual aids, and concluded that there was no need to use the students' native language (Larsen-Freeman and Anderson, 2011). The following developments in education brought about a more developed method called Situational Language Teaching, and Oral Approach or Situational Language Teaching in Britain and, Audio Lingual Method in the United States. Based on behaviourism, these approaches banned L1 completely from the ELT classroom in order to avoid interference. In humanistic approaches, Total Physical Approach, Desuggestopedia, Community Language Learning, and The Silent Way, L1 was used at the elementary levels and, the teacher used the NL less and less when the level of the learners proceeded. L1 was used to increase security, to lower anxiety, and to establish rapport (Larsen-Freeman and Anderson, 2011).

Ellis (2011) claims that the difference between opposing views emerge from different theoretical frameworks. The interactionist perspective holds that maximum exposure to input is required for acquisition. Thus, L2 instead of L1 must be preferred at all costs. Sociocultural theory, on the other hand, accepts L1 use as a valuable cognitive tool for scaffolding L2 production. In addition, theories of motivation also support L1 use.

A useful terminology was presented by Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher (2015): the virtual, maximal, and optimal positions regarding L1 use. The virtual position holds that L1 is the lazy teacher's thing and should be kept to a minimum during the lessons. The position which says L1 can be allowed to some extent in order to facilitate learning but the overuse of it will be counter-productive is called the maximal position. The optimal position sees the learners not as poor imitators of the target language monolinguals but developing bilinguals. Therefore, it supports the view that L1 should be accepted and embraced as a part of their bilingual identity.

The virtual position is the result of the interactionist view and language acquisition studies (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher, 2015). According to this view, students must get as much exposure as possible. The only way of acquiring a language is using it in communicative situations. For example, Gardner and Gardner (2000) strongly recommend using L2 for all classroom instruction. Similarly, when students have limited L2 proficiency, Parks (2015) proposed using some strategies such as employing different materials, task-based activities, dictionaries, and hand gestures and miming instead of just switching to their L1. Harmer (2001) goes as far as claiming that the time when students are not using the target language is a waste of time. He advises that teachers should not use L1 so that students will not be compelled to do so. Gabrielatos (2001) also warns that learners and teachers should be sensitive to excessive L1 use in foreign language classes.

Auerbach (1993) published an article which caused a big debate because she challenged the virtual position. It was a good example of *the maximal position*. She claimed that the decision must be left to the learners. The teachers shouldn't enforce this or that language. Elridge (1996) looked at code switching in learners' language and argued that using L1 is a strategy which has short term benefits but "with a risk of hampering long term acquisition" (p.310). Harbord (1992) admits that L1 is a learner-preferred strategy and cannot be prohibited according to humanism. It also saves time to shortly translate an expression without distracting the task at hand. However, he also points out the dangers of overusing it because students will become too dependent on L1 translations to the point of trying to avoid L2 for all the classroom tasks. Therefore, it should be used and allowed sparingly. According to Cook (2001) deciding to use L1 instead of L2 should depend on some conditions; efficiency (if something can be done more effectively in L1); learning (if it will help students' learning); naturalness (if students feel more comfortable as in natural code switching); and external relevance (if it will help students use the target language better outside the classroom) (p413). Therefore, it is advised that the teachers should

use L1 or L2 as a result of a "dynamic interaction based on evidence and reflection" (Macaro, 2005, p.82).

The optimal position holds that virtual and maximal positions are essentially the same thing because they both see students' L1 as a deficiency which can be prohibited or allowed (Macaro, 2005). "The reason to allow primary language use in foreign language classrooms is that using it can actually be more beneficial to target language acquisition and to the goal of eventual proficiency in the target language than exclusive or near-exclusive use of the target language would be" (p. 330). This view sees students as emerging bilinguals and the teachers should model them. The classroom, then, is not a discourse separated and distinct from the students' mother tongue; on the contrary, it is a language environment where the two languages are intertwined so that the classrooms can make use of L1 use and model the bilingual society and how to function as a bilingual in conversations.

The research related to L1 use depend mostly on the functions of L1 in the classroom (Elridge, 1996; Salı, 2014; Üstünel, 2009; Gulzar, 2010; Harbord, 1992; Kafes, 2011; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2015; Polio & Duff, 1994; Paker & Karaağaç, 2015). They try to understand when and why the teachers and learners prefer using L1. In the light of these findings, the authors discuss the implications in line with their own views. The effect of using L1 is also investigated in experimental design studies (see for example Kahraman, 2009).

