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ABSTRACT

BILINGUALISM AS TEACHING AID IN A LANGUAGE CLASS: L1 AS A FACILITATOR IN TEACHING/LEARNING PROCESS OF L2 AT INTERMEDIATE/CERTIFICATE LEVEL

This study is an investigation into the contribution of bilingualism to learning English as a foreign language; and the limited and judicious use of mother tongue in EFL classroom does not reduce students’ communicative ability but can assist in teaching learning process. It proposes an explanation for this, based on the historical development of bilingualism over time that has remained the dominant practice in English language classes in Pakistan. Moreover, it seeks to understand whether teachers and the learners who do have another language draw on it in ways relevant to the teaching of English, and to suggest reasons why learners’ and teachers’ languages are disregarded in the teaching and learning process. In doing so, the dissertation draws on key bodies of literature in bilingualism, second language acquisition and critical studies in an attempt to provide a framework for considering the research questions. The study employed a qualitative, interpretive research design involving questionnaires, classroom observations and semi-structured interviews. The data chapter analyzed the students and the teachers’ expressed responses and beliefs about the role of learners’ first language(s) (L1) in the EFL class. The findings of the study in general are that bilingualism as a resource in teaching aids and facilitates in learning L2. There are differences between bilingual and monolingual teachers in that the former have much richer resources on which to draw. There are added insights which come from circumstantial or elective bilingual experience, from being a non-native English speaker, and from formal and informal learning experience. These propositions are discussed in the light of the writings of critical theorists to give a wider perspective on bilingualism as a teaching aid. It is suggested that bilingualism as a teaching aid should become a legitimate topic for discussion and further research.
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<td>With whom do you speak English?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>When do you most often come across with English?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>How important is for you to know English?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>How do you feel about English used in your daily life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>Do you feel comfortable with English?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>Is bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure 4.35</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you think bilingualism in the classroom help you learn the target language?</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>How often do you think bilingualism should be used in the classroom?</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>What percentage of the time do you think mother tongue should be used in the class?</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Audio-Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC</td>
<td>Audio-Active-Comparative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS&amp;R</td>
<td>Faculty of Advanced Integrated Studies and Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>Australian Linguistics Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAA</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics Association of Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMES</td>
<td>Adult Migrant English Service – (New South Wales)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATESOL</td>
<td>Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANA</td>
<td>British, Australian and North American Model of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICS</td>
<td>Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALP</td>
<td>Cognitive-Academic Language Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Curriculum Development Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>Communicative Language Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>English for Academic Purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>English as a Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL&amp;AL</td>
<td>Faculty of English Language, Literature and Applied Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>English Language Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>English to the Speaker of Other Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>General Required Courses (Course Code at KAAU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IELTS</td>
<td>International English Language Testing System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCC</td>
<td>Jeddah Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA</td>
<td>Kingdom of Saudi Arabia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAAU</td>
<td>King Abdul Aziz University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>Language Acquisition Device</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCE</td>
<td>National Center for English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>Non Native Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Native Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUML</td>
<td>National University of Modern Languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QER&amp;D</td>
<td>Quality Enhancement Research and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Second Language Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical program for Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFL</td>
<td>Teaching of English as a Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL</td>
<td>Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESEP</td>
<td>Tertiary, Secondary, Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL</td>
<td>Test of English as a Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This is a study of the contribution made by bilingualism as a teaching aid in teaching and learning English language. The study was motivated by the author’s noting, over many years of teaching English language to young and adult learners. An investigation of the role of bilingualism in teaching and learning appeared to be warranted in view of the fact that the author had observed greater levels of metalinguistic awareness among English teachers in Pakistan.

Bilingualism as a teaching aid in L2 teaching and learning has been the subject of much debate and controversy. This study is an investigation of the contribution of bilingualism to teaching and learning English as a foreign language and limited and judicious use of mother tongue in EFL classroom does not reduce students’ communicative ability but can assist in a teaching and learning process. The literature reveals that much has been written about bilingualism in general but very little about bilingualism as a teaching aid. The dissertation proposes an explanation for this based on the historical development of bilingualism over time. Moreover it argues that despite vast changes in a second language acquisition theory and pedagogy in the last five decades, an English-only classroom fronted by a teacher who is monolingual or who is encouraged to behave as if he or she is monolingual, has remained the dominant practice in English language classes in Pakistan.

Admittedly, this research study is not a consideration of the merits of bilingualism versus monolingualism. However, it seeks to understand whether teachers and the learners who do have another language draw on it in ways relevant to the teaching of English, and to suggest reasons why learners’ and teachers’ languages are disregarded in the teaching and learning process. In doing so, the dissertation draws on key bodies of literature in bilingualism, foreign language acquisition, teachers and students’
cognition and critical studies in an attempt to provide a framework for considering the research questions.

The study employed a qualitative and interpretive research design involving classroom observations, questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. A total of three hundred questionnaires were distributed amongst the learners of English language and fifty amongst the EFL teachers. Ten classes of different teachers were observed and the same teachers were interviewed later on.

Three key themes emerged consequently: bilingualism as a teaching aid, limited and judicious use of mother tongue in EFL classrooms, and the purposes for which L1 is used in teaching and learning L2. Bilingual teachers, both circumstantial and elective, appeared to have more realistic and optimistic beliefs about the nature of language learning than did monolingual teachers. Bilingual teachers appeared to see language learning as challenging but achievable. They recognized the dynamic nature of learning as incorporating progress, stagnation, attrition and re-learning. Monolingual teachers tended to see second language learning as almost impossible, and fraught with the potential for loss of self-esteem. Both teachers and students talked about their own language learning as a private undertaking unrelated in any public way to their professional lives.

Similarly, bilingualism does not reduce students’ communicative ability but could assist in teaching learning process. It clarified some misconceptions that troubled foreign language teachers for years; such as whether they should use bilingualism when there is need for it and whether the often-mentioned principle of no L1 in the classroom is justifiable. It helped make more people acknowledge the role of bilingualism in English language classes. Overall the broader and richer the language background, the more sophisticated and developed were the insights which appeared to be relevant to teaching EFL.

The data chapter analyzed the students and the teachers’ expressed responses and beliefs about the role of bilingualism in the EFL classes. Here little difference was found between bilingual and monolingual teachers, but overall L1 was characterized as desirable element in the EFL classes. Teachers’ interaction regarding bilingualism
was found to be heavily characterized by positive terms. This finding, combined with the teachers’ and students’ generally strongly articulated rationales for the inclusion of L1 led to the conclusion that use of bilingualism in EFL classrooms did not reduce students’ communicative ability but expedited teaching learning process.

The findings of the study in general are that bilingualism as a resource in teaching aids and facilitates in learning L2. It appears to be important in informing and shaping their conceptions of their practice as language teachers. There are differences between bilingual and monolingual teachers in that the former have much richer resources on which to draw. There are added insights which come from circumstantial or elective bilingual experience, from being a non-native English speaker, and from formal and informal learning experience. In general, the more and varied the language learning experience, the deeper and more sophisticated the resource it is to draw on in teaching. It is argued that the teaching of EFL is constructed as the teaching of English rather than as the teaching of a foreign language, meaning that the “experiential knowledge” of bilingual teachers is unvalued. It appears to be accepted and unquestioned that a monolingual teacher can teach a learner to be bilingual.

These propositions are discussed in the light of the writings of critical theorists to give a wider perspective on bilingualism as a teaching aid. Bourdieu’s notion of “habitus” as strategic practice which is structured by a sociocultural environment, is the basis for Gogolin’s idea of a “monolingual habitus” in education. Their work, and that of Skutnabb-Kangas who refers to “monolingual reductionism”, suggests a social, political and discursal explanation for the invisibility of teachers’ languages in the EFL profession. It is suggested that bilingualism as a teaching aid should become a legitimate topic for discussion and further research.

1.1 Historical Background of Bilingualism in Pakistan

Though the topic of this research is “Bilingualism as “A” teaching aid”, the researcher is compelled to emphasize the status of bilingualism as a perennial state of all speakers in the civilized world. A resident of urban area in Pakistan, Russia, Iran or USA has to be bilingual if not trilingual, if the citizen has to exist as a civilized,
cultural entity. All the great philosophers and men of letters rose from their origins rooted in the indigenous folklore and vernaculars. Their growth demanded acquisition of a civilized language current in the academic and the elite circle. These consisted of educators, teachers, philosophers, guides and others who were looked up, venerated and respected as such by the youth.

The relationship between the two thrived not alone on sophistication acquiring higher literature and rhetoric but also on bilingualism. Bilingualism was indeed the very foundation on which the edifice of a richer education and culture was built. In the subcontinent, there is a long history of teaching and acquisition of new languages with the help of native and indigenous vernaculars. Even when there is movement of one language giving way to another, the whole movement of retreat and advancement is made possible through the instrument of bilingualism.

Perhaps, first movement was historic when in ancient India, we became aware of a transition from Sanskrit to Pakirat. This, in turn, paved the way for emergence of native and regional languages like Hindi, Urdu and Punjabi. Then there was the incursion of Muslims in the Subcontinent who brought Persian. Persian held sway almost for one thousand years until the British arrived in the Subcontinent.

At this juncture, the situation was that there were three languages having with impact and various social, official and cultural levels. Those who knew Persian as a cultural language used Urdu as a language of communication, as a means of commercial and social interaction. The language of literature and culture was indeed Persian. However, Persian of Iran was evolving into a different shape. The metamorphosis had not touched the local Muslim elite of the continent in the eighteenth century. When they wanted to express themselves in Persian language in their poetry and prose, they were not accepted by the Iranian court and economic world. Hence, a slow conscious change to Urdu during the life of the poet Mazhar Jan-e-Jana. The transition from Persian to Urdu was taking place but it was given encouragement later by John Gilchrest who established Fort William College in Calcutta. The purpose was to get all the established classical long Persian tales to Urdu.
The college was established by Dr. Gilchrest who was fully conversant with Urdu and he intended to introduce Urdu to the British officers working in India. He collected the people who were completely cognizant with Urdu idiom and even the commonly spoken language. The purpose was to create the reading material of taste and cultural status that could create an appreciation of Urdu literature among the foreigners i.e. the British who came to serve in India. Among such people who achieved such books through translation were Mir Amn, Haidri, Sher Ali Afsous and Hussaini et al. A bilingual textbook of Urdu Grammar “The Munshi” was also produced to teach Urdu language with the grammatical rules to be taught to the British officials serving in India through bilingualism.

The researcher has a lot of personal interest in this decision, having believed both extremes of exclusive use of English and some English with heavy reliance on L1 by both a teacher and a student. The language choice question leads the teachers of EFL to another question, language use by whom and with whom? If the student’s first language (L1) is allowed, does that mean between students only or between students and teacher? The answers to all these questions not only influence the learning material, but also strongly influence the affective environment of the classroom because of the power a language can give by permitting or prohibiting communication. After my investigations and personal reflection, I have come to the conclusion that it is advisable to accept L1 in the classroom under specific conditions the teacher can clarify at the very beginning when and why he/she will use L1 because of the impact it has on identity and therefore the language acquisition process.

Creating a classroom environment where the student feels comfortable to take risks is crucial to learning anything, especially for language development. The EFL classroom needs to be a safe place for the student to learn, inquire, and feel empowered through language. The acquisition of English is the basis of their academic success as well as their survival in the English language dominant host culture.

The immediate environment where language acquisition is to take place will let a student know if he/she is valued and the use of language will either empower, or
disempower him/her. If a fifteen years old student is cognitively a fifteen years old student, and scores as a Low English Proficient (LEP) student on assessments, but only allowed to speak in English, then the core essence of that individual is being ignored, and those fifteen years of experiences, hopes, and questions cannot be heard. Prohibiting the native language within the context of EFL instruction may impede language acquisition precisely because it mirrors disempowering relations.

However, if the L1 is allowed, and used to get to all of what is in the student, then the student will want to learn, and be more motivated, to express him/herself in meaningful ways in English and feel the excitement of being able to be understood and heard. This idea is embedded in the communicative approach of language acquisition. The communicative approach is based on the idea of language use for and via communication with less of a focus on grammar and drills.

By permitting the language in the classroom, learners are given a valuable tool to arrive at meaningful communication, as well as recognizing who they are through their language. If one is told one cannot speak, which is often the result of an exclusive English class, the silenced student feels as though his or her thought or opinion or idea or presence is not accepted or acceptable. If a child is told he/she must only speak in a foreign tongue, or not speak, that child in many ways is, in essence, being silenced. By being silenced, the message of lack of importance is clear, and so is the imposition of power of the English speaker.

The home language is relegated to a lower stature than that of the dominant language, and therefore the speaker is also relegated to a position of being less than the speaker of English. How motivated to learn can you be if you feel you are less, not equal to, and don’t yet have the resources to produce proficiently, yet that is the only type of communication allowed. A clear flaw can be seen in implementation of the communicative approach dominated by English only. There is no negotiating for meaning if one does not have a voice. The roles of the teacher and learner are interwoven in all of these areas. There must be trust and validation; there must be self esteem on the part of the learner, which means reflected importance on behalf of the teacher. If a learner is silenced, the relationship with the teacher will suffer greatly, or worse, never develop.
It is felt that the EFL teacher has an additional role beyond that of English educator as an advocate. Many language learners also need help adapting to the dominant culture of the country in which they are studying EFL, where they are placed. In this situation, the role of the EFL educator as one who accepts and aids the student is crucial. In relationship in which the student feels he/she can ask why or how questions and share a concern whether it be illness, or social need and have that comment being made in the L1 that student will be more prone to learn L2 because of feeling good and safe and heard in the overall English language environment.

Throughout much of the history of research into second language acquisition (SLA), the role of learner’s first language (L1) has been a hotly debated issue. Prodromou refers to the mother tongue as a skeleton in the closet, while Gabrielatos calls it a bone of contention. Such views are but a mere reflection of the different methodological shifts in English language teaching, which have brought about new and different outlooks on the role of bilingualism.

Intuitively, many teachers feel partly based on their own experiences as learners of a second language, that bilingualism has an active and beneficial role to play in instructed second language acquisition/learning. In the literature, an increasing number of teacher-researchers stresses the growing methodological need in TEFL/TESOL for a principled, systematic and judicious way of using the mother tongue in the classroom. And yet, for some of us, there seems to be generalized feeling of guilt that we are acting counter to the principles of good teaching when we use the learners’ mother tongue as a tool to facilitate learning.

One of the first and main advocates of mother tongue use in the communicative classroom has been David Atkinson. He points out the methodological gap in the literature concerning the use of the mother tongue and argues a case in favor of its restricted and principled use mainly in accuracy-oriented tasks. His views, however, are reflections of his own personal experience as a teacher and not the result of measures of comparative achievements of students taught in different ways or of perception-based surveys.
There has been very little research done on what use of L1 is actually made in practice in the classroom and what the perceptions are of students, teachers and teacher educators on this subject. The effectiveness of bilingualism in teaching and learning a foreign language (L2) has opened up new vistas of knowledge and possibilities. The learner’s first language plays a significant role in the learning of the second language in terms of cognitive, linguistic and socio-cultural influences. Unlike a foreign language, which the child learns later in the development of L1 is linked directly to every phase of child’s psycho – sociological development.

It is an integral part of the child’s mental make-up that most of foreign language-teaching trends of the structuralist school have become obsolete out of the classroom. In keeping out the first language, L2 learners have been deprived of a large bulk of his dynamism and have been made artificially silent when their very personality surges with enthusiasm to know and speak in a language which is all part of them. Yet we cannot go so far as the grammar-translation method in permitting the L2 learner employ the L1 with all the methodological precautions permits the teacher bring the harnessed horse of the mother-tongue into the classroom with a view to utilizing this powerful resource in the teaching of the foreign language.

This would mean that the bilingualism is used in the classroom not as the medium of teaching as happens in grammar-translation method, but as a teaching technique or if it is allowed to say, as a teaching aid. Once let loose bilingualism pervade the whole of classroom teaching; instead it is used only in well-defined steps of teaching and in clearly defined manner. In using bilingualism the teacher in the grammar translation method has all the freedom of expressing himself in it and bilingual method strikes the middle and permits judicious freedom in the use of the first language.

1.2 EFL Background in Pakistan

Let us have a brief outline of English language learning in Pakistan. From the linguistic point of view, education in Pakistan is being imparted at four levels. Some of the features of these levels are given below:
1. Apart from other subjects, main emphasis is on ENGLISH in the “Convent” schools and some other institutions. These are exclusive and expensive and also residential in which a particular education is imparted in a severely controlled environment. No other language than English is encouraged. It is often observed that the students graduating from such institutions find it difficult to understand or express themselves fluently in Urdu or in their mother tongue.

2. The “English Medium” schools, on a lower and less expensive level try to provide competency in English Language but also try to impart some proficiency in Urdu as well as in other subjects such as Islamiat to be taught in Urdu. Though the desired results are not up to the expectations of higher and better understanding of languages, these institutions do try to achieve some level of standard education.

3. The usual and Government-run institutions have definitely performed at a lower level. Since the system is weak and left unsupervised, the whole routine depends entirely on the individual teacher. In some institutions, very good results have been achieved at a very low cost to the parents and the students. But the fact remains that these institutions produce below average students who could have done better with proper attention to their abilities. Their understanding of English is minimal and of Urdu only a little better.

4. Thousands of “Madrissas” impart education only in L1/Urdu and in a medium of Arabic. English is NOT offered as a subject and is otherwise discouraged, though it cannot be avoided in everyday use. Students of such institutions have a very restricted area of activity for their future professional life.

In short, the cultural, linguistic and intellectual capital of our societies will increase dramatically when it is stopped seeing culturally and linguistically diverse children as a problem to be solved and instead open our eyes to the linguistic, cultural, and intellectual resources they bring from their homes to our institutions and societies.
1.3 EFL Background in KSA

Like Pakistan, Saudi Arabia is an EFL country. English is spoken as a foreign language there, and the Saudi English is essentially a performance variety. It is one of the biggest countries in the world that have a population of long distance foreigners in relation to citizens’ population. Mainly the people of Saudi Arabia communicate with them by using English. Non-native speakers of English from countries like Pakistan, India, Philippine, Indonesia and Bangladesh, represent the majority of the foreigners’ population in Saudi Arabia.

Economic factors also play a role in the status of English in Saudi Arabia. The Saudi Arabian economy has grown at a very rapid rate over the last two decades, and is no longer totally dependent on oil revenues. Moreover, Saudi Arabia plays a leading role in support of the world economy through its contribution to international organizations. The growth of the Saudi economy has achieved international respect and interest. Therefore, it has become a big market for South Asia, South East Asia and Europe as well. Moreover, as a member of the world community, Saudi Arabia has diplomatic relationships with countries of native speakers of English and non-native speakers as well. For all these activities, English language is a means of communication.

1.4 Statement of Problem

This research study has sought to investigate the use of bilingualism in the teaching of English as a foreign language which facilitates the learning of L2 at Intermediate/Certificate level in general English language/integrated skills classes.

1.5 Research Questions

The main research question for the present study has been:
How does use of bilingualism in the teaching of English as a foreign language aid and facilitate the learning of L2 at Intermediate/Certificate level in the speaking skills classes?
However, the researcher has divided various sections of the study in these sub-questions to find out the validity and reliability of the hypothesis:

1. What is the role of L1 in teaching L2 effectively?
2. How frequently should L1 be used in teaching L2 in classes?
3. What is the attitude of the learners towards using L1 in a class?
4. Why is it desirable that the students and teachers use L1 in an EFL class?
5. How do teachers look at the issue of bilingualism in their teaching methodology?

1.6 Hypothesis

Bilingualism in English language classes does not reduce learners’ exposure and capacity to communicate well in L2; rather it assists, aids and facilitates the teaching learning process.

1.7 Delimitation of Present Study

The researcher has delimited his topic by concentrating on the use of bilingualism as a teaching aid. This study was conducted at National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Islamabad and King Abdul Aziz University (KAAU), Jeddah.

1.8 Assumptions

Following areas have been assumed by the researcher:

1. Firstly, L1 is used extensively in mono- and multi-lingual classes, though it is not acknowledged, accepted and allowed by the new breed of communicative and direct methods language users.
2. Secondly, language learners always welcome the use of L1 in L2 classes.
3. Thirdly, the use of L1 ought to be judicious and fair, just where teacher or learner feel impelled to comprehend and understand L2, it should not be used excessively and untimely.
4. Fourthly, the use of L1 has been found facilitating and encouraging for the learners and the teachers.
5. Lastly, L1 brings healthy and positive development of the learners in language learning process.

**1.9 Research Methodology**

My research has focused on teaching-learning process with the aid of L1 in communicating effectively L2 in the classrooms. However, no broad generalizations have been made. Rather the researcher has focused mainly upon the:

1. Spoken aspect of L2 along with the L1,
2. Proper use of vocabulary while communicating,
3. At intermediate/certificate level,
4. Between the age group (15 – 26 years).

The study has been carried out by using qualitative and quantitative research methods including classroom observation, semi-structured interviews, and questionnaires along with thorough study of literature available on the topic. I intended to conduct my research at the Faculty of English Language, Literature and Applied Linguistics at Certificate and Diploma level of Pakistani students and Special English Courses for foreign nationals from Gulf States, Africa and Central Asia at National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan. The other part of my research work was conducted at Department of General Required Courses (English), in Jeddah community College, King Abdul Aziz University, Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The researcher has personally taught extensively, observed classes of his colleagues and thus collected data from these different national, ethnic and linguistic communities. The data obtained as a result of observations made in the classroom, conducting interviews and getting responses to the questionnaires has been analyzed in the light of literature available on the use of bilingualism in a language class. In the light of these research findings, recommendations are given and conclusions have been drawn at the end.
1.10 Objectives of Present Study

This research will investigate the following objectives:

1. The use of bilingualism does not reduce students’ communicative ability but assists in the teaching learning process and limited and judicious use of mother tongue in EFL classroom improves the language competence of the learners.
2. The study would clarify misconceptions that have troubled foreign language teachers for years about bilingualism.
3. The study also investigates and highlights whether language teachers should use the mother tongue when there is need for it
4. Lastly, the study explores whether the often-mentioned principle of no L1 in the classroom is justifiable and it will try to make more professionals acknowledge the role of L1 in EFL class.

