

c-1

Acc 42138

9
25
25
25
25
25

JIMMA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
(TEFL MA PROGRAM)

Exploring the use of First language in 'English Focus' EFL
Classrooms: Focus on Jimma Teachers' College.



0042138/001

By:

Jemal Abdulkadir Kelilo



January 2012

P
29
.J46
2012
Doc.

Exploring the use of First language in 'English Focus' EFL
Classrooms: Focus on Jimma Teachers' College.

**A thesis Submitted to the College of
Social Sciences and Law, TEFL MA program**

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

**In partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

BY

Jemal Abdulkadir Kelilo

January 2012

Jimma University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank Allah, the almighty God, for giving me the courage and firmness to complete this study. Dr. Jamil has been the ideal thesis adviser. His wise advice, insightful criticisms, and patient encouragement aided the writing of this thesis in innumerable ways. I am heartily thankful to him for his supervision and support from the preliminary to the concluding level.

I would also like to thank Ato Taklu and Wakjira G for their steadfast support and unreserved professional and technical guidance without which this thesis wouldn't have been a reality. Also my kindest thanks go to Kate (VSO volunteer) for her relentless effort in reading through the thesis and picking up the impurities.

Finally, I would like to take chances to express my thanks to 'English Focus' students and their teachers at Jimma Teachers College for all their positive cooperation during the data collection process of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
Acknowledgements.....	i
Table of content.....	ii
List of tables.....	v
List of appendices.....	vi
List of abbreviations.....	vii
Abstract.....	viii
Chapter One:	
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the problem.....	4
1.3. Objectives of the Study.....	7
1.4. Significance of the Study.....	8
1.5. Scope of the study.....	9
1.6. Limitation of the study.....	9
Chapter Two	
2. Review of Related Literature	10
2.1. The Ban of L1 throughout the history of EFL.....	10
2.2. Reasons for Banning L1 Use	15
2.2.1. The L1 Acquisition View.....	16
2.2.2. The Language Compartmentalization View.....	18.
2.2.3. Provision of the Maximum Target Language View.....	20
2.3. Factors Favoring L1 Use	21
2.3.1. Arguments forwarded to discredit the English-only approach.....	21
2.3.1.1 The Impracticality of L1 Free Foreign Language Class.....	21
2.3.1.2 Native Teachers Paradox.....	22
2.3.1.3 Exposure Alone not Being Sufficient for Learning.....	22
2.4. Advantages of Using the Mother Tongue.....	23
2.4.1 Humanistic Element.....	23
2.4.2 Preferred Learning Strategy.....	24

2.4.3 Time Saving Device.....	24
2.5 The Role of L1 in EFL Classroom.....	25
2.5.1. The Pedagogical Role.....	25
2.5.2. The Psychological Role.....	27
2.5.3. The Socio- Cultural Role.....	28
2.6 Attitudes of Students and Teachers towards the Use of L1 in EFL classr00m.....	29
2.7. Purposes for which Teachers and Students use L1.....	30
2.8. Empirical Research on the Use of L1 in the EFL Class.....	33
2.9. Amount of L1 and Learners level.....	34

Chapter Three

3. Research Methods.....	36
3.1 Research Design.....	36
3.2. Participants.....	36
3.3. Samples and Sampling Procedure	37
3.4. Pilot test	38
3.5. Methods of Data Collection.....	38
3.5.1. Questionnaire.....	39
3.5.2. Interview.....	40
3.5.3. Observation.....	40
3.6. Techniques of Data Analysis.....	41

Chapter Four

4. Results and Discussion	42
4.1. Analysis of Students' and Teachers' Questionnaire.....	42
4.1.1. Characteristics of the Respondents.....	42
4.1.2. Issues related to L1 Presence.....	43
4.1.3. The Extent to which L1 is Used.....	45
4.1.4. Purposes for which L1 is Used.....	49
4.1.5. Attitudes toward L1.....	54
4.1.6. Attitude Difference among the Groups.....	59
4.1.7. Attitude difference between Sexes.....	61

4.2. Summary of Interview Data.....64

Chapter Five

5. Conclusions and Recommendations.....69

5.1. Conclusions.....69

5.2. Recommendations.....72

References.....73

Appendices.....78

List of Tables

Table 4.1.2.1 Presents students' responses to the issue related to whether Oromo language is present in L2 classroom.

Table 4.1.2.2 Teachers responses to the issue related to whether Oromo language is present in L2 classroom.

Table 4.1.3.1. Students' preferred amount of Oromo language in EFL classrooms

Table 4.1.3.2. Teachers preferred amount of L1 in L2 classroom

Table 4.1.4.1. Purposes for which students use L1

Table 4.1.4.2. Purposes for which teachers use L1

Table 4.1.5.1. Students attitudes toward Oromo language use in EFL classrooms

Table 4.1.5.2. Teachers attitude towards the use of Oromo language in EFL class

Table 4.6. Groups' attitude difference F-test result

Table 4.7. Genders attitude difference on the use of L1

List of Appendices

Appendix A. Questionnaire completed by students.....	78
Appendix B. Questionnaire completed by teachers.....	81
Appendix C. Interview Items for the teachers.....	84
Appendix D. Questionnaire completed by students (Afan Oromo Version).....	85
Appendix D. Observation checklist	

List of Abbreviations

FL- Foreign Language

EFL- English as a Foreign Language

ESP- English for specific purposes

TL- Target language

L1- First language, native language, mother tongue

L2- Second/Foreign Language

MT- Mother tongue

Abstract

There has been an age old debate on whether to use the students' first language in a foreign language classroom or not among teachers and educators (Brown, 2000). L1 opponents argue against its use because they believe that it reduces learners' L2 exposure while those in favor of it claim that judicious use of L1 facilitates L2 learning. The researches carried out so far validated the judicious use of L1 to be facilitative. Inspired by this, the present study set out to examine 'English Focus' students' and their EFL teachers' use of Oromo language in the EFL classrooms of Jimma Teachers college. To this end, a mixed research method involving quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection was employed. The study was conducted on 78 representative students drawn from 1st, 2nd and 3rd year 'English Focus' total student population and six EFL teachers of Jimma Teachers college. In order to investigate the use of Oromo language (L1) in EFL classrooms, distinct questionnaires addressing students and their EFL teachers were developed and employed as a major tool to assess issues like L1 presence, preferred amount, purposes for which it is used, the attitudes of students and teachers toward L1 use and others. Furthermore, open-ended interview to the teachers and classroom observations were used as supplementary data collecting tools.

The results revealed that Oromo language was used in college 'English Focus' EFL classrooms for various functions and the attitudes of the students and teachers about using Oromo were also generally positive. In spite of few functions for which students felt the use of L1 was inappropriate, teachers and students were in most cases in agreement about when L1 should be used or when a teacher should use L1. It was also confirmed that the students' preferred amount of L1 varied from year of study to year of study. First year students claimed 5.5-7.5 minutes or 11-15% out of L2 class time while Second years' claim was 3-5 minutes or 6-10%. The least amount (less than 2.5 minutes or <5% out of L2 class time) was claimed by Third year students. What's more, statistically significant difference was found between the attitudes of first year and third year students. Their L1 need went on dropping as their L2 experience increased with the stay at the college. Similarly, male and female students in the categories were also found to have statistically significant differences in their attitudes toward EFL classroom L1 use. L1 use in L2 classroom does mean a lot to female students than male students. Overall findings do indicate possible support for the use of L1 in the L2 classroom.

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the study

The debate over whether English language classrooms should include or exclude students' native language has been a contentious issue for a long time (Brown, 2000). In recent years, researchers have shifted their attention towards exploring the role that L1 plays in L2 classroom as the issue has become very pressing. Both teachers' and students' perspectives were considered and an increasing number of researchers stress the growing methodological need in TEFL for a principled, systematic and judicious way of using the mother tongue in the classroom (Burden, 2000, 2001; Critchley, 1999; Janulevičienė & Kavaliauskienė, 2002; Kavaliauskienė & Kaminskienė, 2007; Schweers, 1999; Tang, 2000). These researches strongly advocate that the use of L1 in the L2 classrooms can be productive or may even be necessary at times (e.g., Atkinson, 1987; Bolitho, 1983; Choffey, 2001; Frankenberg-Gracia, 2000; Harmer, 2001; Hawks, 2001; Langer, 2001; Murakami, 1999; Prodromou, 2000).

Apart from giving the theoretical roles of L1, some of these (e.g., Choffey, 2001; Deller, 2003) have demonstrated the many ways in which L1 can be used constructively in the L2 classrooms. Several others (e.g., Harmer, 2001; Nunan and Lamb, 1996) give useful advice on the importance of the occasional use of students' first language. One of the most pioneering works in the constructive use of L1 has been carried out by Atkinson (1987). He claims "The potential of mother tongue, as a classroom resource is so great that its role should merit considerable attention and discussion in any attempt to develop a 'Post-communicative Approach' to TEFL for adolescents and adults". He offers three general reasons for allowing a limited L1 use in the L2 classroom: as a learner preferred strategy, as a humanistic approach, and as an efficient use of time. Acknowledging the importance of the occasional use L1, Willis (1981: XIV) on her part indicates that there are times to drop English, for example, to explain the meaning or use of a new word, to explain the aim of the lesson or the next activity, to check students' understanding



0042138/001

after the presentation, and to discuss the main ideas after a reading passage in pairs. It is possible to learn from the scholars' argument that L1 can have productive pedagogical, affective and socio-cultural roles to play in the L2 classroom.

In the Ethiopian Context in general and Oromia in particular, English is taught as a foreign language. Being a foreign language, the only place learners are expected to have access to the language is in the school. But, English has long been distanced from being a medium of instruction particularly in schools in Oromia. This was done without creating an alternative opportunity for students to help them to enhance their English language ability. The situation badly affected the students' ability to communicate in English. Because of their poor proficiency resulted from limited exposure and other factors, students undoubtedly experience problems in learning English through English. As a consequence, learners often show need for mother tongue use in their English classes even at the college level.

The situation in Jimma Teachers' college, which is the focus of this study, is not different from this. Jimma Teachers' College is a regional college located in Jimma town about 350kms to the south west of Addis Ababa. The college was established to meet the objectives of the New Education and Training policy of the Federal government of Ethiopia (1994), which gives the regional states the right to develop and run their own education system. The policy also gives regional states the right to establish colleges to train teachers for primary school, second cycle (5-8) and other education personnel at diploma level. Accordingly, the former Jimma Teachers Training Institution was upgraded to Jimma Teachers Training College in July 1996/1988 E.C after nearly 30 years as a TTI. Besides, the policy gives the regional states the right to decide their respective language of instruction. Consequently, Oromo language is adopted as the instructional language of the training with the exception of Amharic and English Subjects.

Since its inauguration, one can say that, the college has made a good start on the way to meet the growing regional demand for qualified primary school, second cycle teachers and other educational personnel required at this level of education system. The college trains teachers and awards Diplomas in teaching different subjects. Afan Oromo, Amharic, English, Geography, History, Civics, Chemistry, Biology, are some among others. Recently, however, the mode of

training has shifted to (10+3). This follows the revision of the curriculum which merges the subjects and awards cluster diplomas to graduates making them responsible for teaching more than two subjects. It is, thus, difficult to differentiate between Afan Oromo and English Focus students during the first two years of their stay in the college as the courses they take are the same. Their differences only begin to emerge in their third year of study when the English Focus students take more English courses. The change in the curriculum also brought about a change in the administrative structure. The English Department is classified under Language stream which heads the three departments (Amharic, English and Afan Oromo). It does not have its own department head and authorized activities to run on its own. Yet, it has 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year 'English Focus' cluster diploma students.

The students, like in any other teacher training college in Ethiopia, came to the college with a ESLCE result less than what universities often require. According to the information obtained from the English Department, they joined the department based on their choice and their English language EGCE grade. They all speak Oromo language as their first language. Going back to their academic history, one will surely find the inadequate exposure they had to English language. Hence, the judicious use of L1 could have socio-cultural, affective and pedagogic roles to play in EFL classroom. But, teachers and students should know why, when and how much of L1 to use it effectively.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The issue of learners' first language (L1) use in EFL classroom has been a contentious subject among teachers and researchers for centuries. Reading through the research into second language acquisition (SLA), one realizes that the role of learners' first language (L1) has been a hotly debated issue. Prodromou (2000) consolidates this view referring to the mother tongue as a 'skeleton in the closet', and Gabrielatos (2001) refers to it as a 'bone of contention'. Such views are simply a mere reflection of the different methodological shifts in English Language Teaching, which have brought about new and different outlooks on the role of the mother tongue.

The rationale being that proficiency in English is achieved through exposing learners as much as possible to the target language, learners L1 is mercilessly pushed out of the EFL classroom at all levels during early days of language teaching (Auerbach, 1993). A proponent of the monolingual approach, Krashen has argued that people learning foreign languages follow basically the same route as they acquire their mother tongue, hence the use of the mother tongue in the learning process should be minimized (1981). Generations of FL teachers have shared this perception, together with phases of guilt, frustration or inadequacy even when practice suggested the mother tongue approach (Mattioli, 2004; Macaro, 2001). Since then the view continued to have its influence on language teaching all over the world.

Jimma Teachers' College English Department is no exception to this world wide influence. Instructors in the College, like any other EFL teachers, have long been in a dilemma as to the use of the students' first language in L2 class. On the one hand, there has been an English-only philosophy that has been influencing them for years. On the other, they face a challenge in the class because the English language teaching philosophy they hold and the classroom reality fall apart. My experience in the college as an English language teacher also reflects this. The researcher himself often feels discomfort or feels at least unhappy about using it even when a compelling need arises in the class. He often overlooks the students open demand for his L1 use in teaching English as a foreign language. He feels and does so because he believes that English class time at the tertiary level should be devoted to English language use. In the end, however,

the researcher realized that students find it terribly difficult to understand; a view shared by many colleagues of his. But, with a little use of Oromo language, he began to see many changes in the class. Though many teachers seem to be convinced by the classroom reality that learners' first language should be used in EFL classes, they feel uneasy about using it, permitting its use in the classroom or talking about the fact that they use in the class. This is firstly because the value of using the mother tongue in EFL class is a neglected topic in literature on TEFL methodology. Secondly, there has been the widely advocated principle that the native language should not be used in the foreign language classroom. This idea of prohibiting L1 use increases especially when it comes to the tertiary level.

Throughout the world, there has been very little research done on the use of L1 in EFL classroom and on the perceptions of students and teachers. Schweers (1999), perhaps a pioneering work, investigated the use of L1 in his monolingual Spanish-speaking classes in Puerto Rico. He noted that a high percentage of students (over 80%) found the use of L1 in the classroom useful. Most cite the following as instances when they find L1 use the most useful: to explain difficult concepts; when they feel lost; to feel more comfortable and confident; to check comprehension; to define new vocabulary items. Even though all teachers reported using the L1 to some degree, they saw a place for a more restricted use of the L1 than students in the situations mentioned above. A similar study carried out by Tang (2000) in Chinese university context reported that teachers and students have a positive attitude towards the use of Chinese as L1 in their EFL class. Burden (2001) also investigated the attitudes of 290 students and 73 teachers at five universities in Japan. The results showed that both students and teachers believe in the importance of L1 in explaining new vocabulary, giving instruction, talking about tests, grammar instruction, checking for understanding and relaxing the students. Inspired by what Schweers has done in EFL context, Kavaliauskiene and Januleviciene (2007) sought to explore the teachers' attitudes towards the L1 use in teaching ESP and examined if the learners need any translation at intermediate and advanced levels. The most important observation in this research was the supportive and facilitating role of L1 in ESP classroom. Outcomes are all in favor of the *judicious use* of L1 in English language classes, and consider its application an important learning tool. Advocates of this theory do not deny the benefits of FL exposure and practice, but



are aware that responsible mother tongue use can save classroom time which can be devoted to other learning activities.

With regard to the local studies related to the issue in hand, one can find only few researches. In the study he tried to determine the L1- L2 proportion in junior secondary school, Amharic context, Tafesse (1998, as cited in kenenisa, 2003) reported that there was an overuse of Amharic in the English classrooms. In the context of Oromo Language, Italo (1998, as cited in kenenisa, 2003) compared Oromo language and the English segmental phonemes with its implications for English language teaching. His findings suggested that there are areas of difficulties of pronunciation among Oromo learners of English that English teachers need to consider. Perhaps a more relevant study, even though on limited sample, was carried out by Kenenisa (2003) to assess college first year students and EFL teachers' classroom use of L1. His findings indicate that teachers and students use L1 in their EFL classroom for different functions and had positive attitude towards its use. His subjects were 50 first year English major students who received their primary and secondary school education in English and 2 EFL teachers in the then called Adama Teachers college. Since then, no attempt has been made to further investigate the role of Oromo Language in L2 classroom on subjects of different background, varying stay in the college and a relatively larger sample size eventhough the continued curriculum revision has created a completely different situation. Specifically, no study has been carried out at Jimma Teachers College to investigate 'English Focus' students' and their teachers' views toward L1 use, their preferred amount and the purposes for which they use L1 in L2 classrooms. Besides, the nature of the students L1 need from one year of study to the other has never been considered by any of the researchers so far. Again, the preceding researches didn't report anything about genders L1 need in L2 classroom. So, the present study is carried out with the intention of bridging this gap.

1.3. Objectives of the study

Influenced by the long held English-only teachings, teacher educators in the college seem to be still in dilemma as to the use of first language in the EFL classroom. Although L1 has long been distanced from EFL classroom based on the view that English class should be devoted to English teaching only, recent research outputs report that the idea of teaching English only through English is impractical. This means that traditionally learners L1 is pushed out of EFL class without any empirical evidence justifying its influence in L2 acquisition. As a result learners' first language is consequently denied the position it probably deserves. So, this study aims to examine 'English Focus' students and their teachers use of Oromo language in their EFL classroom.

Main Objective

This study aims to examine 'English Focus' students and their teachers use of Oromo language in their EFL classrooms.

Specific Objectives

Specifically, this study strives to

-
- See whether Oromo language is used by college 'English Focus' students and their EFL teachers in their EFL classroom.
 - Determine the Students and Teachers preferred amount of Oromo Language.
 - Identify the Purposes for which Oromo language is used in the target classrooms
 - Investigate 'English Focus' students' attitude towards the use of Oromo language in their EFL classrooms.
 - Assess EFL Teachers' attitude towards the use of Oromo language in EFL classroom.
 - See if there is statistically significant difference among the attitudes of the students in different years of study towards the use of L1 in their EFL classrooms.
 - Examine if there is a statistically significant attitude difference between male and female students toward the use of L1 in L2 classroom.
-

Research questions

To address the above specific objectives, the following leading questions were followed.