Another line of research is related to the teacher's (Salı, 2014; Sarıçoban, 2010; Solhi & Büyükyazı, 2011; Schweers, 1999, Bilgin, 2015) and learners' (Kayaoğlu, 2012) attitudes and views regarding L1 use. The findings are discussed under the light of which attitude is supported. These stated attitudes, beliefs, and values, however, might not be reflected completely in day-to-day reality of the classroom. For example, Cai and Cook (2015) found that the teachers used much more Chinese (the students' L1) in their English lessons than they had stated in the interviews. Also van der Meij and Zhao (2010) calculated that the teachers spoke L1 seven times more frequently than they thought. Similarly, in a study by Paker & Karaağaç (2015) the questionnaire results did not match to the observations. In their study, Duff & Polio (1990) noticed a gap between a teacher's perception and actual practice. Upon reflection, he had said that more than half of his lesson was in L2, but recordings showed that in fact it was only 10 % of the lesson.

This is a follow-up study for a previous study (Şener & Korkut, 2017). Having identified the trainees' views, perceptions, and suggestions regarding L1 use in the FL classroom in the previous study, this study was set up to find out how these views and perceptions were reflected in their practicum demo lessons during the teaching practice.

The Previous Study

Starting from the view that the success of any teacher education program in part depends on how much is known about the trainees, the researchers investigated pre-service teachers' views, perceptions and suggestions, which revealed their awareness levels regarding the L1 use in the FL classroom. The study gave important information about not only the current status of the awareness levels of the teacher trainees, but also the effectiveness of observation protocols in inducing systematic reflection.

The participants of the previous study were 41 pre-service ELT teachers who were seniors in a state university in Turkey during the fall term of 2015-2016 academic year. The trainees had held observations at various state schools and filled in structured observation forms with accompanying reflection questions as a requirement of their School Experience course. The researchers analysed their responses to this observation protocol using general qualitative data analysis procedures and Fairclough's (2003) discourse analysis methods.

The participants' comments clustered around 3 main themes; pros and cons of using L1 in the FL classroom, purposes or functions of L1 in the FL classroom, and the amount of L1 that should be found in the FL classroom. It was found that they were aware of the pros and cons of using L1 in the FL classroom and they seemed to have developed a systematic view about when, how and to what extent L1 should be allowed. Most of the participants' responses indicated that they were more close to the maximal position; they indicated that they will use L1 in their classes in a systematic way without

overusing it (51.4 %). Nevertheless, there were also students who were in a closer position to the optimal (37.8%) and the virtual positions (10.8%).

The purpose of the current study was to capture the degree of congruence between the teacher trainees' stated beliefs and intentions and their actual performances related to mother tongue (L1) use in the FL classroom. Therefore, the research questions that this study sought to address were:

1. To what extent are the trainees' stated views, perceptions and suggestions reflected in their lessons?
2. How are their views, perceptions and suggestions affected from the practical experience they gained?
3. What are (if any) other factors than their views that affects the L1 use in their practice lessons?

Method

This is a case study. The six participants were chosen purposefully based on the findings of the previous study (Şener & Korkut, 2017). These participants were observed and recorded during their demo lesson, which was a requirement of Teaching Practice, held with a real class in a state school. Then, the participants were called for stimulated recall interviews.

Participants and Setting

6 trainees were chosen from different views regarding L1. Two trainees who frowned upon L1 use in the FL classroom (the virtual position) were chosen. Two other trainees were chosen from among those who think that L1 has certain advantages but should be kept to a minimum (the maximal position). The last two trainees were more positive about L1 use; they had stated that L1 would definitely have a place in their classes (the optimal position). In order to establish their views again, they were interviewed and confirmed their results from the previous study. They signed consent for the study.

Data Collection

The trainees planned for demo lessons to be video recorded. Each lesson lasted a normal lesson period (approximately 40 mins). After the video recordings, a stimulated recall interview was scheduled with each trainee. In order to ensure comparability to the previous research, the categories that emerged in the previous study were turned into guiding questions. Before the interview, the researchers watched the videos and decided on which parts were in line with their stated views and which were not. By this way, they determined some moments to ask in the stimulated recall interview. The trainees were also given the permission to stop when they wish to contribute a point. Each trainee was interviewed by either of the researchers and audio-recorded.

Data Analysis

The stimulated recall interviews were transcribed and both of the researchers worked on the transcripts individually first. They identified the similarities and differences in the trainees' expressions from the previous research and during the stimulated recall interview. After that, the researchers came together in order to clear out emerging issues.