1.11 Significance of the Study

One of the on-going debates amongst language teachers is that whether or not bilingualism in foreign language classrooms is a teaching aid in learning environments. Generally, few instructors feel that the primary language of instruction should be the L1. However, there seems to be a wide range of opinions on the degree of L1 use. One end of this spectrum favors banning the L1 from the classroom totally; the remainder (a fairly large number) proposes various types of L1 use or limitation. Factors which affect these decisions include such things as social and cultural norms, student motivation and goals, whether or not English is a primary means of communication in the environment external to the classroom, age and proficiency of the students, and the linguistic makeup of the class (monolingual or multilingual as relates to L1), among others. One interesting point is that the same factors may lead to different conclusions and methodologies for different teachers, and even when different policies and practices are implemented in the classroom, all of them may well lead to successful results.
Although our knowledge has greatly increased in the last few decades yet our present understanding of the process of learning L2 is far from comprehension. Indeed, the knowledge of foreign language learning cannot be separated completely from important increments in our general understanding of language and learning. The research is very clear about the importance of bilingual children’s mother tongue for their overall personal and educational development. In fact, this initiation of the use of bilingualism into the teaching of a foreign language has opened up new avenues of knowledge and possibilities in regard to the use of L1 in foreign language teaching. It is the reply to a far-reaching cry to restore the dignity and potentiality of the learner’s mother tongue, which is totally ignored and neglected in direct method and in the structural approach. The first language is the child’s basic asset; for the child the first language is the behavior, communication, achievement and fulfillment. The first language is intimately linked with the child's biological, psychological and social fulfillment. These were the purposes for which the language is acquired primarily.

The use of the term L1 is vague and is more of convenience than is required for precision in the research work. It has been observed that in some areas and environment, L1 is not necessarily the mother tongue. In Pakistan, in some parts of Punjab in particular, and other parts of NWFP, Sind and Baluchistan, the L1 is not the mother tongue. The medium of education/instruction is Urdu while the mother tongue is Punjabi, Sindhi, Baluchi, Brahavi and Pushto. The word L1 is used in a loose manner and is defined according to the exigencies of the research.

When children continue to develop their abilities in two or more languages throughout their primary school years, they gain a deeper understanding of language and how to use it effectively. They have more practice in processing language, especially when they develop literacy in both, and they are able to compare and contrast the ways in which their two languages organize reality. More than 150 research studies conducted during the past 35 years strongly support what Goethe, the German philosopher, once said: “The person who knows only one language does not truly know that language”. The research suggests that bilingual children may also develop more flexibility in their thinking because of processing information through two different languages.
Likewise, the children who come to school with a solid foundation in their mother tongue develop stronger literacy abilities in the school language. When parents and other caregivers (e.g. grandparents) are able to spend time with their children and tell stories or discuss issues with them in a way that develops their mother tongue vocabulary and concepts, children come to school well prepared to learn the school language and succeed educationally. Children’s knowledge and skills transfer across languages from the mother tongue they have learned in the home to the school language. From the point of view of children’s development of concepts and thinking skills, the two languages are interdependent. Transfer across languages can be two-way: when the mother tongue is promoted in school (e.g. in a bilingual education program), the concepts, language, and literacy skills that children are learning in the majority language can transfer to the home language. In short, both languages nurture each other when the educational environment permits children’ access to both languages.

Bilingual children perform better in school when the school effectively teaches the mother tongue and, where appropriate, develops literacy in that language. By contrast, when children are encouraged to reject their mother tongue and, consequently, its development stagnates, their personal and conceptual foundation for learning is undermined. When the message, implicit or explicit, communicated to children in the school is that they should leave their language and culture at the schoolhouse door. They also leave a central part of who they are-their identities-at the schoolhouse door. When they feel this rejection, they are much less likely to participate actively and confidently in classroom instruction. However, at present, the main aim of research is to analyze and interpret the process of English language learning in Pakistani schools, colleges and universities with the help of bilingualism. My assumption is that students enhance their learning process of L2 if L1 is substituted judiciously during their course of study.

From the above discussion, it may be concluded that code switching is not language interference on the basis that it supplements speech. Where it is used due to an inability of expression, code switching provides continuity in speech rather than presenting interference in language. The socio-linguistic benefits have also been identified as a means of communicating solidarity, or affiliation to a particular social
group, whereby code switching should be viewed from the perspective of providing a linguistic advantage rather than an obstruction to communication. Further, code switching allows a speaker to convey attitude and other emotive using a method available to those who are bilingual and again serves to advantage the speaker, much like bolding or underlining in a text document to emphasize points. Utilizing the second language, then, allows speakers to increase the impact of their speech and use it in an effective manner.

This research study has been divided into five main chapters. The first chapter presents a detailed introduction to the English language learning in Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. Moreover, the researcher has also outlined the statement of the problem, research questions, hypothesis, delimitation of present study and assumptions for this research. There is also a brief introduction about the research methodology adopted in this study.

The second chapter gives a detailed review of the available literature on various aspects of the study. Firstly, bilingualism has been discussed with reference to L2 learning. The next section highlights the importance of learning L2 in a language classroom. The significance and the role of L1 in L2 is the object of the next section. Here, various theoretical perspectives given by different writers, different researchers on language learning/teaching have been discussed. In the last section of literature review, introduction to critical approaches to TEFL which includes ELT as a profession and pedagogical debates and methods are studied and analyzed. Moreover, a number of guidelines on the above subject have also been detailed.

Third chapter gives a detailed overview of research methodology which has been used for the collection and analysis of the data. In this chapter, research instruments, questions and traditions have been presented. Moreover, various characteristics, problems and benefits of selected research methods have also been studied. It also includes the design of the study, data collection, instruments, universe, population and sample of the study. This chapter also gives the date and time of the data collection and various statistical techniques with emphasis on SPSS.
In the fourth chapter, data collection and its analysis has been presented in detail. It includes various tables and bar charts presenting statistical data collected from classroom observations, semi structured interviews of the teachers from NUML and KAAU. Moreover, the data collected from questionnaires for students and teachers has also been presented and analyzed. This chapter is the main focus of the present study because it presents the primary data which has been collected primarily by the researcher for the research purposes alone.

In the fifth and the last chapter, findings of the study are discussed and recommendations based on the results of the study have been forwarded. At the end, eight appendices A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H along with a detailed bibliography are attached.
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CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter seeks to give an overview of the existing literature available on the various aspects of bilingualism. Although not an extensive research has been conducted on this issue, yet the subject invites many different areas of TEFL, which have been sought by the scholars. This has been divided into many parts. Firstly, the researcher wishes to discuss the literature available on bilingualism. In it, various commonly held myths are elaborated. Secondly, the researcher related his concept of bilingualism with the mother tongue development. In the third part, the researcher discussed the interference of L1 on the target language L2. Lastly, a little research conducted in the English classroom is elaborated.

2.1 Bilingualism in L2 Learning

The study of bilingualism covers a field which is both wide and interdisciplinary. The main areas and disciplines, in which bilingualism has been researched, have been outlined in this chapter. This dissertation is mainly concerned with bilinguality rather than bilingualism because it is a study of and use of bilingualism in the classroom and how it may impact on learning a foreign language. However, in as much as bilinguality develops and is manifested in situated social ways, there will be mention of societal aspects of bilingualism at points when it is necessary in interpreting the findings.

Bilingualism can be discussed as an individual phenomenon or a societal phenomenon.¹ Hamers and Blanc² use the term “bilinguality” to denote an individual’s use of two languages, and reserve “bilingualism” for the study of how two or more languages function in a given society.
However, they do not suggest that it is possible to see each in isolation from the other, pointing out their interdependency, they say:

Bilingualism must be approached as a complex phenomenon which simultaneously implies a state of bilinguality of individuals and a state of languages in contact at the collective level. Therefore this phenomenon should be studied at several levels of analysis: individual, interpersonal, inter-group and inter-societal.3

Bilingualism includes several academic disciplinary boundaries,4 yet these different disciplines tend to study it from various perspectives.5 Linguists tend to focus on the origin of bilingualism, and how people become bilingual. Sociologists focus on the function of each language and societal attitudes to each other. Psycholinguists might focus on the origin of bilingualism too while social psychologists and demographers have focused respectively on attitudes and distribution of bilingual speakers. Although over the past two decades there have been developments in the boundaries of all these disciplines, yet it remains a huge challenge for scholars to develop an interdisciplinary approach to the study of bilingualism.6 Romaine7 claims that several of these disciplines have treated bilingualism as incidental to their main concerns, and often as a deviant from a supposed norm.

Bilingualism in education looks at the pedagogical issues when children speaking one language at home enter a school system which operates in another language.8 There are numerous academic institutions all over the world which attempt to find the best way for children to become proficient in the dominant language.9 There are other studies available which look at how children growing up in bilingual families acquire both languages, and how parents can help them to retain both.10

Many authors argue that the discussion of bilingualism can easily be expanded to talk about multilingualism.11 However, there is an increasing focus on multilingualism as a distinguishable phenomenon in its own right. These issues are discussed in the “International Journal of Multilingualism” by the publisher of the existing journal “International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism”. Just as a bilingual speaker is more than a double monolingual, having unique characteristics resulting
from the linguistic and social interplay of two languages it is reasonable to suggest that multilingualism may feature an exponential increase in complexity, rather than simply being quadruple monolingualism.\textsuperscript{12}

2.1.1 Misconceptions about Bilingualism

Unfortunately, many people think that there is only room enough in a child’s or adult’s brain for one language. However, if we look around at other countries, we can easily see that in many places, children grow up learning two, three, and sometimes more languages without any cost to their educational development. For example, in Switzerland, the home language may be French, Swiss-German, Italian, or Romansh, but most children learn one additional language very early, and by the time they graduate from secondary school, majority of the students are trilingual.

Contrary to the idea that two languages confuse people, there is evidence that well-developed bilingualism actually enhances one’s “cognitive flexibility” -- that is, bilingual people including children are better able to see things from two or more perspectives and to understand how other people think.\textsuperscript{13} Bilinguals also have better auditory language skills i.e., they can discriminate sounds of a language more finely than monolinguals, and they mature earlier than mono-linguals in terms of linguistic abstraction i.e., ability to think and talk about language.\textsuperscript{14}

In general, it is best for parents to speak the language they are most fluent in to their children. This could be the native language or a language the parents speak very well. If parents speak to their children in a language the parents do not know well themselves, then they are providing a model for children of a language that is not fully developed. Sometimes, wishing to give children more exposure to English, immigrant parents force themselves to speak English at home even though their English is not very proficient. But this may actually have the undesired effect of delaying the child’s language development and hurting their chances for academic success.

Simply being exposed to a language is no guarantee that we will learn it. If we are exposed to language input that we cannot understand, much of what is said (or
written) will be “over our heads.” In order for language learning to take place, we must receive “comprehensible input” -- that is, language input must be modified so that we can understand it.  

Furthermore, studies have shown that when minority students are provided with native language instruction for at least 50% of the day through grades 5 or 6, they do better academically than those in all-English programs. In other words, they suffer no loss as a result of less exposure to English, and in fact by 6th or 7th grade they appear to be gaining on their counterparts in all-English programs.

Bilingual education is not one thing; it is many. There are at least five different models of bilingual education in the U.S. While all of them share the goals of providing students with equal access to the curriculum and promoting academic success, they differ greatly in the degree to which they promote bilingualism. The vast majority of U.S. programs are designed to use the home language only for a short time as a bridge to English. Main goal is transition of students into all-English classes as quickly as possible, leaving the home language (and much of the culture that goes with it) behind. These are called early-exit transitional programs. Some types of bilingual education promote literacy in English and develop the home language to some extent. These range from late-exit transitional programs to maintenance programs. The most intensive and long-term programs promote full proficiency and literacy in two languages. These programs include two-way developmental and minority language immersion programs such as the ones in Canada and Hawaii. Therefore, when we question whether bilingual education has been effective or not, we have to first know what the program was designed to do; then we can ask whether it has accomplished that goal.

In this respect, the most comprehensive study to date is Thomas and Collier’s 1995 study of 42,000 language minority student records, with 8-12 years of data per student. The researchers found that:

two-way bilingual education at the elementary school level is the most promising program model for the long-term academic success of language minority students. As a group, students in this program
maintain grade level skills in their first language at least through 6th grade and reach the 50th percentile or NCE in their second language generally after 4-5 years of schooling in both languages. They also generally sustain the gains they made when they reach secondary education, unlike students in programs that provide little or no academic support in the first language.\textsuperscript{18}

In addition to academic success, they also were able to understand, speak, read, and write in two languages. Unfortunately, this type of program is very scarce in the U.S. There is a great difference between the conversational phrases taught by short-term language programs and the high level academic fluency needed to succeed in school, college, and the high skills job market. The conversational phrases taught by short-term language programs permit the learner to order food, make hotel reservations or locate a train station. They do not claim to equip learners with the ability to write a high school paper on Moby Dick, for example, at the same level as a native English speaker.\textsuperscript{19}

Similarly, we may often see children on the playground who appear to speak English with no problem. Yet when they are in a classroom situation, they just don’t seem to grasp the concepts. Many people fail to realize that there are different levels of language proficiency. The language needed for face-to-face communication takes less time to master than the language needed to perform in cognitively demanding situations such as classes and lectures. It takes a child about 2 years to develop the ability to communicate in a second language on the playground, but it takes 5-7 years to develop age-appropriate academic language. Many immigrant children have been misdiagnosed in the past as “learning disabled,” when in fact the problem was that people misunderstood their fluency on the playground, thinking that it meant they should be able to perform in class as well. Actually, they still needed time and assistance to develop their academic English skills.\textsuperscript{20}

Also, like present-day immigrants, earlier immigrants did face discrimination. Many earlier immigrants had trouble in school. In 1911, the U.S. Immigration Service found that 77% of Italian, 60% of Russian, and 51% of German immigrant children were one or more grade levels behind in school compared to 28% of American born
Furthermore, the level of education needed to get a job has changed. When immigrants came to this country in the earlier part of this century, they were able to get industrial jobs with relatively little education and not much English. Currently, the job market holds little promise for those without a college education. Low skilled jobs are being done by machines and computers, or moved to other countries, and jobs in the service industry and high tech communications are expanding.

A final point to keep in mind is that earlier immigrants came mainly from Europe and were relatively light-skinned, with Caucasian features. They also came from cultures that were similar in many ways to mainstream U.S. culture. It was easier for them to assimilate into American society because, once they abandoned their home language, they looked like any other American. Today, many immigrants come from Asia, Latin America, and other non-European countries. They have clear physical attributes that mark them as different from white Americans. Long after they have learned English and acquired jobs in this country, they are still subject to racial discrimination and hate crimes.

To summarize, earlier immigrants would have benefited from special programs if they had existed. And having many bilingual citizens would now enrich the U.S. Instead, we lament the fact that so few Americans know a foreign language. This depends on many things. First, it appears that different locations in the human brain are responsible for different language learning tasks. Some of these tasks, like acquiring native-like pronunciation in a second language, are easier for children. This doesn’t mean it is impossible for adult learners to sound native-like; it may just be more difficult. Other language learning tasks, like acquiring grammar, vocabulary, syntax, and literacy, are easier for older learners because they already have developed proficiency in these areas in their native language, and this language ability “transfers” to another language. Older immigrant students whose native language literacy skills are well developed acquire English proficiency significantly faster than younger immigrant students.

However, we must remember that age is only one factor affecting language learning. Others, such as motivation, attitudes toward the two languages, social context, and the learning environment itself, also have a powerful impact on the degree to which
people do or do not acquire a second language. Immigrants recognize that English is the language of power in this country and they are learning it as quickly as they can. Given a supportive learning environment, it takes 2 years to develop basic conversational skills and 5-7 years to be fully literate in another language. There are long waiting lists for English as a Second Language (ESL) classes at many adult schools. Immigrants who want to learn English are being turned away because there aren’t enough classes. In Los Angeles, for example, schools run 24 hours a day and 50,000 students are on waiting lists for ESL classes. According to the 1990 census, over 97% of Americans speak English including immigrants. It is important to distinguish those who cannot speak English at all and those who speak English and another language. Only 0.8 percent of U.S. residents do not speak English.

2.1.2 Classroom Experience of Bilingualism

There is a clear flaw in implementation of the communicative approach dominated by English only. There is no negotiating for meaning if one does not have a voice. The roles of the teacher and learner are interwoven in all of these areas: there must be trust and validation; there must be self esteem on the part of the learner, which means reflected importance on behalf of the teacher. If a student is silenced, the relationship with the teacher will suffer greatly, or worse, never develop. Samovar, L., & Porter, R.E. explain that “Silencing can be the essence of the language of superiority and inferiority, affecting such relationships as a teacher-follower, male-female, and expert-client.”23

Usually, it is experienced that the EFL teacher has an additional role beyond that of English educator, but also of advocate. Many immigrant students also need help adapting to the dominant United States culture and the school culture and just the way we do school in the United States. The role of the EFL educator as one who accepts and aids the student is crucial. In relationship in which the student feels he/she can ask why or how questions and share a concern whether it be illness, or social need and have that comment be heard in the L1 that student will more prone to learn because of feeling good and safe and heard in the English language environment.
In common usage, the silent period is a time in which a student absorbs L2 and perhaps follows commands and has some comprehension, but does not yet produce. The silent period has a new twist in the exclusively English classroom. If a student is forced to speak only the target language, and does not have the vocabulary/skills, or trust, and needed language, then it is certainly more challenging if not near impossible to learn, then there is a whole new teacher imposed silent period that will only be detrimental to language acquisition. Cognitive process is in the native language. Thinking in the second language (L2) in this case English, comes long after basic proficiency in L2, therefore it is reasonable to allow, if not encourage them to think in their language, perhaps speak, then decipher how to transfer it to English. This has the additional bonus that the student is motivated and the communication is real and meaningful.

The best acquisition approach to language is not modeling all and only English, although it seems natural, but rather letting the learning process happen at its’ own pace, and English will be produced naturally. I believe as we have seen that for real communication to take place, the learner must be able to express him/herself, and as one begin to learn a new language, expression comes first in the home language, but can and will then be transferred over to English. The relationship between the learner and the teacher is crucial, and by validating the student via recognizing his/her language and/or communicating with the student in the L1, a relationship of mutual respect is created, and the student can feel the power of being able to use both languages as tools of communication. This positive relationship will foster a more comfortable learning environment, and everyone’s goal will be accomplished; the teacher can teach to a student that is open to learning and English proficiency will be attained.

2.1.3 Research about the Advantages of L1 in L2 Class

The research is very clear about the importance of bilingual children’s first language (L1) for their overall personal and educational development. More detail on the research findings summarized below can be found in Cummins,24 and Skutnabb-Kangas.25
Bilingualism has positive effects on children’s linguistic and educational development. When children continue to develop their abilities in two or more languages throughout their primary school years, they gain a deeper understanding of language and how to use it effectively. They have more practice in processing language, especially when they develop literacy in both, and they are able to compare and contrast the ways in which their two languages organize reality. More than 150 research studies conducted during the past 35 years strongly support what Goethe, the German philosopher, once said: The person who knows only one language does not truly know that language. The research suggests that bilingual children may also develop more flexibility in their thinking as a result of processing information through two different languages.

The level of development of children’s mother tongue is a strong predictor of their second language development. Children who come to school with a solid foundation in their mother tongue develop stronger literacy abilities in the school language. When parents and other caregivers (e.g. grandparents) are able to spend time with their children and tell stories or discuss issues with them in a way that develops their mother tongue vocabulary and concepts, children come to school well prepared to learn the school language and succeed educationally. Children’s knowledge and skills transfer across languages from the mother tongue they have learnt in the home to the school language. From the point of view of children’s development of concepts and thinking skills, the two languages are interdependent. Transfer across languages can be two-way: when the mother tongue is promoted in school (e.g. in a bilingual education program), the concepts, language, and literacy skills that children are learning in the majority language can transfer to the home language. In short, both languages nurture each other when the educational environment permits children access to both languages.

Mother tongue promotion in the school helps develop not only the mother tongue but also children’s abilities in the majority school language. Spending instructional time through a minority language in the school does not hurt children’s academic
development in the majority school language. Some educators and parents are suspicious of bilingual education or mother tongue teaching programs because they worry that these programs take time away from the majority school language. For example, in a bilingual program where 50% of the time is spent teaching through children’s home language and 50% through the majority school language; surely children’s learning of the majority school language must suffer? One of the most strongly established findings of educational research, conducted in many countries around the world, is that well-implemented bilingual programs can promote literacy and subject matter knowledge in a minority language without any negative effects on children’s development in the majority language. Within Europe, the Foyer program in Belgium which develops children’s speaking and literacy abilities in three languages (their mother tongue, Dutch and French) in the primary school most clearly illustrates the benefits of bilingual and trilingual education.26

We can understand how this happens from the research findings summarized above. When children are learning through a minority language (e.g. their home language), they are not only learning this language in a narrow sense. They are learning concepts and intellectual skills that are equally relevant to their ability to function in the majority language. Pupils who know how to tell the time in their mother tongue understand the concept of telling time. In order to tell time in the second language (e.g. the majority language), they do not need to re-learn the concept of telling time; they simply need to acquire new labels or surface structures for an intellectual skill they have already learnt. Similarly, at more advanced stages, there is transfer across languages in academic and literacy skills such as knowing how to distinguish the main idea from the supporting details of a written passage or story, identifying cause and effect, distinguishing fact from opinion, and mapping out the sequence of events in a story or historical account.

Children’s mother tongues are fragile and easily lost in the early years of school. Many people marvel at how quickly bilingual children seem to pick up conversational skills in the majority language in the early years at school (although it takes much longer for them to catch up to native speakers in academic language skills).27 However, educators are often much less aware about how quickly children can lose their ability to use their mother tongues, even in the home context. The extent and
rapidity of language loss will vary according to the concentration of families from a particular linguistic group in the school and neighborhood. Where the mother tongue is used extensively in the community outside the school, then language loss among young children will be less. However, where language communities are not concentrated or ghettoized in particular neighborhoods, children can lose their ability to communicate in their mother tongue within 2-3 years of starting school. They may retain receptive (understanding) skills in the language but they will use the majority language in speaking with their peers and siblings and in responding to their parents. By the time children become adolescents, the linguistic gap between parents and children has become an emotional chasm. Pupils frequently become alienated from the cultures of both home and school with predictable results.

To reduce the extent of language loss, parents should establish a strong home language policy and provide ample opportunities for children to expand the functions for which they use the mother tongue (e.g. reading and writing) and the contexts in which they can use it (e.g. community mother tongue day care or play groups, visits to the country of origin, etc.).