1. Is Oromo language used in the English Focus EFL classrooms at the college level?
 2. For how long do students want to use Oromo Language in their EFL classrooms?
 3. For how long do EFL teachers want to use Oromo Language in their EFL classrooms?
 4. What are the purposes for which Oromo Language is used in college EFL classrooms?
 5. What are the students' attitudes towards the use of Oromo language in EFL classrooms?
 6. What are the teachers' attitudes toward the use of Oromo language in EFL classrooms?
 7. Is there difference among the attitudes of the students in the years of study towards L1 use in their EFL classroom?
 8. Do male and female students' differ in their attitudes toward L1 use in EFL classroom?
-

1.4. Significance of the Study

It is hoped that the findings of the present study will be of the following significance.

- It may enable educational personnel to recognize the actual practices.
- Language teachers can make use of the findings and become aware of the role L1 plays in teaching and learning the target language.
- It could help teacher educators to re-examine their foreign language teaching methodology at the teacher training centers.
- Language Teachers could use them as an input to prepare modules and/or design activities that consider students L1 need
- Material writers & syllabus designers may use the findings to consider learners' L1 while preparing teaching materials and designing the syllabus.
- It might stimulate Language teaching methodology researchers to conduct further research in the area which may open the way to the development of a new English language teaching method and techniques that work to incorporate L1 use in the EFL classroom.

1.5. Scope of the Study

The present study confined itself to first, second and third year regular diploma students majoring in English and the English language instructors offering courses to these students at Jimma Teachers' College. The college is preferred because it is the working area for the researcher and hence creates a convenient environment in terms of proximity and likely cooperation from the students and instructors. The English Department is chosen because the researcher believes that most teachers do not expect to encounter this issue among English major students; they are supposedly/reasonably proficient in English.

1.6. Limitation of the study

Because of time and financial constraints, it was beyond thinking for the researcher to scale up and have the research conducted in more than one of Oromias' teacher education colleges. As a result participants were all taken from Jimma Teachers College. But, the researcher believes that the result obtained would have been proved to be more comprehensive and reliable if the samples of the study had been taken from more than one teacher training colleges of Oromia.

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In order to provide theoretical contexts to the study, a review of related literature has been made. The review is based on the theoretical concepts and available research works on L1 use in L2 class.

2.1. The Ban of L1 throughout the history of EFL

A quick look at the history of L1 use in the L2 classroom reveals periodic but regular changes in how it is viewed (Auerbach, 1999). Several hundred years ago (in 16thc) bilingual teaching was the 'norm', with students learning through translation. Thus, as clearly stated in the history of the development of English language teaching methods (e.g., Howatt 1984), using L1 in L2 classroom was a respected view and was almost a universal and readily accepted idea particularly during the era of the Grammar Translation Method.

But later in 19th century, according to Howatt, 1984, the grammar translation method lost favor because of several factors. There was number of serious objections; the main problem being the lack of every day realistic spoken language content that managed to reverse the trend and proclaim the English-only policy. This method, many believed, led to students' inability to use EFL for communication after having studied it for long. Consequently, the use of L1 in the EFL classroom started to be seen as uncommunicative, boring, pointless and irrelevant (Harmer, 2001). In other words, this method was challenged for doing " virtually nothing to enhance students' communication ability in the language" (Brown, 2000). As dissatisfaction towards the grammar-translation method grew and the demand for oral competence became more evident, 19th century reformers in Europe believed that, among other things, "translation should be avoided, although the native language could be used in order to explain new words or to check comprehension" (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). This brought about the exclusion of students' L1 from an L2 classroom.

As a consequence, a campaign was launched against L1 use and those caught using L1 began to be punished or shamed for doing something wrong (Phillipson, 1992). The idea of bilingual education was seen as unnatural or inefficient (Pennycook, 1994). At the time, the move fuelled by both political reasons (the fact that many teachers themselves were monolingual) and practical reasons (the need to speak many languages) ousted the mother tongue from EFL classroom (Phillipson, 1992).

The middle of the nineteenth century is the time when foreign language teaching received more attention and progress, notably through individuals such as Marcel (1793-1896), Prendergast (1806-1886) and Gouin (1831-1896). Their age was known later as the Pre-Reform Movement (Richards and Rodgers, 2001; Howatt, 2004). They came up with the notion of the similarity between first language acquisition by children and second language learning by adults. In other words, first language acquisition was the model for learning a second language. Therefore, translation was considered as a source of confusion and was replaced by pictures and gestures.

Following was the late nineteenth-century which was known for its introduction of the Reform Movement, whose aim was to develop new language teaching principles (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Using L1 in teaching a foreign language became again a controversial issue among reformers. Some believed that mixing two languages would not help students to reach fluency; therefore, learners should employ their mental abilities to understand the meaning of the new language. Other reformers emphasized the importance of L1, especially when introducing unfamiliar items (Howatt, 2004).

An authority often cited as one of the first advocates of excluding L1, in the early attempt to come up with new method to teach language, was Blackie (Hawkins, 1981 as cited in Richards 2000). His philosophy of learning was that words should be associated directly with objects, and thinking in L1 should be banned. This new method later became known as the Direct Method. With the belief that L2 can best be learnt if students get the maximum exposure to it, L1 lost favor. The belief underpinning this method was that learners acquire L2 in the same way as children acquire their L1 (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). In fact, this method was an extension to

Gouin and his contemporaries' natural view towards language teaching (Brown, 2001). So, the appearance of the direct method further strengthened the view that L1 should be excluded from L2 classroom.

Subsequently, another method known as the Audio-lingual Method appeared, and it also emphasized banning the use of L1. This method viewed the target language and native language as two different systems that should not be linked, so only L2 should be used (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). In this method, learners had to learn through repetition and memorizing; hence, listening and speaking were introduced before reading and writing. Moreover, learning should take place without referring to L1.

Similarly, the Makere report in 1961 further reinforced the idea of using nothing but English in the classroom. The report came up with five basic tenets, which have been called into question, but which were taken as the 'truth', at the time. They are:

1. That English should be taught in a monolingual classroom.
2. The ideal teacher should be a native English speaker.
3. The earlier English is taught the better.
4. The more English used in the classroom during lessons, the better.
5. If other languages are used, English standards will drop (Phillipson, 1992, p185).

Phillipson has described these as the 'five fallacies' of modern English language teaching (Phillipson, 1992) but the implications of these tenets are far-reaching and their influence can be found almost everywhere English is taught, even today. All popular English language teaching methods including the recently accepted Communicative Language Teaching incorporate these five tenets and tend to discourage the use of L1 in the L2 classrooms bluntly (Cook, 1999; 2001 a,b; Prodromou,2001). Eventhough the five tenets cumulatively proclaim the English-only approach, tenets 1 and 5 are emphasized for the purpose of this paper.

The Communicative Approach, which came into being in the 1970s as a new method of language teaching, also firmly advocated that monolingual teaching with authentic communication in L2 is the best way to learn a language (Pennycook, 1994). This view of learners' L1 avoidance has also been reflected in most of modern L2 teaching materials (Atkinson, 1987, 1995; Buckmaster, 2002; Cook, 2002; Cook, 2001b; Hawks, 2001) and syllabus or curriculum (Cook, 2002; Swan, 1985). The main arguments against using the L1 have been that it does not encourage learners to use the L2 and that when the teacher uses the L1 it deprives the learners of input in the L2 (Krashen, 1988, as cited in Prodromou 2002; Ellis, 1984, as cited in Hawks 2001). Several other language theorists and researchers also emphasized L2. Cook (2001), among others, puts that classroom interaction in L2 has been encouraged to provide learners with a naturally communicative environment. Whatever the case might be, L1 became the subject of disfavor.

Following this, an innumerable number of scholars covered the L1- L2 debate. Prodromou (2001), for instance, notes that the mother tongue has been treated as a taboo subject (also Cook 2002; Deller, 2003), source of guilt (Auerbach, 1993; Frankenberg – Garcia, 2000), and a hint of teachers' weakness to teach properly (also Cook, 2002; Buckmaster, 2002). Furthermore, L1 has been considered as a waste of time (Januleviciene and Kavaliauskiene, 2002). As a result, the English only approach has become an influential and often assumed to be the hallmark of good language teaching (Atkinson, 1995). In fact, the view has greatly changed the learners' mind to the extent of demanding that only L2 be used (Frankenberg –Garcia, 2000).

Despite these decade-long rivalry views, English-only and L2 with the support of L1 approaches, are theoretically incompatible, it is known that most teachers actually fall somewhere in the middle using mostly the target language but also using L1 when needed. This has produced a profound sense of guilt among some teachers (Burden, 2000). Teachers often feel that by using L1 they are being lazy or showing a lack of will power to control students (Burden, 2000). Even when a study showed that 80% of teachers did allow some sort of L1 use in the classroom, there was still a feeling of guilt among those teachers due to the prevalence of the English-only ideology (Auerbach, 1999). A possible reason for this onset of guilt is that teacher training usually provides little if any mention of L1 use in the classroom (Atkinson, 1987; Hawks, 2001). There are many explanations as to why the topic of L1 use is ignored in training but perhaps an

association with the grammar/translation method scares off teacher trainers. There is also the widely held belief that you only learn English by speaking English (Atkinson, 1987).

Recently, though, support for an English-only policy has been declining, and some researchers and teachers have begun to advocate a more bilingual approach to teaching, which would incorporate the students' L1 as a learning tool. This means that ELT Professionals have now begun to realize the inevitability of first language in L2 classes and its pedagogical merit (Cole, 1998; Deller, 2003; Frankenberg-Garcia, 2000; Harmer, 2001; Hawks, 2001; Reis, 1996). Others have even gone as far as saying the use of L1 in the classroom is necessary (Schweers, 1999).

Consequently there has emerged a considerable amount of literature which strongly suggests that the use of L1 in the L2 classrooms can be productive or may even be necessary at times (e.g., Atkinson, 1987; Bolitho, 1983; Choffey, 2001; Frankenberg- Gracia, 2000; Harmer, 2001; Hawks, 2001; Langer, 2001; Murakami,1999; Prodromou, 2001; Rinvoluceri, 2001). Apart from giving the theoretical roles of L1, some of these (e.g., Choffey, 2001; Deller, 2003) have demonstrated the many ways in which L1 can be used constructively in the L2 classrooms. Several benefits of using the L1 have been proposed by different researchers:

- it reduces learner anxiety (Auerbach, 1993 as cited in Hawks 2001) and creates a more relaxing learning environment (Burden, 2000; Philips, 1993);
- it is a means of bringing the learner's cultural background knowledge into the class (Prodromou, 2002);
- it facilitates checking understanding and giving instructions (Atkinson, 1987).
- it facilitates the task of explaining the meaning of abstract words and of introducing the main differences in grammar and pronunciation between L1 and L2 (Buckmaster, 2000; Cole, 1998).

As a result, most scholars argue that L1 has been discredited despite the various ways in which it can facilitate the learning and teaching of the target language (e.g., Atkinson, 1987; Tang, 2002; Deller, 2003; Reis, 1996; Linder, 2002; Naimushin, 2002). Atkinson (1987), for example, writes "At present it would seem to be, in general, that in teacher training very little attention is given to the native language. Similarly, Tang (2002) remarks, "The value of using mother tongue is a

neglected topic in the TEFL methodology literature." Also, Deller (2003) concurs the above views as "one particular, baby that has been thrown out with the bath water is the use of the mother tongue" (p. 5).

Proponents of L1 use, though, are also keen to point out that "Mother tongue use should be selective and not seen as just an easy option" (Hawks, 2001), they urge the teacher to use the L1 appropriately and avoid over-use which results in learners feeling that they cannot understand the input of the target language until it is translated in to their L1 (Atkinson, 1987). Others (e.g., Harmer, 2001; Nunan and Lamb, 1996) give useful advice on the importance of the occasional use of students' first language.

The researcher, thus, asks 1) if the prime objective of the classroom is to achieve communication and understanding between teachers and students, and 2) if there is a single method of language teaching as Chapman (1958) succinctly puts "There is no open method with a capital M which excels all others" (p.34), why it is so necessary to disregard the role of the learners' L1 in the L2 classroom?

There seems to be consensus in the literature that the methods and opinions that called for the avoidance of L1 rely on three main weak assumptions, as identified by Cook (2001). The first assumption is the similarity between L1 and L2 learning process, the second assumption is considering learning L1 and L2 as a separate process, and the third is provision of the maximum target language.

2.2. Reasons for Banning the L1 use

According to Cook (2001 a, b) and Hawks (2001), identifying all the possible and concrete reasons behind distancing L1 from the L2 class is difficult as the reasons could be many and diversified but one can cite following as some of the main factors that are assumed to be responsible for keeping L1 away from the L2 classroom. These are:



1. The learning of an L2 should model the learning of an L1 (through maximum exposure to the L2).
2. Successful learning involves the separation and distinction of L1 and L2.
3. Students should be shown the importance of the L2 through its continual use (Cook, 2001).

These three reasons will be thoroughly discussed in the preceding section.

2.2.1 The language Acquisition View

Most L1 opponents argue that language learning by adults is similar to language acquisition by children, and their reason is that both L1 children and L2 learners do not have any previous knowledge about the new language. So, adults learn L2 in a similar way as children pick up their mother tongue. The justification put forward for the claim is that L1 acquisition does not rely on another language or children in the L1 cannot fall back on another language. This view is mainly advanced by Krashen (1981).

The limitation with this argument is, however, that it takes no account of the distinctions which have been identified between learning L1 and L2 (Cook, 2001a, b). Cook further points out that the appeal for L1 acquisition is simply impracticable and beside the point; the fact that by definition L1 children do not fall back on another language has no implication for whether or not L2 learners should make use of their L1 while learning an L2. It's evident that L2 learners make a reference to their knowledge of L1 while learning L2 which apparently indicates that the attempt made to avoid L1 use in the L2 classroom is in vain. There are indeed, differences between the first and the second language acquisitions in terms of age and situations (Cook 2001a, b). Comparing the way children learn L1 and adults learn L2, Weschler (1997) states that "Children take years following the natural order of acquisition to master the concrete before the abstract. "By contrast, already having mastered the former, adults can take a shortcut"(p. 4).

L1 acquisition by children and L2 learning by adults vary in many respects. Bley-Vroman (1990) presents a thorough explanation of five basic differences between L1 acquisition by children and L2 learning by adults. Firstly, children's innate ability to acquire their L1 disappears in adults. Secondly, adults rely on their L1 when learning L2, unlike children who do not have previous

knowledge of their mother language. Thirdly, in contrast to children, adults' exposure to L2 is not sufficient since language input is confined to a learning environment such as schools. Moreover, children are helped by social factors as motivation and personal situations that adults lack. Finally, notwithstanding adults' difficulties when learning, they do, of course, have more mature cognitive abilities. Bley-Vroman (1990) argues that these differences between adults and children may explain why adults often cannot achieve fluency.

Similarly, Macaro (1997) points out further learning differences between L1 children and L2 adults. He states that the learning of L2 by adults combines both conscious and unconscious processes because adult L2 learners can apply more advanced strategies when learning the new language. Moreover, although L2 learners may find it difficult to produce all the new language sounds correctly and achieve oral competence, they are more able to express themselves by applying non-verbal communicative strategies. Finally, while L1 children are corrected by their parents in a natural setting, L2 learners obtain their feedback from their teachers, and they may feel embarrassed and hesitant to produce the language in front of their peers.

Cook (2002) also notes that the idea of relating L2 learning to L1 acquisition is based on assertions without evidence or weak evidence. He further comments that the misguided vision of the first language acquisition is one of those factors that have outlawed the role of translation in second/foreign language teaching. I personally feel that it is not wise to generalize that what is true for children (L1 learners) is also true for adults' learning second language as far as language learning is concerned. Children and adults are different in experience and in the way they approach language. Hence, an attempt to assimilate L1 acquisition by children and L2 learning by adults is a futile effort.

2.2.2. The Language Compartmentalization View

Another argument claimed to be behind the banning of L1, as identified by Cook (2001), is the language compartmentalization argument; the belief that L2 should be developed with no reference to L1. The reasoning behind the belief that considers learning L1 and L2 as two separate processes is to avoid L1 interference (i.e. errors result from L1 negative transfer) Cook (2001b). The argument is that translation fosters a sense of false equivalence between the two languages resulting in the inter-language errors (Cook, 2002).

This view may indicate that language learning is coordinate; therefore, the compound type of learning is neglected (Cook, 2001). In the 1950's, two types of bilingualism were identified: coordinate bilingualism which separated L1 from L2 and compound bilingualism which linked L1 and L2 Stern (1992). As a result of this distinction, two types of learning strategies have been proposed: the intralingual and intracultural strategies that focus on using L2 only and the crosslingual and crosscultural strategies that allow using L1 in learning L2 Stern (1992). Though proponents of L2-only strongly propose the use of only L2 without any adherence to L1, a complete demarcation between the two can hardly be drawn or is practically impossible. Supporting this view Cook (2001a, b) argues that even if the two languages are distinct in theory, they are interrelated in the L2 users' mind in many ways (phonology, morphology, syntax and pragmatics). Thus L2 is affected by L1 and vice versa. Besides, other scholars (e.g., Atkinson, 1987; Cook, 2002; Cohen, 1996, as cited in Weshler 1997; Edie, 1999; Harbord, 1992; Stern, 1992; Swan, 1985) firmly believe that keeping L1 and L2 apart is something unthinkable.

Stern (1992), again, notes "The L1-L2 connection is an undisputable fact of life, whether we like it or not the new knowledge is learnt on the basis of the previously acquired language" (p. 282). And hence contends that L1 should be considered as a resource or facilitator for learning L2 rather than being seen as an obstacle. Similarly, Cook (2002) feels that switching and negotiation between languages is part and parcel of everyday language use for the majority of the world population. This means that comparing the two languages may in fact aid learning processes rather than hindering.

Regarding the Contrastive Analysis Approach, which is built on drawing learners' attention to similarities and differences between L1 and L2, certain empirical studies like the one by Tomasello and Herron (1989) in the context of Portuguese seem to validate the importance of contrastive analysis (Lado, 1964). Their findings show that translation techniques that stress the comparison and contrast between L1 and L2 elements (Phonology, morphology, etc.) are effective ways of dealing with the interference and over generalization errors. It was reported that the analysis helped students to notice areas of differences between Portuguese and English and review their hypothesis regarding what is different and what is similar in the two languages. The result of their study seems to challenge the wide spread assumption that L1 should be avoided because its use results in the fallacy of equivalence between the two languages. It has been found that using L1 could facilitate learning L2 (Cook, 2001). As one can deduce from the literature, there seems to be a belief in the fact that L1 and L2 are interdependent. Since the mother tongue and target language are both frequently present in the learners' mind, they should also be present in the learning activities that the class engages in and an attempt to keep L1 from the target language classroom is often a naive effort.