The results were presented with relevant excerpts from the data of both studies. The findings from the previous study were used to analyse the extent to which their views were reflected in their practices (RQ1), to compare how their views were affected from their teaching practice (RQ2), and to what extent the differing practices were attributable to their views (RQ3).

Results

In this section, the results of the video observations and subsequent stimulated recall interviews were presented. As a first step, the lessons and interviews of students belonging to each position were described separately. Then, the sets of students were compared to each other in terms of the research questions.

All participants' names were changed with pseudo-names for ethical reasons.

Virtual Position: Neriman and Esin

During the interview, both of the students stated very similar opinions about the use of the mother tongue to those they had stated in the previous study. For example, Neriman had observed in the previous study the role of anxiety in language choice:

They felt anxiety when teacher started to use L2. Students didn't want to use L2 because they have never exposed to L2 before. (Neriman – previous study)

In-line with those statements, she stressed her concern about the students' affective states in her demo lesson. She said that Turkish cannot be banned from the classroom for anxiety reasons. Similarly, Esin's interview themes concurred with her statements from the previous study. In both times, she stressed the advantages of beginning English from early ages. She also told an anecdote from her own learning to support her ideas during the interview:

When I was in high school, our teacher was very strict about using only English. I used to feel so bad. So I think high school was too late. The earlier the better and it is good not to compromise because otherwise, the students will think that English is something to memorize. (Esin SR interview)

Both Neriman and Esin used mainly English during their demo lessons. Neriman used L1 only once. When asked why she turned to Turkish at that point she said She said she was not paying attention that's why it happened. She used body language and explained in simpler English rather than using L1. This is again in-line with what she had said in the previous study.

I don't prefer L1 in the lesson. When the students don't understand I can use demonstrations, gestures and mimics, body language, intonation and tone and I pay attention to my speed while speaking English instead of L1 use. I want students to make inference the meaning of unknown words or sentences. (Neriman, previous study)

Esin used mainly English. In a few instances of Turkish, she operated the computer, she made one-sentence switches. When we asked her about these instances, she said she was anxious, these switches were done without thinking.

I really care so much that they don't use Turkish. In that instance, I wasn't paying attention, it was my fault, I wasn't thinking. (Esin, SR interview)

It seems from this answer that she cannot accept even her own Turkish during the classroom. She denies any conscious choice of it. This greatly echoes her sharp expressions in favour of an English-only classroom from the previous study.

My philosophy in using L1 in language classroom is that no matter what the result is I won't let L1 use in classroom, because they have to learn not only for exams but also for the rest of their life.(Esin, previous study)

When the students asked about their afterthoughts about their language choice in their demo lessons, both were content about their choices. Esin had not changed her philosophy in the application phase of the practicum. Neriman, however, has become milder in her position after the demo lesson. She became nearer to the maximal position. The following excerpt comes from her interview:

I think this way; if I teach the primary school, and if my students are very young in age maybe I can use Turkish and English together. Maybe more often English; but Turkish would also be used. If my students are older, I can have all the lessons in English only. (Neriman's interview)

Maximal Position: Osman and Melis

When they were asked about the pros and cons of using Turkish in their classrooms, Osman said "If Turkish is used extensively, this can limit the opportunity for exposure to input and the acquisition is not supported. However, if the entire lesson is in English, it can be boring." Melis said "Their English will not improve if you let them speak in Turkish." These views are greatly congruent with their statements from the previous study. For example, the following excerpt comes from Osman's statements in the previous study. One can easily see the resemblance in terms of the idea that English will be boring and Turkish will be fun and attractive:

We should sometimes use L1 in the classroom for motivating the students, making some explanations or some jokes to attract the attention of the students.(Osman, previous study)

In their demo lessons, both Osman and Melis used Turkish extensively. All the explanations and instructions were given in Turkish. When asked why they did so, both of the students blamed the students' levels for the amount of Turkish in their lessons.

Their level is really low. If you watch carefully, that student does not even understand the question. Most of the students are like him. It is so upsetting to see this situation but it is so. (Osman, SR interview)

I don't know if the others would understand, had I not translated it, but considering their levels, I can say that most of them would be lost. (Melis, SR interview)

This is completely in line with their statements from the previous study.

