

ROLE OF THE L1 IN FL CLASSROOMS: LEARNER AND TEACHER BELIEFS,
ATTITUDES, AND PRACTICES

by

MOHAMMAD RAHIM SAMADI

BA, Kabul University, 2001

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Modern Languages
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2011

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. Abby Franchitti

Copyright

MOHAMMAD RAHIM SAMADI

2011

Abstract

The role of first language (L1) has been controversial in foreign language (FL) learning and teaching. This study examines the relationship between L1 use and gender and level of education of EFL teachers as well as gender and EFL proficiency level of learners in an Afghan university setting. It also investigates the relationship between FL use and learner anxiety by learner gender and EFL proficiency level. The study hypothesized that female FL teachers use the L1 more than male teachers in FL classrooms. Second, low FL proficiency learners consider L1 use as necessary in FL classrooms. Third, low FL proficiency students experience more anxiety with the exclusive use of FL than higher level learners. Fourth, female learners experience more anxiety than male students with the exclusive use of FL by learners and teachers.

Twenty EFL teachers participated in the study by completing a 19-item questionnaire and sixty EFL learners by completing a 27-item questionnaire about their views towards L1/FL use and learner anxiety. The data, analyzed through SPSS software, included calculating frequencies and percentages, computing correlations, and conducting independent-samples *t*-tests to compare the mean difference between the variables.

The first hypothesis was not supported as male teachers reported using the L1 more than female teachers. The study also revealed that male teachers with BA and MA degrees used the L1 more than female teachers with BA degrees. In contrast, female teachers with MA degrees used the L1 more than male teachers with BA and MA degrees and also more than female teachers with BA degrees. The results supported hypothesis two. More elementary learners considered the use of L1 as necessary than intermediate and advanced students. The findings also supported hypotheses three and four. Elementary learners as well as female students experienced more anxiety with the exclusive use of FL than intermediate and advanced level students and male learners. The principal conclusion indicated a significant positive correlation between the exclusive use of FL and learner anxiety.

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	vi
Acknowledgements.....	vii
List of Abbreviations.....	viii
Dedication.....	ix
Chapter 1 - Introduction	1
1.1 Contextual Background	1
1.2 Purpose of the Present Study.....	3
1.3 Education System in Afghanistan	5
Chapter 2 - Literature Review	10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 L1 Use in FL/L2 Learning	10
2.2.1 Negative Influence of L1 on FL/L2 Learning	10
2.2.2 Positive Influence of L1 in L2 Learning	11
2.3 L1 Use and FL/L2 Teaching Methods.....	12
2.3.1 Language Teaching Methods that Allow L1 Use	12
2.3.2 Language Teaching Methods that Reject or Minimize L1 Use	13
2.4 L1 and FL/L2 Private Speech in FL/L2 Learning	15
2.5 L1 Use in FL/L2 Classrooms	16
2.6 Language and Gender	20
2.7 FL/L2 Use and Learner Anxiety.....	24
2.8 Goals of the study	27
Chapter 3 - Methodology	29
3.1 Participants.....	29
3.2 Instruments.....	29
3.3 Data Collection Procedure	31
Chapter 4 - Results.....	33
4.1 Introduction.....	33
4.2 Attitudes of Teachers towards the Use of L1	34

4.2.1	L1 Use and FL Learning.....	34
4.2.2	L1 Use for Classroom Management.....	36
4.2.3	Teacher Perception of Learner Anxiety and FL/L1 Use	37
4.3	Attitudes of Learners towards L1 Use	38
4.3.1	FL Development and L1 Use.....	38
4.3.2	Learner Anxiety and FL Use	40
4.3.2.1	Self-Confidence	41
4.3.2.2	Students' Fear Understanding FL Use by Teacher	42
4.3.2.3	Nervous Speaking FL	44
4.3.2.4	Self-Esteem Speaking FL.....	46
Chapter 5	- Discussion of Results and Conclusion.....	48
5.1	Introduction	48
5.2	Hypothesis 1	48
5.3	Hypothesis 2	50
5.4	Hypothesis 3	51
5.5	Hypothesis 4.....	52
5.6	Study Limitations	53
5.7	Pedagogical Implications	54
5.8	Personal and Professional Impact.....	57
5.9	Possibilities for Future Research	59
Bibliography	60
Appendix A	- Informed Consent Form	65
Appendix B	- Debriefing	71
Appendix C	- Teacher Questionnaire.....	73
Appendix D	- Student Questionnaire	76
Appendix E	- Background Survey Form for Teachers.....	82
Appendix F	- Language Background Survey Form for Students	83
Appendix G	- Questions not Included in this Study	84

List of Tables

Table 1 Amount of L1 Use by Gender and Education Level.....	34
Table 2 L1 Use and FL Learning by Gender and Education Level.....	35
Table 3 Correlations among Purposes of L1 Use by Gender Level.....	36
Table 4 L1 Use for Classroom Management by Gender and Education Level.....	37
Table 5 Learner Anxiety and L1/FL Use by Gender and Education Level.....	38
Table 6 Learner Estimation of Teacher Amount of L1 Use by Gender and Proficiency Level..	38
Table 7 L1Use and FL Development by Gender and FL Proficiency Level.....	39
Table 8 Correlations among L1/FL Use and Learner FL Anxiety by Students' Gender Level..	40
Table 9 Learner Anxiety and L1/FL Use by Gender and FL Proficiency Level.....	41
Table 10 FL Use and Learner Self-Confidence by Gender and FL Proficiency Level.....	42
Table 11 Fear Understanding Teacher FL Use by Gender and FL Proficiency Level.....	44
Table 12 Nervous Using FL by Gender and FL Proficiency Level.....	46
Table 13 Afraid Being Laughed at When Using FL by Gender and FL Proficiency Level.....	47
Table 14 Effects of L1 Use on FL Learning by Teacher Gender and Education Level.....	84
Table 15 Purposes of L1 Use by Teacher Gender and Education Level.....	84
Table 16 Effects of L1 Use on FL Learning by Gender and FL Proficiency Level.....	85
Table 17 Purposes of L1 Use by Gender and FL Proficiency Level.....	86

Acknowledgements

This research project would not have been possible without the support of many people. First and foremost, I am heartily and sincerely thankful to my supervisor, Dr. Abby Franchitti, whose encouragement, guidance and support from the initial to the final level enabled me to develop an understanding of the subject. She patiently read the drafts of this thesis, provided me with insightful comments and suggestions throughout writing this paper. I am especially thankful to Dr. Franchitti because she generously spent much of her precious time to meet me on weekly basis, read the drafts of each chapter and gave me constructive and thought-provoking feedback. I owe my deepest gratitude to Dr. Phillip Marzluf, my committee member, for reading the drafts patiently and providing me with insightful comments and suggestions for writing this paper. This thesis would not have been done without his guidance and thoughtful comments in data analysis and writing of this thesis. I am equally grateful to Dr. Emma Betz, my thesis committee member for reading the draft of the paper and giving me productive suggestions.

I am also grateful to my colleague, Khalid Waziri, who assisted me in collection of the data from the Kabul University, Afghanistan and made this study possible. I also would like to thank all Kabul University EFL teachers and learners who eagerly and voluntarily participated in this study. It is also a pleasure to thank my colleagues who read the first drafts of questionnaires and their translations in this project and provided me with insightful comments.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family for all their love and encouragement. Special thanks to my beloved parents who raised me with a love of education and supported me in all my pursuits. And most of all for my loving, supportive, encouraging, and patient wife whose faithful support during writing this thesis is so appreciated. Thank you.

List of Abbreviations

EFL	English as a Foreign Language
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
FL	Foreign Language
SLL	Second Language Learning
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
KSU	Kansas State University
KU	Kabul University
CA	Contrastive Analysis
GTM	Grammar Translation Method
CLL	Community Language Learning
DM	Direct Method
ALM	Audio-lingual Method
NA	Natural Approach
CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
TEFL/TESL	Teaching English as a Foreign/Second Language
IRB	Institutional Review Board

Dedication

To my parents, wife, and lovely children.

Chapter 1 - Introduction

1.1 Contextual Background

Traditionally, in Afghanistan, my home country and the context of this research project, some Afghan EFL teachers use the L1 (Dari or Pashto) in EFL classrooms to various degrees. These teachers argue that L1 should be used especially at the lower levels since exclusive FL use might make learners experience anxiety as manifested by forgetting words, avoiding speaking FL, and withdrawal from FL classrooms (see Chapter 2, section 2.6 for a discussion of FL use and learner FL anxiety). However, there is a growing feeling that traditional methods are completely ineffective as recently an opposition against L1 has started among Afghan EFL teachers. Many Afghan EFL teachers have begun to associate L1 use with the traditional language teaching methods, for example, the Grammar Translation Method that uses the L1 excessively. These teachers argue that L1 should not be used at all, and they teach their EFL classes entirely in English. There is a feeling amongst these teachers that traditional methods are completely ineffective. It seems that by adopting and adapting to the new trends in teaching methods, these teachers are ignoring the role of L1 in our EFL classrooms without giving it enough thought.

Similarly, I have noticed discussions about the use of L1 and FL among Afghan EFL students. Some students believe that since they do not understand the lesson in English, especially when these students cannot express their opinions in English and are not allowed to do so in their L1, they think that they might experience fear, insecurity, and low self-esteem. As a result, these students may not be able to participate well in the learning process. Yet, there are

students who complain about L1 use in FL classrooms and state that L1 use limits their opportunities to practice the FL and reduces their FL exposure that they need to learn the FL.

I have also observed discussions among EFL teachers and students. These teachers and students tend to evaluate whether it is the male or female teachers who use the L1 more in EFL classrooms. Some teachers and students believe that female EFL teachers tend to use the L1 in EFL classrooms more than their male colleagues do. When I was learning EFL both at school and at the university, I observed that both my male and female EFL teachers used the L1 in EFL classrooms. However, my female teachers seemed to turn to L1 more often than the male teachers did. But this might not be an indication that the female EFL teachers mainly prefer using the L1 in EFL classrooms in the Afghan EFL context. Instead, this might be limited to only the male and female teachers that I had the opportunity to study with. The EFL education, teaching experiences or the particular group of students that they were teaching may be the factors influencing their decisions about L1 use in FL classrooms. I believe further investigation is needed to determine 1) which group tends to use the L1 more often in FL classrooms -- male or female teachers, 2) whether the teaching strategies differ according to FL teachers' gender, 3) and if strategies differ according to teachers' and students' FL proficiency levels.

After completing my MA coursework in TEFL at Kansas State University (KSU), I have realized how EFL learners may better learn a FL. My coursework has also furthered the development of my pedagogical knowledge in regards to the teaching a FL. I understand that having knowledge about teaching methodologies and pedagogical awareness can help a FL teacher to better teach his/her students and make informed decisions concerning when to use and not to use the L1 in FL classrooms. More importantly, as a result of this study, I will be able to recognize when it is necessary to use the L1 and when to only use the FL to effectively facilitate

students' FL learning. I believe that after completing this research project, I will be able to conduct similar studies and find solutions for problems that Afghan EFL teachers and learners are faced with.

1.2 Purpose of the Present Study

This research studies the relationship between L1 use by teachers in FL classrooms and teachers' gender. The project also examines the relationship between FL use and FL anxiety with regard to learners' gender (see Chapter 2, section 2.5 for a discussion of the relationship between language and gender) and FL proficiency levels to see how FL use and learner anxiety differ according to learners' gender and their FL proficiency levels. The research questions investigated in this study include:

1. What is the relationship between L1 use and FL teachers' gender in FL classrooms?
2. How do FL learners of various proficiency levels view the role of L1 in FL classrooms?
3. What is the relationship between FL use by students and teachers and the anxiety that FL learners experience according to the FL proficiency levels of students?
4. What is the relationship between FL use and anxiety that FL learners experience according to students' gender?

The review of previous research (see Chapter 2 for a detailed discussion of these studies by Atkinson, 1987; Duff & Polio, 1990; Gardener et al., 1977; Karathanos, 2005; Levine, 2003; Liu & Jackson, 2009; Losey, 1995; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002; Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney, 2008; Schweers, 1999) helped me formulate the following hypotheses for this study. The data will be analyzed to determine if the four proposed hypotheses are supported:

1. Female FL teachers will perceive the role of L1 as necessary and tend to use it more than male teachers in FL classrooms.
2. Low FL proficiency level students will believe that L1 use is necessary in FL classrooms.
3. Students with low FL proficiency levels will experience more anxiety when FL is used exclusively.
4. Female FL learners will experience more anxiety than male students when FL is used exclusively by learners and teachers.

The Afghan EFL setting presents an important context for educational research concerning possibilities for examining the relationship between language and gender. First, because Afghanistan (particularly rural areas) is a culturally and religiously conservative country in which women play less significant roles in family, and public decision making; women have fewer opportunities to express their opinions. Second, as the Afghan home is male-dominated, decisions are made by men (Moghadam, 2002, p. 19). Third, opportunities for women to interact are limited to those of the same sex other than close family members. Fourth, school education (i.e. primary to high school) is separate for boys and girls, and students are taught by teachers of the same gender because parents do not allow their daughters to be taught by a male teacher (UNESCO, 2006, p. 2). Co-education starts at the university level and this might present women with a cultural shock as they must sit and study with students and teachers of the opposite gender. The above factors might have influence on Afghan male and female FL students' learning, class participation, their choice or preference for language use (either FL or L1), and their feelings about cross-gender conversations in the classroom and learning activities as they start learning in a new educational environment.

This thesis is divided into five chapters. Chapter one provides readers with an introduction to the EFL teaching context in Afghanistan and the purpose for undertaking this project. The current professional literature, examining the role of L1 in FL classrooms from the second language learning (SLL) theories and L2 teaching methodologies, is reviewed in Chapter two. Additionally, Chapter two discusses the current studies on the relationship between gender and FL/L2 learning and the relationship between FL use and anxiety that FL learners experience. Chapter three discusses the methodology used in this study for data collection. The data analysis and its results in this study will be presented in Chapter 4. Finally, Chapter 5 discusses the results of this research, implications of this study, and offers some suggestions for further research in this area.

1.3 Education System in Afghanistan

This section provides a brief overview of the history of education in Afghanistan and attitudes of Afghans towards women education. The discussion will help us better understand the various limitations and restrictions that Afghan women face in seeking education, and how these factors affect their opportunities for education and communications in the classroom as well as inside and outside of home.

There are two education systems in Afghanistan. The first and older one involves teaching by the Mullahs (Islamic scholars) in the village mosques. In this religious system young boys and girls are taught the Holy Koran, Islamic principles, and reading by the Mullahs (Karleson & Mansory, 2004, p. 91; Riley, 2009, p. 7). Boys can continue their studies as long as they and their parents wish them to do so. However, most girls stop going to the mosques between the ages of 10-12 because culturally conservative families in the rural areas consider sending their teen girls for schooling shameful. The honor of the family, “the tribe and

community is invested in women” (Ahmed-Ghosh, 2003, pp. 1-2). Women are often expected to stay at home, look after the children, do household chores, and prepare meals. In addition, Afghan families are male-dominated. Often, men in the rural areas make many family decisions. Gender intermingling is forbidden and interaction between men and women is almost always limited to close family members (Ahmed-Ghosh, 2003, pp. 1-2; Moghadam, 2002, p. 20). These factors negatively affect Afghan women’s access to education, class participation, communication opportunities in and out of home, and in the classroom.

The second system, the modern and formal system which is a free and compulsory primary education was introduced in Afghanistan in 1935 (Karleson & Mansory, 2004, p. 97; Riley, 2009, pp. 10-11). However, during this time there was resistance towards introduction of education for girls (Ahmed-Ghosh, 2003, p. 5). This resistance blocked the development of education in the country, mainly limiting the girls’ schooling (Moghadam, 2002, p. 21). From 1935-1973 the situation of education improved and primary education was made available to at least 50% of the population including both men and women. During this period the secondary school system and tertiary level education were expanded (Karleson & Mansory, 2004, p. 97). During the Soviet supported regime (1978-1992) there was an emphasis on both male and female education, and literacy programs were established in the country (Moghadam, 2002, p. 23).

The situation of education in regards to the quality and gender equality, equity, student access to schools and colleges worsened during the Taliban regime (1996-2001). The Taliban followed a particularly orthodox brand of Islam, one that not only strictly opposed education for girls and employment for women, but also called for compulsory veiling. Women were not allowed to leave their homes and go shopping alone unless were accompanied by male close family members (Moghadam, 1999 as cited in Moghadam, 2002, p. 26). The Taliban regime

greatly emphasized the Islamic subjects and other subjects such as science, history, math, languages received less attention. The student enrollment decreased significantly as the Taliban completely banned education for women, and closed down the girls' schools (Moghadam, 2002, p. 26; Karlesson & Mansory, 2004, p. 97; Riley, 2009, p. 5).

After the fall of the Taliban, not only the quality of education but also gender equality, equity, student access to schools and colleges improved. Many women were provided with educational opportunities. Many girls' schools were reopened and the number of school children has significantly increased. According to Afghan Ministry of Education, about 7 million children – around 37% of them are girls -- are currently enrolled in schools (Ayubi, 2010). In addition, the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Higher Education have tried to improve the quality of education for both men women. There have been efforts to update the curriculum and teaching materials and to provide teachers with training in teaching methodologies.