In spite of the views that oppose its use in L2 learning and teaching, there appears to be a wide spread assumption that language interference is an important characteristics of second language learning (Januleviciene and Kavaliauskiene, 2002). Stern (1992) also argues that since L2 learners often use their L1 for reference, it is impossible to avoid the interference errors; rather we need to acknowledge them as a psycholinguistic given. Stern states that we can help learners to gradually develop a new L2 reference system by demonstrating where the L1 and L2 are similar and different (be it at phonological, lexical and grammatical levels); in effect, this will aid learners to respond to the likely errors in advance. Richards (1986 as cited in Weshler 1997) holds a similar view that comparing and contrasting of the two languages can allow the learners to predict the possible L1 interference. Richards (in the same source) further suggests that interference problems can be addressed through carefully designed teaching materials.

The arguments forwarded and the research outputs indicate that encouraging learners to relate L2 to L1 and discovering the similarities and differences between the two languages would reduce the possible occurrences of the transfer errors and facilitate the target language learning.

Personally, the researcher thinks that the overuse of L1 may interfere with or even hinder the healthy process of learners' inter-language development. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that its judicious use contributes a lot to enhancing the target language learning.

2.2.3 Provision of the Maximum Target Language View

Provision of the maximum target language is the pioneering argument often raised against the use of L1 in the L2 classroom (Tang, 2002). The opponents of L1 use often contend that L2 learners have little or no exposure to the target language outside the classroom. Anything that reduces L2 learning class time jeopardizes the learning of the target language. Students should get the maximum possible exposure as that enhances the target language learning. The tendency is therefore that teachers should not spend this valuable classroom time using L1. They should rather provide learners with ample opportunities for practising the target language.

The fact that the target language should be the medium of classroom communication as much as possible is the view shared by most teachers and theorists (Harbord, 1992). However, this does not and should not imply that L1 ought not to be used at any cost (Cook, 2001b; Turnbull, 2001; Dajani, 2002). According to Cook and Turnbull, teachers can maximize the use of the target language without overlooking the students' first language. "A principle that promotes maximum teachers' use of the target language acknowledges that L1 and L2 can exist simultaneously" (Turnbull, 2001).

The researcher also supports the idea that teachers should fill the classroom with as much of L2 as possible. However, an exclusive target language use may not ensure students' comprehension of the meanings of certain L2 language elements. Therefore, if one assumes that the basic tenets of the true communication should be 'comprehensible input' (to use Krashen's 1985 term), using the students' language may at times be necessary. The principle thus should be "Use English where possible and L1 where necessary" (Weschler, 1997 p.5).

As has been discussed in the foregoing sections, the arguments for discouraging L1 in L2 classrooms mentioned above have not provided strong evidence for avoiding L1 nor have clear

reasons for banning L1 (Macaro, 2001). This and the classroom reality opened the door for re-examining the value held for so long that paved the way for the emergence of several teaching methods encouraging the use of L1 in L2 classroom as a helpful teaching and learning tool.

3. Factors Favoring L1 use in EFL classrooms

Despite growing opposition to the English-only movement, its supporters remain steadfast in their determination to use English as the target language and the medium (Auerbach, 1993) even though there are few specific references referring to actual benefits derived from excluding the L1 from the classroom (Hawks, 2001).

One reason why monolingual teaching has been so readily accepted is due to the “language myths of Europeans” and the belief in their inherent superiority over non-European languages (Pennycook, 1994). Indeed the stigma of bilingualism in the EFL context originates from the ardent belief of the importance of English, and the disrespect shown towards other languages (Pennycook, 1994). English-only has also come about through the blind acceptance of certain theories, which serve the interests of native speaking teachers (Weschler, 1997). However, there is now a belief by some that the use of L1 could be a positive resource for teachers and that considerable attention and research should be focused on it (Atkinson, 1987).

3.1. Arguments forwarded to discredit the English-only Approach

Much of the attempt to discredit the Monolingual Approach has focused on three points: it is impractical, native teachers are not necessarily the best teachers, and exposure alone is not sufficient for learning the target language.

3.1.1 The impracticality of L1 Free Foreign Language Class

The biggest problem with the Monolingual Approach to teaching is that it is very impractical (Phillipson, 1992). One reason the exclusion of L1 is impractical is that the majority of English teachers are not native speakers (Hawks, 2001). Sometimes these teachers’ own English is not very good, and by insisting on an English only policy, we can severely undermine their ability to

communicate and consequently their ability to teach. Another reason it is impractical is that to enforce the sole use of the TL can often lead to a reduced performance on the part of the teachers, and the alienation of students from the learning process (Pachler & Field, 2001). What the researcher personally know from his working environment, particularly the college, is that teachers' exclusive use of the target language marginalizes the students making them passive listeners without understanding. Not only that, but excluding L1 can lead to a higher dropout rate in EFL schools, whereas when L1 is permitted, researchers and teachers alike report much more positive results (Auerbach, 1993). Monolingual teaching can also create tension and a barrier between students and teachers, and there are many occasions when it is inappropriate or impossible (Pachler & Field, 2001). When something in a lesson is not being understood, and is then clarified through the use of L1, that barrier and tension can be reduced or removed.

3.1.2 Native Teachers Paradox

The Monolingual Approach also supports the idea of the native teacher as being the ideal teacher. This is certainly not the case as being a native speaker does not necessarily mean that the teacher is more qualified or better at teaching (Phillipson, 1992). Actually, non-native teachers are possibly better teachers as they themselves have gone through the process of learning an L2 (usually the L2 they are now teaching), thereby acquiring for themselves, an insider's perspective on learning the language (Phillipson, 1992). By excluding these people and their knowledge from the learning process, we are wasting a valuable resource. In addition, the term 'native teacher' is problematic. There are many variations of English around the world, and as to what constitutes an authentic native English speaker, is open to endless debate. Ultimately though, there is no scientific validity to support the notion of a native teacher being the ideal teacher (Phillipson, 1992).

3.1.3 Exposure alone not being sufficient for learning

Another problem with the Monolingual Approach is its belief that exposure to language leads to learning. Excluding the students' L1 for the sake of maximizing students' exposure to the L2 is not necessarily productive. In fact there is no evidence that teaching in the TL directly leads to better learning of the TL (Pachler & Field, 2001). Obviously the quantity of exposure is important, but other factors such as the quality of the text material, trained teachers, and sound

methods of teaching are more important than the amount of exposure to English (Phillipson, 1992). This is particularly obvious with struggling lower-level students. Increasing the amount of L2 instead of perhaps a simple explanation in L1 is likely to have a negative effect and simply add to the frustration on the student's part (Burden, 2000). Teaching in the TL does have benefits but teaching in the TL alone, will not guarantee learning among the students (Pachler & Field, 2001), but excluding it, may impede learning (Auerbach, 1993).

3.2. Advantages of using the mother tongue

The literature on mother tongue use in the classroom discussed above indicates that there are benefits drawn from using first language in EFL classroom. The three main advantages often cited (Atkinson 1987) for using the students' L1 in the classroom is presented below.

3.2.1 Humanistic element

Atkinson (1987) agrees with Bolitho (1983) that permitting students to use their L1 brings a "valuable 'humanistic' element" into the language classroom, allowing students to express themselves clearly and effectively. Humanistic views of teaching have speculated that students should be allowed to express themselves, and while they are still learning a language it is only natural that they will periodically slip back into their mother tongue, which is more comfortable for them. They will also naturally equate what they are learning with their L1. So, trying to eliminate this process will only have negative consequences (Harbord, 1992) and impede learning. Besides it is against the natural right of the students.

Harbord (1992) sees this "humanistic view" as a reasonable attitude towards the use of the students' mother tongue and considers it highly unlikely that a teacher would refuse to answer a question like "How can I say?". Appealing to the teacher for help in such a limited fashion, involving single words or short phrases, may appear harmless but the obvious danger with this strategy is that learners may become overly dependent and revert to it automatically without attempting to express themselves in English. Teachers need to ensure that students only use this technique cautiously as it also proves insufficient outside the classroom.

3.2.2 Preferred Learning Strategy

Another advantage of L1 use worth noting is that it is highly compatible with the learners preferred learning strategy. According to Atkinson (1987), the use of mother tongue in L2 classroom is invaluable because it is consistent with the “preferred learning strategies” of the majority of learners in language classrooms around the world. In other words, the needs of the students have to be considered in order for students to learn effectively. This is to mean that if students want something translated and can learn better, we have to provide them with such opportunity. This is especially evident with beginner and intermediate students. Students often express a desire to know exactly what a new grammatical structure or lexical item means in the first language. In his study of Spanish use in EFL classrooms in Puerto Rico, Schweers (1999) found that 88.7% of students felt Spanish should be used in the classroom to explain difficult concepts, define new vocabulary items and to check for comprehension. It is difficult to ignore the wishes of the students when contemplating one’s approach to teaching, but as teachers we need to know where to draw the line.

3.2.3 Time saving device

Roger Brown (1973 as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 2001) expressed his annoyance in watching a teacher try to explain new vocabulary through elaborate “verbal gymnastics” when in his opinion, “translation would have been a much more efficient technique.” As the anecdote suggests, translation, or mother tongue use, is often encouraged as an efficient, time-saving technique; supported by many ELT professionals (Green, 1970; Atkinson, 1987; Tudor 1987). Many instances of L1 use are associated with the need to save time, but as Harbord (1992) points out, saving time is not an effective use of translation or the mother tongue in general. He quotes Duff (1989) in saying: “The mother tongue should be used to provoke discussion and speculation, to develop clarity and flexibility of thinking, and to help us increase our own and our students’ awareness of the inevitable interaction between the mother tongue and the target language that occurs during any type of language acquisition”. Thinking along these lines, series of research studies have attempted to incorporate the mother tongue into a more communicative approach.

3.3. The Role of L1 in EFL classroom

3.3.1 The Pedagogical Role

Eventhough the opponents of L1 use in L2 class strongly claim that L1 use jeopardizes the progress or effectiveness of L2 learning, the practice and results of many researches confirm that L1 has a role to play in L2 learning. Yet, this huge potential of the mother tongue has been ignored for years. In this regard, Atkinson (1987) contends “Although the mother tongue is not a suitable basis for a methodology, it has, at all levels, a variety of roles to play which are at present, consistently undervalued”.

One of these basic roles it is believed to play is its pedagogic value in the L2 classroom. The major notion behind this argument is that learners use their L1 as a ‘reservoir’ (to use Prodromou’s 2001 term); L1 creates support for students. According to Bolitho (1983) as cited in ‘Talking Shop’ L2 learners do not come to the class with their mind empty. i.e all L2 learners by default speak at least one other language. They use their L1 experiences or they fall back on; L1 knowledge to help them learn the target language. Thus, he advises teachers to recognize the learners’ first language. Stern (1992) also advocates a similar view in which he stated that “L2 learners always make reference to the language they already know; therefore, whether we like it or not the new language is learned on the basis of the previously acquired language.” He goes on to explain that even when students have another L2 to fall back on; this language itself should be treated as an additional resource to learn the target language. Gabrielatos (2001) says that L2 learners tend to rely on their existing knowledge (L1 and other languages) to understand the logic and organizational principles of the target language. Swan (1985) went even to the extent of concluding that one should never learn a foreign language unless he/she keeps making correspondences between the elements of the two languages. Both Swan (1985) and Dajani (2002) conclude that learning a second language is the continuation of the already existing L1 knowledge.

From this, then, it follows that translation is an essential tool to bridge the gap between the learners’ native language skills and experiences and the target language they are supposed to

learn as learning L2 builds on the assets learners bring with them to the classroom. In fact, one bridging function of translation is its usefulness in creating opportunities for comparative analysis between the mother tongue and the target language (Murakami, 1999, Namushin, 2002). For example, by enabling the students “to relate form and function in their L1 to form and function in the L2” (Titford 1983).

Hence, some scholars would like to rationalize the inevitability of the interrelationship between the already known language and the newly learned language from the perspective of the Universal Grammar, Chomsky (1976) “the grammar of a language consists of universal principles of a language”(p.5). In other words, every language is related to the other in principles it holds. Thus, the transfer of L1 knowledge to L2 learning goes without saying. Building on this idea, Towell and Hawkins (1994) indicate that L2 learners transfer the grammatical properties of their L1 into their L2 grammar. Similarly, Ringbom (1987) notes that L2 learners would make use of the existing knowledge in their native language to help them understand the new language. This possibility of transferring L1 knowledge to L2 learning is also a strategy used by most L2 learners in most of places (Atkinson,1987; Harbord, 1992; Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1992).

Probably inspired by the theoretical underpinnings of L1 use discussed above, or driven by her own reasons, Deller (2003) came to a conclusion that L1 is an excellent resource for L2 learning [especially, for students at lower level of L2 proficiency] provided that it is properly handled. She has also tried to justify her contention by mentioning at least seven L1 possible merits:

1. It is useful to notice differences and similarities between the two languages.
2. Learners can enjoy materials that might otherwise be too difficult for them.
3. Learners can develop and produce their own materials including their own tests.
4. Allowing the use of mother tongue can encourage spontaneity and fluency.
5. Using mother tongue can equip learners with the words and expressions they really want and need in English.
6. Using mother tongue can have a beneficial effect on group dynamics.
7. Using mother tongue ensures that learners are able to give ongoing feedback.

(Deller, 2003).

3.3.2. The Psychological Role

Richard-Amato (1996 as cited in Langer, 2001) notes that attitude towards self, the target language and the people who speak it, the teacher and the classroom environment have an influence on the acquisition of a language. In general terms, our perception influences our performance. Expanding on this view, Langer (2001) argues that teachers can keep their students enthusiastically engaged in meaningful communication by allowing students to use their mother tongue in the classroom. If one is banned from using his/her mother tongue, Langer explains, one feels relegated to a position of unimportance.

Shamash (1990, as cited in Auerbach, 1993) believes that using the mother tongue allows learners to experiment and take risks in English. Building on Shamash's (1990) belief, Auerbach (1993) herself concludes, "Starting with L1 provides a sense of security and validates the learners' lived experiences, allowing them to express themselves". According to her, the use of L1 reduces the psychological barriers to English learning and allows for a more rapid progression. Janulevicine and Kavaliauskiene (2002) claim that "The ability to switch to a native language, even for a shorter time, gives learners an opportunity to preserve self-image, get rid of anxiety, build confidence and feel independent in their choice of expression." Atkinson (1993) claims that the occasional use of L1 allows learners to show that they are intelligent and sophisticated people.

According to Murakami (1999), using mother tongue establishes identity and therefore should neither be neglected nor subordinated to any languages. Accentuating teenagers' need for L1 to preserve their identity that teenagers have their own styles and idioms, which they do not want to lose while learning the L2, as this is a part of their identity.

In sum, the arguments for the psychological merits of L1 tell us that by empowering learners to feel more secure, L1 could create a more comfortable learning environment, which will in turn, enhance the L2 acquisition process.

3.3.3 The Socio-cultural Role

In addition to the above mentioned roles, the use of first language in EFL class plays a socio-cultural role which links the L2 classroom and the student's culture. Prodromou (2001), for instance, regarded the use of mother tongue as a means through which L2 learners bring their cultural backgrounds into the L2 classroom. To Prodromou, classroom ethnic cultures are indeed a starting point for a variety of classroom activities. Mentioning the authenticity of the classroom, Widdowson (1996) also argued that contexts which would be meaningful for students have somehow to be constructed in the classroom out of the primary experience of the mother tongue culture. Widdowson believes that the classroom culture and the culture of the society in which they live are a good starting point for supporting students to authenticate the target language. What's more, Linder (2002) claims that the use of classroom translation activities could promote the cultural transfer skills. Using students' mother tongue is useful to evaluate cultural diversity (Dove, 1992 as cited in Auerbach, 1993). Choffey (2001) contends that students' L1 culture and physical environment are of great help in designing L2 classroom activities. He suggested three major reasons for using the L1 cultural and physical environment to learn the L2:

1. To link the activities to the students' situation (experience).
2. Students learn how to deal with specific lexical items between the L1 and the L2 cultures.
3. To establish firm relationships between L1 and L2.

The foregoing three advantages claimed to be the socio-cultural roles of L1 and the disadvantage that it might entail when used recklessly are briefly summarized in Prodromus' (2001) five metaphoric expressions as follows. L1 is:

1. a drug (though with therapeutic potential, it can damage your health and may become additive).
2. a reservoir (a resource from which we draw).
3. a wall (an obstacle to teaching) .
4. a window (which opens out into the world outside the classroom; if we look through it we see the students' previous experience, their interest, their knowledge of the world, their

culture.

4. a crutch (it can help us get by in a lesson, but it is a recognition of weakness).

5. a lubricant (it helps the wheels of a lesson moving smoothly; it thus saves time).

(Prodromou, 2001 p.2)

3.3.4 Attitudes of Teachers and Students towards the use of L1 in

EFL classroom

Naturally man has the tendency to interact with himself and things around him. While doing this he forms feelings and beliefs about the things he encounters, thereby forming either a positive or negative attitude towards the object. According to Crow and Alice (1956) the term 'attitude' is often used to express an individual's pattern of reaction toward himself, his physical environment, his associates and the situation in which he finds himself. The Encyclopedia of Education (1986) vol. 1 also states that attitude refers to how we think, feel about, and act toward the attitude object. So, attitude is concerned with the way one sees and interprets the world, and how one acts towards it. In this regard, students and teachers particularly at the tertiary level also could have their own way of looking at the issue of using L1 in English as a foreign language class.

Findings from small number of studies (Burden, 2001; Schweers, 1999; Tang, 2002) in Japanese, Spanish and Chinese contexts respectively showed that both university teachers and students had positive attitude towards the use of L1 in their English classroom. There were similar findings in an Ethiopian teacher college context (Kenenisa, 2003). The results of their studies further illustrated that a limited amount of L1 had a supportive and facilitating role in the English classes and thus it needed to be welcomed. In the case of Prodromou's (2001) study, however, university students were skeptical about the role of L1 in Greek at the university level. On the contrary, both teachers and students at beginner and intermediate levels in Greek overwhelmingly accepted the use of L1 in their English classes.

Studying students' reactions to the use of the L1 in English classes, Terrence Doyle (1997), in his presentation at TESOL, '97, reported that students in a study he conducted claimed that the L1 was used approximately 90 percent of the time in their classes. Some 65 percent of these

students preferred the use of the L1 in their classes sometimes or often. Bearing many similarities to Schweer's study in Spanish context, Tang (2002) in his research in a Chinese EFL context indicated that students responded positively towards Chinese use. In particular, the vast majority of students (97%) liked it when their teachers used some Chinese. According to students, Chinese was most necessary to explain complex grammar points and to help define some new vocabulary items. A few students indicated that the L1 could be used to translate well-written paragraphs and to compare the two languages (Tang, 2002). Prodromou (2002) carried out research into the perceptions of 300 Greek students regarding L1 use in the monolingual classroom at three levels- beginner, intermediate and advanced. A relatively high percentage of beginner and intermediate students answered that the students 'should use the mother tongue' while only a minority of advanced learners supported those views.