It is difficult to use L2 during the whole lesson because students' level is not enough to understand and speak English. (Melis, previous study)

It would be too difficult to go on in English if the students' level is low, but the teacher should do his/her best to use as much English as possible. (Osman, previous study)

As can be seen, most of the students referred to the students' level as an important determiner of the amount of L1 in the classroom. According to them the teacher should adjust the amount of English according to the students' levels.

Neither Osman nor Melis was content with their choices. Both stated that they would not use as much L1 if they actually had their own classes. There were some external issues that caused them not to perform as they liked. Osman stated that since this was a show to the instructor, he wanted to show as many activities as he could. If it was his own classroom, he would have been more relaxed and plan for fewer activities in one session. Melis also pointed out the existence of the university instructor in the classroom as an evaluator. She reported something that captures the situation well:

If only I could see that at least a few people understood me, maybe I could have continued in English. Because when nobody understands but I speak English anyway, I think it is nothing more than a show for you (the instructor). It is like I get my point and not care about the students' learning which is not at all like that in reality. I wanted the lesson to be useful for them. These thoughts led me to speak more Turkish in my demo lesson. (Melis, SR interview)

In addition to this, both of them were concerned that students would not understand them if they used English. Apparently, they lack the strategies for making the input comprehensible in L2 for their students. However both Melis and Osman had mentioned these strategies in the previous phase:

When I realized when they did not understand me I would try to act and then use L1. (Melis, previous study)

If they don't understand me I will use body language and use very simple words. But if they still don't understand me then I will translate the sentence they don't understand. (Osman, previous study)

It seems, then, that despite the fact that they can list a few strategies to use when students don't understand, they had not operationalized these strategies to be able to use in their actual lessons, yet. Seemingly, contrary to their beliefs that a teacher must try to have as much English as he/she can in the lesson, they felt helpless against the situation. They blamed the system and the level of the students but did not propose any concrete solutions for these problems. They just stated that they hoped they would do better when they had their own classes.

Optimal Position: Bade and Ebrar

When asked about the pros and cons of using mother tongue in the classroom, Bade did not mention about any good or bad sides of using L1. In the previous study however, she had mentioned the affective benefits of using L1 such as the security and motivation it provides.

If L1 wasn't used there was little attention to the lesson. Students could be bored easily because they had difficulty in learning. (Bade, previous study)

Ebrar, on the other hand, emphasized the importance of giving students time to get used to the situation. In her opinion, they should begin using English when they are ready. During the interview, it was clearly seen from what she said that her opinion regarding L1 use remained unchanged:

I would not present English as a completely foreign concept. (Ebrar, SR interview)

In their actual teaching performance, Bade and Ebrar assumed different approaches. In Bade's lesson, she used L1 in a limited way. She mostly spoke in English with occasional short code-switches within sentences. For example "*What is rüya görmek in English?*" , "*It is like sessiz sinema*". She used gestures very often. In one instance, she skipped the instruction completely. When the students spoke in L1 she responded in English like Melis, she also had a student who translated instructions for the class. When asked about this student, she said it was natural. "*They were trying to understand*" she said. In the stimulated recall interview, the researcher interrogated this behavior further. When asked why she let students speak in L1, her comment was as follows:

"They were used to doing it but of course it shouldn't be that way." (Bade, SR interview)

Similarly, in the previous phase of the research she had stated:

As learners should be relaxed as possible in learning, target language should not be completely used in the class. Learners should not be forced to speak, they should be encouraged. (Bade, previous study)

We can observe that her opinion that the students should not be forced to use L1 continues. However, her opinion that the courses should include L1 has slightly changed hence the comment "it shouldn't be that way" during the second phase. Bade herself admitted this change:

Actually I was anxious about my grade. That was why I tried to stick to English. I had not expected that the students would be able to follow so I was surprised. I did not know so much English was possible in that class. I am motivated. I don't think all English classes are impossible any more. My views have changed. (Bade, SR interview)

Ebrar, unlike Bade, depended on Turkish extensively in her lesson. She made the explanations in Turkish and translated some parts of the book for the students. When asked about her opinions about L1 use, she reflected:

We cannot just assume that they did not have any language before coming to the class. They do have a language and it is a means for thinking. The reality is that I am Turkish, and they are Turkish. We are trying to reach a goal or solve a problem so what is more natural than talking in our common language? (Ebrar, SR interview)

We can say that Bade and Ebrar represent two different types of optimal position students. Bade had prejudices and smashed them thanks to her effort of presenting a good show to her instructor whom she believed would be expecting a full L2 lesson to give a high grade. She saw, to her surprise, that speaking English during the whole lesson did not cause stress on her students and the students understood and functioned comfortably in her lesson. Ebrar's concerns were not about prejudices about full L2 classes, but rooted deeper into her epistemological beliefs about language learning. She tried to act consistently with her beliefs.