Despite recent educational gains, women still face significant problems and barriers. The discrimination against women's education and the shortage of female teachers is another issue that concerns some Afghan families, especially in more religiously and culturally conservative areas. Some families do not allow their daughters to go to schools where they are taught by men (Ayubi, 2010). Most parents, especially in the rural areas, want their daughters to be educated in schools not only in a separate building from boys, but also taught by women teachers (UNESCO, 2006, p. 2). Thus, co-education (discussed further below), which starts at the university level, could be a barrier for many girls in Afghanistan to continue their higher education since their families do not allow them study in the same environment with males. Due to cultural and religious restrictions most girls are deprived of education. In general, due to the cultural and religious considerations, the school system (grades 1-12) separates boys and girls from each

other. They are taught separately, in different buildings, and locations, and by teachers of their same gender.

Co-education starts once boys and girls join higher education institutions where they not only have to sit and study with students from their opposite sex, but they are also taught by teachers of different genders. This new education environment is sometimes challenging for all learners because they have to cope with this new learning community and socialize with classmates and educators of the opposite gender. At times, students do well in the new community of practice, but in some respects the transition may not be without problems. A study by Altai Consulting (2010) reported that while classes in Afghan public higher education institutions are co-educational, there is very little interaction between male and female students in the classrooms. Some of the students that participated in this survey said that they simply sit in the same classroom and rarely interact with their classmates of the opposite gender. The researchers observed that there were “a lot of giggling and joking that indicated very unnatural interactions” within the classroom (p. 7). It could be concluded that the presence of their classmates and teachers from the opposite gender might affect students’ communication and participation, especially in FL classrooms.

Despite the significant progress in the number of students’ enrollment at higher education institutes, there is still a major gender gap in the enrollment of students. Furthermore, most Afghan EFL classrooms at the college level are male dominated as there are typically only a few girls in classes of 30 or 40 or more boys. For instance, a study by Kabul University in cooperation with UNDP and UNESCO (2010) indicates that of the 62,000 students enrolled in universities in 2009 only 21% of them were female learners (p. 8). In addition, my observation and experience of teaching EFL students in this context indicates that girls at the university level

appear to be shy and nervous in the classroom, particularly during group activities in which they have to work in the same group with boys at the university EFL classrooms. They tend to participate less in group activities and large class discussions when the class is highly male dominated. These factors might influence their class participation, communication patterns, preference for L1 use in FL classrooms, and their feelings towards FL use in the classroom to avoid embarrassment or losing face.

Chapter 2 - Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews previous research concerning L1 use in FL learning and teaching, and L1 use in the form of private speech. It also discusses past studies that examined the relationship between language learning and gender as well as FL/L2 proficiency levels of students. Finally, the chapter looks at the existing literature related to the relationship between FL use and learner anxiety. The findings of these studies helped to formulate the hypotheses for this research project.

2.2 L1 Use in FL/L2 Learning

Studies of SLL have increased as researchers have addressed a wide range of topics. One of the topics, often discussed in the studies of SLL, is the potential negative or facilitative role of L1 in FL/L2 learning (Atkinson, 1987; Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Duff & Polio, 1990; Edstrom, 2006; Harbord, 1992; Nation, 2003; Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Schweers, 1999; Spada, 2007; Turnbull, 2001). This section discusses the role of L1 in FL/L2 learning from the SLL theories' perspectives. The review is important to this study because it provides us with a clear idea of how the view towards the role of L1 in FL/L2 learning has changed overtime and what role the L1 could play in FL/L2 learning.

2.2.1 Negative Influence of L1 on FL/L2 Learning

Behaviorism argues that children imitate the language they hear from the environment and when their responses are reinforced, they learn (Skinner, 1957; Ellis, 1985, p. 21). Language learning, both L1 and FL/L2, is seen as a process of habit formation (Song & Andrews, 2009;

Ellis, 1985). In learning a first language, students learn new habits when they learn to respond to stimuli in their environment. However, when learning an FL/L2, learners face difficulty because their L1 habits hinder their FL/L2 learning as they have to replace the old L1 habits with new FL/L2 habits (Ellis, 1985, pp. 21-2). Behaviorism argues against the use of L1 in FL/L2 learning (Giacobbe, 1992) because it contends that learners' errors are the result of the existing or transfer of L1 habits in the FL/L2 learning process (Ellis, 1985, p. 22). Behaviorist also claims that learners should be entirely immersed in FL/L2 to avoid the negative influence of L1 on FL/L2 learning.

The Monitor Model, proposed by Krashen, considers that the influence of L1 causes errors in FL/L2 learning. However, Krashen does not argue that L1 will always interfere with L2 learning (1985). Krashen (1985) claims that the L1 may temporarily be useful when students have not acquired enough communicative competence yet. For example, when students lack a target language rule or vocabulary in production, they may turn to use their L1 (p. 11). Song and Andrew (2009) believe that according to the Monitor Model, it is not possible to avoid the presence of L1 in SLL process. However, this model emphasizes that teachers should avoid using the L1 in order to maximize FL/L2 input for learners (p. 26).

2.2.2 Positive Influence of L1 in L2 Learning

A change of focus from behaviorism to mentalism occurred in the attempts to explain the process of FL/L2 learning. Mentalism emphasized the children's innate ability to acquire a language (Song & Andrews, 2009). This development directed learners' attention to the differences between L1 and FL/L2 systems in order to facilitate their FL/L2 learning. The findings of empirical studies support the argument that learners frequently compare the systems of two languages, and that such comparison facilitates their FL/L2 learning (Song & Andrews,

2009, p. 28). Spada (2007) notes that studies have found that L1 use should not be entirely banned in FL/L2 classrooms since it is “impossible to exclude the L1 influence” (p. 280). According to Spada (2007), Cook (2001) and Nation (2003), the commonly held belief that L1 and FL/L2 must be separate in FL/L2 classroom is not supported empirically by SLL research.

The socio-cultural views on SLL perceive learning as “a social and inter-mental activity” (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998, p. 337). From the socio-cultural perspective, “L1 is viewed as providing crucial scaffolding support as learners negotiate form and meaning” (Spada, 2007, p. 280). Lantolf (2000) argues that L1 use should not be ignored in FL/L2 as it plays a significant role when learners help each other and mediate in the process of FL/L2 learning (p. 87).

2.3L1 Use and FL/L2 Teaching Methods

The role of L1 has varied in FL/L2 teaching methodologies. The argument for avoiding L1 use goes back to emergence of the Direct Method that emerged around 1900 in Europe (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Harbord, 1992). While some methods (e.g. the Grammar Translation and Community Language Learning) give a greater degree of importance to L1 use in FL/L2 teaching and learning, others (e.g. the Direct Method, Audiolingual Method, Communicative Language Teaching Approach and the Natural Approach) tend to ignore or minimize its role in FL/L2 classrooms.

2.3.1 Language Teaching Methods that Allow L1 Use

The Grammar Translation Method (GTM) allows for the extensive use of L1 to explain new items and to enable comparisons to be made between FL/L2 and L1 (Stern, 1983, p. 455; Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989, p. 224; Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 5). Translation between L1 and FL/L2 is a normal classroom procedure (Cook, 2001, p. 202; Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009, p.

17; Griffiths and Parr, 2001, p. 247; Herrera & Murry, 2005, p. 174). According to the GTM, FL/L2 is learned best when the structures of FL/L2 are compared and contrasted with those of the learners' L1 and then taught to students. Although the GTM has been seriously criticized and is disfavored in language teaching, yet it is still widely used in some parts of the world particularly in the Afghan EFL teaching context.

The Community Language Learning (CLL) approach emerged due to the previous methods' lack of attention to students' affective domain (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 90). In a CLL lesson, translation is normally used. For example, students sitting in a circle might utter some messages in FL/L2 that the teacher then translates for students to repeat. Typically, the L1 is often used in FL/L2 classrooms, particularly in early stages of language learning (Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989, p. 224; Richards & Rodgers, 2001, pp. 90-1).

2.3.2 Language Teaching Methods that Reject or Minimize L1 Use

The Direct Method (DM), which emerged in late nineteenth century, was a reaction to the GTM because it could not help learners acquire good communicative ability in FL/L2 (Herrera & Murry, 2005, p. 178; Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 11). DM requires that the “teacher must be a native speaker or have native-like proficiency” in the FL/L2. It rejects the use of L1 in FL/L2 classrooms and argues that the FL/L2 teaching should be conducted entirely in FL/L2 without any translation and use of L1 (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 12).

The Audio-lingual Method (ALM) became popular when DM began to fall out of favor (Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989, p. 225). Drawing from the behaviorism theory, ALM tries to produce good habits in language learning through using the stimulus-response-reinforcement model (Omaggio, 2001, p. 110). ALM uses drills, repetition, and substitution exercises in FL/L2 instruction (Griffiths & Parr, 2001; Herrera & Murry, 2005). ALM emphasizes the spoken

language skill over the written skills and requires that classroom practice should be entirely conducted in FL/L2. It does not permit the use of L1 in FL/L2 classrooms and it argues that FL/L2 should be taught without any reference to L1 (Omaggio, 2001, p. 110; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

The Natural Approach (NA), developed by Krashen and Terrell (1983) based on Krashen's theory of SLA emphasizes the importance of meaning in language learning. In the NA, language is perceived as a means for communicating meanings and messages (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 180). NA argues that language comprehension precedes production, and language production emerges in stages (Herrera & Murry, 2005, p. 184). It argues that the class time should be entirely devoted to communicative activities and work on the language forms should be mostly done outside of class by students themselves (Omaggio, 2001, p. 120). Terrell (1977) suggests that instruction at the lower levels should exclusively involve listening comprehension activities and learners should be allowed to respond in their L1 (as cited in Omaggio, 2001, p. 120). However, NA argues that except the limited L1 use only in the very initial stages of FL/L2 learning, the target language should always be used in the classroom without any translation and use of L1 (Howatt, 1982, p. 281).

The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach argues that if learners are "involved in meaning-focused communicative tasks, then language learning will take care of itself" (Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989, p. 224; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). CLT considers that the purpose of FL/L2 teaching is to help students develop ability to communicate in FL/L2. CLT does not forbid L1 use in FL/L2 classroom completely. It allows the instructor and students to use the L1 judiciously where possible (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 156). Despite the fact that CLT accepts judicious use of L1 in FL/L2 classrooms, it is based on the monolingual FL/L2

teaching principle and advocates for minimizing L1 use in FL/L2 classrooms as much as possible (Song & Andrews, 2009, p. 36).

The above brief discussion indicates that the early teaching methodologies like GTM and CLL permitted the extensive use of L1 in FL/L2 classrooms. These methods were then followed by DM and ALM that strongly opposed and banned the use of L1 in FL/L2 classrooms. However, as the discussion shows, the use of L1 has reappeared in the recent FL/L2 teaching methods such as NA and CLT. But unlike GTM, the recent methods permit only a limited use of L1 particularly in the lower levels.

2.4 L1 and FL/L2 Private Speech in FL/L2 Learning

In order to understand how and when learners use their L1 in the FL/L2 learning process, this section reviews studies that have examined L1 use by FL/L2 learners in the form of private speech. Though it may seem unrelated to this study, it clearly shows us what actually goes on in the learners' minds when they engage in the FL/L2 learning tasks and how they use their L1 to organize their mental activities and help each other in the FL/L2 learning process.

Foreign or second language learners engage in private speech, talk to and for themselves instead of talking to the teacher and other students in attempts to organize their mental activities (Anton and DiCamilla, 1998; Hancock, 1997). Anton and DiCamilla (1998), studying L1 use in collaborative interaction with Spanish learners, found that FL/L2 learners used private speech naturally in collaborative interaction with each other. Anton and DiCamilla discovered that students used L1 in "private speech as a tool to direct their own thinking in the face of a cognitively difficult task" while working in a collaborative task to provide one another with scaffolded help (p.334). Similarly, Hancock (1997) argues that learners use their L1 in the form of private speech when they talk to themselves to translate or make sense of the information in

FL/L2 (p. 238). Anton and DiCamilla (1998) maintain that FL/L2 learners use their L1 in collaborative interaction both for producing content and creating a “social and cognitive space” where they can help each other and themselves during the FL/L2 task (pp. 337-8).

In a similar study, Wang and Hyun (2009) examined sociolinguistic characteristics of peer-talk of EFL learners at a preschool in Taiwan. Wang and Hyun discovered that learners engaged in FL learning by using private speech for “self-regulatory learning” (p. 3). In addition, Wang and Hyun also observed that learners used private speech both in their L1 and in FL to create sentences, practice pronunciation, do learning tasks, and to serve as a “self-mediation tool” (p. 13). The learners used private speech when trying to formulate a sentence before saying it to the teacher and other students (p. 14). The learners translated the English structures into their L1 in the form of private speech (p. 15).

The findings of Anton and DiCamilla (1998), Hancock (1997), and Wang and Hyun (2009) indicate that L1 use gives students more agency and power over their language learning. Even if teachers and teaching methodologies discourage the use of L1, students often turn to using it in the process of their FL/L2 learning, and they do in productive ways.

The next section looks at the studies that have examined L1 use in FL/L2 classrooms. This review is important as it will provide us with a better understanding of the purposes for which teachers and learners use the L1. It will also show us whether FL teachers and learners consider the role of L1 as necessary/facilitative or negative in their FL classrooms.

2.5 L1 Use in FL/L2 Classrooms

Atkinson (1987) argues that the role of L1 in FL/L2 classrooms has been undervalued (p. 241). He argues for a limited but judicious use of L1 in FL/L2 classrooms (p. 242). Atkinson used the L1 in FL classrooms for more than 10 months on an experimental basis for eliciting

language from students, checking comprehension, giving instruction and discussing classroom methodology, building co-operation among learners, and testing. Atkinson reports that these uses of L1 made his teaching more effective because they motivated students and gave them a sense of accomplishment (pp. 243-245). Similarly, Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie investigated the role of L1 with four teachers at an Australian university to discover the benefits and effects of L1 use in the FL learning. Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie discovered that teachers used the L1 mostly for establishing a non-threatening classroom environment, explaining grammar, translating vocabulary, managing classroom, and giving instruction (p. 417). Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie conclude that L1 use for translation modifies input for the FL learners. Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie suggest that translating vocabulary might contribute to vocabulary uptake and help students perceive the differences between L1 and FL linguistic systems and thus avoid negative transfer from the L1 to the L2 (p. 424).

Karathanos conducted another study on the use of L1 by teachers in L2 classrooms. Karathanos (2005) examined the self-reported attitudes of 327 L2 teachers in the state of Kansas, USA. She discovered that teachers generally supported the use of L1 in L2 teaching. She found that there was a clear positive relationship between ESL-specific university education and an increased support for L1 use. Experienced teachers with ESL-specific education reported using the L1 more often than experienced teachers with no ESL-specific education and also more than inexperienced teachers with no ESL-specific university education (p. 76). In addition, experienced teachers with no ESL-specific education reported using the L1 more than inexperienced teachers with no ESL-specific university education (p. 76). The findings also indicated that experienced male than female teachers with ESL-specific university education tended to be less likely to use learners' L1 in the ESL classroom teaching (p. 88).

Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney (2008) investigated the use of L1 in FL classrooms at an Australian university. Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney discovered that many students considered the use of L1 necessary for vocabulary and grammar learning. Students believed that L1 use helps them understand vocabulary and grammar better because it makes grammar explanation easier (p. 259). Students also felt that L1 use makes understanding the instructions and explaining assessment requirements easier and also helps them feel confident in asking questions because it reduces the risk of misunderstanding between the teacher and students (p. 260). According to Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney, many students believe that L1 use reduces their anxiety and helps them to participate better in the learning activities and discussions (p. 265).

Duff and Polio (1990) studied the ratio of FL use to L1 use by teachers. They also examined the university level teachers' and students' perceptions about L1 use in FL classrooms. Duff and Polio discovered that the degree of FL that teachers used varied from 10-100% (p. 164). Duff and Polio reported that while some teachers believed that L1 use has a negative influence on learners' FL learning and never used it, others considered the role of L1 important and used it about 90% of the class time. Teachers used the L1 to make the input comprehensible for students as these teachers felt that if they spoke only the FL, students would not understand the information (p. 162). Duff and Polio also found that most learners were satisfied with L1 use by teachers regardless of whether teachers spoke a high percentage of the L1 or not (p. 162).

Similar findings on the role of L1 and FL are reported by Schweers (1999). A majority of students in his study considered L1 use as necessary and facilitative in their FL learning. Many students indicated that they could not learn if they did not understand their teacher. Students preferred the use of L1 for explaining difficult concepts, helping them feel more comfortable, checking comprehension, and for learning new vocabulary (p. 7). The teachers also felt that L1

use facilitates students' FL learning and reported that they use the L1 because it is easier for students to understand a concept in the L1 than in the FL. The teachers used the L1 to establish rapport with students (p. 8). Schweers also reports his own use of L1 during one semester to see how it influences students' attendance, motivation, and attitudes towards learning English. Schweers believes that L1 use in his FL classrooms resulted in increased students' motivation reflected by excellent attendance and completed homework (p. 9). Schweers advocates for a judicious L1 use in FL classrooms, where its use has pedagogical and affective benefits to students (p. 10).

Potential drawbacks of L1 use are addressed in studies by Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney (2008) and Kharma and Hajjaj (1989). Both teams of researchers found that most students and teachers were aware of the disadvantages of L1 use. Some students and teachers reported that L1 use limits students' exposure to the FL. It may result in overuse and dependence on the L1, and this in turn might hinder students' FL development and affect students' motivation negatively. Atkinson (1987) warns us against the overuse of L1 in FL classrooms. Atkinson maintains that the overuse of L1 may result in developing a perception by students that unless a FL item is translated into students' L1 students do not understand it. Students may develop the habit of using the L1 while speaking to the teacher and other students even when they can express themselves through the FL (p. 246). Moreover, Polio and Duff (1994) argue that L1 use deprives students of the useful opportunity to process FL input, practice the new FL structures and express and solve comprehension problems in the FL (p. 322).