3.4. The Purposes for which teachers and students need L1

In an attempt to discredit the criticisms directed to them, proponents of the L1 use quickly shifted their research attention to the specific situations in which L1 should and should not be used (Auerbach 1993). Mitchell (1988), surveyed teachers and found that situations where grammar was being explained were the areas that most teachers felt L1 use was necessary.

Researchers in the field have attempted to categorize when L1 should be used. Proponents of L1 do claim that most EFL teachers take advantages of their Students' first language in practice on many occasions even if they argue against its use in theory. According to Harbord (1992), there are three compelling reasons for using L1 in the classroom which include facilitating communication, facilitating teacher-student relationships, and facilitating the learning of L2. Harbord went on comment that Students can use it for scaffolding (building up the basics, from which further learning can be processed) and for cooperative learning with fellow classmates; (Perhaps the biggest reason for using L1 in the classroom though, is that it can save a lot of time and confusion). Cook (2001) also describes several scenarios in which teachers should consider introducing the L1 into their pedagogy. He contends that the long held tradition of discouraging the integration of the L1 in the L2 classroom has sharply limited the "Possibilities of language teaching." (p.405). Other than claiming for the re-examination of the time-honored view that the

first language should be avoided in the classroom by teachers and students, Cook (2001a) states that teachers should use L1 to convey meaning and organize the class.

More specifically, Atkinson (1987) has listed the following as an area of foreign language teaching in which teachers can make use of L1: eliciting language, checking comprehension, giving instruction, discussion of classroom methodologies, checking for sense, presentation and reinforcement of language, and testing. Agreeing with many of these uses Cook (2001b) suggests that teachers can use L1 as a way to: convey and check meanings of words or sentences, explain grammar, organize the class, maintain discipline, gain contact with individual students and test. Piasecka (1988) as cited in Auerbach,1993) includes the following in her lists of possible occasions for using mother tongue: negotiation of the syllabus and the lesson, record keeping, classroom management, scene setting, language analysis, presentation of rules governing grammar, phonology, morphology and spelling, discussion of cross-cultural issues, instructions or prompts, explanation of errors, and assessment of comprehension. Collingham (1988), as cited in Aurebach (1993) again concurs with many of the used L1 in Piasecka's repertoire and lists some more: to develop ideas as a precursor to expressing them in the L2, to reduce inhibition or affective blocks to L2 production, to elicit language, and discourse strategies for particular situations, to provide explanations of grammar and language functions and to teach vocabulary. Dajani (2002) contends that L1 can also be used by teachers to raise awareness of their students on the styles and the strategy they use to help them to become more reflective and self regulated.

Following are three persuading situations suggested by Cook (2001b) as reinforcing factors to lead learners to their L1 use in EFL class. These include:

1. As a part of the main learning activities.
2. Within classroom activities (group/pair work).
3. As a way to understand the meaning of L2 words both inside and outside the classroom (e.g., the use of bilingual dictionaries).

Nevertheless, teachers are often given advice about how to discourage students from using their first language in pair/ group work. For example, as Ur (1996) states “If they are talking in small groups, it can be quite difficult to get some classes, particularly the less disciplined and motivated ones, to keep to the target language.” (p.47)

Yet, Cook (2001a) argues that code switching is a normal feature of L2 use (also Harmer 2001; Cook, 2002; Harbord, 1992). When the students share two languages without the distrust of L1, there is no reason why students should not resort to their L1. To Cook (2001 b), L1 provides a scaffolding help: through L1 students may explain the tasks to each other, negotiate the role they are going to take, check their understanding or production of the language against their peers. According to Cook, L1 is especially helpful when the activities involve problem solving, in which case students could put their heads together and discuss the solution to the problem (s).

In a way that Complements Cook’s (2001b) view, Harbord (1992) explains that L1 has a variety of roles: explanation by students to peers who have not understood (also Atkinson 1987), giving individual help to weaker students during pair or group work, and student-student comparison or discussion.

A further consolidating statement is made by Cunningham (2000) when he states that denying the use of L1 in pair/group work is almost equivalent to denying students’ access to an important learning tool. Students draw on each other’s knowledge (Atkinson 1993). Harmer (2001) believes that L1 use is quite acceptable, for example, when students are working in pairs studying a reading text. A study carried out by Anton and DiCamilla (1998) also shows that using L1 in pair/group work provides students with scaffold help.

So, allowing L1 during group/pair work ensures that there will be both productive collaboration and discussion among the fellow students as Choffey (2001) notes. However, students’ use of L1 in collaborative activities is not without its problems. There, for example, could be the problem of differentiating between on-task talk and off-task chatting, and difficulty keeping some groups to the target language. The best way to control the problem, according to Harmer (2001), Harbord (1992), is to create awareness among the students of when using their mother tongue is

permissible and when the use of the target language is absolutely important. Encouraging positive use of L1 empowers learners to know when they should use it and when not (Buckmaster, 2002). Therefore, it is the responsibility of the teachers to make students aware before they are engaged in any of the classroom activities, in order to promote a positive use of L1.

3.4. Empirical Research on the Use of L1 in the EFL Class

Reading through the L1-L2 literature; one can hardly find a single piece of research that can unequivocally justify the benefits drawn from ignoring the learners' L1 in the L2 classroom. The often mentioned references in this regard Ellis 1984 and Chamber 1991, (as cited in Hawks 2001) themselves do not give any detailed account of L1 avoidance. They based their arguments solely on a practical survey and failed to demonstrate their evidence. In connection with this, Auerbach (1993, p.46), for instance, writes, "evidence from research and practice suggests that the rationale used to justify English-only in the classroom is neither conclusive nor pedagogically sound". Similarly, Weschler (1997) notes that the English only approach is without any sound theory or substantiated research. In support of this idea, Macaro (1997) adds that the concrete rationale for the exclusive use of L2 is still beyond reach. What's more, Cook (2001a) criticizes proponents of the English-only approach saying that they are unable to provide any real reasons for keeping L1 from the L2 classroom.

Contrary to L1 opponents' claims, save Prodromou's (2001) study in which university students were found to be skeptical about the role of L1 (Greek) at university level and few others, the great majority of the findings side L1 use in L2 classroom. Research conducted by Burden (2001) in Japanese, Schweers (1999) in Spanish and Tang (2002) in Chinese contexts have come up with similar results all in support of L1 use. i.e both university teachers and students have positive attitudes towards the use of L1 in their English classrooms. The results of their studies further suggest that a limited amount of L1 has a supportive and facilitating role in the English classes and thus it needs to be welcomed. So, research evidence indicates that complete deletion of L1 in L2 situation is not appropriate (Schweers, 1999; Nation, 2003; Butzkamm, 2003). When used appropriately, the use of L1 can be very beneficial. Brown (2000) claims that "first

language can be a facilitating factor and not just an interfering factor” p.57, and Schweers (1999) further encourages teachers to incorporate the native language into lessons to influence the classroom dynamic, and suggests that “starting with the L1 provides a sense of security and validates the learners' lived experiences, allowing them to express themselves” (p.7).

In conclusion, researchers have found that evidence for the practice of English-only is neither conclusive, nor pedagogically sound (Auerbach, 1993). There has not been sound rationale validating the benefits of avoiding L1. To the contrary, Chaudron (as cited in Auerbach, 1993) argues that L1 avoidance is often injurious to the students and the learning process. Consequently, Cook (2001a) comments that “If the twenty-first century teaching is to continue to accept the ban on the first language imposed by the late nineteenth century, it will have to look elsewhere for its rationale.” (P.155)

3.6. Amount of L1 and the Learners' Level.

Little research had been done on the amount of mother tongue (MT) used in the EFL classroom. In support of this contention are Stern (1992) and Turnbull (2001) who argue that what exactly constitutes the appropriate mixture of L1 and L2 has not been well investigated. Turnbull further recommends that more exploration needs to be done to address this issue. In 1990, Duff and Polio approached this issue by investigating thirteen native speaker teachers teaching “Typologically unrelated” subjects. Through classroom observation, student questionnaires and teacher interviews, the authors found that there was a huge range across the amount of FL in teacher talk in the FL classroom. They also found that most students were satisfied with the amount of L1/L2 used by their teacher.

So far, there have been widely diverging research reports with regard to L1-L2 proportion in EFL classes. Atkinson (1987), for example, suggests, “at early levels a ratio of about 5% native language to about 95% target language may be more profitable.” In a study of elementary Core French in Western Canada, Shapson, Kaufman and Durword (1987) stipulated 75% of the target language as the acceptable quantity by the teachers (as cited in Turnbull, 2001). A study by Schweers, (1999) also found that students desired up to 39% of class time be spent in L1. A Similar study but on a larger scale evaluation of the same program by Colman and Daniel

(1988), as cited in the same source, in central Canada shows that 95% use of the target language was deemed appropriate by the researchers and school board.

On the other hand, with regard to local studies, Kenenisa (2003) in his research of "Using L1 in the EFL Classroom: The Case of the Oromo Language with Particular Reference to Adama Teacher College" claimed that based on his class recording and observation, the ratio between English words and the Oromo language was about 1:77. This showed that teachers and students in the EFL classrooms at this college used a certain amount of the Oromo language. The 1.68 minutes devoted to the Oromo language is found to be less than the amount both students and teachers ought to have in 50 minutes English lessons. According to their views, 6-10% out of the 50 minutes English class time for Oromo language use was deemed acceptable. Hence, there appeared a gap between students and teachers' perception and what they did in the class. Yet, the results obtained in the research conducted are far from coming to a consensus on the amount of L1 in an EFL class ranging from 5-95%. This is probably why Turnbull (2001) recommends further studies to be carried out in the area.

With regard to the level of students, Atkinson (1987), Stern (1992) and Hawks (2001) suggest that the mother tongue has a variety of roles at all levels. But as Stern (1992) and Hawks (2001) note it may be more important to use mother tongue judiciously and gradually reduce that quantity of L1 as the students become more and more proficient in the target language.

In general, though it is very difficult to quantify the possible amount of mother tongue required for effective second (foreign) language learning. It seems at least that it would be important to be aware of the fact that L1 can be used systematically with varying intensities for learners ranging from early levels to more advanced ones. On the other hand, as a significant amount of the literature claims (e.g., Medgyes, 1994; Nunan and Lamb, 1996; Murakami, 1999; Reis, 1996) an attempt to employ 100% target language, especially with students at lower level of L2 proficiency appears to be impractical. If one does, it is to try to "teach the target language with almost less than the maximum possible efficiency" (Atkinson 1987). The researcher also understand that the monolingual approach to L2 teaching may leave the learners uncertain about the meanings of some words or concepts even with the aid of visual or contextual clues.

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODOLOGY

This study set out to investigate the use of Oromo language in ‘English Focus’ EFL classrooms of Jimma Teachers’ college. This chapter presents the research design, participants of the study, samples and sampling procedure, methods of data collection and techniques of data analysis. Each of these is followed by discussion. Techniques through which all these methods were employed are also described in detail.

3.1. Research Design

A descriptive research design involving quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection (mixed approach) was used in this study to investigate the teachers’ and the students’ use of Oromo language in their EFL classrooms. A descriptive method was employed because the research was set out to describe and interpret what is. According to Best (1970 as cited in Cohen, 2000 p.186), descriptive research is concerned with: “conditions or relationships that exists; practices that prevail; beliefs, points of views, or attitudes that are held; processes that are going on; effects that are being felt; or trends that are developing”. At times, descriptive research is concerned with how *what is* or *what exists* is related to some preceding event that has influenced or affected a present condition or event”. By the same token, this research set out to describe, compare and analyze the L1 reality in EFL classes in Jimma Teachers College. Thus the descriptive method was found to be the most suitable to obtain the pertinent and valid information needed to achieve the objective intended.

3.2. Participants

According to Bless and Higson Smith (2000), research participants are the units of analysis as they are the sources from which research data are being collected. Therefore, data analysis should reflect an accurate picture of the research participants. In light of this, the analysis and the general discussion of this study revolve around students and teachers. The subjects of the study are Jimma Teachers' College first, second and third year 'English Focus' Students and their six EFL teachers.

3.3 Samples and sampling procedure

It is obvious that there is no conventional way of determining a sample size that is representative of the target population as there are diverse views on this issue. However, Gay and Airasian (2003) assert that it is most likely to obtain a representative sample if random sampling technique is used. In addition, Gay and Airasian (2003) stated that the sample of 10% to 20% of target population is often used in descriptive research. They also suggest that a larger sample size increases the reliability of the findings of the study. Accordingly, this study was carried out on a randomly selected sample of 78 respondents out of 156 total populations.

A two stage sampling techniques were used to select representative sample size. At the first stage, Jimma Teachers' college was purposefully selected out of the 10(ten) Oromia's teacher training colleges. The college was preferred because it is the working area of the researcher and hence creates a convenient environment in terms of proximity and likely cooperation from the students and instructors. The English Department was chosen because the researcher believes that most teachers do not expect to encounter this issue among English major students; they are supposedly/reasonably proficient in English. Secondly, the students were categorized into two in their respective groups based on gender. The three groups (1st, 2nd and 3rd year students) were divided into male and female in their respective sections to keep the male-female samples ratio taken from each groups rational. First year students were totally 48: 21 male and 27 female. Out of 52 second year students, 25 were male and the remaining 27 were female. Male and female students in their third year of study were 28 each. Afterwards, representatives comprising 50% of

the individual groups and the respective male and female population in the groups were randomly drawn from their respective population by using lottery system. Accordingly, 10 male and 14 female students were selected from first year and 12 male and 14 female students were selected from among second year students. Because the number of third year male and female students was equal, 14 students were randomly selected from each. Generally, the students' questionnaire was completed by 78 representative students of whom 36 were males and 42 were females.

Since teachers were selected based on the number of the courses offered to the target students at the time of the study, all teachers offering English courses to the selected groups at the time of the study were included. Consequently, six (6) teachers were selected. Hence purposive sampling method was employed to select the representative teachers.

3.4. Pilot Test

A pilot test was conducted to examine internal consistency of the items of the questionnaire, which was used to collect data to undertake this study. The pilot test was carried out on 22 'English Focus' evening students (5 males and 17 females). Similarly, the questionnaire for teachers was tested on 2 Instructors. Students who participated in the pilot study were selected using simple random sampling while teachers were selected purposefully.

The Crombach Alpha reliability coefficient of try out test result indicated that the students questionnaire had internal consistency $\alpha=0.861$. The questionnaire for teachers was also found to have internal consistency $\alpha=0.897$. Based upon Gay's (1980) criteria for accepting a given instrument as reliable, the reliability coefficient should be greater than or equal to 0.5. Thus, these research instruments met the criteria and showed that they had a strong reliability. The face and content validity of the research instrument were ascertained by some experts in test and measurement. The piloted items were used with some modification for the main study data collection. This means that items found to be confusing for participants were taken out and those requiring modification were amended. In order to prevent test contamination, participants who participated in the pilot test study were excluded from the main study.

3.5. Methods of Data collection.

There were three basic instruments used in the process of collecting necessary data for the study. These three instruments were; structured questionnaire, open-ended interview and structured observation.

3.5.1 Questionnaire

For data collection, the researcher employed a questionnaire as the major tool. Separate questionnaires were prepared for teachers and students.

The questionnaires prepared for both students and teachers contained four parts designed to address the variables of the study by providing information that conformed to the leading questions. The respondents indicated the extent of their engagement in a particular behavior/practice by choosing one of the five point scale ranging from "strongly agree" (5) to "strongly disagree" (1). The first part of the questionnaire contained different items on major themes of whether Oromo language is used in the EFL classroom. Items in the second part were designed to obtain information on the teachers' and students' preferred amount of Oromo language in EFL classrooms. Similarly, items in the third and fourth part were designed to obtain information on the purposes for which teachers and students use Oromo language and to assess the attitudes of teachers and students towards L1 use in EFL classrooms. The same scenario holds true for teachers' questionnaire. Items similar to the ones completed by students were completed by teachers who were offering courses to the study groups at the time of the study. Though the teachers and the students' items were separately and distinctively stated, their concepts or what they were destined to investigate were similar. Thus, the teachers' questionnaire was just a slight modification of the items completed by students. The same measurement scale was used for both questionnaires.

Finally, the researcher decided to use questionnaire because it is the most appropriate tool to obtain the desired information relative to the other methods and it allows the researcher to gather information from a larger sample. It is also better for the respondents in minimizing difficulties

of anonymity and reducing the effect of biased conclusion and interpretations that could happen in other methods. The instrument was administered through personal visits by the researcher.

3.5.2. Interview

Lankshear and knobble (2004) affirm that interview is useful tool to generate comprehensive information about the phenomena being studied. It can be inferred that more than any other data collection tool, an interview gives the interviewer a unique opportunity to probe for clarification and in depth information on the topic of interest. For that reason, as interview was used by the researcher to get ancillary data to substantiate the information obtained through questionnaire. During this part of data collection, the researcher interviewed 6 instructors who were offering courses to the subject of the study at the time. The interview was also recorded.

3.5.3 Observation

The researcher also used structured observation method to observe the teachers' classes at least once to triangulate the teachers' and the students' responses to the questionnaire and interviews. An observation checklist containing the points of observation was used. The observation was mainly concerned with identifying the purposes for which L1 is used in EFL classroom. This was done because observational data afford the researcher the opportunity to gather 'live' data from 'live' situations. The researcher is given the opportunity to look at what is taking place *in situ* rather than at second hand (Patton, 1990 as cited in Cohen et.al, 2000). It was believed that this enables the researcher to understand the context of the study and endows the opportunity to see things that might otherwise be unconsciously missed.

3.5 Techniques of Data Analysis

Upon receiving the completed questionnaires back, the information obtained was processed according to the following procedures. To arrive at the intended analyses, the participants' responses were keyed into SPSS version 17.0 software and several sets of statistical analyses were performed: mean point value, standard deviation, variance and t-test of significance. One-way-analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also employed to test the relationship between variables. The t-test of significance was computed to test for statistically significant differences in the variables. A statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

Similarly, data gathered from the teachers through interview and classroom observations was analyzed qualitatively according to the emerging themes. Finally, the data obtained from the teachers and the students and the observation was compared to arrive at a tenable conclusion.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the discussion and interpretation of the results obtained from the data secured through questionnaire to teachers and students, interview to teachers and classroom observation. Issues related to whether Oromo language is being used in college English Focus EFL classrooms or not, the preferred amount of Oromo language in the EFL classrooms, the purposes for which teachers and students use Oromo language in EFL classrooms and the overall attitude of the English Focus students and their EFL teachers toward the use of Oromo language in EFL classrooms were treated.