Teachers can also help children retain and develop their mother tongues by communicating to them strong affirmative messages about the value of knowing additional languages and the fact that bilingualism is an important linguistic and intellectual accomplishment. For example, they can initiate classroom projects focused on:

1. Developing children’s language awareness e.g. surveying and celebrating the multilingualism of students in the class,
2. The sharing of languages in the class e.g. every day a child brings one significant word from the home language into class and the entire class, including the teacher who learns and discusses this word.

Cultural anthropologist Heath, for example, discusses the significance of a child’s learning a language in another cultural background. It is just like committing linguistic genocide.28 He asserts that to reject a child’s language in the school is to
reject the child. When the message, implicit or explicit, communicated to children in the school is that they should leave their language and culture at the schoolhouse door. They also leave a central part of who they are—their identities—at the schoolhouse door. When they feel this rejection, they are much less likely to participate actively and confidently in classroom instruction. It is not enough for teachers to passively accept children’s linguistic and cultural diversity in the school. They must be proactive and take the initiative to affirm children's linguistic identity by having posters in the various languages of the community around the school, encouraging children to write in their mother tongues in addition to the majority school language (e.g. write and publish pupil-authored bilingual books), and generally create an instructional climate where the linguistic and cultural experience of the whole child is actively accepted and validated.

Gibbson, in another discussion on immigrant students learning L2, claims another similar argument. When educators within a school develop language policies and organize their curriculum and instruction in such a way that the linguistic and cultural capital of children and communities is strongly affirmed in all the interactions of the school, then the school is rejecting the negative attitudes and ignorance about diversity that exist in the wider society. In challenging coercive relations of power, the school is holding up to bilingual children a positive and affirming mirror of who they are and who they can become within this society. Multilingual children have an enormous contribution to make to their societies, and to the international global community, if only we as educators put into practice what we believe is true for all children. Children’s cultural and linguistic experience in the home is the foundation of their future learning and we must build on that foundation rather than undermine it; every child has the right to have their talents recognized and promoted within the school.

In short, the cultural, linguistic and intellectual capital of our societies will increase dramatically when we stop seeing culturally and linguistically diverse children as a problem to be solved and instead open our eyes to the linguistic, cultural, and intellectual resources they bring from their homes to our schools and societies.
2.1.4 Code Switching (CS) in L2 Class Context

Research has already been done in the area of code switching or native language interference on the target language. There is considerable controversy over the definition of interference. Dulay\textsuperscript{30} defines interference as the automatic transfer, due to habit, of the surface structure of the first language onto the surface of the target language. Lott\textsuperscript{31} defines interference as “errors in the learner’s use of the foreign language that can be traced back to the mother tongue”. For example, interferences may be seen in the usage of the past tense, articles or the repeated pronoun.

Ellis\textsuperscript{32} refers to interference as “transfer”, which he says is “the influence that the learner’s L1 exerts over the acquisition of an L2”. He argues that transfer is governed by learners’ perceptions about what is transferable and by their stage of development in L2 learning. In learning a target language, learners construct their own interim rules with the use of their L1 knowledge,\textsuperscript{33} but only when they believe it will help them in the learning task or when they have become sufficiently proficient in the L2 for transfer to be possible. In this respect Ellis\textsuperscript{34} cites cases of L1 interference from previous research and does not provide evidence from any current research. Hence this study attempts to provide up to date evidence in the current L2 learning context. This study will focus on an error analysis of the L2 written language and in so doing, provide evidence of L1 interference. This has critical implications for the teaching and learning context as a structured program may be planned based on a prediction of errors made in the target language.

Carroll\textsuperscript{35} argues that the circumstances of learning a second language are like those of a mother tongue. Sometimes there are interferences and occasionally responses from one language system will intrude into speech in the other language. It appears that learning is most successful when the situations in which the two languages i.e. L1 and L2 are learnt, are kept as distinct as possible.\textsuperscript{36} To successfully learn L2 requires the L2 learner to often preclude the L1 structures from the L2 learning process, if the structures of the two languages are distinctly different.
It has been claimed by Ellis\textsuperscript{37} and some other scholars that the second language learner has a more or less voluntary output switch, which inhibits one language while permitting the other to be produced. An automatic input switch is hypothesized, which alerts or sets the language-processing system to deal with different languages, which it hears or reads. This input switch must be at work in those first few confusing seconds of receiving some input.

It appears to be much more difficult for an adult to learn a second language system which is as well-learnt as the first language. Typically, a person learns a second language partly in terms of the kinds of meanings already learnt in the first language.\textsuperscript{38} Beebe\textsuperscript{39} suggests that in learning a second language, L2 responses are grafted on to L1 responses, and both are made to a common set of meaning responses. Other things being equal, the learner is less fluent in L2, and the kinds of expressions he/she uses in L2 bear tell-tale traces of the structure of L1. Regarding the findings of research in second language learning, conducted over the course of these shifts in underlying theories over the past thirty years, the following conclusions are relevant to the scholars:

The native language and the second language are complementary rather than mutually exclusive. Further, native language proficiency is a powerful predictor of the rapidity of second language development. There is no empirical support for the view that time spent on the first language detracts from the development of the second language. If anything, greater elaboration of the native language results in more efficient acquisition of the second language. Hakuta\textsuperscript{40}, for example, finds a pattern of increasing correlation between Spanish and English vocabulary scores in several groups of Puerto Rican children in bilingual education programs observed longitudinally over a period of three years. Other cross-sectional studies, such as Cummins\textsuperscript{41} and Snow\textsuperscript{42}, also report high levels of cross-language correlations among their proficiency measures in the two languages. The fact that older children are more efficient second language learners than younger children is seen as further evidence that stronger first-language proficiency translates into better second language learning. The structural patterns of the native language have minimal influence on the patterns of second language acquisition, especially at the syntactic level. Although prevailing theory in the 1960’s predicted that the bulk of the difficulty in second
language learning consisted of overcoming the previously learned habits of the first language, current researchers no longer hold this view.

All second language learners of English, for example, have much in common in terms of the difficulties they face in learning a second language--regardless of their native languages. Studies of errors made by students acquiring a second language “error analysis”, for example, those reviewed in McLaughlin\(^43\) and earlier studies reviewed in Hakuta and Cancino\(^44\) generally show measurable but not overwhelming impact of native language structures in second language acquisition. However, interference errors--errors made in the second language and which appears to be the result of first-language interference are most noticeable and therefore receive a greater share of the attention of teachers and researchers.

Language proficiency is not unitary, but rather consists of a diverse collection of skills that are not necessarily correlated. A distinction must be made between functional skills used in interpreting language, which draws on context from language removed from context. Contextualized language occurs in oral and written forms, as does decontextualized language. Skills used in interpreting contextualized, face-to-face conversational settings develop more rapidly than skills needed to interpret decontextualized language (oral or written). Verbal academic skills, which are crucial for success in school, are needed most often for the purpose of interpreting decontextualized language. Our understanding of “language proficiency” has undergone a transformation similar to our conception of “intelligence” over the years. The earlier view that the complexity of human intelligence could be reduced to a simple single score (on an IQ test) on which individuals can be rank-ordered is no longer considered valid (Sternberg)\(^45\). Similarly, as language ability is studied more extensively, it is seen as complex, beyond the simple notion of “language aptitude.” Cummins\(^46\) and Snow\(^47\), for example, provide data indicating a distinction between communicative language (in Cummins’ terminology, BICS—basic interpersonal communicative skills) and academic language (CALP—cognitive-academic language proficiency), to support a distinction between contextualized and decontextualized language skills. Despite some important differences between these conceptualizations, they (Cummins and Snow) agree on the inadequacy of measuring proficiency in an undimensional way.
The attainment of age appropriate levels of performance in the second language can take four to seven years. Speculation on how quickly children can acquire a second language has resulted in estimates as low as six weeks (Epstein). Presumably, such views of rapid learning are based on informal observations and do not reflect development in all aspects of language use. Collier recently summarized her own work as well as that of others indicating that limited English proficient students from a variety of language backgrounds do catch up with native-speakers of English. But they take considerably longer than the two to three years often assumed to be the maximum time needed by limited English proficient students for acquiring sufficient proficiency in English. Collier suggests that a minimum of four years may be required by such students, regardless of the type of program or the language and social backgrounds of the students.

Age may be a factor that constrains the acquisition of certain phonological and syntactic features of a second or foreign language, but not its academic functions. There is no clear evidence for a biologically determined critical period near puberty before which second language acquisition happens easily, and after which it happens with difficulty. In the short term at least, there is good evidence that older learners are better due to their greater cognitive maturity, although specific ages have yet to be determined (Snow and Hoefnagel-Hohle). Collier suggests that children between the ages of eight and twelve are the most advantaged second language learners. Studies of older limited English proficient people who began studying English at a mature age suggest that the acquisition of phonological and grammatical skills in a second language decline with age, but that this decline is characterized as slow and linear. In sum, age does not limit the acquisition of a second language.

Although affective factors are related to second language learning, those studied in a foreign-language context may not be applicable to limited English proficient individuals learning English as a second language in the United States. Studies by Gardner and colleagues of English-speaking Canadian high-school students learning French point strongly to the role of attitudes and motivation in the success of foreign-language study during adolescence. These studies can only be generalized with great caution to the learning of English by limited English proficient students in the United States. The Canadian studies are of students formally learning a language that is not
part of the larger social milieu, since they are conducted in English-speaking parts of
Canada. Indeed, they are analogous to the learning of Spanish as a foreign language
by native-speakers of English in the United States. Further, the variables of attitude
and motivation studied among adolescent foreign-language learners may not be
applicable in the same way to limited English proficient children or adults in this
country who are often highly motivated to learn English, and do so quite rapidly. In
one study of students of Mexican descent in Northern California, Hakuta and
D’Andrea\textsuperscript{54} discovered that attitude was a far better predictor of the extent to which
the students maintained Spanish rather than how quickly or how well they learned
English.

The use of L1 in learning L2 is associated positively with greater cognitive flexibility
and awareness of language. Comparisons of bilingual and monolingual children, as
well as comparisons of bilingual children of varying levels of development, indicate
that bilingualism can lead to superior performance on a variety of intellectual skills.\textsuperscript{55}
These can range from performance on tests of analysis of abstract visual patterns to
measures of metalinguistic awareness—the ability to think abstractly about language
and appreciate linguistic form rather than content. For example, the ability to observe
that the sentence “The birds is sleeping” makes perfect sense, but does not follow the
conventions of the variety of English usually used in academic settings. There is some
controversy over the conditions under which these positive advantages of bilingualism
appear, as well as over the specific mechanisms that cause these effects,\textsuperscript{56} but there is
widespread agreement among researchers that these effects are real. And there is
overwhelming rejection of earlier research suggesting negative intellectual
consequences of bilingualism.

One of the most fundamental assumptions underlying the efficiency of bilingual
instruction is that skills and knowledge learnt in the native language transfer to
English. Thus, a child learning about velocity in Spanish should be able to transfer
this knowledge to English without having to relearn the concepts, as long as the
relevant vocabulary (in English) is available. Indeed, having the content knowledge
already available should greatly facilitate the learning of the appropriate vocabulary
items (in the second language) since they provide what Krashen\textsuperscript{57} calls
“comprehensible input.”
In part because of the obviousness that such transfer will occur, little research exists to demonstrate this. Lambert and Tucker\textsuperscript{58}, in reviewing the results of their classic study of Canadian French immersion programs (where the native English-speaking children received instruction exclusively in the minority language, French), made the following observation regarding transfer of skills:

We refer here to the higher-order skills of reading and calculating, which were developed exclusively through the medium of French and yet seemed to be equally well and almost simultaneously developed in English. In fact, we wonder whether in these cases there actually was a transfer of any sort or whether some more abstract form of learning took place that was quite independent of the language of training. These developments took place so rapidly that we had little time to take notice of them. It seemed to us that all of a sudden the children could read in English and demonstrate their arithmetic achievement in that language.

The notion of transfer of skills is also supported by research in cognitive science where attempts are made to look for representational schemas for complex narratives in two languages. For example, Goldman, Reyes and Varnhagen\textsuperscript{59} showed that bilingual children employ similar comprehension strategies when listening to Aesop’s fables in two languages, providing indirect evidence that higher-order cognitive processes manifest themselves regardless of the specific language. Malakoff\textsuperscript{60} showed similarity in performance on analogical reasoning in French-English bilingual children in Switzerland. Additionally, a host of research on adult bilingual memory for lists of words suggests that the particular language of presentation of specific words can be remembered under some conditions, but that in general, the content transcends language. In essence, in the act of learning concepts and skills, people form a schema that is independent of the specific language of presentation, even though the act of learning can involve active recruitment of the language to regulate thinking.
Skills transfer globally rather than piece by piece. Given that skills do transfer across languages, it is possible to think about transfer as occurring on a specific, skill-by-skill componential basis, or, more globally, where the entire structure of skills in a domain transfers as a whole. In one experimental study, researchers taught specific concepts in the area of temporal and spatial relations in Spanish to Puerto Rican first graders in a bilingual program, and assessed the extent to which the transfer to English could be described componentially or holistically. It was concluded that transfer of these skills was best described holistically and depended on the general proficiency level in the first language, rather than on the specific set of skills that were taught.

Expertise in translation exists in all bilingual children, demonstrating considerable ability to transfer regardless of content. Striking evidence for the permeability of information across languages can be found in the skills of translation and interpretation, activities that many bilingual children find themselves performing for family members, schoolmates and others on a daily basis. The psycholinguistic properties of this ability have been documented among elementary school children. In controlled experimental settings, the children proved to be very skilled at avoiding pitfalls of literal translation (e.g., transferring word order or providing literal translations of idiomatic expressions). There was no evidence of confusion between the two languages, even though in normal conversations with their bilingual friends, they engaged actively in switching between their two languages. Furthermore, there was evidence to suggest that translation ability is related to language proficiency in the two languages. In addition, it seems to be related to a meta-linguistic ability that is unrelated to proficiency in the specific languages.

This research has led to a number of attempts to use translation as a way of enhancing meta-linguistic ability and amplifying bilingual skills. Interference may be viewed as the transference of elements of one language to another at various levels including phonological, grammatical, lexical and orthographical (Berthold, Mangubhai & Batorowicz). Berthold et al define phonological interference as:

Items including foreign accent such as stress, rhyme, intonation and speech sounds from the first language influencing the second.
Grammatical interference is defined as the first language influencing the second in terms of word order, use of pronouns and determinants, tense and mood. Interference at a lexical level provides for the borrowing of words from one language and converting them to sound more natural in another and orthographic interference includes the spelling of one language altering another.

Given this definition of interference, code switching will now be defined and considered in terms of its relationship to this concept. Crystal suggests that:

Code, or language, switching occurs when an individual who is bilingual alternates between two languages during his/her speech with another bilingual person. A person who is bilingual may be said to be one who is able to communicate, to varying extents, in a second language. This includes those who make irregular use of a second language, are able to use a second language but have not for some time (dormant bilingualism) or those who have considerable skill in a second language.

This type of alteration, or code switching, between languages occurs commonly amongst bilinguals and may take a number of different forms, including alteration of sentences, phrases from both languages succeeding each other and switching in a long narrative.

Berthold, Mangubhai and Bartorowicz supplement the definition of code switching thus far with the notion that it occurs where “speakers change from one language to another in the midst of their conversations”. An example of code switching, from Russian to French, is “Chustvovali, chto le vin est tiré et qu’il faut le boire” meaning “They felt that the wine is uncorked and it should be drunk” (Cook). Further, Cook puts the extent of code switching in normal conversations amongst bilinguals into perspective by outlining that code switching consists of 84% single word switches, 10% phrase switches and 6% clause switching.
There are a number of possible reasons for the switching from one language to another and these will now be considered, as presented by Crystal.\textsuperscript{69} The first of these is the notion that a speaker may not be able to express him/herself in one language so switches to the other to compensate for the deficiency. As a result, the speaker may be triggered into speaking in the other language for a while. This type of code switching tends to occur when the speaker is upset, tired or distracted in some manner. Secondly, switching commonly occurs when an individual wishes to express solidarity with a particular social group. Rapport is established between the speaker and the listener when the listener responds with a similar switch. This type of switching may also be used to exclude others from a conversation who does not speak the second language. An example of such a situation may be two people in an elevator in a language other than English. Others in the elevator who do not speak the same language would be excluded from the conversation and a degree of comfort would exist amongst the speakers in the knowledge that not all those present in the elevator are listening to their conversation.

The final reason for the switching behavior presented by Crystal\textsuperscript{70} is the alteration that occurs when the speaker wishes to convey his/her attitude to the listener. Where monolingual speakers can communicate these attitudes by means of variation in the level of formality in their speech, bilingual speakers can convey the same by code switching. Crystal\textsuperscript{71} suggests that where two bilingual speakers are accustomed to conversing in a particular language, switching to the other is bound to create a special effect. These notions suggest that code switching may be used as a socio-linguistic tool by bilingual speakers.

From the above discussion, it may be concluded that code switching is not language interference on the basis that it supplements speech. Where it is used due to an inability of expression, code switching provides continuity in speech rather than presenting interference in language. The socio-linguistic benefits have also been identified as a means of communicating solidarity, or affiliation to a particular social group, whereby code switching should be viewed from the perspective of providing a linguistic advantage rather than an obstruction to communication. Further, code switching allows a speaker to convey attitude and other emotive using a method available to those who are bilingual and again serves to advantage the speaker, much
like bolding or underlining in a text document to emphasize points. Utilizing the second language, then, allows speakers to increase the impact of their speech and use it in an effective manner.

To ensure the effective use of code switching there are, however, two main restrictions, as developed by Poplack cited in Cook. The first of these is the free morpheme constraint. This constraint suggests that a “speaker may not switch language between a word and its endings unless the word is pronounced as if it were in the language of the ending”. The example given by Cook to illustrate this constraint is creation of the word “runeando” in an English/Spanish switch. Cook suggests that this is impossible because “run” is a distinctively English sound. The word “flipeando”, on the other hand, is possible since “flip” could be a Spanish word. The second constraint is referred to as the equivalence constraint. This constraint is characterized by the notion that “the switch can come at a point in the sentence where it does not violate the grammar of either language”. The example Cook uses to illustrate the equivalence constraint is a French/English switch with the suggestion that switches such as “a car americaine” or “une American voiture” are both unlikely as they are wrong in both languages. A switch “J’ai acheté an American car” (I bought an American car) is possible as both English and French share the construction in which the verb is followed by the object.

Other researchers have also worked on generating similar specific linguistic constraints on patterns of code switching, with a general view to contribute to the work on language universals. On this basis, constraints provide a mechanism whereby two languages may be integrated together without causing interference in the conversation between two bilingual speakers.

Research studies are inseparable from the intellectual traditions that serve as powerful undercurrents and shape the questions that are asked and the way in which data are interpreted. The understanding of research results entails a certain amount of attention to historical perspective. From a researcher’s basic perspective, it is difficult to avoid the necessary conservatism of the profession and to say that more research is needed. The conclusions cited above are the best guess available on the basis of scientific research to date. It is critical to underscore the fact that their robustness and integrity
depends on their being challenged by new research employing novel techniques, novel subject populations, and novel interpretations.

Beyond advocating the continued advancement of basic knowledge, however, it might be valuable to identify larger issues around which researchers in bilingualism and educators of bilingual children could focus collaborative energy. No single researcher can begin to identify a reasonably exhaustive set of such issues, but the following are a few that might be suggested. Despite large sociolinguistic differences among elite and folk bilinguals, research at the psycholinguistic level indicates a fundamental similarity in the cognitive and linguistic processes, such as in the cognitive consequences of bilingualism or the process of second language acquisition. Yet, the belief that bilingualism might be good for some but not for others is persistent, and different attributions often are made about someone who is bilingual by background (a folk bilingual) rather than by hard formal study (an elite bilingual). This discrepancy between the reality of psycholinguistic equity and sociolinguistic equity needs to be pursued. At the psycholinguistic level, work comparing bilingual processes in elite and folk bilinguals should be continued; at the sociolinguistic level, the basis of the beliefs among various groups (e.g., students, teachers, parents, school and community leaders) might be systematically addressed.

If the languages represented by American linguistic minorities were seen as a natural resource, such as species of birds or trees, there would be public clamor to set up investigative commissions to monitor and prevent their rapid extinction. The linguistic resources represented by these groups need continuous and focused attention by educators and policymakers who should exercise creativity in finding means through which these resources can be harnessed and developed. It would be useful to have vivid documentation of the status of languages and of the processes by which they disappear from the lives of the families and communities, as well as of programs that successfully develop these resources.

Although often viewed with skepticism, educational assessment plays an important role in developing curriculum, and the assessment of bilingual children is not well aligned with our broader aspirations for their development. The development of rich yet reliable methods of assessment is critical. Moreover, a collaborative approach
toward the development of assessment provides a focused opportunity to debate and
draw up architecture of our aspirations for education programs to promote
bilingualism. Such an approach toward assessment is an important augmentation to
the traditional model of summative program evaluation, an activity that often makes
use of limited measures and may be overly sensitive to political concerns.

A number of international studies, such as by the Organization for Economic
Cooperation and Development (OECD)\textsuperscript{73}, have shown that the United States is not
alone in experiencing major changes in the linguistic and cultural diversification of its
student body. Indeed, many nations of the industrialized world are facing similar
issues and hold similar beliefs (including the belief that their country is alone in this
“problem” and has little to learn from the experiences of other nations). Greater
comparative research on how bilingualism is promoted or thwarted through the
institution of schooling can help overcome our parochialism in addressing the needs
of our language minority students.

Ultimately, though, basic researchers on bilingualism can be most helpful in
interactively constructing, with educators, an accurate image of the bilingual child.
The collage offered here advances the image of a child whose social and cognitive
capacities are enriched and amplified (rather than handicapped and impaired) by
experiences with multiple languages. Children in bilingual education programs are
within reach of this vision, and it is our collective responsibility, as researchers and
educators, to provide a learning environment that is conducive to the development of
their full potential.

In another research, conducted by Jinlan Tang\textsuperscript{74} emphasized the same idea that L1 in
the English class helps the students to improve their L2 linguistic capabilities. He
conducted his research on Chinese students and his results proved the idea of
Schweer’s study results. A proponent of the monolingual approach, Krashen\textsuperscript{75} has
argued that people learning foreign languages follow basically the same route as they
acquire their mother tongue in the learning process should be minimized. Authors of
some introductory books on teaching EFL, such as Haycraft (1978), Hubbard et al.
(1983), and Harmer (1997), do not address this issue or pay very little attention to it.
This suggests either the mother tongue does not play an important role in foreign
language teaching or the issue of native language use does not exist in the classrooms of these authors, since most of them are native speakers of English accustomed to working with multilingual groups of students.