The next section looks at the studies that examine the relationship between language and gender to understand how gender influences FL/L2 learning and use.

2.6 Language and Gender

There has been a great deal of focus on which or how different variables (e.g. ethnicity, gender, age, or social class) influence language use and learning. The relationship between language and gender, which focused on the concerns about the relationships between gender, power, and language, appeared as a field of investigation in 1970s (Pavlenko & Piller, 2001, p. 17). Studying the relationship between language and gender, Lakoff (1975 as cited in Pavlenko and Piller, 2001, p. 18), proposed the “deficit framework” suggesting that women are powerless members of the society and speak a form of language that is incompetent and insecure due to the pressure of a “patriarchy culture” (Freed, 1995, p. 4). This framework argues that women speak a very polite, weak, and uncertain language characterized by hedges, tag questions, and hypercorrect (that is, written) grammar. According to Lakoff, this type of language is forced on women “as the price of social approval for being appropriately ‘feminine’” (1975 as cited in Pavlenko and Piller, 2001, p.18). However, this theory has been criticized as “assuming a male-as-norm language standard and ... for treating women as an undifferentiated group” (Pavlenko and Piller, 2001, p. 18). In addition, studies conducted in this field “view features of spoken language such as tag questions and hedges as features of uncertainty”. These “elements of spoken language serve essential and describable functions (e.g. conveying epistemic stance, doing self-repair, mitigating the impact of a socially problematic action) and do not mark uncertainty” (Betz, February 20, 2011, personal communication). Bolden (2006) and Schegloff and Lerner (2009) studied the function of the little words “so”, “oh” and “well” in everyday conversations. Bolden (2006) and Schegloff and Lerner (2009) discovered that these words serve important interpersonal involvement in the conversation. Bolden (2006) notes that these words

play significant role in establishing and maintaining social relationships and solidarity between conversation partners (p. 682).

With the deficit framework's loss of popularity, attention was directed to the study of the male dominance culture and its effect on the speech of women and men (Freed, 1995, p. 5). The "dominance framework" suggested that men dominate or interrupt women in the conversations between men and women (Pavlenko and Piller, 1995, p. 18). The framework has been criticized because although it acknowledges the role of power in studies of women and men's language, it does not pay attention to social, historical, and political role of power that may have influence on the relationship between language and gender (Pavlenko and Piller, 2001).

The other framework, proposed for the study of the relationship between language and gender, is the "difference framework." The difference framework argues that females have a tendency to use more prestigious language than males (Pavlenko and Piller, 2001, p. 19). According to Ellis (1994), this framework suggests that in general, women learn better than men because they have more positive attitudes towards SLL. However, as Polanyi (1995) maintains, the research does not support the superiority of women in language learning and use because in some contexts men outperform women in language learning.

The "gender difference or two-culture" framework argues that men and women learn different ways of communicating to each other because they grow up in single-gender peer groups in preadolescent age (Freed, 1995, p. 5). They form different cultures and as a result men and women cannot always communicate successively in cross-gender conversations (Pavlenko and Piller, 2001, p. 20). This framework resembles Afghan context because as discussed in Chapter 1, Afghan women's interaction and contact are mostly limited to those of their same gender other than their close family members and relatives (Ahmed-Ghosh, 2003, pp. 1-2;

Moghadam, 2002, p. 20). However, this framework has also been criticized because of oversimplifying the assumptions of separate male and female cultures. Males and females live together in the family and in schools and work together at workplace, which can be considered as shared linguistic worlds (Pavlenko and Piller, 2001, p. 21). According to Pavlenko and Piller (2001), these frameworks have focused on and “problematized women, thus normalizing the status of men’s language as unmarked and ungendered” (p. 21). In other words, these frameworks consider male language as the norm and women language as less prestigious.

In Afghanistan, the context of this study, female language is not considered as deficit or inferior to male language. However, the male dominance is felt in every layer of context starting from family environment, schools, colleges, and workplaces. Males are viewed as more powerful and also as decision makers than females and have more opportunities to talk and dominate the talk or interrupt women in cross-gender conversations (Moghadam, 2002, p. 19). This cultural factor may have influence on Afghan male and female opportunities for taking turns and practicing the FL in the classrooms.

A society that may be similar to that of Afghanistan is the Mexican American context in which Losey (1995) studied male and female learners’ patterns of participation in a community college ESL classroom. Losey found that Mexican-American women were marginalized and not given the opportunity to take turns, express themselves, and interact in the classroom. Losey found that men had more chances to participate in classroom talk and L2 learning activities.

Shehadeh (1994) investigated the effect of gender in different classroom situations. He observed single-gender and cross-gender pair and group work interactions with L2 learners of various L1 backgrounds such as Afrikaans, Arabic, Bengali, Cantonese, Farsi, French, Greek, Italian, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Serbo-Croat, and Spanish. The results of his study

revealed that single-gender pair interaction provided better contexts for females to self-initiate repair and produce comprehensible output than males. However, cross-gender interaction provided better contexts for males to request clarification, self-initiate repair, and produce comprehensible output than females. Shehadeh's study indicates that males often dominate the classroom discussions whereas females have fewer opportunities to practice or produce language. However, women's talk and participation increased in the single-gender dyads or group work because perhaps women may feel more comfortable and relaxed in working with other women in the same pair or group (Shehadeh, 1994, as cited in Shehadeh, 1999, p. 258).

Another study that shows the relationship between FL learning and gender in the classrooms is Allyson's (2001) research. Allyson (2001) examined the amount of talk used by female and male L2 learners in a grade two English as an ESL classroom in British Columbia. The findings of her study indicated that women have fewer opportunities to speak and participate in the classroom learning activities. Allyson (2001) reports that the teacher talked for about 89.5% of the class time and the students had the opportunity to talk only for the 10.5% remaining class time to talk. Of the 10.5% of students' talk time, boys spoke for 88.3% and girls only 11.7% of the time. Considering the total discussion or class time, girls spoke just 1.29%. Comparing the time that boys and girls spoke in the classroom, boys talked 9 times more than the girls in the class (p. 12). This study indicates that the classroom discussion is in essence a conversation between the teacher and the male learners. Conversely, this research shows that girls are significantly marginalized as mere observers in the classroom (pp. 14, 16). However, Allyson's study does not differentiate between the amount of teacher and students' talk time (both males and females) in terms of the L2 and L1. Similarly, it did not focus on the female L2

learners' feelings and attitudes in the class as they were marginalized and not given attention and opportunity to participate more and actively in the classroom learning activities.

Having looked at the studies that focus on the role of L1 in FL learning and teaching as well as on the relationship between language and gender, in the next section I review studies that have examined the relationship between FL use and learner anxiety. This discussion is important as it will help us realize how "FL use anxiety" is defined, what type of anxiety learners usually experience, and how or whether their feeling of anxiety influences their FL learning.

2.7 FL/L2 Use and Learner Anxiety

MacIntyre (1999) defines anxiety as a complex factor that deals with students' psychology in terms of their feelings such as insecurity, fear, frustration or self-esteem and self-confidence. According to MacIntyre and Gardner (1994), language anxiety is a "feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language contexts, including speaking, listening, and learning" (p. 284). Anxiety can have a "facilitative or debilitating" influence on students' FL learning process (Young, 1986). Young argues that "facilitative anxiety is an increase in drive level which results in improved performance" on the part of the learners (p. 440). Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) suggest that risk-taking by students in the FL learning process could be an example of facilitative anxiety because it would motivate students to try harder and learn more about the FL. Conversely, as MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) argue, debilitating anxiety hampers students' FL learning. Students who experience debilitating anxiety might have feelings of frustration, fear, insecurity, and they may perform poorly and withdraw from FL classrooms. When students experience debilitating anxiety, it may affect their FL learning and in general their academic achievement (Young, 1991). The results of the anxiety on students might be reflected by students coming to classroom unprepared, late, or even not

coming to class (Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002). According to Young (1999), students who feel anxious would experience low performance in the FL learning process and forget words or may avoid speaking FL.

Liu and Jackson (2008) investigated the relationships between students' unwillingness to communicate in the FL and their anxiety (pp. 72-73). Liu and Jackson found that there was a significant positive correlation between unwillingness of learners to communicate and participation in learning activities and learner anxiety (p. 82). Many students reported that they feel anxious when they were asked to use FL exclusively and as a result they avoided participating and communicating actively in the classroom. However, Levine's study (2003) counters Liu and Jackson's findings (2008). Levine's study (2003) aimed to identify variables that relate to amounts of the FL use and learner anxiety. Contrary to the hypothesized outcomes on the positive relationship between FL use and learner anxiety, Levine found that FL use correlated negatively with students' anxiety (p. 352). Levine argues that more FL use does not translate into more anxiety for FL learners (p. 355). It could be concluded that Liu and Jackson (2008) and Levin's findings (2003) are so different because their studies examined learner anxiety differently. It seems that Levine investigated the causes of learner anxiety such as the exclusive use of FL and expected grade in the class. However, Liu and Jackson research mainly examined the effects of learner FL anxiety particularly students' unwillingness to communicate and participate in the classroom.

Gardener, Smythe, and Brunet (1977) examined the relationship between learner anxiety and learner L2 proficiency levels with learners of French as a second language. The findings of their investigation indicated that beginner level learners felt higher levels of anxiety than advanced level students. Their study also showed that learner anxiety decreased as their L2

proficiency increased. On the contrary, Marcos-Llinas and Garau (2009) investigated the relationship between FL anxiety and learner FL proficiency levels with learners of Spanish as a foreign language. Marcos-Llinas and Garau discovered that students at the advanced FL proficiency levels felt more anxiety than low FL proficiency level learners. In addition, Marcos-Llinas and Garau found that the higher the learner FL proficiency level, the higher their anxiety levels (p. 103).

The studies by Liu & Jackson (2008), Levine (2003), Gardner, Smythe & Brunet (1977) and Marcos-Llinas & Garau (2009) report different and contradictory results on the relationship between FL use and learners' anxiety. None of these studies examined the relationship between FL use and the anxiety that FL learners experience with regard to students' gender to see how learner anxiety differs according to students' gender. The current literature suggests that future investigations should look at the relationship between FL use and learner anxiety, L1 use in FL classrooms "for a greater range of language learning situations" (Levine, 2003, p. 356), and with learners of different FL learning proficiency levels and "background in different contexts to determine how well the results may be generalized to other EFL learners" (Liu & Jackson, 2009, p. 83). Due to these contradictory results on language anxiety and FL/L2 proficiency levels and lack of studies examining the correlations between learner anxiety and learners' gender, this research aims to add new evidence by these variables across three English as a FL proficiency levels – beginner, intermediate, and advanced.

These studies (Duff & Polio, 1990; Rolin-Ianziti & Varshney, 2008; Schweers, 1999; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002) indicate that L1 cannot disappear from FL learners' minds. Learners frequently use the L1 to facilitate their FL learning. Often, teachers use the L1 during FL teaching to facilitate students' FL learning process. My own experience as a FL learner and

teacher has taught me that L1 use can facilitate FL learning. I remember my experience of learning English as a FL. I often used my first language (Dari) in and outside of English classrooms to translate new vocabulary and make sense of the difficult concepts. I recall that when my teachers occasionally used the L1, I felt more comfortable, motivated and willing to participate in the lesson because I had means to share, and I was allowed to express my ideas by using my L1 if I could not express myself in English.

In addition, these studies and my own experience have led me to surmise that L1 can play an important function in our FL classrooms – facilitating FL learning and reducing their anxiety. These studies (Duff & Polio, 1990; Edstrom, 2006; Karathanos, 2005; Gardener, Smythe, & Brunet, 1977; Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989; Levine, 2003; Liu & Jackson, 2009; Marcos-Llinas & Garau, 2009; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002; Rolin-Ianziti & Varshney, 2008; Schweers, 1999) led me to investigate how the gender of teachers impacts their L1 use, and also to examine how students' gender and FL proficiency correlate with FL anxiety. The studies led me to formulate the hypotheses for this research as discussed in the next section.

2.8 Goals of the study

The previous research on the role of L1 in FL classrooms has been conducted in the contexts of teaching languages such as English, French, and German as a FL to speakers of other languages like Chinese, Spanish, Arabic, English, and French. There is little research on the relationship between FL use and learner anxiety with regard to gender and the FL proficiency of students. The data collected for this study are analyzed considering the relationship between L1 use and teachers' gender as well as FL use and learner anxiety with regard to gender and FL proficiency level of learners in an Afghan EFL context where this has never been examined. The data are analyzed to determine if the following hypotheses are supported:

1. Female FL teachers will perceive the role of L1 as necessary and tend to use it more than male teachers.
2. Low FL proficiency students will believe that L1 use is necessary in FL classrooms.
3. Low FL proficiency students will experience more anxiety when FL is used exclusively.
4. Female FL learners will experience more anxiety than male students when FL is used exclusively by learners and teacher.

In the next chapter, the research subjects, materials, and the experimental design that were employed in this research project are discussed in detail.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

3.1 Participants

The survey group in this study is composed of (N=60) university first year and second year EFL learners (30 males and 30 females), and (N=20) EFL teachers (10 males and 10 females) at Kabul University (KU), Afghanistan. Students are native speakers of Dari (N=44) and Pashto (N=16), the two official languages of Afghanistan. Approximately half of the students (N=29) are in their second year of undergraduate studies at the university and have one year of experience in learning English. The other half (N=31) are in their first year at the university and had been learning English for one semester at the time of data collection for the present research. Student participants are between 18 to 25 years old. In addition, they are at three FL proficiency levels: elementary (N=20, males N=10 and females N=10), intermediate (N=20, males N=10 and females N=10), and advanced (N=20, males N=10 and females N=10). Teachers are native speakers of Dari (N=14) and Pashto (N=6). Similarly, teachers have different years of experience in teaching EFL: 1-5 years (N=8), 6-10 years and more than 10 years (N=12). In terms of education, teachers hold BA degrees in English (N=11), and MA degrees in TEFL/TESL (N=9). They are also 21-35 years old (N=16), or 36 and more years old (N=4).

3.2 Instruments

Two questionnaires, one intended for learners with 27 items (see Appendix D) and one for teachers containing 19 items (see Appendix C), were devised to measure EFL learners' and teachers' beliefs about the relationship between L1 use and (a) teachers' gender, and (b) learners' proficiency levels and gender. The questionnaires used also intended to determine the beliefs of

learners and teachers about the relationship between (a) FL use by students and teachers and learner anxiety according to students' FL proficiency levels, and (b) FL use and learner anxiety according to their gender. The questionnaires were designed on a 1 to 5-point Likert-type rating scale, with 1 indicating "strong agreement," 2 "agreement," 3 "no opinion," 4 "disagreement," and 5 "strong disagreement" with each item on the questionnaire.

The questionnaire for student participants was first translated into Dari and then sent via e-mail to three Kabul University EFL teachers currently pursuing their MA degrees at Kansas State University (KSU) to edit the translation to make sure that the translation was as close and accurate as possible to the English version. Based on the comments received, the student questionnaire was revised and then sent out via e-mail to an unaffiliated investigator, a colleague at KU English Department for piloting on learners (N=10). Based on the learner participants' comments, the wording of a few items was changed and refined. The students were given the questionnaire in Dari (see Appendix F) to collect data that could best reflect their views because it was thought that students, especially at lower English proficiency levels, might not be proficient enough in English to understand the questionnaire well and may limit the accuracy of their responses.

Similarly, the first version of the questionnaire for teacher subjects was sent out via an e-mail attachment to four KU EFL teachers currently studying for their masters' degrees at KSU for piloting and refinement. Based on these teachers' comments, the questionnaire was changed and revised. For instance, teachers commented that the target group of students for this study should be made clear. The teachers wanted to know whether students are majoring in English or taking the English course as a foreign language subject at the university so that they could answer the questions considering the characteristics of the targeted group of students.

3.3 Data Collection Procedure

Since this research involved working with human subjects, it was required to have the approval of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at KSU before the data collection process could be initiated. The IRB application, along with all documents to be used with both sets of participants (the informed consent form, the language background surveys, the questionnaires, debriefing form, as well as the unaffiliated investigator's approval form), was completed and submitted to the KSU Research Compliance Office on June 10, 2010. The approval for this study from the Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects was obtained on June 15, 2010.

During the design and application of this research project, the required research protocol for involving the human subjects was taken into consideration and followed strictly. The participation in this research project was completely voluntary. Both student and teacher participants had the option and opportunity to withdraw their participation from the study at any time. The student participants were given the Dari translation of the informed consent form while the teacher subjects were given the English copy of informed consent form (see Appendix A) so that each could understand the purpose of this study and their rights as participants in this research project. Furthermore, each group was made aware that the data collected from them remains confidential and will not be disclosed to other parties without their consent and permission.

The final version of the questionnaires was sent out via e-mail attachments to the unaffiliated investigator to administer both on the student and teacher participants at Kabul University. He asked his EFL colleagues and also the students to complete the questionnaires. Each participant was also asked to complete a brief language background survey in order to facilitate data analysis (see Appendix G). The background survey included questions to elicit

demographic information such as students' EFL proficiency levels and gender, and the teacher participants' teaching experience, educational background, and gender. The unaffiliated investigator also gave the participants the debriefing form (see Appendix B) about the purpose of the study and thanked them for their participation. The data for the study was collected during June and July of 2010, the spring semester at Kabul University.