4.1. Analysis of Students' and Teachers' Questionnaire

4.1.1. Characteristics of the Respondents

This study generally focused on 78 'English Focus' students and 6 JTC EFL teachers. The students were all 'English Focus' with varying length of stay at the college. According to the language stream coordinator, most students joined the department by their choice. Of course, he didn't also want to conceal the fact that some of them obviously came to the department without their choice. Twenty four (24) first year students of which were 10 male and 14 females make (-%) of the sample population. Twenty six (26) second year students of whom 12 were males and 14 were females comprised (--%) of the total sample. An unprecedentedly equal number of male and female students were observed in the third year that consisted of 14 representatives from each sex made the total 28 (--%) of the total sample which was certainly the largest. From the total student sample population, female students made 52.2% while the remaining 47.4% were male students. The students' ages were within the range of 17-22 years. Because the student respondents' age had little to contribute to the subject of the study, not much attention was given to them in the analysis even though age was part of the information collected.

The other respondents were teachers who were offering English courses to the groups at the time of the study. Six teachers completed the questionnaire. All of them were males. Four of them were aged 30-35 while the remaining two were aged 50-55. Again, four of them have 8-13 years

of teaching experience while the remaining two have taught for 23 and 28 years respectively. The work experience has been sought because there was an assumption that experience helps to notice the classroom realities. Regarding their academic status, four teachers are M.A holders and two of them are Bachelors.

4.1.2. Issues related to whether Oromo language is present in EFL classroom or not.

Table 4.1.2.1 Presents students' responses to the issue related to whether Oromo language is present in L2 classroom.

No	Items	First year			Second year			Third year		
		N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Students										
1	I use Oromo language in my English Class	24	4.58	.89	26	4.50	.60	28	4.38	.68
2.	My classmates use Oromo lang. in EFL Classroom	24	4.47	.82	26	3.55	1.18	28	4.5	.54
3.	My college English teachers use Oromo language in EFL Classroom	24	4.58	.55	26	4.47	.55	28	4.38	.61
	Total									

N=number SD=standard deviation M=mean. Assumed mean=3

The three items provided above were designed with the aim of investigating whether Oromo language is used in college EFL classrooms or not. To arrive at a sound conclusion regarding the issue the items were sought to investigate, the mean scores and the standard deviation of the responses of the groups were calculated for the three items. As it has been indicated in the above table, the mean scores and standard deviations for the first item are M= 4.58, SD=.89; M=4.5, SD= .609; and M=4.38,SD= .689 for first, second and third years respectively. Similarly, the mean scores and standard deviation of the second item in the groups are M= 4.47,SD= .82, M=3.55, SD=1.18 and M=4.5, SD= .54 for first, second and third years respectively while the mean scores for the third item is M=4.58, SD= .55 , M=4.47, SD= .55 and M=4.38, SD= .61 for the three respective groups. The implication is that Oromo language is widely used by students in EFL classroom. This is because each of the mean scores of the three items was well beyond the assumed mean (3) with a narrow degree of variability of the individual scores from the mean

scores of the group. The responses cumulative mean scores indicate that students agreed to the points raised. These tell us that the majority of the students reacted to the items positively and would like to use Oromo language in their EFL classroom. The students not only witnessed their Oromo language use in the EFL classroom but also unreservedly pointed out their EFL teachers' use of Oromo language in their EFL classroom. What would teachers say?

Table 4.1.2.2 Teachers responses to the issue related to whether Oromo language is present in L2 classroom.

No	Items	N	M	SD
1.	I use Oromo language in my English lesson	6	4.66	.51
2.	My colleagues use Oromo language in their EFL lesson	6	4.66	.51
3.	My EFL students use Oromo language in their English classroom	6	4.66	.51
Total				

N=number SD=standard deviation M=mean. Assumed mean=3

As can be observed from the above table, teachers reacted to the items destined for assessing the presence of L1 in L2 classroom in a positive manner. The items were designed to take the account of whether teachers use Oromo language in their college EFL classrooms. The obtained result was that teachers strongly showed their support for Oromo language use in EFL classroom. Teachers admitted that they use Oromo language in EFL lessons. They also confirmed that their colleagues and their 'English focus' students use L1 in their EFL classrooms with means similar to that of item 1. In general terms, teachers like students confirmed the presence of L1 in their EFL classrooms and that they were engaged in its use. As one can clearly see from the table, all the mean scores for the items were more than 4.5 which is an indication that the respondents nearly strongly agree to the concepts. This is said because all the mean scores of the descriptors of the L1 presence issue were found to show students' high agreement to the proposed statements. Thus, teachers also accept that L1 is playing some role in their EFL classrooms.

To sum up, it seems that teachers and students declare their L1 use in EFL classroom without any reservation. Both teachers and students uniformly witnessed the presence of Oromo language in their EFL classroom. The unequivocal statement made by students and teachers

about the fact that they were engaged in its use reflects that Oromo language is widely used in EFL classrooms at a college level and hence present.

4.1.3. The extent to which teachers and students prefer to use Oromo language in EFL classroom.

To seek information on the time duration for which teachers and students prefer to use L1 in their EFL classroom, data were collected in terms of minutes based on the teachers and students agreement and or disagreement with responses to the five items designed to elicit information on this issue.

Table 4.1.3.1: Students' preferred amount of Oromo language in EFL classrooms

No	Items	First year			Second year			Third year		
		N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Students										
1.	The time spent using Oromo language to teach English should be less than 2.5 minutes of out of 50 minutes English class time.	24	2.44	1.52	26	2.8	1.23	28	3.84	1.16
2.	3- 5 out of 50 minutes English lesson should be given in Oromo language	24	2.85	1.48	26	3.72	1.2	28	2.63	1.05
3.	Oromo language use in EFL classrooms should take 5.5-7.5 minutes of 50 minutes English class time	24	4.32	1.59	26	2.44	1.2	28	2.54	1.04
4.	Up to 10 minutes out of 50 minutes English lesson should be given in Oromo language	24	2.29	1.56	26	2.36	1.51	28	2.45	1.22
5.	More than 10 out of 50 Minutes of an English lesson should be given in Oromo language	24	1.35	.88	26	1.97	1.27	28	1.84	1.09
	Total									

N=number SD=standard deviation M=mean. Assumed mean=3



0042138/007

Items enumerated above all sought to explore the amount of Oromo language students prefer to use in EFL classroom at the college level. Regarding the previous study in relation to this issue, different results have been reported by different researchers in different contexts. Results ranged from 6-10% of the 50 minutes of English class time at tertiary level to 75% at the elementary level. In the study he conducted on college first year students Kenenisa (2003) reported that students claimed 6-10% of L1 in EFL classroom. Inspired by what has been done and the results that had been discovered so far, the present study provided the respondents with lists of assumed minutes L1 is supposed to be used in L2 classroom to which students show their agreement and/or disagreement by using the rating scale provided. The responses to the items in the levels were also summarized in terms of mean and standard deviation as shown in the table.

The descriptive result for the groups in relation to amount of time indicates that the mean score of the responses for item (2.1) is 2.44, 2.8 and 3.84 for first, second and third years respectively. For item 2.2 it seems that the results are roughly similar in that the mean score reads 2.85, 3.72 and 2.63 respectively. For the third item, on the other hand, the students' response mean score calculated to be 3.61, 2.44 and 2.54 for first, second and third years respectively. From these one can clearly see that the groups vary in the amount of Oromo language they prefer to use though they have commonality in avoiding its extreme cases. The majority of first year students with mean 3.84 of their responses to the third item of the category preferred to have 5.5- 7.5 minutes (up to 15%) of the 50 minutes EFL class time. This means that the mean average of item 2.1 is the only mean above the assumed mean indicating that first year students prefer to use Oromo language in EFL classroom for about 5.5-7.5 minutes. The result obtained here shows that first year students of the present study desired to have more Oromo language in EFL classroom compared with what had been reported by Kenenisa (2003) 6-10% (3-5 minutes) for roughly similar subjects.

With regard to second year students, the responses mean for items 2.2 can be taken as a descriptor of their maximum desire for Oromo language as these score is above the assumed mean score. In their responses, the students showed that they would like to have 3-5 minutes of the EFL lesson in Oromo language. The first item received the maximum mean score 4.32, which is more than the assumed mean among third year students with the means of the

remaining two items less than the assumed one. So, we can safely conclude that third year students prefer to have less than 2.5 minutes (<5%) of total English class time in Oromo language. This has the tendency to match with what Cole (1998) noted, that L1 is most useful at beginning and low levels. Also Butzcamm (2003) claims "With growing proficiency in the foreign language, the use of the mother tongue becomes largely redundant and the FL will stand on its own two feet" (p. 36).

As for items 2.4 and 2.5 there seems to be a great similarity among the groups. The great majority of the students in all groups bitterly objected the more than 7.5 minutes use of L1 in L2 classroom. The mean scores of these items in all levels of study were well below the assumed mean (3). This implies that only a few students' preferred Oromo language to be used either between 11 and 15 percent or 16 and 20 percent of the 50 minutes of English class time. Hence, we can reasonably say that the majority of the students do not want to use Oromo language for more than 7.5 minutes in EFL classroom. The teachers' interview data also confirmed that too much of L1 reduces L2 time unnecessarily. They added, students themselves do not want their teachers to use too much of L1. This indicates that the use of L1 for the time duration of more than 7.5 minutes would not be a preference for either group as it is seen to affect L2 learning.

In conclusion, the groups varied in their Oromo language preference with first years preferring about 5.5-7.5 minutes, second years 3-5 minutes and third year less than 2.5 minutes. The figures discovered in this study more or less complement what Kenenisa (2003) reported (6-10%) and what Tang (2002) claimed (5-10%) but far less class time than what Schweers (1999) found (20-30%) at a university level in Chinese and Spanish contexts respectively. As there is no universally agreed upon determined amount of L1 to be used in L2 classroom and the need for effective communication is very pressing, it is wise to take students' preference into consideration and act upon it.

Table 4.1.3.2 Teachers' preferred amount of L1 in L2 classroom

No	Items	N	M	SD
1.	The time spent using Oromo language to teach English should be less than 2.5 minutes out of 50' of English class time.	6	2.5	1.64
3.	3- 5 minutes out of the 50 minutes of an English lesson should be given in Oromo language	6	4.33	.98
3.	Oromo language use in EFL classrooms should take 5.5- 7.5 minutes out of 50 minutes of English class time	6	2.33	1.26
4.	Up to 10 out of the 50 minutes of an English lesson should be given in Oromo language	6	1.33	1.32
5.	More than 10 out of 50 minutes of an English lesson should be in Oromo language	6	1.33	.81
<hr/>				
Total				

N=number SD=standard deviation M=mean. Assumed mean=3

Like students, teachers were also asked to suggest the L1 amount they thought was appropriate to use in an EFL classroom. The result obtained indicates that teachers think that 3-5 minutes of L1 use in a L2 classroom would suffice. They have clearly showed their support for 3-5 minutes of L1 use through their responses mean score of 4.33. They believe that less than 3 minutes of use of L1 is meager and more than 5 minutes use is too much. For the remaining descriptors of L1 amount exceeding 5 minutes, the teachers' responses mean scores were far below the assumed mean implying that it is undesirable. From this, one can say that teachers neither want to use Oromo language in their EFL classroom for more than five minutes themselves nor do they want their students to use L1 for more than five minutes. It appears that teachers would discourage students if they happen to use Oromo language for more than the time range they prefer.

But, this seems to be in contradiction with students' claim which varied according to their level of study. In the analysis of the data obtained from students, it was confirmed that students' preferred L1 amount decreased as the students stayed in the college. But teachers didn't seem to consider this fact and vary their L1 need accordingly. This means that the 3-5 minutes of L1 use by teachers could be inappropriate for third year students who claimed less than this in the survey and meager for first year students who demanded more. If teachers implement 3-5

minutes of Oromo use to all levels of study, that would surely be against the students need. In fact, the teachers' preferred amount conformed to second year students L1 preferred amount. However, these teachers do not teach only second year students. They offer courses to students in all years of study at different times. Hence, their belief system is likely to affect students in all levels of study. Nevertheless, the students' data result clearly reveals that teachers should vary their amount of L1 use in order to meet their students varying L1 need. Similarly, the majorities of the interviewed teachers also believe in the importance of varying their L1 use and contended that they vary their L1 use in accordance with students' stay in the college and their L2 proficiency level. They strongly stated that their L1 amount is higher for first year students whom they consider to be less proficient and lesser for second and third years (see the interview data summary). Yet, the researcher is skeptical about how far teachers vary the amount in their actual class in accordance with their vow. It didn't appear to be so for the researcher during observation. In other words, there could be a gap between what teachers said about the amount of time they use and their actual practice though a clear-cut answer requires recording and analyzing classroom interaction. The message we get pretty clear from this is that, there generally needs to be a match between teachers and students as far as the use of L1 is concerned. The researcher believes that teachers should be able to reconcile the amount of L1 they think ought to be used in L2 classroom with those of students' needs to meet the students need and thus make learning and teaching effective.

4.1.4: Purposes for which students and Teachers want to use Oromo language in the EFL Classroom

Table 4.4.1 reveals the data obtained in response to items 1-8 from first, second and third year students. The items were designed to seek information from the students on the purposes for which they use Oromo language in the EFL classroom. As was the case for other preceding responses, it was also worth considering the degree of variability of the scores or the extent to which the scores are dispersed around the average figure. The means and standard deviations were calculated for responses of the students in an attempt to investigate the real purposes for which Oromo language is used in EFL classrooms.

Table 4.1.4.1 Purposes for which students use L1

No	Items	First Year			Second year			Third year		
		N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Students										
1.	I use Oromo Language in pair and/ or group work	24	4.02	1.19	26	4.02	1.02	28	4.25	.65
2.	I need Oromo language to learn the meanings of new English words	24	4.2	1.2	26	4.52	.51	28	4.63	.57
3.	I sometimes want EFL teachers to use Oromo language to explain grammar concepts	24	3.41	1.47	26	4.13	1.29	28	4.02	.82
4.	EFL complex instructions should be given in Oromo Language	24	2.54	1.3	26	2.44	1.05	28	2.38	1.2
5.	I want EFL teachers to use Oromo Language to check comprehension	24	2.20	1.27	26	2.16	1.13	28	2.22	1.09
6.	I want EFL teachers to use Oromo language to explain difficult concepts	24	3.88	1.22	26	4.08	1.25	28	4.2	1.15
7.	I want teachers to use Oromo language to elicit language	24	2.11	1.45	26	2.47	1.08	28	2.45	1.06
8.	I want EFL teachers to explain the differences between Oromo and English grammar in Oromo Lang.	24	3.58	1.35	26	3.80	1.09	28	3.7	1.21
	Total									

N=number SD=standard deviation M=mean. Assumed mean=3

The mean scores and the standard deviations of the responses to items 1, 2, and 3 for first year students are M=4.02, SD=1.19; M=4.2, SD=1.2 and M=3.41, SD=1.47 respectively. For second year students, the mean scores and the standard deviations of the items 1, 2, and 3 are M=4.02, SD=1.02; M= 4.52, SD=.51 and M=4.13, SD=1.29 respectively. These items received a similar result from third year students as their mean and SD is M=4.25, SD=.65; M=4.63, SD=.57, M=4.02, SD=.82 for items 1, 2, and 3 respectively. Each of the mean scores of the items discussed above was found to be above (4) which symbolize students' agreement to the proposed statement. The implication is that students, through first to third year would like to use Oromo language to exchange information with others in pair and/ or group work. Nevertheless, views in literature with regard to the use of L1 in Pair and/ or group work are very contradicting though students expressed that they use it. Some (e.g., Ur 1996) oppose the idea mainly because it is

difficult to keep the students to the target language once they started talking in their L1. Others (e.g., Cook 2001a, b; Atkinson 1987) favor it with the belief that code switching is a normal phenomenon through which students can help each other in the L2 classroom. Research findings (e.g., Anton and DiCamilla 1998) on the other hand, indicate that using L1 in pair or group work provides students with scaffold help. In my opinion, as many of the scholars (e.g., Cook 2001a,b; Harmer 2001) believe; since the students' use of L1 in pair/group work is inevitable, it would be better to give them advice on when to use and when not to rather than trying to prohibit it. Again, students claimed that they need L1 to learn the meanings of new English words.

Besides, students indicated that they want their teachers to use L1 sometimes when explaining grammar concepts. There was no disparity among the groups as far as reflecting their high need for L1 is concerned. Put differently, the groups' responses were in agreement with regard to the item that stipulates whether they want the grammar concepts to be explained for them in L1 occasionally. Similarly, students demanded Oromo language use while explaining the differences between Oromo language and English Grammar. Schweers (1999), in a report of the outcomes of his research on the use of the mother tongue in English classes, concludes that 'a second language can be learned through raising awareness to the similarities and differences between the L1 and L2'. (Cole, 1998), if students have little or no knowledge of the target language, L1 can be used to introduce the major differences between L1 and L2, and the main grammatical characteristics of L2 that they should be aware of. This gives them a head start and saves a lot of guessing. As suggested by Cole et al. in Japanese context study, he concluded that students can benefit from appropriate teachers use of L1, especially in order to explain new words, explain grammar, and to facilitate explanation of complex instructions. (Critchley, 1999) also reported that the situations where L1's use was desirable were specified as when students couldn't understand, and when learning difficult words or grammar. Students showed high interest for the mentioned purposes in this study too.

The items disfavored by the students in all samples of the study were items 4, 5 and 7. All through the first to third year, the mean scores for these items were below the assumed mean. This means that students neither wanted to have EFL classroom instructions in Oromo language nor did they want their teachers to use Oromo language to check comprehension. Again they

didn't show agreement with the teachers' use of Oromo language to elicit language. So, students felt that L1 use was inappropriate on these three occasions. With the exception of these, the other items received a warm hug from the majority of the students in the study groups.

With regard to giving complex instruction, which students denied having in L1 altogether, the teachers' questionnaire, interviews and classroom observation report surprisingly different results from the students' questionnaire data. The mean scores of the responses of this item in the groups are all far below the assumed mean implying that students are not in favor of L2 instructions being given in L1. Yet, the teachers' questionnaire data and interview specifically stressed the importance of highlighting L2 classroom instructions in L1. Similarly, the classroom observation also showed that students were unable to understand what to do when instruction was given exclusively in English. Even though students discouraged its use in L2 classroom, the classroom reality seems to dictate the use of L1 to brief the L2 complex classroom instructions. It was also confirmed that students use L1 to check instruction and concepts from one another right on the commencement or in the middle of pair and/or group work quite often.