During the past 15 years, however, monolingual orthodoxy has lost its appeal. Medgyes\textsuperscript{76} considers this orthodoxy “unteachable on any grounds, be they psychological, linguistic or pedagogical”. It has been argued that exclusion of the mother tongue is a criticism of the mother tongue and renders it a second-class language. This degradation of the mother tongue has harmful psychological effect on learners\textsuperscript{77}.

Professionals in second language acquisition have become increasingly aware of the role the mother tongue plays in the EFL classroom. Nunan and Lamb\textsuperscript{78}, for example, contend that EFL teachers working with monolingual students at lower levels of English proficiency find prohibition of the mother tongue to be practically impossible. Dornnyei and Kormos\textsuperscript{79} find that the L1 is used by L2 learners as a communication strategy to compensate for deficiencies in the target language. Auerbuch\textsuperscript{80} not only acknowledges the positive role of the mother tongue in the classroom, but also identifies the following uses for it:

1. Classroom Management
2. Language Analysis
3. Presenting Rules that Govern Grammar
4. Discussing Cross-cultural Issues
5. Giving Instructions or Prompts
6. Explaining Errors
7. Checking for Comprehension

How do students and teachers look at this issue? Schweers\textsuperscript{81} conducted a study with EFL students and their teachers in a Spanish context to investigate their attitudes toward using L1 in the L2 classroom. His results indicate that Spanish should be used in the EFL classroom.
In this part of Literature review, a comprehensive discussion of bilingualism and bilinguality is given. It is relevant to the study section conducted in Pakistan, where most of the people are bilingual, before learning English. It is quite common and usual that people have learnt Urdu along with their mother tongue which can be Punjabi, Pushto, Baluchi, Sindhi and Kashmiri. Bilingualism and bilinguality tend to refer to issues of relative competence in each language, and to the route taken to become bilingual, and so each of these are considered. Further aspects relevant to bilinguality among EFL teachers are affective aspects, or how bilinguals feel personally about their own bilingualism, and about bilingual language use. The aspects of the literature on bilinguality which have been discussed here are the following:

2.1.5 Bilinguality Explained

Bilinguality is defined according to Hamers and Blanc\(^{82}\) (2000) as:

The psychological state of an individual who has access to more than one linguistic code as a means of social communication: the degree of access will vary along a number of dimensions which are psychological, cognitive, psycho linguistic, social psychological, sociological, sociolinguistic, socio-cultural and linguistic.

The above definition is useful because it is essentially broad and imprecise: it does not attempt to define the level of proficiency, as did earlier attempts at defining bilinguality. It focuses on access to more than one, thus including multilinguality, linguistic code which does not restrict us to national languages, or even to languages, but includes varieties, as a means of social communication, focusing on purposeful use rather than technical competence, and side-stepping the question of native-speaker standards which have preoccupied many previous writers.

The distinguished writers present a number of dimensions on which to judge bilinguality. Valdes and Figueroa\(^{83}\) suggest six dimensions which are age, ability, balance, development, context of acquisition, and lastly circumstantial versus elective
bilingualism. In considering the language background of ESL teachers, the key dimensions include relative competence in each language and age of acquisition - e.g. childhood, adolescence or adulthood. However, it is in line with the question about the origin of bilingualism, which, as mentioned above, has always been part of the bilingualism research agenda. Cultural identity is also a relevant dimension, particularly in terms of the personal affect, or “affiliation”, according to Rampton, bilinguals may feel about one or more of their languages.

Hamers and Blan also refer to language use, but claim that this is not a dimension, but an expression of one or more of the other dimensions. Most of the researchers justify this by saying that the notion of “use” presumes that the bilingual has access to both codes and therefore must have a minimal competence in both. This is not to say, however, that they ignore language use as an important, indeed central part of bilinguality, but that they do not consider it as a defining dimension. Their contention is quite different from that of Mackey who takes a functional view, namely that: “bilingualism is not a phenomenon of language; it is a characteristic of its use”.

2.1.6 Bilingual Competence

Bilingualism has been a matter of hot controversy and researchers have long debated the question that: “How proficient in each language does a person have to be to be called bilingual?” One of the earliest definitions of bilingual competence is “a native like control of two languages”, although authors who cite this as an example of an absolutist definition rarely mention that Bloomfield goes on to convey by saying “of course, one cannot define a degree of perfection at which a good foreign speaker becomes a bilingual: the distinction is relative”. However it is true to say that definitions of bilingual competence have ranged from an insistence on “native-speaker” competence to minimalist definitions. Thiery says that a “true bilingual” is someone “who is taken to be one of themselves by the members of two different linguistic communities, at roughly the same social and cultural level”. At the opposite end of the scale are extremely liberal interpretations, such as that of Macnamara believes that bilingualism begins when a person possesses even a minimal degree of proficiency in at least one of the macro-skills of speaking, listening, reading and
writing. This idea is echoed in Diebold’s belief\textsuperscript{91} that “incipient bilingualism” begins with the recognition of words in another language.

Another concept has been forwarded by Haugen\textsuperscript{92} as continuum of bilinguality. It states:

Beginning at the point where the speaker of one language can produce complete, meaningful utterances in the other language. From here it may proceed through all possible gradations up to the kind of skill that enables a person to pass as a native in more than one linguistic environment.

Many researchers have acknowledged this idea of a continuum\textsuperscript{93}. It also includes proficiency in domains of use such as home, work, study or narrower ones such as talk or writing on specific topics. It is now widely recognized that perfect “balanced bilinguals” who have equal proficiency in all aspects of both their languages are undoubtedly rare. Most bilinguals have one dominant language, or have dominance in some domains with one language and in others with the other language. There are many degrees of bilingualism, and there may be variation within the same person over time\textsuperscript{94}.

2.1.7 Ways to Achieve Bilinguality

There are many degrees of bilinguality and there are also various ways to achieving bilinguality and reasons for doing so\textsuperscript{95}. It also covers a range of routes and reasons which were evident among the bilingual teachers in the study. A person may learn two languages from birth in the home (simultaneous acquisition)\textsuperscript{96}, or learn the second language later from other careers, in the wider community, or in any of the levels of schooling. After childhood, a second language may be learned through formal study, through less structured adult learning contexts, through individual study, or by traveling, working and/or living in another country. These routes to bilinguality are not mutually exclusive, and an individual may acquire a second, or indeed a third or fourth language by a combination of any of them. As Kennett\textsuperscript{97} has
shown in her study of adult second language learners, an amalgam of various ways of learning and progressing in a language is the norm.

Thus it is to conclude that the reasons for becoming bilingual are both social and individual. The motivation may be that two or more languages are spoken in the family, or that the family speaks a language other than the dominant one of the surrounding community. Or, as do over half the world’s population, the individual may reside in a country or community where two or more languages are spoken on a daily basis. Gardner and Lambert distinguished integrative from instrumental motivation, arguing that the former is a more effective predictor of successful learning. However as Ellis points out, both of these models rely on an assumption of “internal cause” of motivation, and this is only one of four possible sources of motivation, of which the others are “intrinsic”, “resultative” and “carrot and stick” or external influences and incentives. Recently, Clyne argued for a greater recognition of the role and force of “intrinsic motivation”.

In discussing routes to bilingualism, it is necessary to mention the research into the effects of age on the development of second languages which has been largely undertaken within the field of second language acquisition (SLA) research, and which is vast. As Baker acknowledges the influence of age on SLA, has been debated much. Most tended to focus on whether there is a “critical period” for development of a second language, after which an individual cannot attain native speaker-level competence. It has been concluded by Hakuta that:

The evidence for a critical period for second language acquisition is scanty, especially when analyzed in terms of its key assumptions…. The view of a biologically constrained and specialized language acquisition device that is turned off at puberty is not correct.

There are differences in processes, rate and outcomes between adult and childhood second language learning, people of any age can and do achieve high levels of bilingualism. The attainment of native- speaker-like competence in two languages is no longer regarded as a valid definition of bilinguality. Thus bilinguals will attain or develop language proficiency more comfortably although in learning of a third language.
Finally, a distinction needs to be made between those bilinguals who use their multilanguage skills daily, or regularly, and those who have the skills but are not in a position to use them. Baker\textsuperscript{107} discusses this in terms of the language background of bilinguals, which may include the ability to understand. Grosjean\textsuperscript{108} refers to the distinction between those who “lead their lives with two (or more) languages” and those who are no longer using their different languages but have retained knowledge of “dormant bilinguals”.

The bilingual experience of the teachers varied widely, as does ESL students’ experience of bilinguality. It includes students’ experience through formal instruction in the ESL classroom, and the extent to which this is shared by their teachers.

2.1.8 Aspects of L2 Learning and Bilingualism

The important aspects of second language learning and use are widely recognized in the fields of second language acquisition and bilingualism. In the present study, there were a number of indicators that teachers saw their own bilinguality, or lack of it, as an important aspect of their personal and social selves. In the following section, bilingual as a person in terms of belonging and identity has been discussed.

Edwards\textsuperscript{109} claims that language is generally accepted as an important marker of identity, and that there is evidence that bilinguals’ use of each language reveals different aspects of their personality. Grosjean\textsuperscript{110} attributes these beliefs to the fact that bilinguals have been frequently studied from a monolingual perspective. It may seem to be two personalities is in fact a shift in attitudes and behaviors which correspond to a shift in context. This explanation goes well with the current focus of bilingualism studies on how bilinguals use their languages differentially according to context\textsuperscript{111}. Baker emphasizes that the bilingual person is a complete and integrated linguistic whole, who uses his or her languages with different people, in different contexts and to achieve different purposes. A bilingual person will carry this as an asset and can make use of it in learning the second language.
Edwards makes a distinction between personal and social identity. It makes a further distinction between bilinguals who have a kinship linkage to each language group, and bilinguals who have acquired “another linguistic citizenship” in a more formal way. Both of these are “borderers”: those who live on borders which are not necessarily geographic, but also intellectual, social and emotional. He goes on to argue that the importance of being bilingual is social and psychological rather than linguistic. This is evident in the claim that beyond types, categories, methods and processes is the essential animating tension of identity. Beyond utilitarian and unemotional instrumentality, the heart of bilingualism is belonging.

Rampton has discussed this idea about the terms “mother tongue” and “native speaker”. He argues that in addition to the notion of “expertise” in language (which is relevant to arguments about the proficiency of bilinguals, but not particularly to issues of identity), we should think in terms of language inheritance and affiliation. The key point about these concepts is that both are social processes which do not involve fixed relationships.

These relationships between bilingual proficiency and identity are extremely complex. It has been discussed that people belong to many groups, and all groups including language groups have characteristics which mark their identity. Biculturals are usually bilingual, but bilinguals need not necessarily be bicultural: their bilingualism provides only the potential for biculturalism. Rather than attempting to establish or define particular relationships between bilinguality and forms of identity, it seems more fruitful to see the two as existing in a kind of dynamic tension whereby they are constantly redefined according to changing interpersonal and social contexts. Norton Peirce takes such a perspective when she argues for the need to develop a theory of social identity which can be used to interpret and explain language use and language learning in second language contexts.

Heller’s work on bilinguals in French-speaking Canada refers to changing concepts of bilinguals’ identity, from one focused on conserving a minority language and culture to one which sees their linguistic resources as assets in the new global economy. She proposes that bilinguals are people who are skilled at crossing and
argues that this is a key skill in the twenty-first century workplace. These concepts are fairly well used in understanding teaching learning process.

Rampton’s use of the terms “inheritance” and “affiliation” as social processes rather than immutable givens recognizes the complexity and fluidity of the feelings and emotions with which people imbue their languages. He maintains that affiliation can sometimes involve a stronger sense of attachment than inheritance, a suggestion which has not commonly been recognized. It has often been assumed that strong affective feelings, and identification with a speech community, only occur as a result of growing up with a language, or early bilingualism. These strong feelings may help a learner to consolidate their linguistic competence.

Grosjean gives a brief survey of feelings and attitudes relating to bilingualism. He claims that surveys of bilinguals show that they either have no strong feelings about their bilingualism, seeing it as an unremarkable fact of life, or that they see more advantage than inconveniences therein. The reactions of monolinguals are extremely varied, and range from wonder at the fact that it is possible to use two languages fluently, to negative attitudes such as surprise that bilinguals do not master both languages “perfectly”, or their inability to translate spontaneously. Therefore, it becomes either a major hindrance or a useful asset.

Bilinguality is intricately linked with issues of personal and social identity, as discussed above, and this issue will be raised in the next chapters in discussing the teachers’ views of themselves as second language learners and users. The next section will look at how two languages are used by bilingual speakers, and how such use has been conceptualized by researchers in different ways which are helpful in teaching learning processes.

2.1.9 Bilingualism as a Language Tool

Teachers of EFL who do have a second language are able to use it in their professional lives. One of the arguments of this dissertation is that this state of affairs results in some teachers being effectively “silenced bilinguals” since they operate in a
professionally monolingual environment, while being surrounded by students who are either bilingual, multilingual, or becoming bilingual.

The fact that EFL teachers’ role is to help their students acquire a second language thereby becoming bilingual, leads us to consider another aspect of bilinguality. This is how bilinguals use their two languages. A consideration of research into bilingual language use will lay the groundwork for considering, in the light of the data chapters, whether teachers engage in bilingual language use, and in what ways they may be equipped to prepare their students for life as bilinguals. Thinking about bilinguals’ use of their languages has often been clouded, or even “tainted”, by the use of such terms as “ideal bilingual”, “full bilingual” and “balanced bilingual”, which suggest that there are other less complete forms of bilingualism.

A major characteristic of bilingual language use is that the two languages are used in different domains, with different people, in different contexts, and it is therefore not a matter of one language duplicating the repertoire of the other. There is another major characteristic of bilingual language use i.e. code-switching, which sometimes is known as code shifting. Like many other aspects of bilinguality, code-switching has often been seen in the past as evidence of inferior competence in one or both languages. In this context, Romaine takes Gumperz’ definition of code switching which is: “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or sub-systems.”

Here is an important issue raised before studying how and why code-switching occurs, it is valuable to consider Grosjean’s view that in everyday encounters bilinguals find themselves positioned somewhere along a continuum of language modes. On one end of the controversy, there is a totally monolingual mode where the bilingual is talking to a monolingual user of one of his or her languages. On the other end, the bilingual is in communication with another bilingual person who shares the same two languages and thus permits the possibility of switching in all sorts of ways. In between these two extremes are a number of other possibilities. Various authors outline the functions which code switching performs, and current theories all stress that it is a creative, purposeful use of both languages which is finely tuned to both situational and interpersonal context.
This code-switching may take place at extra-sentential levels, intersentential levels and intrasentential levels, and can be examined from a linguistic perspective which examines how it functions grammatically or sociolinguistically. Baker outlines twelve overlapping purposes of code switching, including to emphasize a point, to reinforce a request or command, to communicate friendship or solidarity, to ease tension, or to exclude other people. Social, economic, cultural and political factors also frequently prompt code-switching in order to define, or redefine relationships between individuals of different social, linguistic, religious, ethnic or national allegiances.

In addition to the literature on code-switching there is increasing attention being paid to the effects of L2 on the L1, in contexts where L2 is the most-used language. This is the main emphasis of the present study. Effects of the L1 on the L2 have long been studied by researchers under the rubrics of “interference”, “transfer” and “cross-linguistic influence”. This process can also work in reverse. Clyne, for example, shows that bilinguals in immigrant societies draw on the L2 for lexical renewal in the L1. Studies which look at the effects of a later-acquired language on the first are indicative of recognition of language learning and use as dynamic systems.

These authors refer to the “dynamism of multilingualism” as the processes of language development, language forgetting, language stability and language maintenance which are normal parts of multilinguals’ language repertoires. Snow and Hakuta, too, recognize that the ability to function in a language in given context may result differently in different circumstances. They argue that the skill of “speaking a second language” cannot be compared with that of “riding a bicycle” as it often is, meaning that once learned it is never forgotten. Instead they propose that use of a second language is more like dancing the lead role in the ballet that it takes not only training and practice, but current and maintained performance to ensure that some of the “steps” are not forgotten.

The views which I have discussed here recognize the reality of the interplay between languages in bilingual individuals. It recognizes the gains, shifts, losses and attrition
which happen over time and in accordance with social and linguistic contexts. This idea is important in considering the language background of EFL teachers.

These sections above have covered issues from the field of bilingualism studies which are pertinent to the consideration of the bilinguality, or lack of it, of EFL teachers. These were definitions and dimensions of bilinguality; the bilingual as a person and bilingual language use. There are two further topics which lie at the intersection of bilingual theory and EFL professional practice which need consideration here. One is the matter of the status and merits of native and non-native English speaker teachers, and the other is the conflation in the profession of the term “native English speaker” with “monolingual” and of the term: bilingual with “non-native English speaker”. These aspects have been detailed in the next two sections.

2.1.10 Native and Non-Native English Teachers

In the context of EFL teaching, native English speakers clearly have different linguistic experiences from those of non-native English speakers. While there are moves to abolish the distinction in a formal sense, the issues of their skills and abilities is a vexed question in the profession. This issue deserves review here as a foundation for discussion of the native and non-native speaker teachers in the study.

In a practical sense the terms “native speaker” and “non-native speaker” are well understood in the field of English language teaching. Sharp distinctions exist worldwide in employment opportunities, promotion opportunities and even pay scales between teachers who have English as a first language and those who have English as a second or third language. Students of English often have strong preferences for native speaker teachers (Takada 2000). In a real sense, non-native teachers tend to suffer second-class status in both English-speaking and other countries. Braine refers to the paradox of the American education system, which willingly accepts students from overseas onto MA TESOL courses but then limits their employment opportunities as ESL teachers. Therefore once qualified, on the grounds that they are non-native speakers; they are rejected, thus lose the opportunities of the job.
Who, then, exactly, is a native speaker? Many have debated whether the native/non-native speaker distinction can be precisely defined. Several writers have pointed to the slipperiness of the concept of the native speaker: most notably Davies who discusses it from psycholinguistic, linguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives. The conclusion that he arrived at was that ultimately the native/non-native distinction is one of “confidence and identity” and that “to be a native speaker means not being a non-native speaker”. The confusion of this definition is self-evident, but it shows us clearly that while we cannot state empirically what a native speaker is, in social life and in the classroom, we know who is and who is not.

A dissatisfaction with the use of the term “native speaker” is expressed by Rampton who, in the absence of agreement on its meaning, proposes the categories of “expertise” to describe proficiency, and “language loyalty” to describe levels of social identification with a language. “Expertise”, he argues, does away with the implication that language ability is necessarily inborn. However, expertise can be achieved, and then the levels of expertise vary. The term “language loyalty”, he maintains, expresses the symbolic and emotive qualities found in “native speaker” and “mother tongue” while not mixing them with linguistic issues.

In this context, Cook has discussed a range of definitions of the term “native-speaker”. He concludes that of the nine characteristics of native speakers. All of these refer to the indispensable fact: “that a person is a native speaker of the language learned first”. He maintains that it is a matter of “adjusting the perspectives about models that underlie language teaching” to bring language teaching to the realization that it is helping people use L2, not imitate native speakers.

The view of non-native teachers as second-best ignores one of the basic tenets of teacher education: that not only subject knowledge (that is, knowledge of, and competence in the English language) but also pedagogical skills are crucial to good teaching. As Widdowson explains this fact that a teacher is both informant and instructor, and while native speakers may be better informants, they are not necessarily better instructors. They have more experience as English language users, but non-native speakers have had experience as English language learners. This fact has been asserted by others as well that it is undeniable that the English learning
experiences of non-native teachers are helpful for learners. O’Neill also argues that non-native teachers have one enormous advantage: that “they have actually learned the target language as foreigners and have direct insight into and experience of the processes involved for other nonnative speakers”.149

Until recently, there was little literature on the non-native speaker teacher, despite the fact that they do the bulk of English language teaching worldwide.150 The literature which has looked at the question since then has been largely devoted to exploring the definition of native/non-native status, or in comparing the two on linguistic bases. There is now, however, increasing interest in the knowledge, experience and skills which non-native speaker teachers have to offer in ESOL teaching in their own right, rather than as a poor imitation of native speakers.

2.1.11 The Confusion about Native/Monolingual/Bilingual/Non-Native Speaker

This section demonstrates that there is a tendency within the ESL profession to use the terms “bilingual”, “monolingual”, “native speaker” and “non-native speaker” in ways which are sometimes inaccurate and confusing. In the field of ESL, all monolingual teachers are native-speakers of English, but not all native English speakers are monolinguals. All non-native English speaker teachers are bilingual by definition, but not all bilingual teachers are non-native speakers of English. However, in the professional literature there is considerable blurring and even confusion of these terms. Native speakers are frequently referred to as “monolinguals”, and “bilinguals” are assumed to be non-native speakers. I suggest that the misuse of these terms does much to confuse important issues to do with the language skills and language background of both native and non-native speaker teachers. It misrepresents issues pertaining to monolingual and bilingual teachers, and monolingual and bilingual teaching.

The following are examples of conflation or of unclear use of terms. O’Grady151 suggests that “all but a few elderly learners would welcome a monolingual teacher as their English proficiency develops”. The meaning of “monolingual” here is ambiguous. It could mean a teacher who teaches mono lingually, using English-only
in class, but such a teacher could well be bilingual, in which case to describe him or her as “monolingual” is inaccurate. On the other hand, it could mean “native speaker teacher”, since in the context of this quote the only teachers referred to as “bilingual” are non-native speakers. Later, in attempting to counter criticism of non-native teachers’ pronunciation, O’Grady[152] states that “bilingual teachers are highly proficient speakers of English”. It is clear that “bilingual” is being used here to mean “non-native teacher”, since this statement made about bilingual native-speaker teachers would be tautologous. Non-native speaker teachers are also referred to as “bilingual teachers” by Forman.[153]

Another example is that of Handsfield,[154] who maintains that teacher bilinguality is irrelevant, since most school systems with students of many language backgrounds do not have the resources to provide bilingual instruction in all languages. Handsfield here assumes that the only value of teacher bilinguality is in the ability to provide mother tongue instruction. This is that since it is impractical to provide bilingual teaching for all students, teacher bilinguality has no relevance. For Handsfield,[155] ‘bilingual teacher’ equates with ‘bilingual teaching’, and, since the latter is impossible in most cases, monolingual teachers are not considered problematic.