Comparison of the three positions

In terms of the congruence between their stated views and practices, we can talk about the best match is in the two virtual position trainees and Bade, who was one of the optimal position group. The observations and the subsequent stimulated recall interviews clearly showed that the trainees' views and perceptions were not reflected in the lessons of the maximal position group. Maximal position group claimed that L1 should be kept to a minimum in order to maximize the use of the target language. However, both Osman and Melis talked in the L1 almost entirely in their lessons. They clearly stated their regret for having used so much L1 and blamed the students' level, or the teaching practice system for the reason of failing to avoid L1 in their lessons.

When we look at the changes in the trainees' views after the experience, the most radical change happened in Ebrar's views. She was initially at the optimal position with regards to L1 use, however, her views changed to maximal position after having successfully presented a demo lesson which was entirely in the target language. Both Neriman and Esin became more tolerant about the use of L1, but still stuck to the idea that L1 is unnecessary most of the time during their stimulated recall interviews. Both trainees of the maximal position failed to live up to their claims in their demo lessons, however, they had not changed their views after the teaching practice experience.

Considering the lessons and interviews of the three groups, it was found that there were other factors than their views influencing their choices of language. These were the students' levels, the classroom atmosphere, and the system. A recurring theme was the students' levels in almost all six interviews. For example, Neriman from virtual position group said during the interview;

Students were a little bit surprised because they were expecting a written thing, they were not expecting a song. That's why they could not participate in the beginning. I was able to do this exercise in English entirely because their levels are high but for example if they were in a lower level, I could have no other options than explaining it in Turkish but again, I would not speak in Turkish during the exercise any more. (Neriman, SR interview)

In all groups, there was at least one trainee who attributed their use of L1 to the established routines and practices of the classroom. For example, Melis from the maximal position and Ebrar from the optimal position had students who translated everything for the rest of the class. This was part of their classes' existing traditional ways. Osman and Melis stated that they had to act according to the way students were already used to. This was one of the reasons for not choosing L2 in their lessons.

Several issues related to the teaching practice system were brought up by the students. First of all, the trainees did not have enough time to establish routines and a classroom atmosphere suitable for conducting a lesson which is in line with their beliefs. The existence of a mentor or a supervisor who oblige them to use more L2 or less L1 is another factor. Ebrar, for example, falsely thought that it was a requirement of the teaching practice lesson to hold the demo lessons in English. This mistake was a happy coincidence for her because she felt better and more motivated about her profession thanks to this incident.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study showed the extent of match between the pre-service teachers' stated beliefs about L1 use and their actual practices in the L2 classroom. Changing students' beliefs is not an easy task. Beliefs that are rooted in the teachers' previous experience as a student can be more resistant to changing with education (Göksu, Büyükkarcı & Genç, 2013). On the other hand, practicum is a crucial period in a teacher's education because they find the chance to apply theory into practice. In this study, four of the six participants maintained their initial views after the teaching experience. Two of them changed their views based on their actual teaching experiences. Esin, who had supported the virtual view, and Bade, who had initially been in the optimal position, came closer to the maximal position.

Including Esin and Bade who changed their minds based on their experience, all of the virtual and optimal position students were content with the amount of L1 they had in their classes; however, both of the maximal position students regretted their choices. Contradiction between the stated philosophies and actual classroom performances can be seen even with experienced teachers (Polio & Duff, 1994) so it was not surprising to see that our students could not exactly behave according to their stated beliefs. They are developing teachers, so maybe they have not found how to maintain an all L2 class yet. Besides, their reflections during the interviews include the same types of problems that teachers typically count as reasons for switching to students' L1. The influence of examination regime (Cai & Cook, 2015), making the meaning clear to students who do not understand (Paker & Karaağaç, 2015), and practical purposes such as saving time (Harbord, 1992; Kayaoğlu, 2012) are common problems that in-service teachers also frequently put forward as the reason for switching to students' L1.

It was a striking finding that although we had found that more than half (51.4%) of the students systematically supported the maximal position with regard to L1 use in the school experience study, the

only students who failed to live up to their claims were both from this view. May be taking the middle path rather than supporting the other two extremes was more attractive for some students. Not having paid so much thought on the subject, the teacher might use L1 haphazardly, "as a response to the constraints imposed upon her by curriculum and examination demands, an idiosyncratic textbook, pedagogic traditions, and the limitations of her own English" (Cai & Cook, 2015, p.243).