Table 4.1.4.2 Purposes for which teachers use L1

No	Items	N	M	SD
1.	Oromo Language is important in EFL pair and/ or group work	6	4.5	.54
2.	I need Oromo language to teach the meanings of new English words	6	3.16	.98
3.	I sometimes use Oromo language to explain grammar concepts	6	3.83	.98
4.	I give EFL complex instructions in Oromo Language	6	3.83	.98
5.	I use Oromo Language to check comprehension	6	3.5	1.22
6.	I use Oromo language to explain difficult concepts	6	4.16	1.16
7.	I use Oromo language to elicit language	6	3.66	1.36
8.	I use Oromo Language to explain differences between Oromo and English grammar	6	4.16	.75
<hr/>				
Total				

N=number SD=standard deviation M=mean. Assumed mean=3

The teachers' data indicate that the mean scores for all items given to teachers to check the purposes for which they use Oromo language in their English language teaching were found to

be above the ideal mean implying that teachers use Oromo language for all classroom purposes they were asked to respond to. Even though the mean scores for the items questioned were all above the assumed mean, the scores for some (items 2, 5, and 7) seem to be closer to 3 making the conclusion drawn less confident. Nevertheless, for items 1, 3, 4, 6, and 8 the mean scores were well above the benchmark. No matter what, teachers confirmed that they use Oromo language for all the mentioned purposes in EFL classroom.

In addition to the questionnaire data, more purposes for which the teachers use L1 were explored through interview. During interview, teachers said that they use L1 for purposes like localizing activities and introducing culture related issues other than the ones mentioned in the questionnaire.

Teachers and students were in some cases in agreement about when L1 should be used or when a teacher should use L1. Both teachers and students believed that L1 is important in pairs and/or group works and helps a lot to teach new vocabulary, explain grammar concepts, explain difficult concepts and to explain the differences between Oromo and English grammar. To the contrary, teachers and students differed in their suggestions of some of the occasions when L1 should be used. Students do not want teachers to use Oromo language to give classroom instructions, elicit language and to check comprehension. Yet, the teachers believe that Oromo language should be used for these purposes contrary to the students as well. For instance, teachers felt that L1 should be used to give classroom instruction, elicit language and check comprehension. Students, however, felt that those were inappropriate occasions. Burden (2001) came up with a similar report in a Japanese university context where he observed the students' purposes for using L1 contravening teachers' purposes on some occasions. So, I do also believe that teachers need to be more aware of when their students want L1 and when they would prefer that the teacher not use L1. This means that it is good for teachers to trace students' needs in their lesson presentation even though students claim themselves can sometimes hardly be trusted. In so doing, I hope, teachers can meet the students' needs and facilitate English language learning.

4.1.5. Teachers and students attitudes toward L1 use in EFL classroom

The students were provided with list of eight items that are destined to investigate students' attitudes toward the use of Oromo language in EFL classrooms. Something we have to bear in mind here is that these are not the only items the researcher believes can reflect students' attitudes. Students' attitudes could also be derived indirectly from the items designed for other purposes based on analysis of the spirit of students when they react to the items. But, it was believed that it is necessary to have items investigating attitudes separately. Accordingly, eight items were designed and made part of the questionnaire. All students taking part in the study attempted these items. The result of the study was based on the mean scores. To help make the conclusion reasonable, the mean scores along with the standard deviations were computed in all years of study for all indicators of attitude as it can be seen vividly in the table given below.

Table 4.1.5.1: Students attitudes toward Oromo language use in EFL classrooms

No	Items	First Year			Second year			Third year		
		N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Students										
1.	I support EFL teachers occasional use of Oromo language in EFL classrooms at the college level	24	4.0	.95	26	3.55	1.2	28	3.18	1.55
2.	English teachers' use of Oromo Language helps me a lot to learn English	24	4.14	1.0	26	3.08	1.36	28	3.25	1.49
3.	The fact that EFL teachers do not use Oromo language in EFL classrooms doesn't affect my understanding of the lesson	24	1.67	1.12	26	2.36	1.29	28	2.79	1.33
4.	I can't avoid using Oromo language even if EFL teachers prevent me	24	3.97	1.05	26	3.25	1.57	28	2.97	1.42
5.	I think using Oromo Language in EFL classroom facilitates the learning of English language	24	4.11	.91	26	3.44	1.53	28	3.09	1.55
6.	I want an English teacher who speaks Oromo Language	24	4.32	1.0	26	4.08	1.15	28	3.47	1.7
7.	I prefer an English teacher who allows us to use Oromo the in English classroom	24	3.44	1.21	26	3.36	1.31	28	3.77	1.52
8.	I like an EFL teacher who teaches English through translation	24	3.85	1.2	26	4.00	1.24	28	3.54	1.6

N=number= SD=standard deviation M= mean. Assumed mean=3

The mean scores of students' responses on the occasional use of Oromo language in the EFL classroom (4.0, 3.55 and 3.18) and whether Oromo language helps them a lot to learn English (4.14, 3.08, 3.25) for first, second and third year students respectively indicated that students are in support of its occasional use and believe that it helps them a lot to learn English language better. The mean figure is even higher for first year students which show the fact that they desperately need it. The third and fourth items are complementary in a sense that the former asks whether their understanding of the lesson is affected if the teacher doesn't use Oromo language and the latter whether they could avoid using Oromo language in EFL classroom if they are asked/forced to do so. The mean scores of the former item (1.67, 2.36, 2.79) were far less than the ideal mean (3) particularly for first and second year students and closer to the ideal mean for third year which comprehensively implies that students would find it difficult to understand the lesson fully in an English-only class.

In reaction to the latter question, first year students responded with the mean score of 3.97 while second year students responded with the mean scores of 3.25 which, of course, was good enough to conclude that first and second year students were highly in support of L1. Students in their first and second year of study were skeptical about avoiding L1 use even if the teachers urged them to avoid it. This clearly indicates the strong bond between the students and L1 in L2 classroom. The tendency is even higher, as one can see from the data computed, among the students in their first year of study. The result clearly signals that using only English is not feasible. Pachler & Field (2001) noted that Teaching in the TL does have benefits but teaching in the TL alone, will not guarantee learning among the students but excluding it, may impede learning (Auerbach, 1993). Medgyes (1994) also argues that the monolingual approach to English language teaching is "untenable on any grounds, be it psychological, linguistic or pedagogical" (p. 66). Hence, it is advisable for teachers to resort to the students' native language in certain situations. What had been arrived at in this research convinced me to accept or share the contentions of Atkinson (1987) and Auerbach (1993) who argue for the inclusion of L1 particularly at lower proficiency levels. (Burden 2001) in a Japanese context also found that lower level proficiency students were more likely to favor more L1 by teachers. The researchers do not recommend that the L1 become the dominant language in the classroom, but rather that L1 be used judiciously in particular instances to promote language learning.

In contrast, third year students showed slight disagreement with the proposition that they can't avoid using Oromo language in an EFL class even if the teacher prevents them. So, third year students had a different claim with regard to item 3 and 4 even though they showed that they had a positive attitude towards L1 use. They believed that their understanding of the lesson would not be harmed because the teacher didn't use L1. Besides, they think that they can avoid L1 use if they are asked to. First and second year students, however, showed that they can neither understand an English-only lesson nor can they avoid the use of Oromo language in EFL class. This strongly indicates the groups' interest disparity on L1 magnitude even though it is needed by all groups. The way students reacted to the two questions give a picture that students desperately need Oromo language. The fact that first, second and third year students claimed different amounts of Oromo language that decreases with the level of their study, in the preceding section, coupled with their views here toward the use of L1 that roughly correspond with their preferred amount persuades the researcher to conclude that the need for L1 goes with the proficiency level. From this, it wouldn't be so naïve to say that students' need for Oromo language in the EFL classroom goes on decreasing as the participants' year of study increased. As Butzcamm (2003) argues "With growing proficiency in the foreign language, the use of the mother tongue becomes largely redundant and the FL will stand on its own two feet".

Regarding items 5, 6, 7, and 8 the students had a similar response all showing agreement. The result obtained for each indicator in terms of mean score was uniformly recorded. That means, the mean scores for items related to whether students think Oromo language facilitates English language learning, whether they want an EFL teacher who speaks their mother tongue, whether they prefer a teacher who encourages their Oromo language use and if they like to be taught English through translation of some concepts to Oromo came up with a result that showed the students' agreement to all the points raised. None of the mean scores were found to be below the ideal mean. The degree of variability of the scores is also not that high. They are closely clustered around their respective mean scores which is a vivid indication that the students in the strata were in agreement to the points. With regard to the students view about whether they believe their EFL teachers should know Oromo language, students responded positively indicating that they agree to the idea. other studies also found that regardless of level there was the feeling among students that the teacher should know the student's mother tongue (Burden,

2000), in some cases as high as 91% (Critchley, 1999). Students tend to prefer teachers who understand their L1 (Briggs, 2001 cited in Milles, 2004). The outcome of this research together with aforementioned seem to intensely challenge the decades long taken for granted assumption that English teachers do not need to know students language to teach English.

Put in nut shell, the students under the study had positive attitudes towards the use of Oromo language in EFL classrooms at the college level. i.e Students' opinion on the whole tells us that using Oromo language in the English classroom has certain roles (pedagogical) in facilitating their learning of English. Though there appear to be slight differences between the mean scores which will be discussed in depth later, the mean scores of the items in each group were well above the bench mark. So, it is logical to conclude that students, through first to third year, want Oromo language in their EFL classroom regardless of their study level. They not only expressed that they want to use L1 themselves but they also indicated that they want their teachers to use L1 in their EFL classroom. Similar output has been reported by other researchers in different contexts. Burden (2001), Schweers (1999) and Tang (2002) in Japanese, Spanish and Chinese contexts respectively showed that both university teachers and students had positive attitudes toward the use of L1 in their English classroom; also Kenenisa (2003) found this in Ethiopian teacher training college context. The results of their studies further pointed that a limited amount of L1 had a supportive and facilitating role in English classes and thus it needed to be welcomed. Since it is difficult to imagine successful teaching and learning without taking students' need into consideration, I also believe that students' need should be respected.

4.5.2 Teachers' attitudes towards the use of Oromo language in EFL classrooms

The descriptors of attitude issues designed with the intention of exploring teachers' attitudes towards L1 use were completed by six teachers who were offering courses to the subjects of the study. As can clearly be observed from the table, the mean scores and the standard deviation of items completed by teachers were computed. The mean scores of the great majority of items were found to be well above the minimal.

Table 4.1.5.2 Teachers' attitudes towards the use of Oromo language in EFL class

No	Items	N	M	SD
1.	I support 'English Focus' students' occasional use of Oromo language in the EFL classroom at a college level	6	4.5	.54
2.	My use of Oromo language helps students to learn English bet	6	4.16	.75
3.	The fact that I do not use Oromo language in the EFL classroom doesn't affect my 'English Focus' students' understanding of the lesson	6	2.0	.63
4.	Students' need for translation forces me to use Oromo Language in my EFL classroom even if I don't want to	6	4.33	.51
5.	I think using Oromo Language in the EFL classroom facilitates the learning of English language	6	4.16	.75
6.	EFL teachers should speak Oromo language	6	4.0	1.09
7.	I allow my students to use Oromo Language in my EFL classroom	6	3.66	1.03
8.	I teach English to my EFL students through translation of some concepts into Oromo Language	6	2.83	1.16
<hr/>				
Total				

N=number SD=standard deviation M=mean. Assumed mean=3

Teachers believe that they support occasional L1 use because students desperately need it. Again, they believe that using Oromo language facilitates the learning of English and hence they allow their students to use it. Because there could hardly be understanding between them and their students if they use English-only, they were forced or persuaded to use Oromo language in their EFL classroom. From these one can say that teachers have a positive attitude towards the use of Oromo language. Kennenisa (2003) also came up with a similar output which confirmed that teachers and students who were the subjects of his study had a positive attitude towards the use of Oromo language in EFL classroom. In conclusion, both teachers and students under the study showed a positive attitude towards L1 in this research too.

4.1.6. Attitude difference among the groups

To address research question 5, a comparison of mean scores analysis was carried out to determine if there were statistically significant differences among the mean scores of the three groups with regard to their attitudes toward the use of Oromo language in the EFL classroom. This means that the means of students' responses to items 4.1- 4.8 in their respective levels were compared with one another using ANOVA. A Post Hoc test was applied to make multiple comparisons and identify where exactly the difference lay, if there was one. For the purpose of this study, the threshold for statistical significance was set at $<.05$.

Table 4.6 Groups attitude difference F-test result

Items	F	Df	Sig.
1.I support EFL teachers' occasional use of Oromo in the EFL classroom at a college level	3.84	2	.024
2.English teachers' use of Oromo Language helps me a lot to learn English	6.49	2	.002
3.The fact that EFL teachers do not use Oromo language in the EFL classroom doesn't affect my understanding of the lesson	7.55	2	.001
4.I can't avoid using Oromo language even if EFL teachers prevent me	5.15	2	.007
5.I think using Oromo Language in the EFL classroom facilitates the learning of English language	5.29	2	.006
6.I want an English teacher who speaks Oromo	4.05	2	.020
7.I prefer an English teacher who allows us to use Oromo Language in the English classroom	4.05	2	.361
8.I like an EFL teacher who teaches English through translation	4.05	2	.326
Total			
F= F test result Df = Degree of freedom P<.05			

Accordingly, the mean analysis showed that there was statistically significant difference among the groups particularly on items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Though it was known that there was statistically significant difference, applying a post hoc test was mandatory to identify the exact

place of the difference. Consequently, the post hoc test was administered and the points of the differences were identified.

To begin with, there was statistically significant difference $F= 3.84$, $P<.24$ between first year and third year students with regard to item 1 which was on whether students support teachers' occasional use of L1 in the EFL classroom. According to the data secured, more students in first year of study support teachers' occasional use of Oromo language in EFL classroom than students in their third year of study. Although third year students also support teachers' use of L1 in the EFL classroom, the support provided by first year students was much higher. For items 2 and 3, the difference seems to be very close to perfection as the groups were found to be nearly completely different in their responses to the items. First and third year students were different again on how far they think Oromo language helps them to learn English better $F= 6.49$, $P<.002$. Compared to third year students, first year students deeply believe that L1 helps them a lot to learn English better. The same groups mentioned above also have responded in a significantly different way to the third item. This time again the difference was so high that it was very close to perfection $F=7.55$, $P<.001$ which indicates that first and third year students belief systems were widely divergent. First year students were badly in need of L1 compared to third year students as they can hardly understand the lesson if English alone is used throughout the lesson.

Similarly, there was found to be statistically significant difference $F=5.15$, $P<.007$ between the mean scores of the same groups regarding the fourth item which seeks information on whether students could avoid L1 if they were prevented from resorting to it. The figure obtained indicates that first year students were more L1 dependent compared to third year students. This means that first year students do not only think that they can't refrain from using L1 but also believe that their English language learning would be at risk if they were to do so. In contrast, the majority of third year students think that avoiding L1 would not be a huge challenge for them. What's more, they don't think that their English language learning would be at stake if they stopped using L1. The same scenario holds true for items 4 and 5. There still appears to be statistically significant difference between first and third year students on these items. The difference between the groups with regard to how far they think using Oromo language can facilitate L2 learning and whether they prefer an English teacher who allows them to use L1 in EFL classroom was statistically significant at $F=5.29$, $P<.006$ which tells us that first year students have a more

serious concern about whether their EFL teachers know their L1 or not. It is not surprising to see first year students showing huge concern about EFL teachers speaking their L1 as they clearly stressed in item 3 that they can hardly understand the lesson if L1 is not used. Third years were, however, relatively hesitant implying that they were not that fanatic about it. As for items 7 and 8 there wasn't statistically significant difference among the groups. This implies that the students in the categories taken reacted to the items in a closely similar way. The differences between second year and third year or first year and second year means of the eight descriptors of attitude issue were not statistically significant.

After conducting the whole mean comparison between groups using ANOVA, there was found to be statistically significant differences in the overall average view of first year students and third year students toward L1 use. For the great majority of the items intended to explore attitude, there were found to be statistically significant differences between the views of first year and third year students. First year students favor L1 more than third year students do. Besides, it was confirmed that first year students' learning would be gravely endangered compared to third year students' learning if L1 is removed from the L2 classroom.

4.1.7. Attitude difference between Genders towards L1 use

Research question 6 was concerned with the attitude difference between male and female students. In order to explore the attitude differences between male and female students, the attitude issue descriptors data was used. An independent sample t-test was employed to see if there is statistically significant difference between male and female students' attitudes towards Oromo language use in the EFL classroom. The threshold for statistical significance was set at .05

Table 4.1.7 Genders attitude difference on the use of L1

Items	T	Df	Sig.
1.I support EFL teachers' occasional use of Oromo language in EFL classroom at the college level	.54	112	.59
2.English teachers' use of Oromo language helps me a lot to learn English	-1.85	112	.066
3.The fact that EFL teachers do not use Oromo language in the EFL classroom doesn't affect my understanding of the lesson	5.90	112	.000
4.I can't avoid using Oromo language even if EFL teachers prevent me	-.66	112	.508
5.I think using Oromo Language in EFL classroom facilitates the learning of English language	.13	112	.893
6.I want an English teacher who speaks Oromo Language	.82	112	.410
7.I prefer an English teacher who allows us to use Oromo Language in the English classroom	-4.58	112	.000
8.I like an EFL teacher who teaches English through translation	-2.25	112	.026
<hr/>			
Total			
<hr/>			
t= t- test result	sig. (two tailed)	P<.05	

As is evident from the table above, there were found to be statistically significant differences between the groups in connection with the items worded: the fact that EFL teachers do not use L1 in the EFL classrooms doesn't affect my understanding of the lesson and I prefer to have an English teacher who allows us to use Oromo language in EFL classroom. Male and female students responded to these items in an absolutely different way. The .difference between the groups was perfect for these items. Put differently, the difference between the responses of male and female students to the first item was statistically significant at $t= 5.90$ and $P<.01$ and their responses to the second item was statistically significant at $t= -4.58$ and $P<.01$. This means the majority of students who contended that their understanding of the lesson would be severely affected if teachers do not use L1 and those who prefer an English teacher that allows them to use Oromo language in the EFL classroom were found to be female. Compared to male students, female students were again found to be fonder of learning through translations. Because, the mean score difference of the sexes was statistically significant at $t= -2.25$ and $P<.05$. This clearly

reveals the huge English language proficiency gap between the sexes. So, the researcher personally feels that a lot has to be done by the teachers and the administration to bridge the gap.