Some of the confusion arises from the fact that in ESL teaching, “monolingual” and “bilingual” can be used to refer to teachers, to students, to a class grouping of students, or to a method of teaching. These distinctions are often not made clearly enough, with the result that assumptions go unchallenged, skills go unacknowledged, and possibilities for different approaches go unexamined.

A “monolingual teacher” is a teacher who speaks only English and no other languages at all; or a teacher who teaches mono-lingually - that is, using English-only, regardless of his or her other language skills. Although this teacher might be a native speaker (NS) or a non-native speaker (NNS), in practice a NNS is not referred to as a “monolingual teacher” by virtue of teaching mono-lingually.

A “bilingual teacher” is a NNS teacher, who may be in a position to use L1 in his or her teaching or not; or a NNS teacher who is engaged in teaching a group of students
who share his or her L1 via a bilingual method; or a teacher, either NS or NNS, who speaks more than one language.

A “monolingual class” is a group of students of mixed L1s who are taught via English-only; or a group of students who all share the same L1, for example Urdu or Arabic. They may be taught via English-only or via a bilingual Urdu/English method by a teacher who speaks both Urdu and English.

A “bilingual class” is a group of students who all share the same L1 for example Urdu, who are taught via a bilingual method by a teacher who speaks both Urdu and English.

Hence, a class of Urdu/Arabic speakers may be called a “monolingual class” from the perspective of linguistic homogeneity or a “bilingual class” from the perspective of teaching method. A “monolingual teacher” may in fact be a bilingual person. It is little wonder that discussion is confused.

The widespread tendency to call non-native English speaker teachers ‘bilingual teachers’, is often a conscious decision by the writers who have done the most to promote recognition of the extra skills these teachers have. As Kershaw puts it:

> We should cease to use the negative term non-native speaker and perhaps use bilingual teacher instead. This is not to downgrade those whose mother tongue is English Rather it is to emphasize the advantage enjoyed by those whom we currently call non-native speaker teachers: and that is recourse to the common language (and culture) of the student.

The intentions are to stress the added language and cultural skills of the non-native (bilingual) teacher rather than stressing the deficit of being a non-native teacher. However in addressing one problem of nomenclature these authors create another, by making the term ‘bilingual’ unavailable for describing native-speaker teachers who are bilingual. Kershaw is also referring to a context where the students all share the same L1, which is clearly not the case in most Pakistani EFL classes. Further, in a process well recognized by linguists to be a result of euphemisation, it appears that, at
least in the Pakistani EFL context, the stigma attaching to ‘non-native speaker teacher’ has transferred itself to the term ‘bilingual teacher’. It is acknowledged by many authors that ‘bilingual’ teachers are accorded low status in the profession. In a wider context, the same process seems to be at work in bilingual education in the United States, in that ‘bilingualism’ has come to mean “deficiency in English” and that ‘bilingual education’ has come to mean English monolingualism.

O’Grady and Wajs described a situation in NSW where many bilingual (NNS) teachers had lost interest in teaching bilingual classes. They claim that the bilingual (NNS) teachers they spoke to feared being restricted to low-level classes, felt a stigma at being known as ‘bilingual teachers’ and felt valued only for their second language skills rather than for their teaching ability. Further, they found that their position as “bilingual teacher” led to an increase in their workload as students sharing their L1 were encouraged to seek them out for counseling and solving of work and health problems.

Another factor contributing to the poor status of non-native teachers is that there is a history of their being employed as ‘teaching assistants’ or rather than as teachers. This has been the practice in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia where the researcher has been teaching for over three years. The assistants recruited for this program were either postgraduate students of TESOL or overseas-trained teachers, and they were paid less in Saudi Arabia. While admittedly budget constraints have severely curtailed bilingual provision, the employment of bilinguals as ‘assistants’ at a quarter of the casual hourly teaching rate will not lead to enhanced perceptions of the possible roles of bilingual teachers who are qualified both in language and in teaching. Chau herself points out that Public Service workers receive pay increments for fluency in another language, whereas ESL teachers do not.

There is an assumption throughout the literature that the prototypical ESL teacher is a monolingual native speaker, and even writers, who are proposing wider use of bilingual teaching methods, and a greater presence in the classroom of the learners’ L1, appear to accept that monolingual teachers are the norm. Cook refers to the common assumption in linguistics that “the native-speaker” speaks only one language, tracing it to the theoretical work of Chomsky and Saussure.
ESL in Britain, Collingham states that “at present, most ESL teachers are monolingual and white, and most learners are bilingual and black”. She goes on to outline various teaching strategies that can be used by both “bilingual and monolingual teachers”, and suggests without irony that “teachers will find that it is helpful if they try to learn something of their learners’ languages”. Spiegel quotes an ESL colleague as questioning the need for bilingual ESL teachers, since there are lots of bright, trained experienced teachers who, yes, are white and monolingual, but are broadminded and have very sympathetic attitudes to the students. In doing so, Spiegel attempts to point out the common disregard for the skills and attributes of bilingual teachers. Papaefthymiou-Lytra states that bilingual strategies may not be so easy to use in second language settings “if teachers are monolingual speakers”.

Other authors, however claim that both bilingual and monolingual teachers can each bring a range of benefits and strengths to the ESL classroom, and Baynham asks how do we as teachers, not necessarily bilingual, begin to tap this knowledge which the learners have of their own L1? All of these authors either assume that the native speaker teachers they describe are monolingual, or else accept without question that a substantial portion of the ESL teaching profession is monolingual.

Forman has observed a similar tendency in Australia, and writes that “there is no expectation that ESL teachers are anything other than monolingual”. In O’Grady and Kang’s study of views about the use of L1 in ESL teaching, they found that “some young, well-educated learners expressed a preference for two teachers: a bilingual teacher for problem solving and explanation, a monolingual teacher [meaning, presumably, a native speaker] for pronunciation and as a motive for conversation practice”. There are suggestions that monolingual teachers may sometimes feel threatened by bilingual teachers and/or bilingual teaching methods. Tejos’ survey elicited the response that to construct a register of the language skills of ESL teachers (which was contemplated in the 1980s) would be discriminatory to the monolingual teachers. Collingham maintains that “monolingual teachers will have to be prepared to allow the use of other languages in the ESL classroom, and not feel threatened by this as they often do at present”. There is strong evidence found that monolingual ESL
teachers in the Sindhi felt threatened by the deployment of bilingual teachers or assistants in the classroom, fearing that complaints would be voiced in L1 about them. It therefore seems to be the lot of bilingual teachers that they must tread carefully in order not to upset the sensibilities of “monolingual teachers”.

In this section I have attempted to show how the use of the terms “bilingual” and “monolingual” are often used inaccurately to denote, respectively, non-native speaker teachers and native-speaker teachers. This has had the dual effect of perpetuating the invisibility of bilingual skills among the NS teachers, and of extending the stigma which NNS teachers already labor under, to the very fact of being bilingual. Even proponents of bilingual teaching and of the recognition of teachers who know the L1 of their students are surprisingly tentative about the value of language skills, as this quote suggests:

The bottom line in the successful implementation of bilingual provision in AMES is the extent to which all of us are willing and generous enough to recognize the special skills that bilingual and bicultural teachers posses a heightened awareness of the linguistic and cultural presuppositions their learners bring to the classroom.

The aim of the researcher is not to criticize the authors, who have contributed a great deal, both theoretically and in the production of practical guidelines, to the promotion of bilingual teaching approaches and the valuing of students’ first language(s). Rather it is to show that the professional climate when this was written was such that recognition of skills which are central to the teaching of language was left up to the individual volition and generosity of mainstream (that is, monolingual) colleagues. The oddity of this can be highlighted by imagining a similar call to recognize key skills in other professions.

In short, there is much evidence that monolingualism has been and still is perceived as the norm for ESL teachers, and that the prototypical teacher is still seen as the native speaker, despite an emerging literature which contests this. Non-native speaker teachers are constructed along deficit lines as having questionable proficiency in English, rather than as having additional language skills and learning experience.
which may be of value. Those authors who argue for a wider recognition of the skills of NNS teachers have begun calling them ‘bilingual’, but this only serves to confuse the use of terms even more, with ‘bilingual’ teacher being a euphemism for ‘non-native speaker’, and a ‘native-speaker’ teacher being understood to be a monolingual. Second language skills are, it seems, invisible and entirely unutilized for native-speakers and are a liability for non-native speakers since they condemn them to limited and undervalued roles.

2.1.12 Bilingualism and L2 Learning – A Summary

This section has considered questions of bilingualism and second language learning and has given a review of selected aspects of the literature which are pertinent to the research questions of this study. Definitions of bilinguality have been discussed, as well as differing routes to the development of bilinguality. A brief review was given of the research into the effects of age on second language development. The bilingual person was discussed from the perspective of studies of individual and social identity, and a description of bilingual language use given to show how, in Grosjean’s terms, the bilingual is a unique and integrated language user, and should not be thought of as a “double monolingual”. Two final issues were discussed which have particular relevance to the present study because they touch on questions of bilingualism and SLA as they relate specifically to the EFL profession. These were firstly the debate surrounding the merits of native English speaker teachers versus non-native English speaker teachers, and secondly the tendency in the EFL literature to confuse “native-speaker” with “monolingual” and “bilingual” with “non-native speaker”.

2.2 The Importance of Learning L2

The Australian Language and Literary Policy make the observation that “language learning can result in a better understanding of one’s first language and stimulate rigorous thinking and memory. Learning another language may also broaden linguistic perspectives”.
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The focus of this dissertation is on the value of bilingualism in teaching/learning L2. It is essential to examine the literature, which argues that language learning in general has benefits of an intellectual, cultural and emotional nature. In this regard, relevant literature is discussed here.

The learning of languages other than one’s own tends to be regarded unanimously by the public as a general good. However, such generalisation needs to be examined carefully to understand how this might vary across different times, different political contexts and different philosophies about education, immigration, international affairs and other major societal concerns. Language learning cannot be ascribed lack of value without reference to individual, educational and societal aspirations, and statements on its worth will inevitably reflect sociopolitical positions. This section will examine varying views in Pakistan and other societies where English is taught as a second language. The literature discussed will be used to support this idea, but it is also worth mentioning that there exists no literature which attempts to argue that the learning of languages lacks value. Rather, any such position comes into being through public policies which neither fund nor promote language learning.

First, policy statements by governmental and many internationally recognized bodies professional bodies are considered. This literature review which claims that language learning promotes intellectual development, and moreover, a review of the literature claiming that it promotes the development of cultural understandings. Thirdly, discussions of monolingualism as the counterpoint to language learning are reviewed, and finally all the main arguments for the promotion of language learning are summarized and linked to the subjects.

### 2.2.1 Statement from the Language Teaching Profession

A major statement from the language teaching profession was made by a joint committee of the Australian Linguistics Society and the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia (henceforth ALS/ALAA) in 1981 as a response to the Curriculum Development Center’s (CDC) paper “Core Curriculum for Australian Schools”. They argue, “language is the fundamental expression of culture: a
multicultural society must be multilingual if the term multicultural often used in the
document is to have any real meaning.”

There is another argument that runs like this:

… and that this is true for all languages, whether community
languages, indigenous languages or languages of international use,
whether or not they coincide with those traditionally taught in
schools. There are three main categories of benefits conferred by
the study, which is discussed further:

1. Enrichment (cultural and intellectual)
2. Economic (vocations and foreign trade)
3. Equality (social justice and overcoming disadvantage)

There is a wide range of objectives which are potentially met through the various
studies, such as “to contribute to the learners’ conceptual development” and “to give
access to mother tongue development for those whose home language is not
English”. There are three possible contributing factors to the low status and lack of
consistent funding of language learning in Pakistan.

1. One is the generally poor record of large numbers of Pakistanis in learning
   English language with any success, which may lead to a public perception that
   languages are difficult to acquire.
2. A second possible contributing factor is community attitudes to English
   language in the public sphere, where it is seen as “a language of Frungies
   (British Masters)” and threatening.
3. Thirdly, some would argue that since English is now recognized virtually
   unchallenged as the dominant global language, it has become even less
   necessary for speaking to learn any other.

Kirkpatrick, arguing for the importance of educating multilingual and multicultural
university graduates, claims that we must counter the tired but common and
“comfortably persuasive” argument that the world speaks English. Peel makes the same point.

In view of the above three factors which we suggest may contribute to the poor status of English in Pakistan, it is worth considering in more detail the arguments which have been put forward for the importance of language learning. Since the choice of languages to be included in education systems is always dependent on funding issues and sociopolitical contestation, most of the argument centers on the ‘traditional’ European and Asian languages which are or have been taught in schools, with less emphasis on languages spoken within the community, and almost none on Aboriginal languages.

The abovementioned categories of benefits are wide-ranging and comprehensive, comprising individual enrichment, economic benefits, social equity benefits, trade and foreign affairs benefits. Lo Bianco’s categories are not used in the following discussion, however, since the focus of this dissertation is on the possible contribution of bilingualism towards second language learning. The emphasis here is thus on individual benefits, but some mention is made of the other three categories. Individual benefits of learning English are usually framed as intellectual, cultural and economic. The economic arguments have little relevance here, but discussion of intellectual and cultural benefits follows in the next section.

This discussion shows a clear recognition that language learning has a valuable contribution to make to the country’s ‘cultural capital’, but that educational policymakers have had ambiguous and varied attitudes to the amount and nature of language learning which should be supported. This section provides a general backdrop to the society in which many of the teachers in this study have learned and taught language, and lays the foundation for the following consideration of claims for specific benefits of language learning.

2.2.2 Academic and Scholarly Blessings of Bilingualism

Traditionally, the study of English has been justified educationally by the supposed benefits which the rigorous, sustained learning of classical or modern European
languages would have on the development of disciplined, logical thinking and of problem-solving abilities. It was also claimed that the process of contrasting languages would provide heightened linguistic awareness. Until a few decades ago, it was commonly thought that only European or classical languages (i.e. languages of high status) could provide this intellectual discipline, which Van Abbe claimed arose from their formal grammar. According to this view, Asian languages are too differently structured, and some, such as Indonesian, feature too little grammar (sic) to provide the requisite intellectual value.

This view may well still be held in most situations, but it is no longer defensible in the face of current thinking about language and learning. Lo Bianco acknowledged in the National Languages Policy that second language study has long been advocated as intrinsically valuable, but was at pains to point out that this is true for all languages. All languages are complex in linguistic, cultural and sociopragmatic ways and therefore bring equivalent and diverse, challenges to the learner.

It is commonplace for authors to acknowledge in very general terms that language learning has cognitive benefits, suggesting that this is so well-accepted that it needs little elaboration. Discussion of the issue, however, must go beyond the level of assertion, and some of the most common arguments follow.

Language study is credited with assisting cognitive processes as it constitutes an “intellectual stimulus” and includes “new ways of thinking and learning and organizing knowledge”. It “enhances learners’ conceptual development by introducing them to other ways of thinking and communicating”. Gibbons contends that language learning can “help learners to understand that there are alternative ways of conceiving and labeling the physical universe”. Evidence from research in bilingual education suggests that bilingual children show greater cognitive flexibility and creativity in problem-solving. In addition, language learning can improve learning in other academic subjects, providing an “analytical and communicative skill that enhances learning in other fields”. This is a claim, which does not incommensurate with long-standing traditional views mentioned above. Smolicz takes a similar line, saying that English language learning can develop cognitive, social and learning skills, which can be used in other subjects and contexts.
The concept of extending content knowledge beyond the actual language content recurs frequently. Language learning is said to give deeper knowledge of the structures and processes of communication, “provide access to different bodies of knowledge which are unavailable to the monolingual speaker” and give “access to a wider range of ideas in a greater variety of areas”.

Another important point in the available literature which looks at intellectual aspects of language learning is the potential for extending learners’ knowledge of and understanding of languages in general and their first language in particular. It has often been argued in various studies as having the side-effect of “extending students’ awareness, knowledge and understanding of English” and increasing their “ability to analyze the function and structure of language”. Gibbons concurs that it can “enhance understanding of how languages work and act as a mirror to one’s own language and culture”.

An important corresponding point to the claims of the authors cited above needs to be made. Most authors concede that language study has only the potential to cause all these developments. Dewaele et al. make the important qualification that bilingualism can confer intellectual, psychological, social and cultural benefits “given the right conditions”. So, too, does Jessner emphasize that bilingualism can be cognitively advantageous “under certain circumstances”. These authors do not elaborate in these instances, having other concerns, but from what we know about bilingualism and second language learning we can suppose what these conditions and circumstances might be. In the case of bilingualism, a supportive home and school environment, and continuing linguistic and conceptual development in L1 are crucial. In formal second language learning, the needs are for sound teaching, appropriate and relevant materials, continuity, and explicit teaching of linguistic and cultural features of language, or focus on form and function. In the absence of all or some of these features, language learning may deliver on few or none of its claimed virtues.

Liddicoat et al. provide a more detailed analysis of the benefits of language learning than any cited above, and it is worth considering in some detail the aspects of
their analysis which bear on intellectual development. They make a distinction between the substance, the process and the outcomes of language learning. Regarding the substance, they call on Kramsch’s \(^{206}\) notion to argue that, far from being a basic process of memorizing lexis and grammar rules, second language learning necessitates going through a process of stages of ‘metaphorization’ in order to understand culturally contexted language use, and that this process occurs in understanding even linguistically simple texts. In speaking, the learner is forced to draw on a limited linguistic repertoire to express complex messages. Experience of both of these factors is intellectually stretching.

The process of language learning involves analyzing the links between text and context, and provides a balance between inductive and deductive learning, being a matter of hypothesis forming and hypothesis-testing. The outcomes of language learning, apart from the most apparent ones of ability to speak the language concerned and the vocational opportunities that offers, include “a set of transferable skills in terms of analysis and synthesis of information in contexts of communication”. \(^{207}\)

Their discussion of the educational benefits of language learning is more detailed and exhaustive than many similar arguments, which sometimes confine themselves to mere statements that language learning confers intellectual development. In contrast, Liddicoat et al. \(^{208}\) show persuasively that language learning calls on and develops a range of cognitive (and metacognitive abilities which are both internal and internal/external; the latter involving communicating with others with varied linguistic repertoires. They point out that language learning is a complex intellectual task from the beginning and call on research in educational psychology and second language acquisition as well as theories of communication to justify their claims. One further aspect of the intellectual contribution of language learning is considered in this section, and that is language awareness.

### 2.2.3 Language Awareness as an Important Dimension for EFL Teachers

Language awareness is widely recognized as an important dimension of the language teacher’s professional knowledge, \(^{209}\) and this section reviews literature which claims
that language learning assists the development of such awareness. Language awareness is considered under its own heading here, because, while it is undoubtedly included in many of the definitions of improved cognitive functioning mentioned above. This literature tends to take a broad view of language education, including mother tongue teaching and language across the curriculum as well as second language learning.

A key definition of language awareness is given by Donmall,\textsuperscript{210} that is: “Language awareness is a person’s sensitivity to and conscious awareness of language and its role in human life”. Hawkins proposed a ‘trivium’ of language studies for the school curriculum\textsuperscript{211} which consists of mother tongue (MT) study, foreign language (FL) study and language awareness work. In this model, learners are assisted to develop language awareness tools such as “noticing” and linguistic intuitions and to apply them both to their mother tongue and to the language they are learning. James,\textsuperscript{212} working on the same model, claims that:

One’s understanding of the workings of the FL can be illuminated by MT study, by transferring one’s MT metacognitions to the task of FL learning. Seeing MT and FL ‘objectively’, first in terms of their immanent systematicity, and then each in terms of the other, is to develop one’s linguistic metacognitions of each.

There is evidence, too, that bilinguals possess greater language awareness than monolinguals, most notably in the work of Ben-Zeev\textsuperscript{213} who summarized her findings on their increased awareness as follows:

1. A bilingual indulges in language analysis, or practices a form of “incipient contrastive analysis”\textsuperscript{214}
2. Bilinguals work hard to keep their two languages separate by maximizing their perception of the structural difference between them and keeping a lookout for contrastivity
3. Bilinguals are more sensitive to linguistic feedback than monolinguals and therefore, more open to correction. They thereby exercise metalinguistic and metacognitive skills largely than monolinguals.
Hawkins offers three ways in which foreign language study contributes to “awareness of language”.

a. Firstly, it provides feedback on the mother tongue and the culture it expresses.
b. Secondly, it encourages the learner to pay close attention to words and all their meanings.
c. Thirdly, it encourages the “mathetic” function of language, or using language to learn about the world.

All these ways in which it has been claimed that language learning can contribute to greater language awareness are clearly relevant to EFL teachers, since language awareness is part of language teacher competence.

2.2.4 Socio-Cultural Advantages of Language Learning

EFL teachers have a responsibility to teach about the culture of the target language. Language learning is often claimed to have the advantage of broadening cultural horizons and this is clearly of relevance to teachers who are charged with teaching elements of culture themselves. This section will consider in what ways language learning has been credited with conferring greater cultural understanding.

The word culture is one of the most complex ones in the English language, mainly because it is used to express different concepts in a range of disciplines. What most concerns us here are ways of discussing culture, which are most relevant to language and language learning. An early such definition is that of Edward Sapir: “language does not exist apart from culture, that is, the socially inherited assemblage of practices and beliefs that determines the texture of our lives”.

Sapir’s definition does suggest by “assemblage” that culture is a static phenomenon, a view that now has little currency. Definitions that are more recent emphasize the fluid, situated and negotiated nature of ‘culture’, meaning that it will manifest differently in different social and interpersonal contexts and different times. As Morrissey puts it: “‘Culture’ is not an item of baggage but a continuous process of
renegotiation grounded in specific times and places and affected by other social processes.** Carr defines culture as “the systematic and collective making of meaning” and argues that language has a central role in the making of meaning, as does Halliday, who contended that learning one's first language is learning how to mean. The language use cannot be disassociated from the creation and transmission of culture.

Pakistan can be described as “multicultural” while it is a contested term, it is usually understood to mean that we are a nation which includes indigenous inhabitants who represent many different cultures, and that there is acceptance of, and some institutional support for, the maintenance of this diversity. Cross-cultural communication, then, is an important feature of intra-national education, politics and business, as well as of international contacts. Cultural diversity becomes a kind of spectacle whereby only colorful surface forms such as food, dance and clothing are visible and available to be “appreciated” by members of a dominant majority culture. Ethnicity, or culture, is the province of the “other”, and a dominant group tends to regard its own culture as an unproblematic baseline to which others may be compared. It is the normalization of one’s own culture which appears to be the enemy of successful cross-cultural communication, and many of the statements about the value of learning languages emphasize the perspective it gives on one’s own culture. Learning how a different set of social meanings are created and sustained through language can lead to a realization that one’s own habits, values and mores are arbitrary.