The findings of this study lead us to three important implications;

• Actual experiences can change the students' views and perceptions as in the situation of Esin and Bade. We should keep a close eye on what they take out from their school experience.

• Theoretical knowledge does not necessarily translate into practice as in the situation of Osman and Melis. We should provide them with more chances to try themselves in actual teaching.

• If not understood well, maximal position can backfire. Therefore, maximal position should be emphasized more by allotting more time and more examples for how and when to allow L1 in the L2 classrooms. We are not saying that we should "impose" a view, but at least the students should not be allowed to get away with a superfluous thinking and quick choice from their teacher training.

References

Auerbach, E.R. (1993). Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1). Retrieved from www.ncela.us

Bilgin, S.S. (2015). *Code switching in ELT teaching practice in Turkey: Teacher practices, beliefs and identity*. Unpublished thesis. The University of Warwick, Centre for applied linguistics.

Cai, G., & Cook, G. (2015). Extensive own-language use: A case study of tertiary English language teaching in China. *Classroom Discourse, 6*(3), 242-266. DOI: 10.1080/19463014.2015.1095104

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

Dailey-O'Cain, J., & Liebscher, B. (2015). Primary language use in foreign language classrooms. In M.Bigelow & J. Ennser-Kananen (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Educational Linguistics* (pp.327-338). New York: Routledge.

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

Ellis, R. (2011). *The study of second language acquisition (2nd ed.)*. China: Oxford University Press.

Elridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal, 50*,4, 303-311.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Gabrielatos, C. (2001). L1 use in ELT: Not a skeleton, but a bone of contention. A response to Prodromou. *Bridges, 6*, 33-35.

Gardner, B. & Gardner, F. (2000) *Classroom English*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Göksu, A., Büyükkarcı, K., & Genç, B. (2013). The effect of practicum on the discipline orientations of pre-service teachers. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 1(1), 2-10.

Gulzar, M. A. (2010). Code-switching: Awareness about its utility in bilingual classrooms. *Bulletin of Education and Research, 32*,2, 23-44.

Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal, 46* (4), 350-355.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language learning (3rd ed.)*. China: Pearson Education Limited.

Kafes, H. (2011). A Neglected resource or an overvalued illusion: L1 use in the foreign language classroom. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications. 2*, 2, 128-140.

Kahraman, A. (2009). The role of mother tongue in fostering affective factors in ELT classrooms. *English as an International Language Journal, 5*, 107-128.

Kayaoğlu, M.N. (2012). The use of mother tongue in foreign language teaching from teachers' practice and perspective. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 32*, 2, 25-35.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching (3rd ed.)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E.Llurda (Ed.). *Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp.63-84). Springer: New York.

Özçelik, N. (2013). Mother tongue use in French foreign language classrooms. Turkish Studies - *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 8*, 10, 541-553.

Paker, T., & Karaağaç, Ö. (2015). The use and functions of mother tongue in EFL classes. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 199*, 111-119.

Parks, S. (2015). Maximizing target language use in a pre-service practicum: Tensions, power,and identity formation. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign language, 19*, 1-12.

Polio, C., & Duff, P.A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 313-326.

Salı, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System, 42*, 308-318.

Sarıçoban, A. (2010). Should Native Language Be Allowed in Foreign Language Classes? *Eğitim Arastırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 38*, 164-178.

Schweers, W. Jr. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 37*, 2, 6-9.

Şener, S., Korkut, P. (2017).Teacher trainees' awareness regarding mother tongue use in English as a foreign language classes.*Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13*(1), 41-61.

Solhi, M., & Büyükyazı, M. (2011). The use of first language in the EFL classroom: A facilitating or debilitating device? In Proceedings of the *1st International Conference on Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Üstünel, E. (2009). *The Sequential Organization of Code-Switching in EFL Classrooms*. Verlag Dr. Müller: Saarbrücken.

Van der Meij, H., & Zhao, X. (2010). Codeswitching in English courses in Chinese universities. The Modern Language Journal, 94(3), 369-411. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01090.x0026-7902/10/396–411

Yatağanbaba, E., & Yıldırım, R. (2015). EFL teachers' code-switching in Turkish secondary EFL young language learner classrooms. *International Journal of Linguistics, 7*, 1, 82-101.