On the other hand, the two groups were also found to be different on some descriptors of attitude issue. There was no statistically significant difference between male and female students in connection with support for occasional use of L1 in L2 classroom and refraining themselves from using L1 upon teachers' orders. For these items, the t-test result was < 1.7 and the probability that the result occurred because of chance was $>.05$ making it statistically not significant to conclude that there exists a difference between the groups. Similarly, statistically significant difference was not found between the sexes for items intended to elicit information on whether the students believe that the use of Oromo language can facilitate L2 learning and if having a teacher who speaks Oromo language or not really matters for them. As it has been for the preceding items, both the t-test results as well as significance levels for the items were found to be against the norm. This means that both male and female students gave similar responses to the items. The uniformity of responses of the groups outweighs the differences. Hence there was no statistically significant difference between the groups with regard to these items. Nevertheless, the groups appeared to be invariably different in their responses to the statement that asserts whether students feel that teachers' use of L1 in the EFL classroom helps them a lot to learn English. This means that the scores were nearly different as the result was very close to the requirements for the difference to be significant. Yet it falls short of that and all we can say is that the groups were invariably different in their responses to this item with $t = -1.85$ and $\text{sig} = .066$. In other words, even though there was difference between male and female students' responses to this item, the difference was not found to be statistically significant.

Generally speaking, there were found to be statistically significant differences between the sexes on some descriptors of attitude. Of course, there were situations where students shared a common ground supporting the idea forwarded. There were also situations where they were diverged. The data secured reveal that female students' understanding of the lesson would be endangered if L1 is avoided altogether which is not the case for male students. Seen in general terms, more female students want L1 than male students.

4.2. Summary of teachers' interview data

In order to cross check the validity of the information secured through the questionnaire, the six teachers from whom questionnaire data was secured were interviewed. The main objective of the interview was to validate teachers' responses to the questionnaire and to elicit further tips on their belief system or the teaching philosophy they held for so long regarding the L1 and L2 dilemma and see if that had influenced their classroom practice. In light of this, six interview questions were prepared and administered. Three of the questions were intended to seek information on the use and non-use of L1 while the remaining three were inference questions designed to obtain tips on teachers' belief systems. Since the ideas raised by the interviewee were more or less similar, thematic approach was followed to compose the summary.

In response to why they use Oromo language in their EFL classroom, all teachers interviewed said that they use L1 for the sake of helping the students get the point of the lesson. So, as they say, their justification for occasional use of L1 emanates from helping students. All teachers believe that using L1 is mandatory as students can't understand L2 exclusive lesson because of their poor English proficiency. So, resort to L1 on certain occasions is a must. Owing to his research report, (Schweers, 1999) also went as far as saying the use of L1 in the classroom is necessary. "I use L1 in my L2 class for a number of reasons", said one of the teachers. Among the reasons he put forward, giving complex instruction was the pioneer; the purpose disfavored by students in all levels in the questionnaire data. Almost all the teachers interviewed stressed the importance of making the complex instructions clear using L1 as they thought this was the key to unlocking the door that paves the way to classroom interaction. If instructions are not clear, one of the teachers said, it would be a disaster; students sit confused and idle and hence can't carry out any of the tasks they are supposed to accomplish. According to the interviewee, using L1 in their classroom paves the way for healthy classroom interaction based on mutual understanding which thereby facilitates L2 learning. The interviewees' view perfectly matches with (Harbord, 1992) conclusion that there are three reasons for using L1 in the classroom. These are: facilitating communication, facilitating teacher-student relationships, and facilitating the learning of L2. By using L1, teachers contended, they can save time, energy, avoid confusion and improve interaction. A case in point is (Harbord, 1992) who reported that the biggest reason for using L1 in the L2 classroom is that it can save a lot of time and avoid confusion. Again,

teachers assured the researcher that they use L1 when localizing activities and when they teach culture related issues. Another reason why, teachers argue, they were involved in its use was that there are concepts which are better explained using L1 than L2. In conclusion, teachers said they use L1 in their classrooms to help their students learn better.

In reaction to the question seeking their response on whether they argue for or against the common criticism that L1 reduces learners' L2 exposure, they were all found to refute the criticism ascribing to many practical realities they knew in their EFL classrooms. It would have been a preference for them all to use only English in English classroom had the practical classroom reality been encouraging. However, in their situation it was not fertile to use English only. Hence, they argue against the exclusive use of L2 and believe that the English-only view doesn't work in their case. But teachers were not without knowledge of the danger that the extreme case of L1 might cause to L2 learning in their assertion. They all do believe that overuse of L1 highly harms L2 practice time. That was why most teachers partly shared the concern of English-only proponents. No single teacher started his response to this statement without reservation. Most began with the expression "it depends on its usage". As the teachers argue, if the teacher uses it wisely and purposefully on occasions where L1 use does better than even the L2 simple forms, the use of L1 doesn't affect L2. It rather facilitates L2 learning and can be taken as a resource. If used properly, according to the teachers, L1 can easily clear doubts, develop confidence, motivate and increase students' engagement. Nevertheless, L1 can be a disaster if the teacher uses it for almost every classroom activity. One teacher commented from his primary school observation that teachers use too much of it at lower grade levels to the extent that it would be difficult to distinguish the target language from the other. But, we shouldn't allow our trainees, who would be teachers in the levels mentioned, to adopt the habit of using too much L1. We have to minimize it even if resorting to it happens to be inevitable. So, all teachers seem to be persuaded that L1 is essential in the L2 classroom and thus strongly stated that the English-only view is impractical and invalid. According to the interviewee, teachers should have purpose for L1 use and should be able to determine its amount accordingly. To sum up, it appears that the English-only proponents' view was reasonably objected.

With regard to item 3 which was designed to seek information on the problems that teachers and students encounter in relation with the exclusive use of English, teachers gave broad and complementing accounts. Teachers said students do not understand the concept of an English exclusive lesson because of their poor English proficiency resulted from lack of adequate exposure. If they don't understand, they lose interest and become passive. What's more, they would be discouraged to explore further. (Burden, 2000) points that increasing the amount of L2 instead of perhaps a simple explanation in L1 is likely to have a negative effect and simply add to the frustration on the student's part. To directly quote what one of the teachers said, "I tried to use English exclusively and I ended up with nothing in their mind after series of explanations. Almost all of them were unresponsive to my effort. From then on, I feel like I am talking to an empty class when I use English only. Hence, I am convinced that my efforts to provide what is wanted would be ruined if I used English only". The implication is that teachers can use only the TL and even force students to avoid L1 but that can hardly secure the L2 production. But, the moment he clarifies things in L1, the teacher added, he observes facial expressions and gestures signaling happiness and understanding of the concept followed by active engagement. This seems to be in line with what (Auerbach, 1993) reported that researchers and teachers alike report much more positive results with regard to minimizing tensions and avoiding teacher-student communication gap when the use of L1 is permitted. Also (Ogane , 1997) who claim that the use of L1 actually has benefits in that it can reduce anxiety and enhance the effective environment for learning, facilitate the incorporation of learners' life experiences into the learning process, promote learner-centered curriculum development and allow for language to be used as a meaning making tool. The interviewees also pointed that there are times when they themselves run out of words/expressions to explain some concepts. Since the main important thing in learning and teaching is communication, all the teachers interviewed contended, anything that could be a barrier to it has to be mitigated using any means possible for otherwise the classroom effort would be in vain. In conclusion, the teachers interviewed believe that the exclusive use of L2 badly harms teacher-student communication and learning-teaching as a whole.

Concerning the impacts of using L1 in the L2 classroom, teachers blamed its overuse. According to them, what matters is the length of time and frequency of L1 use. If teachers use L1 very frequently for purposes that can be addressed using the target language itself, students develop unwanted habit. Students always expect teachers to use L1 and thus promote L1 dependence which in turn affects learners' English language competence. While arguing for the option of using L1 in the classroom, most researchers also have cautioned against the overuse of it (Burden, 2000), because it can create an over reliance on it (Polio, 1994), and can oversimplify differences between the two languages, create laziness among students. According to the teachers, frequent and purposeless resort to L1 badly harms learners' L2 exposure and makes them L1 dependent. This shrivels efforts students exert to learn English through English.

To the question they were asked about whether they use a similar amount of Oromo language for their students in different years of study, the majority of teachers responded that they don't use the same amount. i.e teachers contended that they vary the amount of L1 they use together with the study level of the students. The reasons the four teachers forwarded for varying their L1 amount were roughly similar. They all believe that first year students deserve more L1 compared to second and third year students whom they believe are well accustomed to the college learning and teaching process. For them, first year students are less experienced and with lower L2 proficiency level resulting from their poor background. Hence, they need more L1. Consequently, as the teachers claim, they use more L1 in first year EFL classroom and relatively less L1 in second and third year classrooms. The remaining two teachers gave a response that somehow deviates from the former four teachers. One of the two said that he uses L1 not necessarily following the students' year of study. He rather focuses on the students' proficiency level to use L1. "My amount goes with their L2 proficiency. When I feel learners understood me, I don't use L1. But if I find them unable to understand after several attempts, I use L1 until they get the point whatever the level might be", he said. The other teacher said that he doesn't vary his L1 amount together with the proficiency level of the students. He uses L1 where he thinks is necessary regardless of the students' L2 proficiency. I do believe that idea that the amount of L1 teachers use in L2 classroom should be in accordance with the learners need. Besides, one should make sure that the amount he/she use does not suppress L2 learning.

Lastly, teachers were asked if they feel guilty for using L1 in L2 classroom. All of them said they don't feel guilty so long as they use it meaningfully. Yet, only few of the teachers (2) claimed that they are happy to use it. Four of them said that they are in fact not comfortable with the situation they are in even if they don't consider it as a feeling of guilt. They said they use L1 because the classroom situation is compelling and they are not quite comfortable in doing so. Even though teachers do not take L1 as a suitable methodology for teaching L2, L1 use proved itself to be an unavoidable reality in the foreign language classroom that persuaded the teachers to indulge in its use (Atkinson, 1987).

CHAPTER FIVE

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Conclusions

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the classroom use of Oromo language in College 'English Focus' EFL classrooms of different levels. To this effect, the study was guided by leading questions that the researcher wanted to be answered at the end. Specifically, the first question was about whether Oromo language is used in College target groups' EFL classrooms or not. The second one probes the study groups' preferred amount of L1 in the target language classroom while the third demands answer from the investigation regarding the purposes for which Oromo is used in EFL classrooms. The fourth question enables the researcher to investigate the teachers and the students' attitudes towards L1 in 'English Focus' EFL classroom. The penultimate question loves to see if there are statistically significant differences among the attitudes of the study groups who are in different years of study in the college. The last leading question, but not the least, wonders if it can find answer to the question that asks whether there is gender based attitude difference or whether male and female students are significantly different in their responses to the attitude items. To this end, the study devised mechanisms that would enable it to dig out what it was set out to unveil. Three distinct but intertwined tools were used to collect the data required to satisfy the leading questions caring feelings. They are questionnaire (for both teachers and students), Interview to teachers and classroom observation. The harmony among the three instruments helped the researcher to come up with the following conclusions.

To begin with, the result of this study indicates that Oromo language is not only present in college 'English Focus' EFL classrooms, but also that teachers are making use of it as a linguistic tool. The items designed with the intention of investigating this fact came up from all the study groups with a positive result that reveals the presence of L1 in college EFL classroom. The data secured from both teachers and students indicate that L1 is widely used. The second thing the research set out to investigate was the maximum amount of L1 preferred by the target

groups. The amount of the native language the students preferred to use in their respective EFL classrooms varied with their level of study. First year students claimed the highest L1 amount (5.5-7.5 in terms of minutes) or 11-15% out of the 50 minutes English class time compared to second and third year students who demanded (3-5 in terms of minutes) or 6-10% and (less than 2.5 minutes) or up to 5% of the EFL class time. What is more interesting to me as a researcher is the facts behind the figures or the reality that compelled the students to claim the amount they claimed and the fact that these demands vary from group to group. The questionnaire and interview data result showed that students L1 need is high for first year students, medium for second year and least for students in their third year of study in relative terms. One can easily predict the L2 proficiency level of the students as the amount of L1 they prefer using is a clear indicator of their L2 command. The students L1 preferred amount went on decreasing as their L2 experience or their stay in the college increased. So, we can reasonably conclude that much L1 amount was claimed by the least L2 experienced students and that amount keeps dropping with more and more L2 experience during their stay in the college. In other words, the more L2 experienced the students were the less L1 amount they claimed and the Less L2 experienced they were the more L1 amount they were found wanting. In conclusion, the amount of L1 students need depends on their L2 proficiency situation. Meanwhile, the teachers' preferred L1 amount directly matched with what had been claimed by second year students (6-10% or 3-5 minutes out of English class time. In spite of the varying L1 amount needs claimed by students and their pledge during interview that they vary their L1 use in accordance with students L2 proficiency level, teachers appeared to use nearly the same amount of L1 in all the study groups EFL classes. There was a huge gap between the teachers' belief and their practice in the classrooms.

According to the study result students and teachers did not only believe that L1 is important or has a role to play in L2 classroom if used occasionally, but also actively choosing to use L1 in their EFL classrooms for certain functions. Both teachers and students agree that using L1 is important for functions like in pair and/or group work, to explain grammar concepts, to teach/learn the meanings of new English words, to explain difficult concepts, and to see differences between L1 and L2 grammar. Functions like checking comprehension and eliciting language using L1 had been supported by teachers but students declined and oppose teachers L1 use for these functions. As far as the classroom instruction was concerned, the tools produced conflicting results. Teachers, both in the questionnaire they completed and interview, strictly

stressed the importance of highlighting EFL classroom instructions in Oromo language ascribing to the students poor comprehending ability while the data obtained from the students was in contradiction with this view. The observation data was used as a reconciling tip. Students, especially those in their second and third year of study, couldn't understand complex instructions given by teachers during the class times they were visited even though they were respondent enough to the simple and commonly used instructions. Consequently, the observation result validated the teachers claim. Teachers might take this into account when using L1.

With regard to the students and teachers attitude, findings of the present study indicated that teachers and students have a positive attitude towards the use of the Oromo language in EFL classrooms. Both teachers and students believe that the occasional use of L1 facilitates the learning of the target language while its absence badly hurts the learning and teaching process. The point is that the use of Oromo language in EFL classroom doesn't reduce the L2 exposure, it rather facilitates. Meanwhile, it was identified through interview that the excessive use of it results in L1 dependence and affects L2 learning. So, the consensus was that a teacher should know when and how to use it. The finding is in accord with what had been reported by Kenenisa (2003).

This result may not be too different from what the theorists and practitioners might intuited, based on their experiences, but some of the details derived from the attitude data revealed interesting and worth considering results. There found to be statistically significant differences between the views of first year and third year students towards L1 use in EFL classroom. The difference is even close to perfection on the majority of the items. The attitude difference is an indication of the extent of their groups L1 needs difference. From this we can say that first year students showed a more positive attitude towards the use of Oromo language compared to third year students. This is also in line with the result obtained from the time data.

Lastly, result obtained by comparing the students attitudes based on gender suggest that there is statistically significant difference between male and female students with respect to their attitudes towards L1 use. The differences were very high on one of the attitude items whose females' attitude descriptors means were greater. From this it follows that female students showed more positive attitude towards L1 use.

5.2 Recommendations

Depending on the findings of the study and conclusion derived so far. The following recommendations are forwarded

1. This study gives invaluable insight into the use of first language in EFL classrooms for various functions. Both teachers and students believe that the use of L1 avoids anxiety that emanates from linguistic barrier and promotes healthy classroom interaction based on mutual understanding; overcomes the L2 proficiency shortage and make English learnable. It was also confirmed that the use of L1 saves EFL classroom time and energy. Since the findings indicate that the wise use of L1 in EFL classrooms has pedagogical and psychological roles to play, it should not by any means be discouraged in college EFL classrooms if the purpose of teaching is fostering communication and thereby English language learning.
2. It was found out that students in different years of study claimed a different amount of L1 in their EFL classrooms. Teachers should vary the L1 amount they use in accordance with the groups need. Similarly, teachers should be able to relate their purposes of using L1 with the students' expectations to address the needs of the students as their feelings should be respected and acted upon.
3. The study revealed that female students were more L1 dependent compared to male students. Thus, the college administration together with the English teachers should establish and strengthen a sustainable extra class English language improvement activities like English Drama club, tutorials and trainings to enhance the students' L2 proficiency.
4. Module /course book writers, syllabus /curriculum designers for the level under study should also make reference to the students' mother tongue wherever appropriate while preparing English language teaching materials.

References

- Atkinson, D. (1987). The Mother Tongue in the Classroom-a Neglected Resource? *ELT Journal*, 44(4), pp. 241-247
- _____.(1993). *Teaching Monolingual Classes*. London: Longman
- _____.(1995). English-Only in the Classroom: Why Do We Do It? *On-line internet*. Available: <http://etc.Uwb.edu.Pl/ptt Feb95/8.htm>
- Auerbach, E.(1993). Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom, *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), pp.9-32
- Bless,C.and Higson-Smith,C.(2000). *Fundamentals of Social Research Methods: An African Perspective*. 3rd edition. Cape Town :Juta Education Ltd.
- Bolitho, R.(1983). The Communicative Teaching of English in Non-English Speaking Countries, *ELT Journal*, 37(3), pp. 235-242
- Brown, R. (1973) . *A First Language*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, H. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Longman: San Francisco.
- Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using Surveys in Language Programs*. Cambridge University Press
- Buckmaster R. (2002). Using L1: What Kind of Sin? *On-line internet*. Available:<http://iatefl.org.pl/nletter18/nlet18-2.html>.
- Burden, P. (2000). The use of the students' mother tongue in monolingual English "conversation" classes at Japanese universities, *The Language Teacher Online*, 24(6). Retrieved April 15, 2011 from <http://www.jaltpublications.org/tlt/articles/2000/06/burden>
- Burden, P.(2001). When do native English speaking teachers and Japanese college students disagree about the use of Japanese in the English conversation classroom?, *The Language Teacher Online*, 25(4).Retrieved May 15, 2008 from <http://www.jaltpublications.org/tlt/articles/2001/04/burden>
- Chapman, L.R.H.(1958). *Teaching English to Beginners*. London: Longman, Green and Co. Ltd
- Choffey, S.2001. The L1 Culture in the L2 Classroom, *Modern English Teacher*, 10(2),pp.54-58.
- Chomsky, N.(1976). *Reflection on Language*. London: Temple Smith.