How then does culture relate to language learning and teaching? It has been said that all teachers of language are teachers of culture. Fitzgerald points out that students are learning cultural practices from the very first day of a language course, whether or not these are explicitly pointed out by the teacher. McMeniman and Evans outline how culture has been included in major trends in language teaching methods: the civilization approach, or culture as a formal body of classical knowledge as represented in literature, the audio-visual approach, which assumed cultural understanding would be revealed once linguistic competence was achieved, the communicative approach, which focused on culture as pragmatics, and the intercultural approach, where language is treated as a semi-logical system.
Let us now consider some of the statements which have been made about the contribution of language learning to a broader perspective on cultures. A major point made by many authors is that language learning gives us insights into the cultures of the peoples who use that language, and that any such insights developed without knowledge of the language must inevitably be shallow. Baker and Prys-Jones\textsuperscript{224}, for instance, argue that participating in the core of a culture requires knowledge of the language. With each language go “ways of understanding and interpreting the world, ideas and beliefs, ways of thinking and eating, loving and caring, ways of joking and mourning”, and so acquiring two or more languages provides a wider cultural experience.

Crozet et al.\textsuperscript{225} emphasize that the important learning which occurs through the experience of difference as articulated in language is due to the analysis of one’s own culture and the ways in which language works it. They maintain that culture in language only becomes visible when examined in relation to another language and culture. Byram\textsuperscript{226} introduces. This indicates the strong argument asserted that how the study of languages contributes to an enriched understanding of the world.

Language is the deepest manifestation of culture. It facilitates the expression of universals and those features that are specific to a particular culture, i.e. its way of looking at the world. The very discovery that different cultures express the same reality in different ways and sometimes emphasize different aspects of reality is a significant contribution to any young child’s educational development, for this is what liberates people from ethnocentrism.

Baldauf\textsuperscript{227} claims that cultural development is the second major reason why language learning is important. He states that when taught in a cultural and social context, languages widen the mind’s horizons, and help us to look outwards to the world as well as inwards to our own society. Further, he argues that language learning is indispensable to understanding diversity in a multicultural society like Pakistan. Passmore\textsuperscript{228} calls this ability to go beyond one’s own experience and to see how others conceptualize the world “sympathetic imagination”.
Several authors stress that language learning also leads to the development of different perspectives on one’s own culture. Therefore, through successful learning of a second language one can reflect on one’s own culture in a more objective way, perceiving differences and commonalities. Understanding the cultural basis for behavioral differences can set up a mirror to one’s own language and culture. Learning a second language can assist in learning about one’s own culture, and lead to recognizing one’s own cultural conditioning. This ability to contrast cultures in terms of shared meanings, values and practices is also emphasized as a key outcome of language learning. This competence in a foreign language is different from that of a native speaker’s because it involves the ability to see the relationships between the learner’s and the native speaker’s languages and cultures.

Crozet et al. argue for an intercultural approach to language education which takes a dynamic rather than a static view of culture. It proposes that our aim should be to educate speakers who are truly able to interact across cultures. This does not mean adopting the position of the interlocutor (even if this were possible), nor does it mean demanding that the other adapt to our own central and neutral position.

There is a danger of assuming that language learning will automatically lead to various desired outcomes, and this is true too of the supposed increased cultural understanding. As Byram and Risager point out, the term ‘cultural awareness’ has been used for many things over the past decade, and can include knowledge of other countries, positive attitudes to speakers of other languages, and heightened awareness of difference of all kinds. None is an inevitable result of language learning, and McMeniman and Evans offer evidence that formal second language learning has very little relationship with the lessening of insular attitudes.

Most of the writers cited so far speak from the perspective of teaching intercultural competence in “foreign” language teaching to a linguistically homogenous learner group, whereby essentially two cultures are available for comparison. Mughan, however, in calling for intercultural training for all foreign languages undergraduates, maintains that learning to communicate across cultures prepares the learner for exposure to all cultures: that is, he clearly sees intercultural competence as informed
by the learning of one or more languages, but also as developing a set of generic skills in negotiating difference.

Barraja-Rohan\textsuperscript{236} writing about intercultural language teaching in ESL, maintains that “through becoming multilingual, a speaker is more likely to have acquired some degree of intercultural competence, whereas a monolingual speaker who has less profound exposure to cultural diversity is less likely to have acquired this competence”. Byram and Risager\textsuperscript{237} refer to the ability of foreign language teachers to mediate between learners’ cultures and others, to teach learners themselves to mediate and to encourage learners to explore communication and understanding. It is not at all clear whether monolingual teachers of ESL in the contexts examined in this thesis would be equipped to undertake this kind of mediation between cultures.

The previous two sections have considered intellectual and cultural benefits of language learning. The next sections will consider other benefits: language apprenticeship, exhilaration and social equity.

2.2.5 Related Advantages of Language Learning

There has been a proliferation of texts teaching or discussing successful language learning strategies. An implication of this focus on how to learn language is that once these strategies have been acquired, they can be applied to the learning of a third or subsequent language. These views are reviewed as under.

Baker and Prys-Jones,\textsuperscript{238} writing about the benefits of bilingualism, contend that being bilingual gives one confidence in learning another language. “Knowing that it is easy to operate in two languages makes it seem entirely possible to learn a third (or fourth) language”. Edwards,\textsuperscript{239} citing examples of highly multilingual individuals, suggests that the more languages one has, the easier it is to add more. This idea, that learning a second language is the key to unlocking a kind of mental door to further language learning. He claims that foreign language learning in schools should be “an apprenticeship in learning how to learn language and more talk about language than has been the fashion”. In other words, Hawkins is not advocating that there is
necessarily a progressive easing of the task as one learns further languages, but that educational intervention of the language awareness type which he proposes, should be planned to ensure that this is so.

An interesting empirical perspective is provided on this aspect by Postmus\textsuperscript{240} who compared the language learning processes of adult bilinguals with those of adult monolinguals, all of whom were learning Mandarin as a foreign language at an Australian university. She found that differences in prior linguistic experience influenced learners’ conceptions of language learning and their approaches to the language learning task, specifically their strategic use of meta linguistic thinking. The studies of Jessner\textsuperscript{241} is also notable for the fact that he investigated adult learners of third or subsequent languages, while the vast majority of research into metalinguistic and meta-cognitive benefits has taken place with children or adolescents.

2.2.6 Euphoria about Language Learning

Sometimes overlooked in claims for the benefits of language learning are the enjoyment, pleasure, and satisfaction which can accompany the process. Hawkins\textsuperscript{242} bemoans the fact that language learning is often regarded as simply the acquisition of a useful skill, meeting individual or national needs, rather than as being an essential part of education.

Clyne\textsuperscript{243} also strengthens the same argument citing intrinsic motivation as a little-researched but powerful driver of language learning. A study by Nicholas et al.\textsuperscript{244} too, found that the strongest motivator of language teachers was their love of languages and desire to pass this love on to others. Kramsch,\textsuperscript{245} in her defense of the special abilities and privileges of the non-native speaker, gives an eloquent justification for second language learning, claiming that learners can:

\begin{quote}
\textit{take intensive physical pleasure in acquiring a language, thrill in trespassing on someone else’s territory, becoming a foreigner on their own turf, becoming both invisible and differently visible multilingual speakers create new discourse communities whose aerial existence monolingual speakers hardly suspect.}\textsuperscript{246}
\end{quote}
She further claims that speaking the language of others can enable one to construct new linguistic and cultural identities, between the spaces of national languages. She conjures the concept of “linguistic travel and migration” and suggests that second language speakers can linger and re-invent themselves on the margins of monolinguals’ landscapes.\textsuperscript{247}

Many language learning autobiographies evoke a strong sense of the power of second languages to transform experience and identity,\textsuperscript{248} and this is evident in that of Lvovich\textsuperscript{249} who talks of the “nourishment” and “passion” which her learning and speaking of French afforded her in contrast to her grim Soviet existence.

### 2.2.7 Social Equity as an Advantage of Language Learning

The previous sections discussed the intellectual, cultural and emotional benefits which can potentially be gained by individuals through the learning of a second language. In addition to these, there are well-recognized benefits to the individual and the nation related to the usefulness of languages in overseas trade and communications and in the diplomatic service.\textsuperscript{250} These are not discussed here in any detail as they have little relevance to the argument of this thesis. A further dimension, which does have some relevance to the language background of EFL teachers, is what Lo Bianco terms the “equality” dimension, to do with social justice and overcoming disadvantage. The predominant linguistic manifestation of social inequality is in lack of access to or skill with English.\textsuperscript{251} This is the core business of EFL teachers, whose entire profession is devoted to providing opportunities for other language speakers to develop proficiency in English. This is relatively uncontroversial. What is more contentious, however, is another aspect of the “social justice” perspective, and this is the right of immigrants and speakers of indigenous languages to maintain their own languages, to pass them on to their children and to have them recognized in the education system.\textsuperscript{252} In other words, learning English should not be at the expense of one’s first language, either for children or for adults, but should be aimed at achieving additive rather than subtractive bilingualism.\textsuperscript{253}
Adults are in general in less danger of losing their L1 than are children, but loss is not the only danger. Recognition of the first language(s) and a certain amount of inclusion in the learning process are important for adults, since to ignore them is to implicitly devalue them and imply that they are somehow less worthy than English. Such an implication may well begin to have an effect on how immigrants perceive their languages, how and whether they are likely to stand up for their linguistic rights in education and other areas, and how and whether they pursue language maintenance within their family. Attitudes to and practices regarding learners’ first language in the EFL classroom, then, are more than a matter of pedagogical procedure: they go to the heart of what it means to teach English and to learn English. If the first language is recognized, welcomed and explored linguistically and sociolinguistically, then it can become an important building block in the learning of EFL. The whole enterprise of learning languages can be approached with celebration, as an approach to bilingualism.

2.2.8 Summary of the Importance of Learning L2

There follows a summary of the main points of this part of the chapter and a discussion of how they relate to the language background of adult EFL teachers as the focus of the present study. Policy documents and statements state that language learning has many benefits. These benefits are individual (intellectual, cultural and vocational), intra-societal (equal opportunity, social justice, family language maintenance) and inter-societal (global trade, economics and foreign affairs). The focus here has been on individual advantages derived from language learning of an intellectual and cultural nature, as being the most relevant to the work of EFL teachers.

The intellectual value of language learning includes the development of alternative ways of conceiving of and describing the universe, and of a deeper understanding of the processes of communication, and involves processes of “metaphorization” and “hypothesis forming and testing”. Speakers of second languages develop skills in analyzing and synthesizing knowledge in order to communicate in contexts of limited linguistic resources and imperfectly grasped cultural concepts. Since in the
process of teaching EFL, teachers are assisting learners to undertake all these processes, it would seem advantageous for the teachers to have experienced them through their own language learning. EFL Teachers are expected to be skilled analysts of English, and have in-depth knowledge of the underlying systems of language and an ability to explain them. Language awareness is a pre-cursor to ability to language analysis for teaching purposes, and there is evidence that language awareness training activities which involve reflecting on and contrasting the mother tongue and a foreign language lead to a great understanding of how language and languages work in different and similar ways. Contrasting languages has been shown to be a feature of bilingual language use and it is likely that the kind of language analysis which can be done on the basis of two or more languages will be deeper and will proceed from a more informed base than that done on the basis of the mother tongue alone. A further intellectual aspect of language learning is the apprenticeship aspect: that through learning one language, one learns important cognitive, meta-cognitive and communicative strategies which assist in learning further languages. Since “learning strategies” education is an explicit part of EFL teachers’ role, they proceed from a basis of experience if they have learned a second or third language themselves.

The value of increased cultural understanding and perspectives gained by language learning is also relevant to EFL teachers. As teachers of immigrants they deal with people from many different cultural backgrounds, and it is well-accepted that “cultural awareness” is an essential criterion for the job. All the studies cited in this section suggest that such cultural awareness is impossible to achieve in any depth without language learning. A view of culture which does not include language is based on surface, visible features which can often lead to the stereotyping of people and cultural groups. EFL teachers are charged with teaching about Pakistani cultural practices and culture as it is manifested in language, and numerous authors attest that developing a more objective and relative view of one’s own culture is a major outcome of successful language learning. Teachers need to know about their learners’ lingua-cultures too, and this knowledge is likely to be superficial if approached from a monolingual perspective. EFL teachers are, ideally, supposed to be teaching their learners to be “inter-culturally” competent and to meet interlocutors in the “third place”; and we need to ask if this is possible based on knowing only one language.
Learners stand to benefit from the intellectual and cultural “stretching” afforded by learning English as a second language, but this will only come about if they are assisted in developing increased insights by teachers who are able to highlight, compare and contrast languages.\textsuperscript{266} Teachers who have not learned other languages cannot effectively contrast English with anything, nor can they “get outside” English to view it more objectively in highlighting its patterns.\textsuperscript{267}

### 2.3 Significance and Role of L1 in L2

L2 learners not only already possess a language system which is potentially available as a factor in the acquisition of a second language, but equally importantly they already know something of what a language is for, what its communicative functions and potentials are. In this part the literature has been reviewed which deals with the role of the first language in second language learning. The use of the learner’s L1 in second language teaching, either by the teacher or by students, has become a debatable issue. A majority of current theoretical stances admit that the L1 has an important role to play linguistically, psychologically and socially in second language learning. Current practice in the EFL profession however appears to be ambivalent: to acknowledge in theory the social benefits of its use and its role in the second language learning process, while effectively banning it, restricting its use or ignoring it in the EFL class. The next sections will first define the term ‘first language’ and then examine the history of method, policy and practice in this area.

#### 2.3.1 Definition of L1/First Language

First language is usually defined as the mother tongue, native language or L1. All these terms are used here interchangeably. This does not mean that they are always used to imply the same thing in other contexts. Stern\textsuperscript{268} points out that these terms may refer either to the language acquired first in infancy, or to a language which was acquired later but has come to be the dominant one. Skutnabb Kangas\textsuperscript{269} defines the first language as the language one thinks in, the language one dreams in and the
language one counts in. She identifies four features:

1. Origin of the Language learnt First
2. Competence which means the Language known Best
3. Function that the Language used most
4. Attitude where one identifies with language and is identified by others as a native speaker)

For the purposes of this chapter, all the above terms will be used to mean the language acquired first in infancy and still dominant. Where this usage does not accurately describe an individual, any ambiguity will be clarified by distinguishing the ‘mother tongue’ (in infancy) from the (currently) ‘dominant language’.

2.3.2 Development of Method in Language Teaching

In considering the development of methods in the last two centuries, Stern proposes a useful division of the many methods and approaches into those which are intralingual and those which are cross-lingual. Intralingual strategies are characterized by:

a. the use of the second/foreign language (L2) as a reference system
b. an exclusive focus on L2 and culture 2 (C2)
c. the separation of L2 from L1
d. the avoidance of translation
e. teaching via the medium of L2
f. an emphasis on co-ordinate bilingualism

Cross-lingual approaches are characterized by:

a. the use of L1 as a reference system
b. comparison between L1 and L2, C1 and C2
c. the use of grammar-based methods and a belief in the achievement of compound bilingualism
The grammar-translation method is the first I shall consider in this brief review of the history of language teaching methods. It arose out of centuries of the teaching of Latin grammar, texts and rhetoric, through exercises in grammatical manipulation and translation\textsuperscript{271} in UK and other European countries. As modern languages also became the focus of school study, they were taught using the same methods, which at the time aimed to provide intellectual challenge and develop logical thinking rather than to equip students to use the language. In the nineteenth century increased travel and commerce between European countries led to a greater interest in achieving oral proficiency in languages. Early reformers experimented with an approach based on child language acquisition, while later linguists such as Sweet and Victor laid down ordered principles on phonology and teaching methods aimed at developing speaking and listening skills.\textsuperscript{272}

This early work by what became known as the Reform Movement resulted in the development of the Direct Method, characterized by: “the use of the target language as a means of instruction and communication in the language classroom, and by the avoidance of the first language and of translation as a technique”.\textsuperscript{273} Stem further maintains that this key aspect of the direct method persists until the present day, and, since many teachers are not able to teach wholly in L2, has introduced a division between what they actually do in the classroom and what they believe they should be doing. In considering the context in which much English Language Teaching (ELT) takes place, in a non-English speaking country, and taught by a non-native speaker teacher, Harbord\textsuperscript{274} also recognizes this division. He argues that non-native speaker teachers feel guilty if they use L1, despite the fact that their proficiency may not be sufficient to teach solely in L2. Medgyes\textsuperscript{275} describes a case where a Hungarian teacher would laboriously explain a new word in English, and then give the Hungarian equivalent whispered into a pupil’s ear, such was the disapproval leveled at the idea of using L1 in class.

The direct method has had a profound influence on many of the methods and approaches which developed later. Although later methods cast off some of the principles of the direct method, the emphasis on use of the target language alone remained throughout the periods when Audio-lingualism, the Audio-visual approach,
and Situational Language Teaching were in vogue. It largely remained through Krashen and Terrell’s Natural Approach, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and the implementation of genre-based and competency-based curricula in many areas of the world in the 1990s and beyond. In some eras and some methods, the avoidance of the first language took on almost evangelical proportions, and in others, though instruction took place in L2, the use of L1 was permitted at times. Finocchiaro and Brumfit in comparing the Audio-lingual Method and the Communicative Approach, explain that in the former the use of the students’ native language is banned, and translation is only permitted at higher levels whereas in the Communicative Approach selective use of the native language is accepted where feasible, and translation may be used where students find it necessary or beneficial. Stem concedes that throughout the decades of adhesion to intralingual approaches there have been exceptions maintained by some writers and theorists. For example, Dodson advocated a “bilingual method” which involved both crosslingual and intralingual elements, and made systematic use of L1 in establishing meaning and in practicing structures. Dodson believed that this was necessary since “the sign of true bilingualism is not merely the possession of two languages, but also the ability to jump easily from one to the other”.

In this Dodson differs markedly from Brooks, a key methodologist of the time, who drew on the distinction made by Ervin and Osgood between co-ordinate and compound bilingualism. Brooks believed that co-ordinate bilingualism was the ideal aim of second language learning, whereby the two languages had to be kept strictly apart. Widdowson, too, long an influential writer in applied linguistics, has from time to time pleaded for the reconsideration of cross-lingual techniques such as translation. Swan in a critique of the Communicative Approach maintained that:

“as far as the British version of the Communicative Approach is concerned, students might as well not have mother tongues students are always translating into and out of their own languages - and teachers are always telling them not to”.

He continues to advocate a greater use of contrastive teaching, highlighting similarities and differences between L1 and L2, particularly in the area of pragmatics.
These are lone voices, however, and as I shall attempt to show in later sections, intralingual strategies still very much hold sway in the contemporary ESL profession.

2.3.3 SLA Theory

Another important area in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) is the orientation in the field. ESL has other sources of theory, such as the fields of education, adult learning, psychology and sociology but second language acquisition is prominent, dealing as it does with questions of how second languages are learned.

The discipline of second language acquisition is generally accepted to have begun in the late 1960s, but the first major theoretical position which has a bearing on the role of the first language in fact came from psycholinguists, the best known of whom is Skinner. Skinner, working within a behaviorist orientation to human learning, coined the term “verbal behavior” as a description of language, and explained that second language learning was a matter of learning a set of new “habits” which had to override and replace the old “habits” of the first language. Methods which were based on this view of language, then, such as audio-lingualism proceeded from the belief that the first language should be avoided in the classroom as a hindrance. The concept of ‘interference’ was a part of this view, and referred to the effect of the L1 patterns being imposed on the L2, resulting in error. Training in L2 patterns (syntax, morphology, phonology) was considered best done in complete isolation from the L1.

In the field of first language acquisition, nativists such as Chomsky challenged Skinner’s view of language and language learning by proposing that humans have an innate propensity to learn language, and that far from being a matter of stimulus-response and repeated imitation, as the behaviorists would have it, language learning is a process of constructing an internally logical grammatical, phonological and pragmatic system from fragmentary and imperfect input. This view is borne out in Chomsky’s notion of the Language Acquisition Device (LAD), which is supposed to be the locus of development of this system. Nativist theory became associated with cognitive approaches to language teaching, which emphasized that errors were a sign of the learner’s conscious experimentation with the patterns of the language. This
shift in views had an impact on the way the first language was regarded via a change in the interpretation of the significance of errors. In the behaviorist view, it was maintained that learner errors could be predicted by comparing the structures of L1 and L2. Where they differed, the learner would follow the L1 pattern, producing an error. Where the languages had the same structure “positive transfer” would occur, resulting in an error-free utterance. This was known as the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis.

Error analysis, practiced by those who favored cognitive accounts of language learning, focused on finding broader explanations for learner error than simply influence of the first language. An increasing emphasis on intralingual errors was reflected in growing interest in describing the learner’s’ interlanguage, a language system with internal consistency which operates in the zone between L1 and L2. These developments resulted in a lessening of the emphasis on the negative influence of L1. This theoretical change in the view of L1 does not appear to have altered very much the practitioners' view of it as a hindrance to the learning process. Krashen, in his influential “Natural Approach” to language learning suggested that errors showing the influence of the first language are a result of incomplete acquisition. Where the learner lacks a word or a structure in L2, she or he will “fall back” on something based on L1. The “cure” for L1-based errors is more acquisition through comprehensible input in the target language. Although this is a more benign view of L1, it lays the groundwork for an emphasis on “more English”, and contributes to what Phillipson describes as a major tenet of ELT worldwide: “English is best taught monolingually” (that is, without recourse to L1). He counts this as one of the contributors towards English linguistic imperialism.

Since the 1970s, interest in language learning has moved somewhat away from psycholinguistic approaches to a consideration of sociolinguistic factors which emphasize language as communication and as social interaction. Schumann’s Acculturation Model pointed to the importance of social distance between the second-language society and the learner as a key indicator of whether learning would take place. The more involved the learner with the target group, the more successful the learning. Gardner and Lambert’s work on integrative motivation found much the same phenomenon. Although neither of these theories about social factors in SLA
had much to say about language teaching, or still less the role of L1 therein, they have been influential in persuading language teachers of the virtues for their students of becoming part of the target culture, and this usually means ignoring or minimizing interaction in L1.