The analysis of the data and its results are discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Chapter 4 - Results

4.1 Introduction

The data for this study were analyzed through the SPSS statistical package to test the research hypotheses. The analysis included calculating frequencies and percentages, computing correlations, and conducting independent-samples t -tests to compare the mean difference between independent variables of gender and education for teachers as well as gender and FL proficiency levels for students. A statistical level of $p > .05$ for correlations and $P < .05$ for comparing means of two independent groups were considered significant. Teachers' data were analyzed to examine their attitudes towards L1 use and FL learning, L1 use for class management, and learner use anxiety and FL use. Similarly, students' data were analyzed to test their attitudes towards FL development and L1 use as well as learner FL anxiety and FL use. Some items such as the following were originally part of the questionnaires:

1. When teachers use the L1 in FL classrooms, students speak more L1 than FL.
2. More L1 use by teacher results in less student effort to understand his or her use of FL.
3. L1 use in FL classrooms reduces students' exposure to the FL.
4. L1 use in FL classrooms delays students' FL learning.

These items were excluded from the discussions since they were found to be less important for the purpose of this study and were, therefore, beyond the scope of this paper. Furthermore, some of the items were repeated with different wording (see Tables 14-17, Appendix G).

4.2 Attitudes of Teachers towards the Use of L1

Overall, both male and female teachers reported using the FL more than L1. Male teachers report that they use the L1 more than the female teachers. In addition, when the education level of teachers was also factored in, the results indicate that more male than female teachers with BA and MA degrees report using the L1 (see Table 1).

Table 1 Amount of L1 Use by Gender and Education Level

Gender & Education Variables			Frequency Total	Percentage of Time for L1 Use by Teacher				
				1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%
Gender	Male		10	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Female		10	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Gender & Education	Male	BA	5	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Female	BA	6	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		MA	4	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

4.2.1 L1 Use and FL Learning

The results counter the first hypothesis of this study. More male than female teachers reported using the L1 for teaching difficult grammar concepts, vocabulary, grammar rules, and for checking comprehension. In addition, more male than female teachers with BA and MA degrees use the L1 for teaching difficult grammar concepts, and vocabulary and for checking comprehension. Similarly, more male than female teachers with BA degrees report using the L1 for teaching grammar rules. However, females with MA degrees report using the L1 for teaching grammar rules more than the male teachers. The independent-samples t test indicates a significant relationship between L1 use for teaching vocabulary and the education variable, $t(8) = -3.77$, $p = .005$. Male teachers with BA degrees ($M = 2.00$, $SD = .00000$) on the average agreed with L1 use for teaching vocabulary more than male teachers with MA degrees ($M = 4.20$), $SD = 1.30384$) (see Table 2).

Table 2 L1 Use and FL Learning by Gender and Education Level

Purposes of L1 Use	Gender & Education Variables		Frequency Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement				
					Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Teaching Difficult Grammar Concepts	Male		10	2.10	0 (0%)	9 (90%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Female		10	2.80	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)
	Male	BA	5	2.20	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	2.00	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Female	BA	6	2.83	0 (0%)	3 (50%)	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)
		MA	4	2.75	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
Teaching Grammar Rules	Male		10	3.10	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)
	Female		10	2.80	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)
	Male	BA	5	2.00	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	2.00	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)
	Female	BA	6	3.00	0 (0%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)
		MA	4	2.50	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
Teaching Vocabulary	Male		10	3.70	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)
	Female		10	3.60	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	3 (30%)
	Male	BA	5	2.00	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	4.20	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)
	Female	BA	6	4.33	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (66.7%)	2 (33.3%)
		MA	4	3.00	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
Comprehension Check	Male		10	3.20	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)
	Female		10	3.50	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)
	Male	BA	5	2.60	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	3.80	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)
	Female	BA	6	3.33	0 (0%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	4 (66.7%)	0 (0%)
		MA	4	3.75	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)

Note: The bold items in overall average are significant.

Male teachers' responses indicate that L1 use for teaching grammar rules positively correlates with L1 use for teaching vocabulary and giving instructions. In addition, L1 use for teaching vocabulary positively correlates with L1 use for instruction giving. Yet L1 use for explaining difficult grammar negatively correlates with L1 for instruction giving. For instance, female teachers' responses show a positive correlation between L1 use for teaching vocabulary and class management. However, there are significant negative correlations between 1) L1 use for teaching vocabulary and checking comprehension, and 2) L1 use for comprehension check and classroom management (see Table 3).

Table 3 Correlations among Purposes of L1 Use by Gender Level

Sex	L1 Giving Instructions	L1 Teach Vocabulary	FL Use Learner Anxiety	L1 Class Management	L1 Comprehension Check
Male					
L1 Explain Difficult Grammar	-.69	-.27	-.22	-.39	-.32
L1 Teach Vocabulary	.68		.35		.34
L1 Teach Grammar rules	.68	.79	.35	.60	.34
L1 for Classroom Management	.63	.82	.17		-.06
Learner L1 Use Makes Teacher Angry	-.45	-.15	.40	-.45	.31
L1 Use Reduce Learner Anxiety	.31	.18	.76	.00	-.10
Female					
L1 Teach Vocabulary	.13		-.21	.97	-.78
L1 Comprehension Check	.30		.36	-.70	

Note: Significant correlations are in bold.

4.2.2 L1 Use for Classroom Management

With regards to L1 use for class management, the first hypothesis was partially supported. Male teachers use L1 for class management more than female teachers. Male teachers with BA degrees also use L1 for class management more than females with BA degrees. Moreover, more female than male teachers as well as female than male instructors with BA and MA degrees report that they get angry when learners use L1. However, the hypothesis was supported as more female teachers with an MA use the L1 for classroom management and giving instructions than male teachers. The independent-samples t -test indicates a significant mean difference between the attitudes of female teachers with a BA and an MA towards L1 use for giving instructions, $t(8) = -2.53$, $p = .035$. Female teachers with an MA ($M = 3.00$), $SD = 1.15470$) on average agreed with L1 use for giving instructions than females with a BA ($M = 4.33$, $SD = .51640$) (see Table 4). Male teachers' responses indicate that L1 use for class management positively correlates with L1 use for teaching vocabulary (see Table 3).

Table 4 L1 Use for Classroom Management by Gender and Education Level

Purposes of L1 Use	Gender & Education Variables		Frequency Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement				
					Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
L1 Use for Class Management	Male		10	3.50	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)
	Female		10	3.70	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	2 (20%)
	Male	BA	5	2.80	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	4.20	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)
	Female	BA	6	4.16	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (83.3%)	1 (16.7%)
		MA	4	3.00	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
L1 Use for Giving Instructions	Male		10	3.80	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)
	Female		10	3.80	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	2 (20%)
	Male	BA	5	3.40	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	4.20	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)
	Female	BA	6	4.33	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (66.7%)	2 (33.3%)
		MA	4	3.00	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
Learner L1 Use and Teacher Feeling Angry	Male		10	2.80	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)
	Female		10	2.30	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Male	BA	5	2.60	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	3.00	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)
	Female	BA	6	2.16	1 (16.7%)	3 (50%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		MA	4	2.50	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)

Note: The bold items in overall average are significant.

4.2.3 Teacher Perception of Learner Anxiety and FL/L1 Use

The results of this study did not support the first hypothesis. More male than female teachers report that exclusive FL use makes learners anxious and that using the L1 reduces learner anxiety. Moreover, more male teachers with BA and MA degrees report that L1 use reduces learners' anxiety than female teachers. The independent-samples *t*-tests indicate a significant relationship between using the L1 to reduce learner anxiety and teacher gender variable, $t(18) = -2.88, p = .010$. More male teachers ($M = 2.40, SD = .699$) agreed that L1 use reduces learner anxiety than female teachers ($M = 3.40, SD = .843$). There is also a significant relationship between exclusive FL use/learner anxiety and the education variable, $t(8) = -2.44, p = .040$. More male teachers with BA degrees ($M = 2.00, SD = .70711$) on the average agreed that exclusive FL use makes students anxious than male teachers with MA degrees ($M = 3.20, SD = .83666$). In addition, more male than female teachers with BA degrees believe that exclusive FL use makes learners anxious. However, the belief that exclusive FL use makes learners anxious was found to a greater degree in female teachers with MA degrees (see Table 5). Male teachers'

responses indicate that L1 use for reducing learner anxiety positively correlates with exclusive FL use/learner FL anxiety (see Table 4).

Table 5 Learner Anxiety and L1/FL Use by Gender and Education Level

Learner Anxiety & L1/FL Use	Gender & Education Variables		Frequency Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement				
					Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Exclusive FL Use & Learner FL Anxiety	Male		10	2.60	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Female		10	2.90	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)
	Male	BA	5	2.00	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	3.20	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)
	Female	BA	6	3.00	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
		MA	4	2.75	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
L1 Use Reduces Learner FL Anxiety	Male		10	2.40	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Female		10	3.40	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)
	Male	BA	5	2.20	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	2.60	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Female	BA	6	3.50	0 (0%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	4 (66.7%)	0 (0%)
		MA	4	3.25	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)

Note: The bold items in overall average are significant.

4.3 Attitudes of Learners towards L1 Use

Most students report that their teachers use the L1 21-60% in FL classrooms. Sixty four percent of female and 54% of male students report that their teachers use the L1 41-60% (see Table 6).

Table 6 Learner Estimation of Teacher Amount of L1 Use by Gender Level

Gender & FL Proficiency Variables		Frequency Total	Percentage of Time for L1 Use by Teacher				
			1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100%
Gender	Male	30	3 (10%)	11 (36.7%)	16 (53.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Female	30	2 (6.7%)	7 (23.3%)	19 (63.3%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)

4.3.1 FL Development and L1 Use

The results of this study support hypothesis two. More elementary than intermediate and advanced students agreed with the use of L1 for teaching difficult grammar concepts, grammar rules, and vocabulary and for checking comprehension. In addition, more female than male students agreed with the use of L1 for teaching difficult grammar concept, grammar rules, vocabulary and comprehension check (see Table 7). Female learners' responses indicate positive correlations between L1 use for teaching difficult grammar concepts as well as students' fear

when they do not understand FL use by teachers. Male learners' responses show that L1 use for checking comprehension positively correlates with L1 use for teaching vocabulary and teaching grammar rules. There is also a positive correlation between L1 use for teaching vocabulary and grammar rules (see Table 8).

Table 7 L1 Use and FL Development by Gender and FL Proficiency Level

L1 Use and FL Development	Gender & FL Proficiency Variables		Frequency Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement				
					Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
L1 Use for Teaching Difficult Grammar Terms & Concepts	Male		30	2.30	9 (30%)	13 (43.3%)	2 (6.7%)	2 (6.7%)	4 (13.3%)
	Female		30	2.00	12 (40%)	13 (43.3%)	0 (0%)	3 (10%)	2 (6.7%)
	Elementary	Male	10	1.50	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	1.50	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	2.70	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	1.80	5 (50%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
	Advanced	Male	10	2.70	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)
		Female	10	2.70	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
L1 Use for Teaching Grammar Rules	Male		30	3.06	6 (20%)	6 (20%)	2 (6.7%)	12 (40%)	4 (13.3%)
	Female		30	2.76	10 (33.3%)	5 (16.7%)	1 (3.3%)	10 (33.3%)	4 (13.3%)
	Elementary	Male	10	1.90	6 (60%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	2.40	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	3.80	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	2 (20%)
		Female	10	2.80	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)
	Advanced	Male	10	3.50	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	3.10	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)
L1 Use for Teaching Vocabulary	Male		30	2.53	8 (26.7%)	10 (33.3%)	3 (10%)	6 (20%)	3 (10%)
	Female		30	2.60	3 (10%)	17 (56.7%)	2 (6.7%)	5 (16.7%)	3 (10%)
	Elementary	Male	10	2.10	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	1.90	3 (30%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	2.70	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	3.00	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)
	Advanced	Male	10	2.80	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	2.90	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
L1 Use for Comprehension Check	Male		30	3.06	5 (16.7%)	5 (16.7%)	4 (13.3%)	15 (50%)	1 (3.3%)
	Female		30	2.56	1 (3.3%)	19 (63.3%)	3 (10%)	6 (20%)	1 (3.3%)
	Elementary	Male	10	2.90	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.50	0 (0%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	3.50	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	3.00	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	2.80	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.20	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 8 Correlations among Purposes of L1/FL Use and Learner FL Use Anxiety

Sex	Cut Class Understand Teacher FL Use	Fear Teacher FL Use	Insecure FL Use	L1 Explain Difficult Grammar Concepts	L1 Teach Vocab.	FL Use/ Nervous Forget	Nervous Take Test FL Instruction	Panic FL Use	L1 Teach Gram. Rules
Female									
Afraid Laugh Use FL	.42	.20	.48	.30	.55	.64	.59	.62	-.09
L1 Teach Diff. Gram. Terms	.18	.51	.29		.41	.37			.30
L1 Teach Gram. Rules	-.2	.21	.2	.30	.34	-.25	-.1	-.09	
FL Use/ Nervous Forget	.47	.47	.59		.22		.67		
Nervous Take Test FL Instruction	.57	.59	.51	.59	.35				-.1
Panic FL Use	.36	.46	.53	.52	.38	.62	.81		
Male									
Afraid Laugh Use FL	.78	.38	.46	.23	.51	.62	.56	.60	.55
Cut Class Understand FL Use		.26	.63	.19		.62	.59	.56	.49
L1 Comprehension Check	.36	.27	.36	.34	.60	.11	.44	.35	.51
L1 Teach Grammar Rules		.7	.21	.37		.24	.30	.33	
L1 Teach Vocabulary	.47	.25	.30	.23			.44	.15	.72
FL Use/ Nervous Forget		.27	.57	.23	.29			.72	
Nervous Understand Vocab.	.35	.52	.32	.15	.26	.28	.63	.30	.04
Nervous Take Test with FL Instruction		.50	.49	.30		.65		.55	

Note: Significant correlations are in bold.

4.3.2 Learner Anxiety and FL Use

The results of the present research support hypotheses 3 and 4. More elementary than intermediate and advanced students reported that they feel anxious when FL is used exclusively. Furthermore, female learners report feeling more anxious with exclusive FL use than male learners. The independent-samples t test indicates a significant relationship between learner anxiety with exclusive FL use and learner proficiency level, $t(18) = 3.012$, $p = .007$. Female learners at the intermediate level ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.43372$) on the average feel more anxious with exclusive FL use than male learners ($M = 4.10$, $SD = .87560$). There is also a significant relationship between L1 use for reducing learner FL anxiety and learner proficiency level, $t(18) = 2.867$, $p = .010$. More female learners at the intermediate level ($M = 2.30$, $SD = .94868$) on the average report that L1 use reduces their FL anxiety than male learners ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.07497$) (see Table 9).

Table 9 Learner Anxiety and FL Use by Gender and FL Proficiency Level

Learner Anxiety & L1/FL Use	Gender & FL Proficiency Variables		Frequency Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement				
					Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Exclusive FL Use & Learner Anxiety	Male		30	2.73	2 (6.7%)	7 (23.3%)	2 (6.7%)	14 (46.7%)	5 (16.7%)
	Female		30	2.83	6 (20%)	11 (36.7%)	1 (3.3%)	6 (20%)	6 (20%)
	Elementary	Male	10	2.80	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	1.90	3 (30%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	4.10	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	3 (30%)
		Female	10	2.50	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
	Advanced	Male	10	3.40	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)
		Female	10	4.10	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	5 (50%)
L1 Use Reduces Learner FL Anxiety	Male		30	3.33	0 (0%)	9 (30%)	6 (20%)	11 (36.7%)	4 (13.3%)
	Female		30	2.76	2 (6.7%)	16 (53.3%)	3 (10%)	5 (16.7%)	4 (13.3%)
	Elementary	Male	10	3.00	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.20	1 (10%)	7 (70%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	3.60	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)
		Female	10	2.30	1 (10%)	7 (70%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	3.40	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)
		Female	10	3.80	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	4 (40%)

Note: The bold items in overall average are significant.

4.3.2.1 Self-Confidence

When compared to intermediate and advanced students, elementary students feel more insecure when using the FL and miss more class according to self-reports. Similarly, female students feel more insecure when using the FL and miss class more often than male learners. The independent-samples t test indicates a significant relationship between learners' gender and their insecurity when using the FL, $t(58) = 3.018, p = .004$. Female learners ($M = 3.73, SD = 1.20153$) on the average feel more insecure when using the FL than male learners ($M = 2.76, SD = 1.27802$). The test was also significant for learner insecurity when using the FL by proficiency level, $t(18) = 4.005, p = .001$. Female learners at the elementary level ($M = 1.90, SD = .56765$) on the average felt less secure when using the FL than male learners ($M = 3.30, SD = .94868$). The test was also significant for intermediate level, $t(18) = 5.547, p = .000$. Female learners at the intermediate level ($M = 2.40, SD = .96609$) feel more insecure when using the FL than male learners ($M = 3.30, SD = .70711$). In addition, the test was significant for students' decisions to miss class when they do not understand FL use by teachers, $t(18) = 3.206, p = .005$. More

females at the elementary level ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 1.13529$) on the average decide to miss class than male learners ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .94868$) (see Table 10).