- Cole, S.(1998). The Use of L1 in Communicative English Classrooms, *The Language Teacher JALT Journal*, on-line internet. Available: [http:// www. JAL Publications. Org/tlt/files /98/dec/cole. Html](http://www.JALPublications.Org/tlt/files/98/dec/cole.html)
- Cohen, L. (2000). *Research methods in education*. RoutledgeFalmer 29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001. 5th ed.
- Cook, G. (2002). Breaking Taboos, *English Teaching Professional*, Issue23, pp.5-7.
- Cook, V.(1999). Creating Second Language Users. On-line internet. Available: [http://private www.essex.ac.uk/~ Vcook/OB519.htm](http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~Vcook/OB519.htm).
- _____.2001a. *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold.
- _____.2001b. Using the First Language in the Classroom, *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3),pp.403-419.
- Crow L.D and Alice(1956). *Human Development and learning*. New York, American book Company
- Critchley,M. (1999). Bilingual support in english classes in Japan: *A survey of student opinions of L1-use by foreign teachers*. *The language teacher*,23(9),19-13.
- Cunningham,C.(2000). Translation in the Classroom. A Useful Tool for Second Language Acquisition. On-line internet. Available: [http:// www.cels.bham.ac.uk /resources /essays/cindyc2.pdf](http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/cindyc2.pdf).
- Dajani, J. (2002). *Using Mother Tongue to Become a Better Learner: Why and How*, *Modern English Teacher*, 11(2), pp.65-67.
- Deller, S.(2003). The Language of the Learner, *English Teaching Professional*, Issue 26, pp.5-7.
- Duff, A. (1989). Translation. *Oxford: Oxford University Press*
- Frankenberg-Garcia, A.(2000). Using Portugese in the Teaching of English. *On- line internet*. Available:[http://www. Portuguese mct.pt/ Repositorio/ Frankenburg-Garcia 2000b.doc](http://www.Portuguese mct.pt/ Repositorio/ Frankenburg-Garcia 2000b.doc).
- Gabelatos,C.(2001). L1 Use in ELT: Not a Skeleton But a Bone of Contention. *A Response to Prodromou*. *On-line internet*. Available: [http://www.tesolgrece. com /nl /70/700/.html](http://www.tesolgrece.com/nl/70/700/html).
- Gay I.R. and Airasian (2003). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application*. 7th edition .New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Green, J. F. (1970). The Use of the Mother Tongue and the Teaching of Translation. *ELT Journal*, 24: 217-223.
- Harbord, J.(1992). The Use of Mother Tongue in the Classroom, *ELT Journal*, 46(4),pp.350-355
- Harmer, J.(2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Ltd.

- Hawks, P. (2001). Making Distinctions. A Discussion of the Use of Mother Tongue in the Foreign Language Classroom, *Hwa Kang Journal of TEFL*, Online internet. Available: [http://www. Geocities.Com/HawksTongue.html](http://www.Geocities.Com/HawksTongue.html).
- Howatt, A.P.R.(1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen,S.(1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*.Oxford: Pergamon .
- _____.(1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York: Longman.
- Lado, R.(1964). *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach*. New York Pergamon .
- Langer, S.L. (2001). The Effect of Home Language Use in the ESL Classroom: Additive or Subtractive? *On-line internet. Available: A:/the effect of home language use in the ESL classroom.5-langer.htm*
- Linder, D.(2002). *Translation, English Teaching Professional*, Issue 23,pp39-41
- Macaro, E.(1997). *Target language, Collaborative Learning and Autonomy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- _____(2001). Analyzing student teachers' code switching in foreign language classrooms: theories and decision making, *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 531-548.
- Mattioli, G. (2004). On native language intrusions and making do with words: Linguistically homogeneous classrooms and native language use, *English Teaching Forum*, 42(4), 20-25.
- Medgyes, P.(1994). *The Non-native Teacher*. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Miles, R. (2004). *Evaluating the Use of L1 in the English language Classroom*. School of Humanities. Centre for English Language Studies Department of English. University of Birmingham
- Ministry of Education. (1997). *English for Ethiopia: Grade Eleven – Teacher's Book I*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- Mitchell, R. (1988). *Communicative Language Teaching: in Practice*. CILT: London
- Murakami, I.(1999). The Bridging Strategy: Active Use of Learners' First Language in Second Language Teaching. On-line internet. Available: [http:// www.htmlmag.co.uk/nov01/martnov 013.rtf](http://www.htmlmag.co.uk/nov01/martnov013.rtf).
- Nation, P. (2003). *The role of the first language in foreign language learning. Asian Inviting Students to use their L1 in the EFL classroom*. (Joice. Alison. Hans)
- Naimushin , B.(2002). *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching*, *Modern English Teacher*, 11(4),pp. 46-49
- Januleviciene, V. and Kavaliauskiene,G. (2002). Promoting the Fifth Skill in Teaching ESP. *On-line internet. Available:http.www esp-world-info/Articles*.
- Kenenisa, B.(2003). Using L1 in the EFL classroom:The case of the Oromo language with particular reference to Adama Teachers Colege. *AAU*, unpublished MA thesis.
- Krashen,S.(1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon .

- Lankshear, C. and Knobble (2004). *A Handbook for Teacher Research: From Design to Implementation*. New York: Open University Press.
- Nunan, D. and Lamb, C. (1996). *The Self-Directed Teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogane, E. (1997). Codeswitching in EFL learner Discourse. *JALT Journal*, 19 (1):107-121
- Pachler, N & Field, K. (2001). *Learning to Teach Modern Foreign Languages in the Secondary School*. Routledge: London.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Longman: London & New York.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Polio, C. (1994). Comment on Else Roberts Auerbach's "Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (2):153-161
- Prodromou, L. (2001). From Mother Tongue to Other Tongue, *On-line internet*. Available: <http://www.Tesolgreece.com/mother.html>
- Reis, L.A.V.P. (1996). The Myths and the Practical Needs of Using L1 in the EFL Classes: A Learner Training Experiment, *English Teaching Forum*, 34(4), pp. 61-62
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press
- Ringbom, H. (1987). *The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd
- Rubin, J. 1975. What the Good Language Learners can Teach Us, *TESOL Quarterly*. 9(1), pp.41-51
- Rinvolutri, M. (2001). Mother Tongue in the Foreign Language Classroom: *Why and How*, *Modern English Teacher*, 10(2), pp. 41-44
- Schweers, C.W. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 Classroom, *English Teaching Forum*, 37(2), pp.6-13
- Stern, H.H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swan, M. (1985). A Critical Look at the Communicative Approach (2), *ELT Journal*, 39(2), pp.76-87.
- Tang, J. (2002). Using L1 in the English Classroom, *English Teaching Forum*, 40(1), pp.36-43.
- Titford, C. (1983). Translation for Advanced Learners, *ELT Journal*, 37(1), pp 52-57.
- Tomasello, M. and Herron, C. (1989). *Feedback for Language Transfer Errors: The Garden Path Technique*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, pp.385-395
- Towel, R. and Hawkins, R. (1994). *Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*. UK, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd
- Tudor, I. (1987). Using Translation in ESP. *ELT Journal*, 41/4, 268-273.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a Role for the L1 in Second and Foreign language Teaching. *But...*, *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(4), pp.531-540.

- Ur, P.(1996). *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weschler, R. (1997). Uses of Japanese (L1) in English Classroom: *Introducing the Functional-Translation Method*, *The Internet TESL Journal*, [On-line]3(2). Available:<http://www.aitech.ac.jp/~iteslj/>
- Widdowson, H.G.(1996). Comment: Authenticity and Autonomy in ELT, *ELT Journal*, 50(1),pp. 67-68.2 1
- Willis, J.(1981). *Teaching English Through English*. Essex: Longman.

Appendix A



Jimma University School of Graduate Studies Department of English

Questionnaire filled in by students

Dear Students

This study is aimed at assessing Jimma Teachers' college English Focus students and their Instructors use of Oromo language in their English classroom. Your response will be used only for research purposes and there won't be any risk you incur because you completed the questionnaire. There is no need to put your name on the questionnaire you complete as individual responses will not be reported. Your answers are completely confidential. Your honest answers to this question will help me in better understanding of the subject of the study. So I request your truthful and keen participation. If you want to change any of your response, make sure that you have cancelled unwanted ones. Indicate your response by putting an " X " mark against the questions and the numbers of your choice.

Thank You in Advance for Your Kind Cooperation

Section I: Background Information

1. Age _____
2. Sex _____
3. Year of Study _____

For the response to each statement

5= Strongly Agree

4= Agree

3=Neutral

2=Disagree

1=Strongly Disagree

A. Issues related to L1 Presence in L2 classroom

NO	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	I use Oromo language in my English class					
2	My college English teachers use Oromo language in EFL classroom					
3	My classmates use Oromo language in EFL classroom					

B. Preferred L1 class time

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	The time spent using Oromo language to teach English should be less than 5 minutes out of the 50 minutes English class time.					
2	6-10 minutes out of 50 minutes of an English lesson should be given in Oromo language					
3	Oromo language use in EFL classrooms should take 5.5-7.5 minutes out of 50 minutes of English class time					
4	Upto 10 out of 50 minutes of an English lesson should be given in Oromo language					
5	More than 10 out of 50 minutes of an English lesson should be given in Oromo language					

C. Purposes for which L1 is used

	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	I use Oromo Language in pair and/or group work					
2	I need Oromo language to learn the meanings of new English words					
3	I sometimes want EFL teachers to use Oromo language to explain grammar concepts					
4	EFL complex classroom instructions should be given in Oromo Language					
5	I want EFL teachers to use Oromo Language to check comprehension					
6	I want EFL teachers to use Oromo language to explain difficult concepts					
7	I want teachers to use Oromo language to elicit language					
8	I want EFL teachers to explain the differences between Oromo and English Grammar in Oromo Language.					

D. Students' attitude

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	I support EFL teachers' occasional use of Oromo language in EFL classrooms at a college level					
2	English teachers' use of Oromo Language helps me a lot to learn English					
3	The fact that EFL teachers do not use Oromo language in EFL classrooms doesn't affect my understanding of the lesson					
4	I can't avoid using Oromo language even if EFL teachers prevent me					
5	I think using Oromo Language in EFL classroom facilitates the learning of English language					
6	I want an English teacher who speaks Oromo language					
7	I prefer an English teacher who allows us to use Oromo Language in the English classroom					
8	I like an EFL teacher who teaches English through translation					



Appendix B

Jimma University School of Graduate Studies Department of English

Questionnaire completed by Teachers

Dear Teachers

This study is aimed at assessing Jimma Teachers' college English major students and their Instructors use of Oromo language in their English courses' class. Your response will be used only for research purposes and there won't be any risk you incur because you completed the questionnaire. There is no need to put your name on the questionnaire you complete as individual responses will not be reported. Your answers are completely confidential. Your honest answers to this question will help me in better understanding of the subject of the study. So I request your truthful and keen participation. If you want to change any of your response, make sure that you have cancelled unwanted ones. Indicate your response by putting an " X " mark against the questions and the numbers of your choice.

Thank You in Advance for Your Kind Cooperation

Section I: Background Information

1. Age _____
2. Sex _____
3. Qualification _____
4. Teaching experience _____

For the response to each statement

- 5= Strongly Agree
- 4= Agree
- 3=Neutral
- 2=Disagree
- 1=Strongly Disagree

Questionnaire for Teachers

A. Issues related to L1 Presence in L2 classroom

NO	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1.1	I use Oromo language in my English lesson					
1.2	My colleagues use Oromo language in their EFL lesson					
1.3	My 'English Focus' EFL students use Oromo language in their English classroom					

B. Preferred L1 Class time

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1
2.1	The time spent using Oromo language to teach English should be less than 2.5 minutes out of the 50 minutes of English class time.					
2.2	3-5 minutes out of the 50 minutes of an English lesson should be in Oromo language					
2.3	Oromo language use in EFL classrooms should take 5.5- 7.5 minutes out of 50 minutes of English class time					
2.4	Up to 10 out of 50 minutes of an English lesson should be given in Oromo language					
2.5	More than 10 out of 50 minutes of an English lesson should be given in Oromo language					

C. Purposes for which L1 is used in L2 classroom

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1
3.1	Oromo Language is important in pair and/or group work					
3.2	I need Oromo language to teach the meanings of new English words					
3.3	I sometimes use Oromo language to explain grammar concepts					
3.4	I give EFL complex classroom instructions in Oromo Language					
3.5	I use Oromo Language to check comprehension					
3.6	I use Oromo language to explain difficult concepts					
3.7	I use Oromo language to elicit language (e.g How do we say.... in English?)					
3.8	I use Oromo Language to explain the differences between Oromo and English grammar					

D. Teachers' Attitude

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1	0
4.1	I support 'English Focus' students' occasional use of Oromo language in EFL classroom at a college level						
4.2	My use of Oromo language helps students to learn English better						
4.3	The fact that I do not use Oromo language in the EFL classroom doesn't affect my 'English Focus' students' understanding of the lesson						
4.4	Students need for translation force me to use Oromo Language in my EFL classroom even if I don't want to						
4.5	I think using Oromo Language in the EFL classroom facilitates the learning of English language						
4.6	EFL teachers should speak Oromo language						
4.7	I allow my students to use Oromo Language in my EFL classroom						
4.8	I teach English to my EFL students through translation of some concepts into Oromo Language						

Appendix C

Teachers' Interview Questions

1. In the questionnaire you completed, you indicated that you use Oromo language in your EFL lesson. Why do you do so?
2. What reason would you put forward to convince those who believe that only English should be used in English classroom?
3. What do you think would be a problem to you and your students if you use English exclusively in EFL classroom?
4. In your view, what are the problems that using L1 in the English classroom entails?
5. Do you use the same amount of Oromo language for your students in different years of study? Why?
6. How do you feel about using Oromo language in English classroom? Do you feel guilty?

Bargaafii Barattoota

Questionnaire to be completed by students

Barattoota!

Kaayyoon inni guddaan qo'annoo fi qorannoo kanaa **faayidaa barnoota afaanIngiliizii keessatti afaan Oromoo fayyadamuun qabu adda baasuu fi yaada falaa eeruudha.** Bargaafii kana guutuun na gargaaruun keessan qo'annoo fi qorannicha adeemsifamuuf baay'ee barbaachisaa ta'uu ibsaa gaafilee hunda qablbeeffannoon akka naaf guuttan kabajaan isin gaafadha. Deebiin isin kennitan iciitiin qabama!

Galatooma!

OdeeffannooDuraa: (Tokkorra mari)

Waggaa: 1^{ffa} 2^{ffa} 3^{ffa}

Saala: Dhiira Dubartii

Umrii: _____

Gaafilee kanatti aananii dhufan deebisuuf filannoowwan 0,1,2,3,4, fi 5 jedhamanii kennaman keessaa filuudhaan sanduuqa lakkoofsa isa yaada keetiin walsimu qabate keessatti mallattoo “ x” kaa'i.

Qajeelfama: Yaadawwanarmaangadiitiif

5= Cimsee waliigala /Strongly agree

4=Waliigala /Agree

3=Yaada hinkennu /Neutral

2=Waliihingalu /Disagree

1= Cimsee Dida /Strongly disagree

No	Gaafilee	5	4	3	2	1
1	Yemmuu barnoota A/Ingiliizii baradhu A/Oromooti nan fayyadama					
2	Barsiisonni keenya kanneen A/Ingiliizii barsiisan daree A/Ingiliizii keessatti A/Oromooti ni fayyadamu					
3	Barattoonni daree kootii yemmuuarannoota A/Ingiliizii barannu A/Oromooti ni fayyadamu					
4	Daqiiqaa 50 sa'aa barnoota A/Ingiliizii keessaa, A/Oromooti fayyadamuun A/Ingiliizii kan barsiifamu daqiiqaa 5 gadi ta'uu qaba.					
5	Daqiiqaan 6-10 barannoo A/Ingiliizii A/Oromooti fayyadamuun ta'uu qaba					
6	Daree A/Ingiliiziitti itti fayyadamini A/Oromoo daqiiqaa 11-15 ta'uu qaba					
7	Daqiiqa 50 barannoo afaan Ingiliizii keessaa daqiiqaan 16-20 A/Oromoon ta'uu qaba					
8	Daqiiqaa 50 barannoo A/Ingiliizii keessaa daqiiqaa 20 ol barnootichi A/Oromoon kennamuu qaba					
9	Hojii cimdii fi garee barannoo A/Ingiliizii keessatti A/Oromotti nan fayyadama					
10	Jechoota A/Ingiliizii haraa baruuf A/Oromoo na barbaachisa					
11	Barsiisonni A/Ingiliizii yaadrimee seerluga A/ingiliizii ibsuuf A/Oromooti akka gargaaraman nan barbaada					
12	Qajeelfamni daree A/Ingiliizii A/Oromoon kennamuu qaba					
13	Barsiisonni A/Ingiliizii hubannoo barattootaa madaaluuf A/Oromotti akka fayyadaman fedha.					
14	Barsiisonni A/Ingiliizii yaadrimeewwan ulfaatoo ibsuuf A/Oromootiin akka dubbatan barbaada					
15	Barsiisonni dandeetti afaani barattotaa qirqirsuuf A/Oromootiin akka dubbatan fedha					
16	Garaagarummaa seerlugaa A/Ingiliizii fi A/Oromoo ibsuuf barsiisonni A/Ingiliizii A/Oromooti akka gargaaraman fedha					
17	Daree A/Ingiliizii sadargaa kolleejjiitti itti fayyadamiinsa A/Oromoo barsiisotaa A/Ingiliizii nan deeggara					
18	Barsiisonni A/Ingiliizii barannoo keessatti A/Oromoon dubbachuunsanii A/Ingiliizii akkan baradhuuf hedduu na gargaara					
19	Barsiisaan A/Ingiliizii A/Oromootiin gonkumaa dubbachuu utuu dhiiseeyyuu barnooticha rakkoo tokko malee hubachuu nan danda'a.					
20	Barsiisonni daree keessatti A/Oromooti fayyadamu utuu na dhoorganiyyuu ani dhiisuu hindanda'u					
21	Daree A/Ingiliiziitti A/Oromoo fayyadamuun barnoota A/Ingiliizii ni deeggara jedheen yaada					
22	Barsiisonni A/Ingiliizii barsiisan A/Oromoo beekuu qabu					
23	Barsiisonni keenya yemmuu A/Ingiliizii barannu A/Oromooti akka fayyadamnu nu jajjabeessu					
24	Barsiisaa A/Ingiliizii A/Oromooti hiikaa barsiisu nan jaaladha					

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work, not presented for any degree in any universities, and that all the sources used for it are duly acknowledged.

Candidate's Name Jemal Abdulkadir Signature _____ Date _____

CONFIRMATION

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as a thesis advisor.

Advisor 1: Name _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Advisor 2: Name _____ Signature _____ Date _____

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

As members of the Board of Examiners of the M.A. thesis Open Defense Examination, we certify that we have read and evaluated the thesis prepared by **Jemal Abdulkadir** and examined the candidate. We recommended that the thesis be accepted as fulfilling the *Thesis* requirement for the Degree of Master of Art in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Tekle Ferede

Chairperson

[Signature]

Signature

24/01/2012

Date

Haregewan Abuse

External Examiner

[Signature]

Signature

Jan. 15, 2012

Date

Getachew Seyoum

Internal Examiner

[Signature]

Signature

Jan. 15, 2012

Date



This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 License.

To view a copy of the license please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

This is a download from the BLDS Digital Library on OpenDocs
<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/>