Norton Peirce\textsuperscript{299} has criticized SLA theorists for failing to articulate a theory of social interaction which takes account of the complex relationships of power between the individual and social structures. She argues that learners:

cannot be defined unproblematically as motivated or unmotivated, introverted or extroverted.. without considering that such affective factors are frequently socially constructed in inequitable relations of power, changing over time and space and possibly coexisting in contradictory ways in a single individual.\textsuperscript{300}

She proposes a theory of social identity, drawing on Bourdieu\textsuperscript{301} and Weedon,\textsuperscript{302} which attempts to place interaction in the L2 in a wider social context. Auerbach\textsuperscript{303} too is interested in social power relations between learners and society at large, and her work focuses partly on how the learners’ L1 is an important part of their identity.

An area of second language acquisition which has had an effect on teachers’ classroom practice is research on learning strategies, which has gathered ground since Rubin’s early work\textsuperscript{304} on ‘what makes a good language learner’. It has become commonplace for teachers to incorporate “learner strategy training” into the classroom on a regular basis. James,\textsuperscript{305} in arguing for a more prominent role for L1, claims that: “no fewer than 60 percent of those making up her “analyzing and reasoning metastrategy” are interlingual strategies. She claims that learners resort to translation to make input comprehensible; they analyze contrastively and they transfer from NL to FL”. A further “interlingual strategy” included is ‘switching to the mother tongue’ (as a compensatory strategy) makes a total of 4 out of 62 which involve L1 in the learning of L2. The point here is not whether or not L1 is involved in 6.45% of learning strategies, or more or less, but it does not distinguish L1 based strategies as a category, or as worthy of any particular comment: it is effectively a non-issue, being subsumed within an array of cognitive, metacognitive and communication strategies.
There is a strand of thought which is critical of the discipline of SLA itself as being characterized by a monolingual perspective and therefore paying little heed to the fact that learners are becoming bilinguals, rather than double monolinguals. As Kachru\textsuperscript{307} says:

“One fundamental misconception, pervasive in SLA literature, is that acquiring a second or additional language means being able to use it in the same way as its monolingual native speakers”.

However, Sridhar\textsuperscript{308} calls on Grosjean’s\textsuperscript{309} claim that bilingualism does not duplicate L1 competence, but rather complements it, to support his contention that the model of bilingualism relevant to SLA is a composite pragmatic model, in which a bilingual acquires as much competence in two or more languages as is needed and that all of the languages together serve the full range of communicative needs\textsuperscript{310}.

The rejection of a monolingual view of SLA has led some writers to consider learners’ use of L1 in second language learning as being a form of code switching\textsuperscript{311}. Code switching is a well-recognized and well-documented practice of bilinguals, and is frequently studied and discussed in the literature on bilingualism. Kasper\textsuperscript{312} argues that although code-switching is sometimes regarded as a “strategy to compensate for insufficient linguistic knowledge”, it can also serve as an “act of identity” or a positive politeness strategy. The application of code switching theory to classroom practice suggests a fundamental difference in thinking from that common in the SLA field, of L1 as interference at worst, as a “communication strategy” or sign of underdeveloped inter-language at best.

It shows that the learner is becoming a bilingual and there is an expectation that he or she will develop skills and strategies, including code switching, used by bilinguals.\textsuperscript{313} The more traditional view sees the acquiring of English as an enterprise entirely separate from the first language, sometimes even replacing it, and L1 use is thus an intrusion, a distraction, an unnecessary derailment of purposeful activity. Sridhar\textsuperscript{314} makes this point, claiming that in SLA learners’ first languages “are not viewed as resources; they are at best shadowy presences, which have only a nuisance value as
Halliday’s systemic functional model of language has been used extensively as the basis for the development of curricula in adult ESL as well as in teacher education curricula. It has been central to the development of the genre-based approach to teaching ESL, which has in turn informed the development of competency-based syllabuses now required by government bodies as a prerequisite for funding. Halliday’s theory of language has made an important contribution in the study of first language development, but it does not include a theory of second language learning, and therefore does not in itself take a position on the role of the first language in SLA. The actual teaching methods used in curricula based on a systemic view of language and/or a genre-based view tend to be those of the communicative approach, and this includes the direct method practice of teaching wholly in the target language. As a result, there is no systematic inclusion of L1 in the classroom, and it tends to be left to individual teachers to decide its role, if any.

2.3.4 Different Perspectives on First Language in L2 Learning

As well as perspectives from second language acquisition theorists and of those who study the effectiveness of various methods, there are different views proposed by those who take a critical view of language use and language learning in a worldwide context. The term ‘critical’ here is used in the sense of: “aiming to show up connections which may be hidden from people - such as connections between language, power and ideology”. These critical writers can be considered in two groups: those writing about linguistic imperialism and those concerned with language learning and use as an issue of political and social identity.

In the writings on linguistic imperialism, the focus is more on English as a second language than language learning in general, since English is widely recognized as the major world language and is thus perhaps the most obvious contender for examination of the effects of its dominance on societies, education systems and on individuals. I shall focus here on only a small aspect of this literature relevant to the present
discussion: namely, how these writers discuss the issue of the role of L1 in English language learning.

Phillipson examines the creation of the ELT profession worldwide and proposes that it has been governed in the second half of the twentieth century by five key tenets, which he sets out to show as being fallacies. Those relevant to this discussion are:

a. English is best taught mono lingually - i.e. through the medium of English
b. The more English is taught, the better the results
c. The use of other languages will result in a drop in English standards

Phillipson demonstrates the faulty reasoning behind each of these in turn. With respect to the tenet “English is best taught mono lingually”, Phillipson demonstrates how this arises both from colonial teaching experience and from the spoken language teaching methods originating from the Reform movement which were outlined earlier in this chapter. He cites physical and psychological sanctions which have at various times been used against students using L1 to claim that: “a monolingual methodology is organically linked with linguist disregard of dominated languages, concepts and ways of thinking. It is highly functional in inducing a colonized consciousness”.

In considering the tenet “the more English is taught, the better the results”, Phillipson cites Cummins as showing that the notion of maximum exposure as beneficial is fallacious. He states: “there is no correlation between quantity of L2 input, in an environment where the learners are exposed to L2 in the community, and academic success”.

As to the tenet that “if other languages are used much, standards of English will drop”, Phillipson suggests that in some “periphery, countries this may be true, particularly in the case of expanding education systems, under-trained teachers and few adequate textbooks”. However, he points out that it is not true in the case of some ‘periphery’ countries such as Sweden and Denmark which use English as an international language much on their own terms. We should therefore reformulate the tenet as “if dominated languages are used much, standards in the dominant language
will drop”. This should lead us to ask whose the standards may be and whose interests they serve. Pennycook also in his work on the hegemony of the English language, its speakers and teachers, claims that:

“The English language classroom, as idealized in the discourses of Western ELT theory, is not a place in which (languages can be freely used and exchanged but rather has come to reflect a dogmatic belief in a monolingualist approach to language learning”.  

Canagarajah makes a similar point in his consideration of the domination of ELT by native speakers. He argues that the worldwide preference for native English speaker teachers both stems from and contributes to the status quo of monolingual teachings and ensures continuing employment for ‘Centre’ teachers. This point is also made by Medgyes and Widdowson. Skutnabb-Kangas takes a much stronger position on the issue of ignoring or banning use of the mother tongue. Writing about educational practice in the teaching of minority children, she states unequivocally:

“If you are an ESL teacher and/or you teach minority children through the medium of a dominant language, at the cost of their mother tongue, you are participating in linguistic genocide”.  

Among those who take a perspective on first language as a right and a social good is Ruiz, who proposes three orientations towards language and its role in society and education: language-as-problem, language-as-right and language-as-resource. He uses these three orientations to discuss attitudes and practices in US language planning.

2.3.5 Role of First Language in L2 Learning Class in Late 20th Century

Over the last two decades, there have been a number of calls, in the international literature for increasing attention to be paid to the role played by the learner’s L1 in the process of learning English as a Second Language. This section will detail the reasons why, according to the authors considered here, L1 has been ignored or
undervalued, the reasons why it should have a greater role in the ESL class, ways of achieving this at a practical level, as well as cautions and reservations which have been voiced about LI use. I shall first consider the literature from the 1980s and early 1990s and then that from the last five years in an attempt to show that little has changed, and the same calls are currently being made.

2.3.5.1 Causes of Lack of Interest for First Language (L1)

The contention that L1 has largely been ignored in the teaching of ESL (and EFL) needs little defense. As Swan336 baldly states: “as far as the British version of the communicative approach is concerned, students might as well not have mother tongues.”

Four major reasons are frequently referred to as being behind the reluctance to include L1:

1. The first is that L1 use is tainted by association with the grammar-translation method of teaching, which is now seen as outdated, theoretically baseless and of little use in teaching learners to use language communicatively.337
2. The second reason is the influence of approaches to language teaching based on the direct method.338
3. A third reason is that many teachers of ESL and of EFL are trained in English-speaking countries where their practicums are done with mixed-language groups of students, and it appears axiomatic that L1 cannot be used in this context. As Phillipson339 and Canagarajah340 among others have pointed out, the L2-only training model has also often been followed in the training of non native speaking teachers from parts of the world where they do share their students’ L1. They suggest that this is an example ‘ideological power’ exercised by Centre bureaucrats and educators. The term ‘ideological power’ is used here in the sense of” the power to project one’s practices as universal and ‘common sense”.341 A related point is that the L2-only model of teacher training and teaching practice has suited the rapid growth of ELT as a casual
career wherein monolingual, minimally-trained native speakers can work anywhere in the world. 

4. The fourth reason is the influence of Krashen’s work, which, while theoretically contested and even rejected by many linguists, has had enormous appeal to teachers in its insistence on maximum exposure to comprehensible input in the target language.

2.3.5.2 Advantages of First Language Use

I shall now review some reasons given in the literature for why L1 is an important part of the process of learning L2. First is the fact that for adult learners, L1 forms part of their experience which they bring to any learning. As Corder puts it:

Second language learners not only already possess a language system which is potentially available as a factor in the acquisition of a second language, but equally importantly they already know something of what a language is for, what its communicative functions and potentials are.

He further points out that it is inconceivable that this knowledge should not play a part in learning a second language, since all we know about learning suggests that previous knowledge and skills are drawn upon in the acquisition of new ones. He suggests that the effect of the mother tongue in learning L2 is “... predominantly facilitatory; it helps in the process of discovery and creation”. Baynham states that the “ignoring of the learner's own pre-existing knowledge of how language works” recalls the Freirean criticism of an approach to education which sees the learner as a blank slate and the teacher as the keeper of all knowledge. Littlewood in discussing transfer, argues that the learner uses his or her knowledge of language, gained from the mother tongue, to organize the second language data, and that this is both economical and productive since it means the learner does not have to discover everything from scratch. Swan maintains that if we did not constantly make correspondence between vocabulary items in L1 and L2 we would never learn foreign languages at all: “imagine having to ask whether each new French car one saw was
called ‘voiture’ instead of just deciding that the foreign word was used in much the same way as ‘car’ and acting accordingly”.

All these authors recognize that if learners assume that L2 works in exactly the same way as L1 they will run into trouble: it is this issue that those who study transfer and interlanguage examine. Rather these authors are arguing for teachers to take a more informed perspective on the value of L1 as prior experience, and for an end to the attempt to destroy the firm association that the learner has between his native language and the universe of things.

There is an argument that however much teachers ignore the learners’ L1, it is inevitable that learners will refer back to it. Danchev, in his examination of the roles played by transfer and translation, and their interrelationship in second language learning, maintains that translation is a natural, unconscious, spontaneous process which cannot be checked, and that being so, teachers should try to “capture, channel and exploit it”. He cites Halliday et al. who claim that: “if one is taught a second language...even by something approaching the ‘direct method’, one usually sets up patterns of translation equivalence”.

In arguing for a greater role for bilingual teachers, Piasecka describes how their knowledge of two languages can enable them to monitor this process of referring back to L1 and help students to avoid false assumptions and analogies. Swan, too, maintains that “students are always translating into and out of their own languages - and teachers are always telling them not to”.

This idea has been tried and it corresponds to the idea that recourse to L1 is inevitable, is the claim by Atkinson and Harbord that drawing on the mother tongue is a learner-preferred strategy. Atkinson goes on to point out that there is a contradiction between the fact that we know very little for certain about what constitutes effective language learning, yet teachers are often too ready to impose their views on learners in opposition to what the learners find helpful. There is, too, the argument that “a belief in the way one approaches a task is likely to affect one’s chances of success”. This can be expressed this way that if students think referring back to L1 will help them, it probably will.
Interestingly, in Birch’s study of ESL trainee teachers as second language learners learning in the country where the language is spoken he found that the teachers had a strong desire for their L1 to be used in class.

The finding of Birch’s suggests that inclusion of L1 is a learner-preferred strategy even when the learner is a teacher whose training and prior beliefs have led him or her to advocate an English-only approach.

A broader, more sociolinguistic argument for the inclusion of L1 in the learning process is made by Collingham, Hopkins and Piasecka and concerns the role of L1 in the adult’s concept of self. Piasecka argues that the individual’s sense of identity is inextricably intertwined with one’s mother tongue, and that if learners are expected to ignore it, their sense of identity may well be threatened.

Hopkins continues this idea, claiming that the first language is part of a person’s essence, and connected with his or her emotions, dreaming, world concepts and group identity. Our understanding of the concept of social identity has expanded considerably since these statements were made. Denying a place for the learner’s L1 in the EFL classroom can, according to some authors, be disrespectful towards the learners’ speech community: it constitutes a denial of their right to maintain, use and be proud of their language and culture. Norton quotes Bourdieu’s contention that “at the level of relations between groups, a language is worth what those who speak it are worth” to show the intrinsic link between valuing a language and valuing, or respecting, those who are its speakers. Using L1 as part of a bilingual approach to teaching, will, Collingham maintains, assist in increasing the status of minority languages in the community. This, she argues, will raise the self-esteem of the learners and thus contribute to their more effective learning. She also points out that encouraging students’ contributions in L1 at low levels reduces the likelihood of lesson content being trivial and patronizing. Harbord considers including L1 to be part of an overall ‘humanistic’ approach to teaching, since it allows students to say what they want and to be themselves.
A further argument for the inclusion of L1 in learning L2 is that selective use of comparative and contrastive techniques can help students to acquire awareness of the conceptual, formal and cultural differences between their own language and English.\textsuperscript{375} Baynham\textsuperscript{376} too, advocates heightening learners’ awareness of the patterns of the target language by contrasting them with equivalent features in their own language.

“The aim of second language acquisition is bilingualism” states Sridhar\textsuperscript{377}, and a monolingual perspective can lead to the obscuring of this truism. Often the goal of second language instruction has been to produce native speaker-like abilities, and since this is rare, not only do learners fail on this account, but more importantly, it sets up a native speaker monolingual instead of a bilingual as the ideal speaker. Fishman\textsuperscript{378} writes that the goal of second language instruction should be to produce functional bilingualism, and to act otherwise is unrealistic and counter-productive. He maintains that most learners will never want or need to function purely in L2 but will continue to use their first language in some domains.

One of the early advocates of cross-lingual teaching methods, Dodson\textsuperscript{379} (cited in Piasecka),\textsuperscript{380} argued that a true bilingual is able to switch rapidly from one language to another, and leaving L1 out of the learning process is likely to inhibit learners’ ability to do this. This early argument is taken up by Papaefthymiou-Lytra\textsuperscript{381} in her discussion of language switch in second- and foreign-language learning contexts. In their discussion of an intercultural approach to language learning, Crozet and Liddicoat\textsuperscript{382} emphasize that the bilingual or multilingual speaker is the goal to aim for, since only this is what language learners can become. They will never become monolingual native speakers, which has appeared to be the target in the past. These authors also argue that if learners are to be encouraged to be bilinguals or multilinguals, their first language(s) need to be included in the classroom. Byram and Risager\textsuperscript{383} describe competence in a second language as involving the ability to see relationships between the two languages and cultures, and to deal with difference. It should not entail casting off one’s own social identities and attempting to become a native speaker of the second language.
Baynham\textsuperscript{384} points out that since bilingualism is the norm in immigrant minority communities, the teaching of English should have as its aim the addition of another language as opposed to the replacement of the mother tongue. To act otherwise is to waste the language resources available in the community. In the USA, Ruiz\textsuperscript{385} points out the irony of educators lamenting the lack of ‘foreign’ language skills of English-speakers, while ignoring the fact that precisely those skills have been purposely eradicated in non-English speakers through the operation of educational and social policy.

A possible skill for any bilingual is to perform interpreting and/or translation. ESL instruction which ignores the first language also ignores the possibility that learners may wish to pursue interpreting as a profession or to perform it informally within their speech community, a point also made by Stern\textsuperscript{386} and Danchev.\textsuperscript{387}

\textbf{2.3.5.3 Disadvantages of the Use of First Language}

Most authors, in arguing for increased recognition for L1 in the L2 classroom, advocate a principled approach to its inclusion which inevitably involves setting some limits on its use. Not to do so risks a return to a classroom where teacher and students talk about the L2 in L1 and students develop little communicative competence. This is particularly the case in linguistically homogenous classes where the teacher shares the students’ language. As Atkinson\textsuperscript{388} points out, it can lead to students feeling that they have not understood a new item until it has been translated, or students using L1 in performing communicative activities when the point is for them to be done in English. O’Grady and Wajs\textsuperscript{389} list a number of strategies teachers can use if L1 is being overused, but they maintain that if students understand the purpose of a bilingual approach, and the ground rules thereof, they are less likely to over-rely on L1. Hopkins\textsuperscript{390} study found that some students felt time was wasted using L1 which could have been better spent using L2, but as Medgyes\textsuperscript{391} points out, judicious use of L1 in certain situations can actually save a lot of class time. O'Grady and Kang’s\textsuperscript{392} study found a number of teacher concerns about negative effects of the use of L1, but these tend to be either unproven (for example the contention that L1 acts as a crutch,
creating dependency and reducing the urge to speak English) or theoretically indefensible.

2.3.5.4 Translation

It is worth considering what has been said about translation as a teaching device, since there appear to be sharply divided opinions on it. Associated as it is with the grammar translation teaching method, it has been cast out of communicative approaches to ESL as irrelevant, difficult, boring, pointless and uncommunicative. 393 There are, however, several authors and teachers willing to argue for its place as a valid and valuable learning activity. Duff 394 maintains that translation develops three important qualities essential to all language learning: accuracy, clarity and flexibility. It trains the learner to search (flexibility) for the most appropriate words (accuracy) to convey what is meant (clarity). This combination of freedom and constraint allows the students to contribute their own thoughts to a discussion which has a clear focus - the text.

Zabalbeascoa 395 acknowledges that translation as a pedagogic device suffered a period of banishment, but maintains that it is now making a comeback. He offers two solutions to the problem of its negative connotations: first, being aware of the difference between translation pedagogy and pedagogical translation, and between translator competence and linguistic competence, and second, integrating translation activities into an eclectic, communicative methodology. As far as spontaneous mental or verbal translation is concerned, (as opposed to translation as a purposeful teaching activity), some claim that this is an inevitable part of second language learning, which learners will do whether or not teachers attempt to stop it. 396 This being so, they argue, the tendency is better harnessed and directed productively rather than ignored or prohibited.

2.3.6 Contemporary International perspectives on First Language

The overall tone of the arguments from the 1980s and 1990s in favor of a greater recognition of the place of L1 in the learning of EFL and other second languages, is one of optimism about the dawning of a new era of recognition for L1 in L2 learning.
There are suggestions of a turning of the tide away from the prevailing orthodoxy of instruction solely via the medium of L2. It is now interesting to look at a selection of writings from the last five years to see whether and how these ideas have progressed, and whether they have been incorporated into ESL teaching in general.

An edited collection of email posts on the TESL EJ Forum, an international discussion list for ESL and EFL teachers and researchers shows that there is still considerable debate, at least among classroom teachers, about whether L1 should be admitted to the EFL class. As the editor comments: “there seems to be a wide range of opinions on the degree of L1 use. One end of this spectrum favors banning the L1 from the classroom totally; the remainder (a fairly large remainder) proposes various types of L1 use or limitation”. 397

Florez398 reports a study on whether or not to use L1 in the adult ESL class when teacher and students share the same L1, and concludes that limited and systematic use is beneficial. Canagarajah399 refers to the still-prevailing exclusive use of L2 in language teaching, and Papaefthymiou-Lytra400 mentions that use of L1 has until now often been viewed as evidence of deficit in L2. Jessner401 argues that it is the exception rather than the rule for teachers to point out common features between L1 and L2 or L3, but since this is clearly facilitative “the role of L1 in the L2 classroom should therefore clearly be re-examined”. James402 maintains that “holding one’s two (or more) languages in isolation from one another is an undesirable state of affairs for the FL learner”, suggesting that most classrooms lend themselves to exactly this state of affairs. Rinvolucri403 describes his change of heart from banning the students’ L1 in the class to admitting its value, and suggests a range of activities which can draw on the mother tongue. He gives some activities given for teachers of linguistically homogenous classes who speak their students’ L1 and some for mixed-language classes where the teacher does not share the students' mother tongues. Turnbull and Arnett404 conducted a review of theoretical and empirical literature on teachers’ use of the target language (L2) and of L1 in second and foreign language teaching. They concluded that there appears to be near consensus that L2 use should be maximized but that more studies are needed to determine if judicious use of L1 might help input to become intake. However, since their focus was largely on language and less on ESL, a more relevant picture of current thinking is that of Cook.405 Cook presents a
wide-ranging justification for a re-examination of “the time honored view that the first language should be avoided in the classroom by teachers and students”.406

It is both the continued scarcity of articles recommending more attention to L1 as well as the tone of the articles discussed here which leads to the conclusion that not a great deal has changed in the last two decades in the use of direct-method, English-only instruction in EFL contexts. The tone of these articles, whether from 1982 or 2002, is still one of pleading for a greater role for the L1 in the face of standard practice, which still seems to be to exclude it or to see it as something to be tolerated under limited circumstances. There are, however, no articles promoting or defending L2-only classrooms to be found, and this too suggests that L2-only is such an article of faith, such an established reality, that it needs no defense.