Table 10 FL Use and Learner Self-Confidence by Gender and FL Proficiency Level

FL Use & Learner Self-Confidence	Gender & Education Variables		Frequency Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement				
					Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Learner Insecurity Using FL	Male		30	3.73	8 (26.7%)	14 (46.7%)	1 (3.3%)	7 (23.3%)	0 (0%)
	Female		30	2.76	5 (16.7%)	19 (63.3%)	1 (3.3%)	5 (16.7%)	0 (0%)
	Elementary	Male	10	3.30	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	1.90	2 (20%)	7 (70%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	4.50	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	6 (60%)
		Female	10	2.40	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	3.40	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	4.00	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	4 (40%)
Cut Class Not Understanding Teacher FL Use	Male		30	4.23	0 (0%)	2 (6.7%)	1 (3.3%)	15 (50%)	12 (40%)
	Female		30	3.43	3 (10%)	8 (26.7%)	2 (6.7%)	7 (23.3%)	10 (33.3%)
	Elementary	Male	10	3.70	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	2.20	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	4.70	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	7 (70%)
		Female	10	3.60	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)
	Advanced	Male	10	4.30	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	4 (40%)
		Female	10	4.50	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (10%)	2 (20%)	7 (70%)

Note: The bold items in overall average are significant.

Male learners' responses indicate that the decisions of learners to miss class when they do not understand FL use by teachers positively correlates with learner insecurity and panic when using the FL. It also positively correlates with learner anxiety when using the FL and with test anxiety. Similarly, female learners' responses indicate that learner insecurity when using the FL positively correlates with learner anxiety when using the FL. In addition, learner insecurity when using the FL positively correlates with test anxiety and with students' feeling of panic when using the FL (see Table 8).

4.3.2.2 Students' Fear Understanding FL Use by Teacher

Elementary students report feeling more frightened and panicked than intermediate and advanced level learners when they do not understand FL use by teachers. Female students also feel more frightened and panicked than male learners when they do not understand FL use by

teachers. The independent-samples t test was significant for learners' feeling of fear by proficiency variable, $t(18) = 3.280$, $p = .004$. Female learners at the elementary level ($M = 2.00$, $SD = .94281$) on the average feel more frightened than male students when they do not understand FL use by teachers ($M = 3.40$, $SD = .96609$) (see Table 11). The test was significant for learner panic when using the FL by proficiency variable, $t(18) = 2.73$, $p = .029$. Female learners at the elementary level ($M = 2.10$, $SD = 1.10050$) feel more panic when using the FL than male learners ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 1.15950$). The test was also significant at the intermediate level, $t(18) = 4.919$, $p = .000$. Female learners at the intermediate level ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 1.03280$) on the average feel more panic when using the FL than male learners ($M = 4.40$, $SD = .96609$) (see Table 11).

Male students' responses indicate that their feeling of panic when they are asked to use FL positively correlates with their feeling of being laughed at when using FL and also with their decision to miss class when they do not understand FL use by teachers. There are also significant correlations between male students' fear when they do not understand FL use by teachers and their nervousness when they do not understand FL vocabulary used by teachers. In addition, male students' fear when they do not understand FL use by teachers positively correlates with test anxiety.

Similarly, female students' responses indicate that their fear when they do not understand FL use by their teachers positively correlates with their test anxiety. Furthermore, female students' feeling of panic when using the FL positively correlates with their insecurity when using the FL and also with L1 use for teaching difficult grammar concepts. Moreover, female students' feeling of panic when using the FL positively correlates with their anxiety when using the FL and also with test anxiety (see Table 8).

Table 11 Fear Understanding Teacher FL Use by Gender and FL Proficiency Level

FL Use & Learner Fear	Gender & FL Proficiency Variables		Frequency Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement				
					Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Fear Understanding Teacher FL Use	Male		30	3.40	2 (6.7%)	6 (20%)	4 (13.3%)	14 (46.7%)	4 (13.3%)
	Female		30	3.06	5 (16.7%)	7 (23.3%)	2 (6.7%)	13 (43.3 %)	3 (10 %)
	Elementary	Male	10	3.40	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	4 (40 %)	1 (10 %)
		Female	10	2.00	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	1 (10 %)	1(10 %)	0 (0 %)
	Intermediate	Male	10	3.30	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	0 (0 %)	4 (40%)	2 (20 %)
		Female	10	3.20	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	1 (10 %)	5 (50 %)	1 (10 %)
	Advanced	Male	10	3.50	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	4.00	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	7 (70 %)	2 (20 %)
Panic Using FL	Male		30	3.83	0 (0%)	7 (23.3%)	1 (3.3%)	12 (40%)	10 (33.3%)
	Female		30	2.56	5 (16.7%)	15 (50%)	1 (3.3%)	6 (20.3%)	3 (10%)
	Elementary	Male	10	3.30	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	2.10	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	4.40	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	6 (60%)
		Female	10	2.20	2 (20%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	3.80	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)
		Female	10	3.40	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)

Note: The bold items in overall average are significant.

4.3.2.3 Nervousness Speaking FL

More elementary than intermediate and advanced students report feeling nervous and forget things they know when using FL and also report feeling more nervous when they do not understand FL use by teachers and when they take tests with FL directions. In addition, more female than male students report feeling nervous and forget things they know when asked to speak FL. They also report feeling nervous when they do not understand FL use by teachers, and feel nervous when they take tests with FL directions more than male learners. The independent-samples t -test was significant for learners' nervousness when using the FL and forgetting things by FL proficiency variable, $t(18) = 2.23, p = .039$. Female learners at the elementary level ($M = 1.60, SD = .96609$) feel more nervous and forget things when asked to use the FL than male learners ($M = 3.20, SD = 1.39841$). The test was also significant at the intermediate level, $t(18) = 2.724, p = .014$. Female learners at the intermediate level ($M = 2.40, SD = 1.34990$) on the

average feel more nervous and forget things when asked to use the FL than male learners ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 1.10050$). Moreover, the test was significant at the intermediate level for learner feeling of nervous when taking tests with FL directions, $t(18) = 2.385$, $p = .028$. Female learners at the intermediate level ($M = 2.70$, $SD = 1.41814$) on the average feel more nervous when they take tests with FL instructions than male learners ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 1.19722$). However, the test at the advanced proficiency level, $t(18) = -2.305$, $p = .033$ indicate a different result. Male learners at the advanced level ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.10050$) on the average feel more nervous than female learners when they take tests with FL instructions ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 1.03280$) (see Table 12).

Male learners' responses indicate that learner FL anxiety positively correlates with their insecurity and panic when using FL. Furthermore, students' feeling of nervousness when they do not understand vocabulary use by teacher positively correlates with students' fear of not understanding FL use by teachers and also with test anxiety. The test anxiety positively correlates with 1) learner anxiety when using the FL, 2) panic when students have to use FL, and 3) their fear when they do not understand FL use by teachers. Similarly, female learners' responses indicate that test anxiety positively correlates with learner feeling of insecurity when they asked to use FL. In addition, learner anxiety when using the FL positively correlates with their insecurity when using the FL and also with test anxiety. Finally, learner anxiety when using the FL positively correlates with test anxiety (see Table 8).

Table 12 Nervous Using FL by Gender and FL Proficiency Level

Nervous Using FL	Gender & FL Proficiency Variables		Frequency Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement				
					Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Nervous Speaking FL and Forgetting Things Learners Know	Male		30	3.16	4 (13.3%)	9 (30.0%)	1 (3.3%)	10 (33.3%)	6 (20%)
	Female		30	2.43	9 (30%)	10 (33.3%)	2 (6.7%)	7 (23.3%)	2 (6.7%)
	Elementary	Male	10	3.20	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	1.60	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	3.90	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	3 (30%)
		Female	10	2.40	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
	Advanced	Male	10	2.80	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)
		Female	10	3.30	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)
Nervous Understanding Teacher FL Vocabulary Use	Male		30	3.50	2 (6.7%)	7 (23.3%)	1 (3.3%)	14 (46.7%)	6 (20%)
	Female		30	2.93	7 (23.3%)	7 (23.3%)	0 (0%)	13 (43.3%)	3 (10%)
	Elementary	Male	10	3.20	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.40	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	3.70	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	4 (40%)
		Female	10	2.70	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	3.60	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)
		Female	10	3.70	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)
Nervous Taking Test with FL Directions	Male		30	3.40	1 (3.3%)	10 (33.3%)	3 (10%)	8 (26.7%)	8 (26.7%)
	Female		30	3.03	5 (16.7%)	9 (30%)	2 (6.7%)	8 (26.7%)	6 (20%)
	Elementary	Male	10	3.00	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)
		Female	10	2.20	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	4.10	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	5 (50%)
		Female	10	2.70	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
	Advanced	Male	10	3.10	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	4.20	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	5 (50%)

Note: The bold items in overall average are significant.

4.3.2.4 Self-Esteem when Speaking FL

Elementary students are more afraid of being laughed at when using the FL than intermediate and advanced students. Furthermore, more female than male students report feeling more afraid of being laughed at when using the FL. The independent-samples t test was significant for afraid being laughed at and gender variable, $t(18) = 3.66, p = .035$. Female learners ($M = 2.36, SD = 1.42595$) are on the average more afraid of being laughed at using the FL than male learners ($M = 3.66, SD = 1.32179$). The test was also significant by proficiency level, $t(18) = 2.278, p = .035$. Female learners at the elementary level ($M = 1.60, SD = .96609$) are more afraid of being laughed at than male learners ($M = 2.90, SD = 1.52388$). Similarly, the test was significant at the intermediate level, $t(18) = .414, p = .002$. Female learners at the

intermediate level ($M = 2.30$, $SD = 1.33749$) are on the average more afraid of being laughed at using the FL than male learners ($M = 4.20$, $SD = .91894$) (see Table 13).

Male learners' responses indicate that their feeling of being laughed at when using the FL positively correlates with their decisions to miss class because they do not understand FL use by teachers. In addition, their feeling of being laughed at when using the FL positively correlates with L1 use for teaching grammar rules, vocabulary, and with learner anxiety when using the FL, test anxiety and panic using the FL. Similarly, female learners' responses indicates that their feeling of being laughed at when using the FL positively correlates with learner anxiety when using the FL, test anxiety, and also with their feeling of panic when using the FL (see Table 8).

Table 13 Afraid of Being Laughed at When Using FL by Gender and FL Proficiency Level

Afraid Laugh Using FL	Gender & FL Proficiency Variables	Frequency Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement					
				Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Afraid Laughed at by Other Students When Speaking FL	Male	30	3.66	2 (6.7%)	6 (20%)	2 (6.7%)	10 (33.3%)	10 (33.3%)	
	Female	30	2.36	10 (33.3%)	11 (36.7%)	1 (3.3%)	4 (13.3%)	4 (13.3%)	
	Elementary	Male	10	2.90	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)
		Female	10	1.60	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	4.20	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	4 (40%)
		Female	10	2.30	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
	Advanced	Male	10	3.90	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)
		Female	10	3.20	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)

Note: The bold items in overall average are significant.

Chapter 5 - Discussion of Results and Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

The present research investigated Afghan EFL teachers' and learners' attitudes towards the use of L1 and FL as well as learner anxiety with exclusive FL use. It aimed to discover how L1 use in FL classrooms differs according to teachers' gender. The study also intended to find how learners with different FL proficiency levels view the role of L1 in FL classrooms and whether they experience anxiety when FL is used exclusively. Finally, this research aimed to examine if learner FL anxiety differs according to learners' gender. In this chapter, I will first discuss the findings of this study which are organized around the research hypotheses. Second, I will analyze limitations of the present research as well as pedagogical implications of the study for language teaching. Finally, I will discuss the possibilities for future investigations.

5.2 Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that female FL teachers would perceive the role of L1 as necessary and tend to use it more than male teachers in FL classrooms. Comparing the attitudes of teachers towards using the L1 by gender variable, the findings did not support the hypothesis. Male teachers reported using the L1 more than the female teachers. They considered the use of L1 necessary for teaching difficult grammar concepts, vocabulary, and grammar rules, as well as for checking comprehension, managing classroom, and reducing students' FL anxiety. In addition, more male than female teachers felt that exclusive FL use makes learners anxious.

Additionally, comparing teachers' attitudes towards L1 use by education level, the results indicate that more male than female teachers with BA and MA degrees use L1 for teaching

difficult grammar concepts, vocabulary, and for checking comprehension and reducing students' anxiety. Similarly, more male teachers with BA degrees use L1 for teaching grammar rules and classroom management (e.g. grouping students, maintaining discipline) and they tend, more than female teachers with BA degrees to believe that exclusive FL use makes students more anxious. The hypothesis was supported when the teachers' education level was also factored in. More female than male teachers with MA degrees report using the L1 for teaching grammar rules, giving instructions and classroom management and they believe that exclusive FL use makes learners anxious. A possible reason for why female teachers with MA degrees report using the L1 more than male teachers would be that as they obtain higher education, they realize the pedagogical importance of L1 use in FL classrooms. However, more research is required to examine how further education and training in FL/L2 teaching methodologies and pedagogy influence the attitudes of teachers towards using the L1 and FL in their classrooms.

Overall, the results of this research support the findings of previous studies by Atkinson (1987), Duff and Polio (1990), and Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002) that FL/L2 teachers consider the role of L1 as necessary and tend to use it in FL classrooms. None of these researchers examined the use of L1 in FL classrooms by the gender and level of education of teachers, so the results of the present study suggest that the interaction of L1 use and teachers' gender and level of education merits further research. When the gender and level of education of teachers were also factored in the present research, the findings revealed a significant difference between the attitudes of teachers towards the use of L1. That is, when examining L1 use by teachers, it would be important to consider which groups of teachers – male or female or teachers with a BA or an MA degree – tend to use the L1 in FL classrooms and what factors or variables influence their decisions.

5.3 Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 anticipated that low FL proficiency level students would believe that L1 use is necessary in FL classrooms. The results supported the hypothesis because, as predicted, more elementary than intermediate and advanced level students considered the use of L1 in FL classrooms necessary. For example, more elementary than intermediate and advanced level students considered the L1 use necessary for teaching difficult grammar concepts, rules, and vocabulary and also for checking comprehension and reducing learner anxiety. This result corresponds to the findings of Schweer (1999) and Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney (2008), who reported that students in their respective studies considered the L1 use as necessary and felt that it facilitates their FL learning. However, the studies by Schweer (1999) and Rolin-Ianziti and Varshney (2008) did not examine L1 use by learners' level of FL proficiency so the findings of the present research suggest that the relationship between L1 use and students' level of FL proficiency and gender deserves more in-depth research. That is, the present study suggests that low FL proficiency level students in general and female learners at low FL proficiency levels in particular consider the role of L1 in FL classrooms as necessary. These students believe that the use of L1 facilitates their FL learning and reduces their FL use anxiety. One reason for why low level learners, especially female students at low proficiency levels, consider the use of L1 as necessary might be that they report that they experience higher levels of anxiety when L2 is used exclusively (see discussions under hypotheses 3 and 4 in the next sections). Therefore, using the L1 would help create a non-threatening classroom environment for such students where they feel less anxious and will be able to participate more actively in the learning activities.

5.4 Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 predicted that low FL proficiency level students would experience more anxiety when the FL was used exclusively. The findings supported the hypothesis. More elementary than intermediate and advanced students reported feeling anxious with the exclusive FL use. Elementary students reported that they feel panic, insecurity, and fear of being ridiculed at using the FL. Moreover, more elementary than intermediate and advanced learners reported that they miss class, feel more frightened, get nervous and forget things when using the FL, get nervous when they do not understand FL use, and also get nervous taking tests with FL directions. The results of this research confirms the findings of a previous study by Gardener, Smythe and Brunet (1977) that low level learners feel higher levels of anxiety than advanced level students. The results also support the findings of the study by Gardener et al. (1977) that learner anxiety decreases as learners' proficiency increases. That is, the findings of this study show that anxiety of the elementary level students decreases as their proficiency increases.

However, this study counters Marcos-Llinas and Garau's findings (2009) that advanced students feel more anxiety than low proficiency learners. In general, the present study supports the findings of Liu and Jackson (2008) which illustrate that learners' unwillingness to communicate and participate actively in the classroom correlate positively with learner anxiety and FL use. Yet, the present research counters Levine's findings (2003). The present research revealed that there is a significant positive correlation between learner anxiety and FL use. One explanation for why the low FL proficiency level learners feel higher levels of anxiety might be that elementary learners feel, as Liu and Jackson (2008) suggests, that the exclusive use of FL prevents their active participation and communications in the classroom. In addition, the

exclusive use of FL increases elementary learners' fear that their performance would be negatively evaluated (p. 131).

5.5 Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 predicted that female FL learners would experience more anxiety than male students when FL is used more by learners and teachers. The findings of this study supported the hypothesis: More female than male learners report feeling anxious with exclusive FL use. For instance, they reported that they feel panicked, insecure, and fearful of being laughed at while using FL. As pointed out earlier, the results of the present investigation confirm the findings of a previous study as reported by Gardner et al. (1977) which found that learner anxiety decreased as their FL proficiency increased. That is, the findings of the present research indicate that the anxiety of female learners decreases as their FL proficiency increases. Female learners reported that they feel less anxious in the intermediate and advanced FL proficiency levels. However, this study indicates a different scenario for male FL learners. Male learners reported that their anxiety decreases as their FL proficiency increases from elementary to intermediate level, but their anxiety reemerges and increases once they are at the advanced levels. This result supports Marcos-Llinas and Garau's findings (2009) that advanced students feel more anxiety than low proficiency level learners. However, although Marcos-Llinas and Garau's research included both male (29.9%) and female (70.1%) subjects, Marcos-Llinas and Garau did not control for gender to see if learner anxiety differs according to gender of the learners at the advanced level. Perhaps male learners feel anxious at the advanced level because they might be concerned about their mistakes and embarrassment in the classroom. Further research is needed to determine why male learners' anxiety reappears as their proficiency increases.

In summary, comparing the findings of the present study with the previous research (Duff and Polio, 1990; Gardener, et al., 1977; Levine, 2003; Liu and Jackson, 2008; Marcos-Llinas and Garau, 2009; Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie, 2002; Schweer, 1999), this study contributes new findings to L1 use by teachers and students. The findings of the previous research which indicate that FL/L2 teachers and learners consider the role of L1 as necessary and tend to use it in various degrees and for different purposes are also supported by the present study by teachers' gender and education variables as well as students' gender and FL proficiency levels. Male teachers tend to use the L1 more than the female teachers. However, the results of comparing the attitudes of teachers by their level of education lead to somewhat different results. While more male teachers with BA and MA degrees report using L1 more than female teachers with a BA degree, female teachers with an MA degree report using L1 more than male teachers with BA and MA degrees and also more than female teachers with a BA degree. Further research is needed to examine this finding more closely by looking at the actual classroom performance of the teachers.

Moreover, the present study contributes new findings with regard to learners' attitudes towards using L1 and learner anxiety. More elementary and female learners than advanced and male students consider the use of L1 necessary. In addition, low proficiency and female students experience more anxiety than higher level and male learners.

5.6 Study Limitations

The findings of this study are based on the self-reported beliefs and perceptions of the participants and not on samples of actual classroom performance. In self-reported data, there is a "possibility of conscious bias" in the research subjects providing the data (Baldwin, 2009, p. 3), and subjects might provide too favorable an impression of themselves (Eysenck, 2004, p. 457). Most probably, data would be distorted by participant's "desire to look good" (Baldwin, 2009, p.

3). In the present study, student participants might have provided responses that would keep their instructors pleased probably because of fearing for their grades. Although they were told explicitly that their data would not be shared with their instructors, the presence of their teachers in the classrooms while the unaffiliated investigator was collecting data might have influenced students' responses. Moreover, teacher subjects might have given responses to provide favorable impressions of themselves and to look good rather than reporting what they actually believe and do in their FL classrooms. Perhaps, the amount of FL and L1 use in the classroom was one factor they may have falsely represented.

5.7 Pedagogical Implications

The focus of this research was to examine the attitudes of EFL teachers towards L1 use by teacher gender and education levels. The study also set out to investigate the attitudes of EFL learners towards L1 use and anxiety that FL learners experience by the learners' gender and FL proficiency levels. The study, though small in scale, highlighted important findings regarding L1 use and anxiety that FL learners experience with exclusive FL use which have pedagogical implications for FL teaching.

First, a majority of teachers and students reported that they use the L1 to various degrees because they believe that it facilitates their FL learning and teaching. The existing literature also suggests that the limited, but judicious use of L1 where it has pedagogical and affective purpose is beneficial in the FL learning and teaching process (Atkinson, 1989; Estrom, 2006; Reis, 1996; Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie; Schweers, 1999). Estrom (2006) maintains that it is difficult to define the appropriate amount of L1 use since it depends very much on the purpose for which it is used in FL/L2 classrooms. While any amount of L1 that is used without any pedagogical purpose would not be justifiable, L1 use by teachers for other functions such as reducing learner

anxiety might be reasonable (pp. 288-9). The present study suggests that it would be beneficial to use the L1 judiciously for teaching difficult vocabulary and grammar rules, terms, and concepts and giving instructions. A majority of students in this study reported that the use of L1 helps them learn better and makes learning difficult vocabulary and grammar easier for them. The use of L1 for giving instructions decreases the potential perceptual mismatches between the teachers' intention and learners' interpretation of the aims and objectives of the lessons. When the gap between teachers' intention and learners' interpretation of the aims and objectives of the lessons is narrower, there will be more learning opportunities for students and teachers will be able to better achieve learning and teaching objectives (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, pp. 91, 254).

Second, female learners and low FL proficiency level students in this research reported that they feel anxious, nervousness, panic, fear, and a low self-esteem when the FL is used exclusively. Thus, I would suggest that in order to better facilitate learners' EFL learning and reduce their anxiety teachers may need to consider:

1. Using the L1 judiciously in FL classrooms whenever possible and beneficial to encourage anxious, nervous, frightened, and reluctant students as well as learners with low self-esteem.
2. Establishing a supportive and non-threatening learning environment in FL classrooms where students can open up and participate actively in the learning process rather letting them stay in the classroom as passive listeners or miss the class due to our emphasis on exclusive FL use. Schumann (1986) argues that students will learn the FL/L2 "to the degree they acculturate to the target language group" (p. 379) or classroom community. The more learners feel anxious and avoid acculturation with the classroom community, the less opportunity they may have to develop the target language. Thus, the

establishment of a supportive and non-threatening FL classroom environment will help to decrease the social and psychological distance of learners with the classroom community, which will facilitate their FL learning.

3. Building confidence and self-esteem of the students in FL classrooms.
4. Discussing with learners that mistakes are a normal part of the language learning process by emphasizing that mistakes are inevitable. Teachers would need to convince students that neither they will negatively evaluate learners' mistakes nor they will allow other students in the class to ridicule those students who make mistakes.
5. Telling learners that there is not always one right answer and the teachers will not always evaluate students' responses as right or wrong.
6. Encouraging students to participate voluntarily in FL classrooms rather than forcing them to speak, especially in front of the class.
7. Avoiding marginalizing female learners and low FL proficiency level students who experience higher levels of anxiety. As the current research indicates, female students are usually marginalized in language classrooms and are not given the opportunity to actively participate, take turns, express themselves, and interact in the classroom talk and learning activities (Losey, 1995).
8. Paying careful attention when arranging students in pair and groups to work when asking learners to work on a task together. Shehadeh (1994) and Watanabe and Swain (2007) examined effects of patterns of pair and group work on learners' participation and language learning. Shehadeh's study indicated that female learners' talk, participation, and output increased in single-gender dyads and group work. Shehadeh notes that female learners performed better in single-gender dyads because they may feel more comfortable

and relaxed in working with other women in the same pair or group (Shehadeh, 1994 as cited in Shehadeh, 1999, p. 258).

Lastly, many students in this context come to higher education institutions from religiously and socially conservative family backgrounds in which females play much less of a role in decision making, gender intermingling is prohibited, and the interaction between male and females is almost limited to same sex and to close family members (see Chapter One, Section 1.3). These factors negatively affect women's access to education, communication opportunities in and out of home, and in the classroom. Since higher education is their first experience in co-education, learners particularly females, may feel anxiety when studying in the same learning environment with students and teachers of the opposite sex, particularly in the classrooms where majority of students are male learners. Thus, the administrators may need to be careful about the distribution of students in each classroom. It would be beneficial to have an equal number of male and female learners in a classroom whenever possible to avoid marginalization of female students by being in a class where majority of the learners are male. This would also help teachers to reduce learners' anxiety in the classrooms to some degree.

5.8 Personal and Professional Impact

This study provided me with valuable insights about the role and use of the learners' L1 in FL learning and teaching. As a result of undertaking this research project and my course work at Kansas State University, I have realized that FL/L2 teachers must have knowledge about FL/L2 teaching methodologies and pedagogical awareness so that they can make informed decisions concerning the emerging issues in their FL classrooms. Having such knowledge, the teachers will be able to identify, analyze, and investigate learners' language problems and find

appropriate solutions to address them. The present research has had a great influence on my personal and professional development; as result, I believe that I have acquired the ability and experience to conduct similar studies in the future and find solutions for the potential problems that my students and I will come across in the process of learning and teaching English. In particular, the present research enabled me to recognize when it is necessary to use the L1 and when to only use the FL to effectively facilitate students' FL learning. Furthermore, the process of analyzing the data in this study provided me with a valuable learning experience. I learned how to analyze data through using the SPSS statistical package and I am sure it will help me greatly in the future when I undertake similar quantitative studies. I believe that my experience and learning from conducting the presenting study and going through all the stages of writing a research study has given me the capability to undertake similar studies, especially when I possibly start a higher degree like a PhD abroad after teaching EFL for a few years in Afghanistan.

In addition, as a result of this research, I will be able to better supervise and advise my students to carry out research and write their "monographs," 30-page long research paper which students are required to write and submit as a requirement for their BA degrees at Kabul University Department of English. For example, I will be better able to guide and advise my student to choose a topic, write a research proposal, and create hypotheses, design tools to collect data, choose research subjects, write a literature review, analyze data, and report and discuss findings of their studies. The results of this study will also be helpful to my colleagues at Kabul University Department of English. I believe the findings of this study would be of interest to them and help improve their teaching practices. Once I return to Afghanistan and resume my teaching position at Kabul University, I plan to share the results of the present research with my

colleagues by giving public lectures and workshops and discussing with them how we could improve our practices using the findings of this study.

5.9 Possibilities for Future Research

In light of the findings of this study, particularly the significant positive relationship between the FL use and anxiety that FL learners experience as well as the attitudes of teachers and learners towards using the L1, further research would be required to compare attitudes to L1 use by observing actual classroom performance. I plan to conduct research similar to the present study in the future using/adding different data. In a future project, the experimental tools would compare the self-reported attitudes of learners and teachers towards L1 use as well as FL use and anxiety that FL learners experience with actual classroom practice so that clearer results in regards to L1 and FL use and learner FL anxiety are obtained. The study would determine the observable features of learner anxiety such as embarrassment, lack or unwillingness to speak and participate in the class. Then, possibly through observation and/or video recording the classroom sessions the study would look at learner anxiety and the use of L1 and FL. Second, further research would be needed to examine the use of the L1 by teachers' level of education in more detail. Third, further research is necessary to examine the attitudes of teachers and learners by carefully selecting participants who come from different cultural and family backgrounds to see how such factors influence their attitudes towards L1 use and learner FL anxiety with exclusive FL use. Lastly, with regard to the use of L1 by teachers, future research would look at the relationship between teachers' FL proficiency and their attitudes towards L1 use. In the present study, the FL proficiency levels of some teachers may not have been good enough and this factor might have influenced their beliefs about the L1 and FL use (Polio & Duff, 1994, p. 324).

Bibliography

- Ahmed-Ghosh, H. (2003). A history of women in Afghanistan: Lessons learnt for the future or yesterdays and tomorrow: Women in Afghanistan. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 4(3), pp. 1-14.
- Allyson, J. (2001). Speaking silence? A study of linguistic space and girls in an ESL classroom. *Paper presented at annual meeting of TESOL*. British Columbia.
- Anton, M. & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaboration interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, pp. 314-342.
- Altai Consulting. (2010). Afghan media in 2010: Community case studies. Retrieved February 11, 2011, from <http://www.altaiconsulting.com/docs/media/2010/Case%20Studies.pdf>.
- Atkinson, D. (1989). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource. *ELT Journal*, 41 (4), pp. 241-247.
- Ayobi, S. (2010). Ministry of Education: Where we are now? Retrieved July 21, 2010, from <http://english.moe.gov.af>.
- Ayubi, N. (2010). The Asia foundation: Women's biggest problems in Afghanistan. Retrieved February 08, 2011, from <http://asiafoundation.org/in-asia/2010/01/27/womens-biggest-problems-in-afghanistan/>.
- Baldwin, W. (2009). Information no one else knows: The value of self-report. In Stone, A. A., Turkkan, J. S., Bachrach, C. A., Jobe, J.B., Kurtzman, H.S., & Cain, V.S (Eds.). *The science of self-report: Implications for research and practice* (pp. 3-7). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bolden, G.B. (2006). Little words that matter: Discourse markers “so” and “oh” and the doing of other-attentiveness in social interaction. *Journal of Communication*, 56, pp. 661-688.
- Burstall, C. (1975). Factors affecting foreign language learning: A consideration of some recent research findings. *Language Teaching and Linguistic Abstracts* 8, pp. 5-25.
- Butzkamm, W. & Caldwell, J. A. W. (2009). *The bilingual reform: A paradigm shift in foreign language teaching*. Tübingen: Narr Studienbücher.
- Chavez, M. (2003). The diglossic foreign-language classroom: Learners' views on L1 and L2 functions. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign-language classrooms: Contributions of the native, near-native, and the non-native speaker* (pp. 163–208). Boston: Heinle.
- Cook, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching (3rd ed.)*. London: Arnold.

- Duff, P., & Polio, C. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *Modern Language Journal*, 74, pp. 154-166.
- Edstrom, A. (2006). L1 use in the L2 classroom: One teacher's self-evaluation. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(2), pp. 275-292.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eysenck, M. (2004). *Psychology: An international perspective*. East Sussex: Psychology Press.
- Freed, A. (1995). Language and gender. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15, pp. 3-22.
- Gardner, R., & MacIntyre, P. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning*, 43, pp. 157-194.
- Gardner, R. C, Smythe, P. C., & Brunet, G. R. (1977). Intensive second language study: Effects on attitudes, motivation and French achievement. *Language Learning*, 27, pp. 243-261.
- Giacobbe, J. (1992). A cognitive view of the role of L1 in the L2 acquisition process. *Second Language Research*, 8(3), pp. 232-250.
- Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, pp. 562-570.
- Griffiths, C. & Parr, J. M. (2001). Language-learning strategies: theory and perception. *ELT Journal*, 55(3), pp. 247-254.
- Hancock, M. (1997). Behind classroom code switching: Layering and language choice in L2 learner interaction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), pp. 217-235.
- Harbord, J. (1992). The use of mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 46(4), pp. 350-355.
- Harvey, P. (1994). The presence and absence of speech in the communication of gender. In Burton, P., Ketaki, K. D. & Shirley, A. (Eds.), *Bilingual women: Anthropological approaches second language use* (pp. 44-64). Oxford: Berg.
- Herrera, S. G. & Kevin, G. M. (2005). *Mastering ESL and bilingual methods: differentiated instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1982) Language teaching must start afresh. *ELT Journal*, 36(4), pp. 279-282.
- Kabul University. (2010). Gender based violence: A study three universities in Afghanistan. Retrieved February 11, 2011, from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001899/189969e.pdf>.
- Karathanos, K.A. (2005). Exploring the self-reported perspectives and behaviors of predominantly English-speaking teachers regarding the incorporation of English language

- learners' native languages into instruction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.
- Karlsson, P. & Mansory, A. (2004). Islamic and western-style education in Afghanistan: Conflictual or complementary? In Daun, H. and Walford, G. (Eds.), *Educational strategies among Muslims in the context of globalization: Some national case studies* (pp. 81-101). Leiden: Brill Academic.
- Kharma, N. N., & Hajjaj, A. H. (1989). Use of mother tongue in the ESL classroom. *IRAL*, 27(3), pp. 223-235.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.
- Krashen, S.D. & Terrell, T.D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. London: Prentice Hall Europe.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Language across cultures*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Second language learning as a mediated process. *Language Teaching*, 33, pp. 79-96.
- Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *Modern Language Journal*, 87, pp. 343-364.
- Liu, M. & Jackson, J. (2008). An exploration of Chinese EFL learners' unwillingness to communicate and foreign language anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, pp. 71-86.
- Losey, K. (1995). Gender and ethnicity as factors in the development of verbal skills in bilingual Mexican American women. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(4), pp. 635-661.
- MacIntyre, P. (1999). Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers. In D. J. Young (Ed.), *Affect in foreign language and second language learning. A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere* (pp. 13-33). Boston: MxGraw-Hill.
- MacIntyre, P., & Gardner, R. (1999). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, 44, pp. 283-305.
- MacIntyre, P., & Gardner, R. (1991). Language anxiety: It's relationship to other anxieties and to processing in native and second language. *Language Learning*, 41, pp. 513-534.
- Marcos-Llinas, M., & Garau, M. J. (2009). Effects of language anxiety on three proficiency-level courses of Spanish as a foreign language. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42, pp. 94-111.
- Moghadam, V. M. (2002). Patriarchy, the Taliban, and politics of public space in Afghanistan. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 25(1), pp. 19-31.
- Moghadam, V. M. (1999). Revolution, religion and gender politics: Iran and Afghanistan compared. *Journal of Women's History*, 10(4), pp.172-195.

- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in the foreign language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), pp. 1-8.
- Omaggio Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Opoku-Amankwa, K. (2009). English-only language-in-education policy in multilingual classrooms in Ghana. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 22, pp. 121-135.
- Pavlenko, A. & Piller, I. (2001). New directions in the study of multilingualism, second language learning, and gender. In Pavlenko, A., Blackledge, A., Piller, I. & Teutsch-Dwyer, M. (Eds.) *Multilingualism, second language learning and gender* (pp. 17-52). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Polanyi, L. (1995). Language learning and living abroad: Stories from the field. In Freed, B. (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 271-291). Philadelphia: John Benjamin.
- Polio, C. G. & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, pp. 313-326.
- Reis, L. A. V. P. (1996). The myths and the practical needs of using L1 in EFL classes: A learner training experiment. *English Language Teaching Forum*, 34, pp. 61-62.
- Riley, M. (2009). The importance of education in Afghanistan reconstruction. The Johns Hopkins University: Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies. Retrieved February 10, 2011, from http://www.sais-jhu.edu/bin/k/k/RILEY_AF_ED_final.pdf.
- Rolin-Ianziti, J. & Brownlie, S. (2002). Teacher use of learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 53, pp. 403-426.
- Rolin-Ianziti, J. & Varshney, R. (2008). Students' views regarding the use of first language: An exploratory study in a tertiary context maximizing target language use. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 65, pp. 249-273.
- Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2009). Beginning to respond: Well-prefaced responses to wh-questions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42, pp. 91-115.
- Shehadeh, A. (1999). Gender differences and equal opportunities in the ESL classroom. *ELT Journal*, 53, pp. 256-261.
- Schumann, J.H. (1986). Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7, pp. 379-392.
- Skinner, B. (1957). *Verbal behavior*. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

- Song, Y. & Stephen, A. (2009). *The L1 in L2 learning – teachers' beliefs and practices*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.
- Spada, N. (2007). Communicative language teaching: current status and future prospective. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *The international handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 271-288). Norwell, MA: Springer.
- Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, pp. 532-540.
- UNESCO. (2006). The impact of women teachers on girls' education: Advocacy brief. Bangkok: UNESCO. Retrieved February 11, 2011, from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001459/145990e.pdf>
- Wang, L. & Hyun, E. (2009). A study of sociolinguistic characteristics of Taiwan children's peer-talk in Mandarin-English-speaking preschool. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 7(1), pp. 3-26.
- Watanabe, Y. & Swain, M. (2007). Effects of proficiency differences and patterns of pair interaction on second language learning: Collaborative dialogue between adult ESL learners. *Language Teaching Research*, 11, pp. 121-142.
- Young, D. J. (1986). The relationship between anxiety and foreign language oral proficiency ratings. *Foreign Language Annals*, 19, pp. 439-445.
- Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *Modern Language Journal*, 75, pp. 426-439.
- Young, D. J. (1999). *Affect in foreign language and second language learning: A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix A - Informed Consent Form

Role of the L1 in FL Classrooms: Learner and Teacher Beliefs, Attitudes and Practices

APPROVAL DATE OF PROJECT: June 15 2010 EXPIRATION DATE OF PROJECT:

You are invited to participate in a project that looks at how teachers and students from Afghanistan view the role of L1 (Dari or Pashto) in FL (English) classrooms and the relationship between FL use and learners' anxiety. My name is Mohammad Rahim Samadi, a graduate student at Kansas State University. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are currently learning or teaching English as a foreign language at Kabul University.

If you decide to participate in this study, I will ask you to complete a questionnaire, which will take 10 to 15 minutes. The questionnaire will be used in my research, but your name will not be used in any way for my research. I will also ask you to complete a brief questionnaire providing information about your background in studying English. Completing these tasks will take 20 to 25 minutes. Any **risks** (i.e. physical, psychological, social, or legal) involved in this study are minimal and are comparable to risks in everyday life.

There is **no cost** to you for participating **nor** will you receive **any payment** for your participation in this study. However, this project hopes to provide you with an indirect benefit by contributing to knowledge of how English language learners and teachers use the L1 in FL classroom in the process of learning and teaching English as a foreign language.

Please note that **any information obtained by this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.** More specifically, all written computer files will be coded so that no personally identifying information is on the label or the file name. Any analysis of the written documents will use code names and

numbers. No personally identifying information will be included in the analysis of your answers, thus your anonymity will be ensured. All materials will be kept in a secure place such as a locked file cabinet; all data files will be stored on a computer that requires password access. All of your written answers in this research project and any photocopies will be used for research and data analysis purposes only. The data files will not be released to anyone, including other researchers, without your written permission (you can give your consent to this below).

Following analysis, **the data will be kept in a secure place for possible further research purposes or destroyed if no longer needed for research**. In the future, very brief excerpts of the data and might be used for research publications if you give your consent to this below. All data used for these purposes will be coded to ensure the protection of your identity.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your future relations with me or Kansas State University. **You are under no obligation to participate in this study**. You are free to (a) discontinue participation in the study at any time, and (b) request that already written answers be destroyed and thus excluded from the study.

Your signature below indicates that you have read and understood the information provided above and willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described. You understand that this project is for research. You also understand that you are free to withdraw your consent at any time and stop participating at any time after signing this form without explanation and without consequences (without penalty, or loss of benefits, or academic standing to which you may otherwise be entitled).

If you have any **questions about this study** now, please ask me. If you need additional information later, please do not hesitate to contact Mohammad Rahim Samadi or Dr. Abby Franchitti, his thesis advisor. You can reach Mohammad Rahim Samadi at 785 320 9163, e-mail:

rsamadi@k-state.edu, and Dr. Franchitti at: 532-0064 e-mail: abbyfran@ksu.edu. Should you have any **questions regarding your rights as a research subject**, you can contact: Rick Scheidt, Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, 203 Fairchild Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, (785) 532-3224 *or* Jerry Jaax, Associate Vice Provost for Research Compliance and University Veterinarian, 203 Fairchild Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, (785) 532-3224.

You may keep a copy of this same form.

Name of Participant

Signature of Participant

Date

Signature of Investigator

Date

Please answer the following questions by checking a response and by signing your initials:

I grant the investigator permission to **share with students (researchers in training)** in the field excerpts of the data in the classroom.

[] yes [] no _____
Initials

I grant the investigator permission to **share with other researchers** in the field excerpts of the transcribed data.

[] yes [] no _____
Initials

I grant the investigators permission to use the written excerpts at professional meetings and in professional publications. Any name or place references will be changed.

[] yes [] no _____
Initials

Dari Translation of Informed Consent Form

موافقتنامه

نقش و استفاده لسان اول یا مادری در آموزش و تدریس لسان خارجی و ارتباط میان استفاده لسان خارجی و

اضطراب آموزندگان لسان خارجی

تاریخ ختم پروژه:

تاریخ منظوری پروژه: 15 جون 2010

از شما دعوت میگردد تا در برنامه تحت عنوان "نقش و استفاده لسان اول یا مادری در آموزش و تدریس لسان خارجی" اشتراک نمائید. اینجانب () استاد دپارتمنت انگلیسی دانشگاه کابل به اطلاع شما میرسانم که شما به دلیل اینکه فعلاً در حال آموزش لسان انگلیسی منحصی لسان خارجی در دانشگاه کابل میباشید، منحصی اشتراک کننده این برنامه تحقیقی انتخاب شده اید.

در صورتیکه شما تصمیم به اشتراک در این برنامه را داشته باشید، به شما یک پرسشنامه داده میشود که حاوی 25 سوال میباشد. از شما خواسته میشود تا به سوالات مذکور جواب تحریری ارائه نمائید که بیشتر از 10-15 دقیقه وقت شما را نخواهد گرفت. همچنان از شما تقاضا میگردد تا پرسشنامه مختصر را در مورد سابقه آموزش انگلیسی تان تکمیل نمائید. تکمیل نمودن هر دو پرسشنامه در مجموع 20 الی 25 دقیقه وقت شما را خواهد گرفت.

هر نوع خطر (فیزیکی، روانی، اجتماعی و یا حقوقی) که ممکن در این برنامه متوجه باشد به حداقل بوده و میتواند معادل خطراتی باشد که افراد بصورت روزانه با آن روبرو میگرددند. در صورت اشتراک، شما نه کدام مصرف را متقبل میشوید و نه هم برای شما کدام امتیاز مادی داده میشود. اما توقع میرود که در نتیجه تطبیق این برنامه شما از نفع غیر مستقیم که رشد دانش علمی در مورد اینکه استفاده از لسان اول یا مادری در تدریس و آموزش لسان خارجی چگونه نقش و موثریت میتواند داشته باشد، مستفید خواهید شد.

بخاطر باید داشت هر نوع معلومات را که شما طی این برنامه فراهم مینمائید، محرم حفظ گردیده و صرف به اجازه شما با سایرین در میان گذاشته خواهد شد. مشخصاً باید یادآور شد که تمام اسناد و مدارک تحریری کمپیوتری به شکل کد مشخص خواهند گردید تا معلومات فراهم شده به نام شخص اطلاق نگردد. هر تحلیل که در مورد معلومات اجرا میگردد، با استفاده از کد و شماره صورت میگردد. هیچ نوع معلومات شخصی در تحلیل جوابات ارائه شده شامل نمیگردد و از همین رو محرمت اسم شما کاملاً تضمین میگردد. تمام مواد برنامه در محل امن یعنی در یک الماری قفل شده حفظ میگردد. تمام معلومات کمپیوتری در فایل های که باز کردن آن به رمز نیاز دارد، حفظ خواهد گردید. تمام جوابات کتبی شما طی این برنامه تحقیقی و فوتوکاپی مواد بدست آمده از شما صرف بمنظور تحقیق و تحلیل معلومات مورد استفاده قرار میگردد. معلومات مذکور به هیچ شخص دیگر به شمول تحقیق کننده گان، بدون اجازه کتبی شما داده نمیشود. (شما میتوانید رضایت خویش را کتباً در اوراق ذیل اظهار دارید).

بعد از ختم تحقیق و تحلیل، جوابات شما بخاطر استفاده در تحقیق های بعدی در محل امن حفظ میگردد. در آینده خلاصه از جوابات شما و تحلیل آن ممکن در بعضی از نشریه های تحقیقی به نشر برسد که آنهم در صورتیکه شما رضایت خویشرا در ذیل اظهار دارید. قابل یادآوری است که تمام معلومات جمع آوری شده به این هدف، کد داده خواهد شد تا شناسائی شما محفوظ باشد.

تصمیم مثبت ویا منفی شما جهت اشتراک در این برنامه تحقیقی بالای ارتباط شما با من و یا دانشگاه کنزاس کدام اثر منفی نخواهد گذاشت. اشتراک شما در این برنامه تحقیقی الزامی نیست. شما اختیار دارید که: الف) هر زمانی بخواهید ادامه برنامه را توقف دهید. ب) تقاضا نمائید تا جوابات قبلاً ارائه شده ای شما از بین برده شود و شامل برنامه تحقیق نگردد.

امضای شما در ذیل نمایانگر آنست که شما تمام معلومات حاوی این سند را مطالعه و درک نموده اید و داوطلبانه و بدون کدام فشار میخواهید در این برنامه تحقیقی با شرایط فوق اشتراک نمائید. شما همچنان فهمیده اید هر زمانی که بخواهید میتوانید رضایتنامه خویشرا باطل اعلان نمائید و اشتراک خود را در این برنامه تحقیقی توقف دهید بدون اینکه از شما کدام سوال و یا توضیحات خواسته شود و یا کدام عواقب دیگر از قبیل جریمه، از دادن امتیازات، ویا امتیازات علمی که ممکن شما مستفید گردید، متوجه شما گردد. امضای شما در ذیل تصدیق بر آن خواهد بود که شما یک کاپی امضا شده این رضایتنامه را دریافت نموده اید.

در صورتیکه شما در مورد این برنامه تحقیقی کدام سوال داشته باشید، با من به تماس شوید. در صورتیکه بعداً به کدام معلومات اضافی نیاز مند باشید، لطفاً با محمدرحیم صمدی ویا داکتر ابی فرنگیتی در آدرس های ذیل به تماس شوید:

اسم	شماره تلفون	آدرس ایمیلی
محمدرحیم صمدی	0017853209163	rsamadi@ksu.edu
داکتر ابی فرنگیتی	0017855320064	abbyfran@ksu.edu

در صورتیکه شما در مورد حق تان پیرامون موضوع تحقیق کدام سوال داشته باشید، لطفاً با محترم ریک سکیت، رئیس کمیته تحقیق ویا محترم جیری جاکس، معاون کمیته روی موضوعات بشری به این آدرس به تماس شوید: اطاق 203، تعمیر فیر چاپلد، دانشگاه ایالتی کنزاس، شهر منهاتن ایالت کنزاس 66502، ایالات متحده امریکا، شماره تلفون: 7855323224

شما میتواند کاپی این فورمه را نزد خود حفظ نمائید.

اسم اشتراک کننده -----

امضای اشتراک کننده: ----- تاریخ: -----

امضای تحقیق کننده ویا همکار ایشان ----- تاریخ: -----
لطفاً سوالات آتی را با گذاشتن علامه صحیح در مقابل جوابات داده شده و امضا در مقابل آن، پاسخ دهید.

من به تحقیق کننده اجازه میدهم تا خلاصه جوابات را با محصلین شامل برنامه تحقیقی در میان بگذارد.

بلی () نخیر () امضا

من به تحقیق کننده اجازه میدهم تا خلاصه جوابات را با سایر تحقیق کننده گان که شامل این برنامه تحقیقی نیستند، در میان بگذارد.

بلی () نخیر () امضا

من به تحقیق کننده اجازه میدهم تا خلاصه تحریری جوابات را در مجالس علمی و در نشریه های علمی به چاپ برساند.
(هر نام و مکان استفاده شده توسط شما در جوابات، تغییر داده خواهد شد.)

بلی () نخیر () امضا

Appendix B - Debriefing

Dear Participant,

I appreciate your participation in this research project. Please remember that you can withdraw your participation in this research at any time. This research project, in general, focuses on students learning English as a foreign/second language. Particularly, it examines the role of learner's first language (L1) in English language (FL) classrooms by Afghan EFL learners and teachers and the relationship between FL use and learners' anxiety.

Your contribution to this research project has provided me with data for completion of my research project. Please do not hesitate to ask me any questions about this research project or your participation.

Dari Translation of Debriefing

خلاصه موضوعات

اشتراک کننده گان عزیز:

از اشتراک فعالانه شما در برنامه تحقیقی هذا اظهار قدردانی مینمایم. بخاطر داشته باشید که شما میتوانید هر زمانی حتی بعد از اكمال این پروژه از این برنامه خارج شوید. شما میتوانید تقاضا نمائید که پرسشنامه های خانه پری شده توسط شما نباید استفاده شود.

بعد از امضای فورمه رضایتنامه، به شما گفته شده بود که این تحقیق روی نقش و استفاده لسان اول یا مادری در آموزش و تدریس لسان خارجی متمرکز میباشد. موضوع مورد بحث این تحقیق به شکل بسیار مفصل توضیح گردید تا قناعت شما حاصل گردد و موضوعاتی را که ما روی آن تحقیق مینمائیم بالای شیوه جوابگویی شما در پرسشنامه ها تاثیر نگذارد. هدف خاص از این تحقیق این است تا "نقش و استفاده لسان اول یا مادری در آموزش و تدریس لسان خارجی" را توسط آموزگاران لسان انگلیسی یا خارجی تحلیل نماید.

در صورتیکه در این مرحله کدام سوال داشته باشید، میتوانید بپرسید. از اینکه مرا در تکمیل این برنامه همکاری مینمائید، باز هم اظهار امتنان مینمایم.

تشکر!

Appendix C - Teacher Questionnaire

This questionnaire investigates the beliefs and attitudes of university level English teachers about the role of learners' first language (L1) in English (FL) classrooms & the relationship between FL use & learners' FL anxiety in the classroom. Please look at the statements carefully and circle the appropriate number based on your current teaching situation. 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=no opinion, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree.

1. Teachers should use Dari or Pashto in English classrooms to explain grammar rules.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

2. Dari or Pashto should be used for classroom management (e.g. giving instructions, homework, and grouping students) because it promotes English language learning.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

3. Teachers should use Dari or Pashto in English classrooms to teach vocabulary.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

Please explain your answer:

4. When teachers use Dari or Pashto in English classrooms, students speak more Dari or Pashto than English in the classroom.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

5. The more the English teacher makes use of Dari or Pashto, the less effort students make to understand the teacher's use of the English language.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

6. Teachers should use English for explaining 'simple' grammatical terms concepts, and Dari or Pashto for more 'difficult' terms concepts.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

7. The use of Dari or Pashto in English classes reduces students' exposure to English.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

8. The use of Dari or Pashto should be prohibited in English classrooms.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

9. Learners should be discouraged from translating English to Dari or Pashto.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

Please explain your answers:

10. The only way to learn an English word completely is to know its definition in Dari or Pashto.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

11. It is useful for teachers to ask learners to translate a word or sentence into Dari or Pashto as a comprehension check.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

12. When giving instructions for tasks to be carried out by learners, teachers should use Dari or Pashto.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

13. The use of Dari or Pashto in the English classroom prevents learners from thinking in English and delays their English language learning.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

14. Estimate the amount of class time you spend speaking Dari or Pashto in English classrooms?

1) 1 – 20% 2) 21 – 40% 3) 41 – 60% 4) 61 – 80% 5) 81 – 100%

15. When students speak Dari or Pashto in the English class, it makes me angry.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

16. More use of English in the classrooms makes students anxious.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

17. The use of Dari or Pashto in English classrooms reduces students' anxiety.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree

18. Discuss your experiences of advantages and disadvantages of using Dari or Pashto in the English classroom.

19. Any related comments?

Thank you for your cooperation and completing this questionnaire.

Appendix D - Student Questionnaire

This questionnaire investigates the beliefs & attitudes of university level English learners about the role of their first language (L1) in English (FL) classrooms & the relationship between FL use & learners' FL anxiety in the classroom. Please look at the statements carefully and circle the appropriate number based on your current English language learning situation. 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=no opinion, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree.

1. I like when teachers use Dari or Pashto in English classrooms to explain grammar rules.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

Please explain your answer:

2. I like when teachers use Dari or Pashto for classroom management (e.g. giving instructions, homework, groupings students) because it promotes my English language learning.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

3. I like when teachers use Dari or Pashto in English classrooms to teach vocabulary.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

Please explain your answer:

4. When teachers use Dari or Pashto in English classrooms, students speak more Dari or Pashto than English in the classroom.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

5. The more the English teacher makes use of Dari or Pashto, the less effort students make to understand the teacher's use of English.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

6. I like when teachers use English for explaining 'simple' grammatical terms and concepts, and Dari or Pashto for more 'difficult' terms and concepts.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

7. I do not like when teachers use Dari or Pashto in English classrooms because it reduces my exposure to English.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

8. The use of Dari or Pashto should be prohibited in English classrooms.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

9. Learners should be discouraged from translating the English language into Dari or Pashto.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

10. The only way to learn an English word completely is to know its meaning in Dari/Pashto.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

11. I like when teachers ask me to translate a word or sentence into Dari or Pashto as a comprehension check.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

12. I do not like the use of Dari or Pashto because it prevents me from thinking in English and delays my English language learning.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

13. Estimate the amount of class time that your teacher speaks Dari or Pashto in the English classroom.

1) 1 – 20% 2) 21 – 40% 3) 41 – 60% 4) 61 – 80% 5) 81 – 100%

14. I sometimes speak Dari or Pashto to my classmates to clarify teacher's directions and also the meanings of words.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

15. Discuss your experiences of advantages and disadvantages of using Dari or Pashto in the English classroom.

In the following section you will read a list of statements that refer to how you feel about learning & using English. Read each statement carefully and check the response that best describes your attitudes and feelings. 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=no opinion, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree.

16. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in the English class.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly agree agree no opinion disagree strongly disagree

17. It frightens me when I do not understand what the teacher is saying in the English class.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly agree | agree | no opinion | disagree | strongly disagree |
18. I start to panic when I have to speak English in the class.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly agree | agree | no opinion | disagree | strongly disagree |
19. When I am asked to speak English, I get so nervous that I forget things (e.g. words or sentences) I know.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly agree | agree | no opinion | disagree | strongly disagree |
20. I often feel like not going to my English class because I do not understand what the teacher says in English.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly agree | agree | no opinion | disagree | strongly disagree |
21. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly agree | agree | no opinion | disagree | strongly disagree |
22. I get nervous when I do not understand every word the English teacher says.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly agree | agree | no opinion | disagree | strongly disagree |
23. I get nervous when I take a test in English in which all directions are in English.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly agree | agree | no opinion | disagree | strongly disagree |
24. When teacher speaks Dari or Pashto to explain the test, I feel more comfortable.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly agree | agree | no opinion | disagree | strongly disagree |
25. Exclusive use of English in the classroom makes me anxious.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly agree | agree | no opinion | disagree | strongly disagree |
26. The use of Dari or Pashto in English classrooms reduces my anxiety.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly agree | agree | no opinion | disagree | strongly disagree |
27. Any related comments?

Thank you for your cooperation and completing this questionnaire.

Dari Translation of Student Questionnaire

پرسشنامه برای شاگردان

هدف پرسشنامه هذا تحقيق و تحليل نظريات محصلان دانشگاه در مورد نقش و استفاده زبان اول يا مادری و ارتباط بين استفاده لسان خارجی و اضطراب شاگردان در صنوف آموزشی لسان انگلیسی منحيث زبان خارجی میباشد. از شما تقاضا میگردد تا جملات مندرج پرسشنامه را دقیق مطالعه نموده و شماره مناسبی (1=کاملاً موافق، 2= موافق، 3= نظر ندارم، 4=مخالف، 5= کاملاً مخالف) که نمایانگر وضعیت فعلی استفاده از زبان مادری و لسان انگلیسی در صنف شما میباشد، را نشانی کنید.

1. استاد انگلیسی باید گرامر لسان انگلیسی را به زبان دری یا پشتو تدریس و تشریح نماید.

کاملاً موافق 1
موافق 2
نظر ندارم 3
مخالف 4
کاملاً مخالف 5

لطفاً در مورد جواب تان معلومات ارایه نمایند:

2. استاد انگلیسی باید زبان دری یا پشتو را برای کنترل صنف (طور مثال: هدایت دادن به شاگردان، بیان نمودن کارخانگی، به گروه ها تنظیم کردن شاگردان) استفاده نمایند زیرا استفاده از زبان دری یا پشتو به این هدف شاگردان را در آموزش انگلیسی کمک مینماید.

کاملاً موافق 1
موافق 2
نظر ندارم 3
مخالف 4
کاملاً مخالف 5

3. استاد انگلیسی باید واژه های انگلیسی را به زبان دری یا پشتو تدریس و تشریح نماید.

کاملاً موافق 1
موافق 2
نظر ندارم 3
مخالف 4
کاملاً مخالف 5

لطفاً در مورد جواب تان معلومات ارایه نمایند:

4. کاربرد دری یا پشتو در صنف توسط استاد انگلیسی باعث میگردد تا شاگردان نسبت به انگلیسی بیشتر به دری و پشتو صحبت نمایند.

کاملاً موافق 1
موافق 2
نظر ندارم 3
مخالف 4
کاملاً مخالف 5

5. کاربرد بیشتر دری یا پشتو توسط استاد انگلیسی باعث میگردد شاگردان کمتر تلاش نمایند تا صحبت استاد را به انگلیسی درک کنند.

کاملاً موافق 1
موافق 2
نظر ندارم 3
مخالف 4
کاملاً مخالف 5

6. استاد انگلیسی باید اصطلاحات و مفاهیم ساده گرامر انگلیسی را به انگلیسی و اصطلاحات و مفاهیم مشکل گرامر انگلیسی را به دری یا پشتو تدریس و تشریح نماید.

کاملاً موافق 1
موافق 2
نظر ندارم 3
مخالف 4
کاملاً مخالف 5

7. استاد انگلیسی نباید به دری یا پشتو صحبت نماید زیرا کاربرد دری یا پشتو اندازه ای لسان انگلیسی را که من بخاطر آموزش انگلیسی به آن نیاز دارم، کاهش میدهد.

کاملاً موافق 1
موافق 2
نظر ندارم 3
مخالف 4
کاملاً مخالف 5

8. زبان دری یا پشتو نباید در صنوف انگلیسی استفاده گردد.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

9. شاگردان باید تشویق گردند تا انگلیسی را (در صنف درسی انگلیسی) به دری یا پشتو ترجمه نکنند.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

لطفاً در مورد جواب تان معلومات ارایه نمائید:

10. یگانه شیوه آموزش کامل واژه های انگلیسی فهمیدن معنی آنها به دری یا پشتو است.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

11. استاد انگلیسی باید از من بپرسد واژه ها یا جملات انگلیسی را به دری یا پشتو ترجمه نمائیم تا معلوم گردد که من معنی واژه ها یا جملات را فهمیده و درک نموده ام.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

12. لسان دری یا پشتو نباید در صنف انگلیسی صحبت گردد زیرا کاربرد دری یا پشتو باعث میگردد تا من به انگلیسی در مورد موضوعات فکر و تمرکز نکنم. همچنان استفاده از دری یا پشتو، آموزش لسان انگلیسی مرا به تاخیر میاندازد.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

13. استاد انگلیسی در صنف چند فیصد دری یا پشتو صحبت می نماید.

(1) 1-20 فیصد (2) 21-40 فیصد (3) 41-60 فیصد (4) 61-80 فیصد (5) 81-100 فیصد

14. من بعضی اوقات جهت فهمیدن هدایات داده شده توسط استاد انگلیسی و درک معانی واژه ها با شاگردان دیگر به دری یا پشتو صحبت مینمایم.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

15. لطفاً تجربه تانرا در مورد فواید و اضرار (نواقص) کاربرد زبان دری یا پشتو در صنف درسی لسان انگلیسی تحریر نمائید.

در این بخش جمله های را میخوانید که نمایانگر احساس شما در مورد استفاده انگلیسی میباشد. جمله ها را مطالعه نموده و جوابی را نشانی کنید که احساس تانرا بهتر بیان میدارد. 1=کاملاً موافق، 2= موافق، 3= نظر ندارم، 4=مخالف، 5= کاملاً مخالف

16. زمانی که در صنف به انگلیسی صحبت مینمایم، من هیچگاه بالای خود اطمینان ندارم و احساس آرامش نمیکنم.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

17. زمانیکه صحبت استاد انگلیسی را در صنف نمیدانم، احساس ترس مینمایم.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

18. زمانیکه در صنف به لسان انگلیسی صحبت مینمایم یا باید صحبت نمایم، احساس ترس مینمایم.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

19. زمانیکه از من تقاضا میگردد تا به انگلیسی صحبت نمایم، بسیار مضطرب شده و موضوعاتی را که میدانم (طور مثال: واژه ها یا جمله ها)، فراموش میکنم.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

20. بعضی اوقات احساس میکنم تا به صنف درسی انگلیسی نروم زیرا صحبت نمودن استاد را به انگلیسی نمیدانم.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

21. وقتیکه به انگلیسی صحبت مینمایم میترسم که شاگردان دیگر بالایم میخندند.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

22. وقتیکه تمام کلمه های را که استاد انگلیسی بکار میبرد نمیدانم، بسیاد ناراحت و دستپاچه میشوم.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

23. زمانیکه امتحان انگلیسی را که تمام هدایات آن به انگلیسی میباشد سپری مینمایم، بسیاد ناراحت و دستپاچه میشوم.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

24. وقتیکه استاد انگلیسی امتحان را به دری یا پشتو توضیح میدارد، من احساس راحتی و آرامش مینمایم.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

25. استفاده یا کاربرد مطلق لسان انگلیسی در صنف مرا مضطرب میسازد.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

26. استفاده یا صحبت نمودن به دری یا پشتو در صنف انگلیسی اضطراب مرا کاهش میدهد.

5	4	3	2	1
کاملاً مخالف	مخالف	نظر ندارم	موافق	کاملاً موافق

27. سایر نظریات تانرا میتوانید در ذیل تحریر نمایند:

از همکاری شما در این برنامه تحقیقی و تکمیل نمودن پرسشنامه هذا ابراز امتنان مینمایم.

Appendix E - Background Survey Form for Teachers

This questionnaire aims to gather your personal data, and information about your English study. The information collected from the completed questionnaires will be used for research purposes only and treated as confidential. Your name will not be used in any published report of the result. Please answer the questions as accurately and fully as you can.

1. Sex:
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
2. Age: -----
3. Your highest academic qualification is:
 - a. Bachelor degree
 - b. Masters degree
4. How long have you been working as an English teacher?
 - a. 1 - 5 years
 - b. 6 - 10 and more years
5. Have you received any teacher training?
 - a. Pre-service
 - b. In-service training without degree
 - c. In-service training for master degree
6. Your mother tongue is:
 - a. Dari
 - b. Pashto

Appendix F - Language Background Survey Form for Students

This questionnaire aims to gather your personal data, and information about your English study. The information collected from the completed questionnaire will be used for research purposes only and treated as confidential. Your name will not be used in any published report of the result. Please answer the questions as accurately and fully as you can.

1. Age
 - a. 18 – 25
 - b. 26 - 35
2. Sex
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
3. You are currently in a) freshman b) sophomore c) junior year at Kabul University.
4. How long have you been studying English? Include the course you are taking at Kabul University.
 - a. 3-6 months
 - b. 7-12 months
 - c. 1- 2 years
 - d. More than three years
5. When did you first start learning English?
 - a. In secondary school
 - b. High school
 - c. University
 - d. Other place
6. The level of English you are taking is:
 - a. Elementary
 - b. Intermediate
 - c. Advanced
7. How long have you been using English as a means of communication?
 - a) Less than 1 year b) More than 1 year, but less than 2 years
 - c) More than 2 years, but less than 3 years d) More than 3 years, but less than 5 years
 - e) 5 years or more
8. Your mother tongue is:
 - a. Dari
 - b. Pashto

Appendix G - Questions not Included in this Study

Table 14 Effects of L1 Use on FL Learning by Teacher Gender and Education Level

Influence of L1 Use on FL Learning	Gender & Education Variables		Frequencies Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement				
					Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Teacher L1 Use Results in More Learner L1 Use	Male		10	1.50	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Female		10	2.20	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
	Male	BA	5	1.60	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	1.40	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Female	BA	6	2.50	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)
		MA	4	1.75	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
More Teacher L1 Use Results in Less Learner Effort to Understand Teacher FL Use	Male		10	2.00	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Female		10	1.70	5 (50%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Male	BA	5	2.00	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	2.00	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Female	BA	6	2.00	2 (33.3%)	3 (50%)	1 (16.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		MA	4	1.25	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
L1 Use Reduces Learner FL Exposure	Male		10	1.60	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Female		10	1.60	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Male	BA	5	2.20	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	1.00	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Female	BA	6	1.66	2 (33.3%)	4 (66.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		MA	4	1.50	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
L1 Use Delays Learner FL Development	Male		10	2.30	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Female		10	1.80	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Male	BA	5	2.40	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	2.20	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Female	BA	6	1.83	1 (16.7%)	5 (83.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		MA	4	1.75	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)

Note: The bold items in overall average are significant.

Table 15 Purposes of L1 Use by Teacher Gender and Education Level

Purposes of L1 Use	Gender & Education Variables		Frequency Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement				
					Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
L1 Use Should Be Prohibited in the FL Classroom.	Male		10	3.00	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)
	Female		10	2.50	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)
	Male	BA	5	2.80	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	3.20	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)
	Female	BA	6	2.66	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)
		MA	4	2.25	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
L1 Use for Translation	Male		10	3.00	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)
	Female		10	2.20	2 (20%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Male	BA	5	3.60	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)
		MA	5	2.40	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)
	Female	BA	6	2.50	1 (16.7%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)
		MA	4	1.75	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
L1 for Explaining Vocabulary Definition	Male		10	3.70	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)
	Female		10	3.60	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	1 (10%)
	Male	BA	5	2.80	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)
		MA	5	4.60	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)
	Female	BA	6	3.83	0 (0%)	1 (16.7%)	0 (0%)	4 (66.7%)	1 (16.7%)
		MA	4	3.25	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)

Note: The bold items in overall average are significant.

Table 16 Effects of L1 Use on FL Learning by Gender and FL Proficiency Level

Influence of L1 Use on FL Learning	Gender & Education Variables		Frequency Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement				
					Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Teacher L1 Use Results in More Learner L1 Use	Male		30	2.20	11 (36.7%)	10 (33.3%)	2 (6.7%)	6 (20%)	1 (3.3%)
	Female		30	2.10	11 (36.7%)	10 (33.3%)	4 (13.3%)	3 (10%)	2 (6.7%)
	Elementary	Male	10	2.50	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.50	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	2.00	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	2.10	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	2.10	4 (20%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	1.90	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
More Teacher L1 Use Results in Less Learner Effort to Understand Teacher FL Use	Male		30	1.96	13 (43.3%)	11 (36.7%)	1 (3.3%)	4 (13.3%)	1 (3.3%)
	Female		30	1.76	15 (50%)	9 (30%)	4 (13.3%)	2 (6.7%)	0 (0%)
	Elementary	Male	10	2.40	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	1.90	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	1.90	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	1.50	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	1.60	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	1.90	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
L1 Use Reduces Learner FL Exposure	Male		30	2.13	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)
	Female		30	2.20	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
	Elementary	Male	10	2.50	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.50	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	2.10	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.30	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	1.80	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	1.80	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
L1 Use Delays Learner FL Development	Male		30	2.43	3 (10%)	18 (60%)	2 (6.7%)	7 (23.3%)	0 (0%)
	Female		30	2.43	3 (10%)	19 (63.3%)	0 (0%)	8 (26.7%)	0 (0%)
	Elementary	Male	10	3.00	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	3.20	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	2.20	1 (10%)	7 (70%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.40	0 (0%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	2.10	2 (20%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	1.70	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Note: The bold items in overall average are significant.

Table 17 Purposes of L1 Use by Gender and FL Proficiency Level

Purposes of L1 Use	Gender & Education Variables		Frequency Total	Overall Average for Each Item	Level of Agreement				
					Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
L1 Use Should Be Prohibited in the FL Classroom.	Male		30	2.66	5 (16.7%)	10 (33.3%)	7 (23.3%)	6 (20%)	2 (6.7%)
	Female		30	2.76	5 (16.7%)	15 (50%)	1 (3.3%)	6 (20%)	3 (10%)
	Elementary	Male	10	3.20	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	3.70	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	2.10	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.30	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	2.70	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
		Female	10	2.30	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
L1 Use for Translation	Male		30	2.40	4 (13.3%)	18 (60%)	0 (0%)	8 (26.7%)	0 (0%)
	Female		30	2.53	5 (16.7%)	14 (46.7%)	1 (3.3%)	10 (33.3%)	0 (0%)
	Elementary	Male	10	2.80	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	3.10	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	2.60	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.80	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	1.80	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	1.70	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
L1 for Explaining Vocabulary Definition	Male		30	3.20	2 (20%)	9 (30%)	2 (6.7%)	15 (50%)	2 (6.7%)
	Female		30	3.23	0 (0%)	12 (40%)	2 (6.7%)	13 (43.3%)	3 (10%)
	Elementary	Male	10	2.90	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.70	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	3.50	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	7 (70%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	3.20	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	3.20	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)
		Female	10	3.80	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	2 (20%)
L1 Use for Clarifying Teacher's Instructions/ directions	Male		30	2.23	8 (26.7%)	14 (46.7%)	1 (3.3%)	7 (23.3%)	0 (0%)
	Female		30	2.20	5 (16.7%)	19 (63.3%)	1 (3.3%)	5 (16.7%)	0 (0%)
	Elementary	Male	10	1.70	5 (50%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	1.70	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	3.20	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.70	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	1.80	3 (30%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.20	1 (10%)	7 (70%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
L1 Use for Explaining Test Directions and Learner Feeling	Male		30	2.90	4 (40%)	9 (30%)	7 (23.3%)	6 (20%)	4 (13.3%)
	Female		30	2.26	10 (33.3%)	11 (36.7%)	3 (10%)	3 (10%)	3 (10%)
	Elementary	Male	10	2.20	3 (30%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	1.40	1 (10%)	7 (70%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Intermediate	Male	10	3.60	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	2.10	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)
	Advanced	Male	10	2.90	3 (30%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
		Female	10	3.30	1 (10%)	7 (70%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)

Note: The bold items in overall average are significant.