2.3.7 Summary of the Significance and the Role of L1 in L2

It first reviewed both the history of method in language teaching and then second language acquisition theory, from the perspective of a contention of this thesis that attitudes towards L1 are part of a dominant monolingual approach in the ELT profession. Literature from the last two decades which argued for the inclusion of L1 was reviewed, and was compared with the literature of the last five years in order to examine whether views have changed on the role of L1 in L2 learning. Methods can be broadly classified as intra-lingual or crosslingual,407 the first, which is now almost universal, minimizing L1, the second making it an integral part of teaching.

The field of SLA has had a number of perspectives on L1, ranging from a hindrance to an aid, and more recently has seen it as a key part of a learner's social and linguistic identity as a bilingual. Critical perspectives on the role of L1 were examined, and these tend to show that little has changed in the dominant practice of restricting the use of L1 in the EFL classroom.

Finally, the arguments and programs in Pakistani EFL up to the present were examined. Overall, it seems clear that the role of L1 is still debated, and while there are no current arguments for it to be banned, in practice it seems that EFL teachers
commonly prohibit or limit it. Supporters of the use of L1 find the need to justify its inclusion on similar grounds to those used two decades ago.

2.4 Approaches to TEFL/TESOL- An Introduction

This section will consider current critical approaches to TEFL/TESOL as well as to the wider field of applied linguistics. The focus of this study is on the value, or lack of it, placed on the language learning experience of EFL/ESL teachers. The working hypothesis is that this experience of these teachers has been ignored within the discourse and practice of the profession. There is very little literature which addresses this exact question, and so it becomes necessary to examine why there might be such an absence. In order to question this absence of focus on teacher language learning, it is necessary to go outside the accepted parameters of the various theoretical fields contributing to EFL/ESL. The previous sections of this literature review have discussed areas which are commonly accepted parts of the literature on bilingualism and second language learning. Critical approaches to TEFL may provide useful theoretical justification for asking the research questions, as well as possible tools for explaining the findings of this study.

Since the early 1990s, there have been an increasing number of studies of the dominant place of English in the world, and of the structure and practices of the English Language Teaching (ELT) profession as a worldwide enterprise. These studies have also been applied to the entire discipline of Applied Linguistics and to the sub-discipline of Second Language Acquisition, as being among the main fields which inform ELT theoretically. The critiques have taken place in the international arena and while links are made here to Pakistani EFL, for the most part the authors discussed refer to worldwide contexts.

Pennycook acknowledges that the idea of critical applied linguistics, is greatly struggled over. He describes several ways of, doing’ “critical applied linguistics”: as a critique of mainstream applied linguistics, or as critical text analysis, or as an attempt to understand the global spread of English, all of which attempt to relate language to broad social, cultural and political relations. However, he says, merely drawing such
connections is not enough: to be “critical” we need to take a problematic view of social relations in order to discover how language perpetuates inequitable social relations, and to use this analysis towards social transformation.

A central element of critical applied linguistics, therefore, is a way of exploring language in social contexts that goes beyond mere correlations between language and society, and instead raises more critical questions to do with access, power, disparity, desire, difference, and resistance. It also insists on an historical understanding of how social relations came to be the way they are.409

An early contribution to the critical literature is that of Pennycook,410 who argued that a major shortcoming in second language education was its isolation from broader issues in educational and social theory. He maintained that language teachers and applied linguists were preoccupied with questions which derive from an instrumentalist and positivist orientation towards language teaching. This orientation is removed from consideration of its social, cultural, political and historical contexts and implications. He argued for the establishment of a “critical pedagogy”, which he describes as beginning with the recognition that all knowledge is socially and historically constructed, and that therefore all claims to knowledge are ‘interested’.411 That is, knowledge is never neutral, but always reflects the interests of various parties and is therefore bound up with questions of power and power relations.

The “power” which is exercised through language and via established norms of language education412 also needs defining. Fairclough maintains that power can be exercised through coercion, as in the application of force or sanctions by bodies such as the police, army and legislative organizations, and also by consent. Exercising power through consent involves convincing others that it is in their best interests to conform, and occurs via “an unconscious acceptance of institutional practices”.413 It is this latter sense of the exercise of power through consent which is most relevant to considerations of language teaching. Practices which derive from particular views of teaching and learning, of immigrants and their rights and responsibilities, of government-subsidized language teaching or of fee- for-service language teaching, of bilingualism, of second language acquisition, of curriculum and of teaching methodology, come to be seen as ‘common sense’ and unavailable for challenge.
It will be argued that the primacy of English in the ESL classroom, the ignoring of bi- and multilingualism among learners and the ignoring of teachers’ languages have become normalized by long-standing practice and by research conducted within a loop which does not permit such practices to be challenged. Ramanathan\textsuperscript{414} calls these self-perpetuating and self-legitimizing forms of discourse ‘thought collectives’ (after Fleck 1981) and argues that it is difficult, but crucial, to think outside these accepted patterns in a critical fashion in order to raise awareness of how teachers sustain and reproduce various biases and assumptions in TESOL. Fairclough\textsuperscript{415} refers to the tendency to see a dominant discourse type as ‘common sense’ as “the naturalization of a discourse type”, which is a process by which discourse types appear to be neutral, obvious, in the best interests of all, and divorced of any link with the interests of groups or individuals.

Pennycook\textsuperscript{416} refers to this process when he describes the worldwide spread of English as being seen as “natural, neutral and beneficial”. He goes on to describe how a naturalized discourse type comes to be seen as outside ideology even while it is intensely ideological in that it represents the wielding of power through mutual agreement: the “power by consent” referred to above. Ideology, as used in this context (while recognizing that it is a much-contested term), has the Marxist sense of “the set of ideas which arise from a given set of material interests or, more broadly, from a definite class or group”. Fairclough\textsuperscript{417} carries on to explain the links between ideology and power, and ideology and language, saying that the exercise of power in modern society is most often achieved through the ideological workings of language.

These ideas did not originate, of course, in applied linguistics, but stem from an increasing interest in how language shapes society by social theorists such as Bourdieu,\textsuperscript{418} and Habermas\textsuperscript{419} in recent decades. The ideas of these and other social theorists have been tapped and applied to the study of the spread of English, the establishment of English Language Teaching (ELT) and the acceptance of particular pedagogies in English Language Teaching.
2.4.1 English Language Teaching as a Profession

The profession of English language teaching has come under particular scrutiny by critical applied linguists. Let us turn now to consider in what ways ELT as it has been practiced reflects the dominant discourses, and how this might be relevant to the focus of this thesis on the language learning background of Pakistani ESL teachers.

Howatt,\textsuperscript{420} in his history of the English language teaching profession does not take a critical perspective. He does refer in the epilogue to the difficulty and falseness of asking learners to withhold, or suspend, their literacy in L1 in order to learn through the monolingual, oral-based methods which have been common in both audio-lingualism and communicative teaching, but essentially this work is not a ‘critical’ history of ELT.

Phillipson\textsuperscript{421} traces both British and American strategies for the promotion of English and of English-based expertise in ensuring their interests in post-war political and economic affairs. He then describes the growth and development of the ELT profession, ascribing a key role to the Commonwealth Conference on Teaching of English as a Second Language at Makerere, Uganda, in 1961. The Makerere Report established a doctrine to underlie ELT which Phillipson has expressed in five key tenets:

1. English is best taught mono-lingually
2. The ideal teacher of English is a native speaker
3. The earlier English is taught the better the results
4. The more English is taught the better the results
5. If other languages are used much, standards will drop

Phillipson\textsuperscript{422} terms all of these “fallacies” and goes on to show how each was formed and put into action. Much of his discussion centers on how these “fallacies” affected language planning and teaching in African, Indian and Asian educational systems, but he also claims that they were adopted in the EFL sector serving the adult education market. He states that the monolingual approach to EFL in Europe and Japan was the
hallmark which set it aside from foreign language teaching, which was firmly based on a bilingual tradition. This monolingual approach to the teaching of English in EFL and ESL is one of the “tenets” or fallacies which are relevant to this research study, since Phillipson locates the development of a monolingual teaching approach in its historical and political context and exposes it as highly ideological in nature. The second tenet is also relevant, since the debate about whether native-speaker teachers are better, worse, or complementary to, non-native speaker teachers is still active.423 The other tenet which has relevance here is number 5 - that standards will drop if other languages are used much. This has a bearing on the exclusion of the learners’ L1 from the adult ESL classroom, and hence the perceived lack of relevance of the teacher’s knowledge of languages other than English.

Pennycook424 maintains that the discourse of ELT has been infused with ethnocentric notions of development and modernization, encouraging the notion that English language teachers going to work overseas are bringing advanced ideas to backward areas. This tendency has also been critiqued by Kachru425 and Holliday.426 The discourses of ELT have construed it as socially, culturally and politically neutral, and, increasingly, are construing it as located within a global market oriented philosophy.427

At the same time these analyses of the profession and discourses of ELT show that it is dominant in a worldwide context, we also find the paradox that English language teachers do not enjoy high status, particularly outside state-funded school or development aid projects. Phillipson428 refers to the marginal status of such teachers, and Kaplan429 and Nunan430 both question whether ELT is even a profession, citing lack of agreed professional standards, the employment of unqualified native speakers, the lack of control teachers have over entry and the lack of powerful advocacy of language teachers’ associations.

2.4.2 Pedagogical Debates and Methods in ELT

Pedagogical methods in ELT tend to reflect a Western, liberal ‘humanistic’ view of education, although Pennycook431 points out that by labeling as ‘humanistic language
teaching’ the kind of self-focused activities inspired by popular psychology e.g. Moskowitz, we are implicitly suggesting that other approaches are less than human. One effect of this is to reify the anglocentric approaches exported from the English-speaking countries to other countries with well-established localized approaches to education. Another effect is to frame the backward, traditional, quaint and misguided approaches of the recipient country as exoticised and other.

Other aspects of Western-approved pedagogical methods include the emphasis on student-centredness, the privileging of the development of oral skills over written skills, an informal relationship between teacher and students and an expectation that students will be self-motivated and willing to make decisions about their learning. Tollefson refers to the ‘pragmatic paradox’ in which students in some ELT classrooms are place ordered by the teacher to ‘take control’ they are not really free to do so, since the teacher is truly in control, but neither are they free to disobey the teacher. Asked to discuss topics they may find inappropriate such as sexuality or religion, the students were not free to refuse to participate, as they would be in the ‘real life’ situation which communicative approaches try to emulate.

Holliday, although he disagrees with Phillipson’s ‘linguistic imperialism’ thesis saying it assumes a lack of agency on the part of those dominated, nevertheless sees a conflict between two halves of the ELT profession. On one hand are the perspectives and methods of the British, North American and Australasian model of education (BANA) and on the other those of state education in the rest of the world which he labels TESEP (tertiary, secondary, primary). Like Kachru, Pennycook and Kumaravadivelu, Holliday argues that the methods of BANA have been exported with little or no adaptation to the social, educational and historical realities of TESEP societies. Widdowson points out that not only are such practices arrogant and ill informed, but even ridiculous and embarrassing, since the BANA countries export ELT “experts” with little training or expertise to train others in countries which have sophisticated traditions of linguistics and education.

Moreover, he points out that there is a supreme irony in Britain professing expertise in second language teaching when as a nation its own citizens are such abject failures at language learning. Such a comment is resonant with a contention of this
dissertation, which is that the ELT profession sees itself purely as teaching English rather than as teaching a second language; with all the implications of the latter for the development of bilingualism, the role of the first language, the role of prior literacy and linguistic knowledge and the potential for contrastive, cross-lingual approaches. It is possible for Britain to see itself as the repository of all expertise in ELT because it is the fountainhead of English. The dismal record of both countries in second language learning is, therefore, invisible and irrelevant: a clear case of the ‘naturalization’ of a discourse. In this case, the discourse is one of monolingualism and native-speakerhood as the primary requirement of an English language teacher. Pennycook too recognizes that “The English language classroom, as idealized in the discourses of Western ELT theory, is not a place where languages can be freely used and exchanged but rather has come to reflect a dogmatic belief in a monolingualist approach to language learning”.

Auerbach examines the practice of using English exclusively in the ESL class, and concludes that it is ideologically driven rather than pedagogically justified. She writes in the particular context of the US political movement known as ‘English-only’ which includes widespread hostility to bilingual education, and so her conclusions are not all directly applicable to Pakistani ESL. However many of Auerbach’s arguments are applicable, such as the claim that even teachers who oppose ‘English-only’ policies at a political level tend to practice the exclusion of L1 in class. She comments that since the exclusion of L1 is an unnatural and counter-intuitive practice, teachers are forced into the schizophrenic position of disapproving of L1 but actually permitting it in a clandestine way. Auerbach and Burgess questioned the ubiquity of survival ESL materials and concluded that they presented a sanitized, idealized version of reality which denies and trivializes the experience of adult immigrants, silencing them in the process.

Auerbach further developed the idea of the exercise of ideological power in projecting particular practices as universal and “common sense”, calling for teachers and researchers to look at the TESOL classroom in a new light. She argues that since her learners have multiply-constructed subjectivities, such simple and static explanations of their struggles to learn and use English as immigrants in an Anglophone society present only limited and largely unfavorable perspectives on the
learners’ efforts. Further, such traditional perspectives of the learner as motivated or unmotivated, with or without aptitude, serve to obscure the role of powerful agencies in permitting or limiting access to both material benefits (goods, housing, health care) and symbolic power (the right to be heard or to have one’s language recognized). In other words, Norton is arguing for the importance of framing language learning in an EFL context as a social process rather than simply a psycholinguistic process on the part of an individual. By opening up the question of social processes, we can begin to see how issues of power, both coercive and ideological, influence EFL learners.

This point brings us to a consideration of another critical perspective by those authors who comment on the discipline of second language acquisition (SLA) for focusing too much on a monolingual, native-speaking individual. Sridhar and Kachru both refer to the monolingual bias in SLA research, claiming that it is a result of constraint by powerful Western cultural premises, or what Fairclough might call “naturalized discourses”. Sridhar claims among others things that SLA ignores the following: that L2 is typically used alongside L1 rather than replacing it; more SLA takes place in non-native than in native contexts; there are vast traditions of the acquisition of second languages other than English in multilingual societies, and that increasing amounts of world communication takes place in speakers’ second, third or fourth languages. Kachru calls for a re-evaluation of the key notions of native speaker, competence and fossilization to show how they result from a monolingual bias in SLA research. She claims, like Sridhar, that the field of SLA has ignored questions of language acquisition in bi- and multilingual settings, particularly in its pursuit of the idea of interlanguage, and most notably in its failure to distinguish interlanguage behavior from examples of multilingual competence where code-switching to non-standard varieties may be a reflection of a number of social features of the interaction.

2.4.3 Guidelines

There is vigorous debate about some of the key notions discussed here, as evidenced by the ongoing arguments about whether the concept of linguistic imperialism has any
validity or not. Despite the existence of these debates, there is a growing recognition that English teaching as it has been practiced over the past half century cannot be accepted without question, and numerous writers are calling for a critical re-evaluation of ELT/TESOL. According to one author, it is now possible to research TESOL only from a critical perspective, suggesting that she sees little benefit in continuing to research within the existing paradigms. Phillipson sees two possible paradigms for language policy in a worldwide context: a diffusion of English paradigm, and ecology of language paradigm. The first implies the kind of linguistic imperialism Phillipson has decried elsewhere and the second implies the promotion of language diversity, multilingualism and linguistic human rights.

A closer focus on ELT is offered by Kumaravadivelu who argues that language teaching has been narrowly focused on the concept of “method”. He proposes a postmethod pedagogy which has three dimensions: pedagogy of particularity, practicality and possibility. Particularity means taking into account local linguistic, sociocultural and political factors, practicality means aiming for a teacher-generated theory of practice, and possibility recalls the teaching of Freire in challenging accepted relations of power and dominance. Kumaravadivelu welcomes the renewed focus on the complex issues of teacher knowledge but argues that they mainly focus on particularity and practicality. Without a focus on possibility, he warns that teacher development will remain socio-politically naive. If teachers are encouraged to reflect on their personal biographies and personal theories without connecting them to broader historical and sociopolitical questions, a shallow and self-perpetuating form of “development” will result.

Pennycook too sees the need for a “critical pedagogy” which he attempts to locate within an overall framework of “critical applied linguistics”. He explains that taking a critical approach to TESOL is not simply introducing a critical element into a classroom, but involves an attitude, a way of thinking and a way of teaching. Critical theory is ultimately about problematizing accepted beliefs and practices, and refusing to accept official accounts of how things came to be as they are. This position is a justification for the focus of the present study. Teacher language experience and language proficiency has become invisible in ESL as well as more generally in ELT,
and this study attempts to discover some of the official accounts of why this may be the case, as well as to review them and expose them as “naturalized discourses”.

The most relevant aspects of the critical work reviewed above are expressed in the following points:

1. The issues of teacher second language proficiency and teacher second language learning experience have received no attention in ELT
2. This absence is itself little remarked upon
3. Ambivalent attitudes to learners’ first languages appear to be common among ESL teachers
4. There may be connections between the monolingualist discourses described above and the way the Pakistani EFL profession has been structured and is now practiced

The final chapter will attempt to link the findings to the literature which has been reviewed in all the sections of this chapter, employing a critical framework in order to attempt to answer the research questions.
Works Cited


3 Ibid.


17 Ibid

18 Ibid

19 NABE report on bilingual education available on: http://www.wested.org/lcd/links_bilingual.htm


21 ACLU 1988


40 Hakuta (1987)


43 McLaughlin (1984, 1985)

44 Hakuta and Cancino (1977),

45 Sternberg (1985)


48 Epstein 1977

49 Collier 1988

50 Ibid

51 Snow and Hoefnagel-Hohle 1977

52 Collier 1988

53 Gardner 1985

54 Hakuta and D’Andrea (1990)

55 Diaz 1983


57 Krashen 1985


59 Goldman, Reyes and Varnhagen (1984)

60 Malakoff (1988)


62 Ibid

63 Berthold, Mangubhai & Batorowicz, 1997

64 Ibid

66 Berthold, Mangubhai & Batorowicz, 1997

67 Cook, 1991

68 Ibid


70 Ibid

71 Ibid

72 Cook, 1991

73 OECD 1989


88 Ibid


113 Ibid


138 Ibid


145 Ibid

146 Ibid


152 Ibid


Tejos (1986). Does the learner’s first language have a place in the process of second language learning? Some data on AMES teachers’ attitudes. Masters Thesis, Macquarie University, Ryde, NSW.


challenges. Amsterdam, Canberra, John Benjamins, Language Australia.


187 Ibid


208 Ibid


Melbourne, Language Australia: 103 - 112.


Ibid

Ibid


Bellingham W.A., Western Washington State University.


Ibid


Ibid


300 Ibid


307 Ibid


Ibid


Ibid

Ibid

Ibid


Ibid


Ibid


334 Ibid


347 Ibid


University Press.


352 Ibid


363 Birch (1992). Language learning case study approach to second language teacher education. In J. Flowerdew, M. Brock and S. Hsia (eds.) Perspectives on Second Language Teacher Education. Hong Kong, City University of Hong Kong.

364 Ibid


368 Ibid


Language Learning and Language Teaching 2: 39 - 61.


394 Ibid


Ramanathan (2003). Personal communication.


Ibid
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter explained the theoretical justification for the research method and described the design of the study in terms of its aims, respondents, the data collection and the data analysis. It begins by re-stating the research questions. There follows an outline of qualitative and quantitative research traditions, leading into an overview of the characteristics, problems and benefits of qualitative interview-based research. The methods used in similar studies are discussed, and finally the design of the present study is outlined. It also highlights the research strategies, methods and techniques employed in this research project. The purpose of this is to note down the ways in which material has been gathered, formulated and evaluated in order to test and verify the hypothesis made at the beginning of this research project.

3.1 Area of the Study

The researcher has selected to analyze the research topic from the aspects of integrated skills as taught at National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Islamabad and JCC, King Abdul Aziz University (KAAU), Jeddah, Saudi Arabia to the learners of English language for the development of the topic. As analysis helps in thoroughly examining the topic from all dimensions, the researcher looks upon all the aspects of the research topic to discover the problems and suggest remedies after conducting a careful survey.

The population comprises a total number of 291 students from both the universities (145 from NUML and 146 from KAAU) i.e. all students from Certificate and Diploma Level (Level-I & II) and 44 teachers (20 from NUML and 24 from KAAU) who were teaching these students.
3.2 Instruments

Field research was conducted in order to gather the required information for the analysis of the topic. This research draws its material from different sources such as:

1. By observing the integrated skills classes where the researcher was the silent observer and collected information on how many times and at what occasions the teachers used the mother tongue to make the students understand and facilitate them in learning a foreign language.
2. Questionnaires were distributed among the students and the teachers comprising a series of questions to investigate how bilingualism is a facility while learning a foreign language.
3. Semi-structured interviews with the teachers were conducted to gather data to authenticate research.

3.3 Research Questions

The main research question for the present study has been:

How does bilingualism in the teaching of English as a foreign language aid and facilitate the learning of L2 at Intermediate/Certificate level in the integrated skills classes?

However, the researcher has divided various sections of the study into these sub-questions to find out the validity and reliability of hypothesis:

1. What is the role of L1 in teaching L2 effectively?
2. How frequently should L1 be used in teaching L2 in classes?
3. What is the attitude of the learners towards using L1 in a class?
4. Why is it desirable that the students and teachers use L1 in an EFL class?
5. How do teachers look at this issue of bilingualism in their teaching methodology?
The whole research was organized and conducted around five core questions. In carrying out this research project, the researcher employed both qualitative and quantitative research methods.

Thus, the method selected for this study was a combination of questionnaires, semi-structured interviews and classroom observations with teachers of EFL, conducted at National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Islamabad, Pakistan and JCC, King Abdul Aziz University (KAAU), Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. These methods are consistent with the view that a wide-ranging interpretive methodology in the qualitative tradition was the most appropriate to generate insights useful in addressing the research questions. The decision to use these methods is placed in the overall context of research traditions in the next section.

3.4 Research Traditions

Many writers explaining about research methods make a distinction between quantitative and qualitative approaches, also called “scientific” and “naturalistic” inquiry, although opinions differ about the extent to which they are separate paradigms, and about the value and applicability of each. Silverman\(^1\) sees them as two schools of social science, calling the first ‘positivist’ and stating that in essence it attempts to test correlations between variables. The second school he terms ‘interpretive social science’, claiming that it is more concerned with observation and description; and occasionally, generating hypotheses rather than seeking to prove or disprove them. Other researchers, though, frown on the view of qualitative research as having the purpose of generating hypotheses to be later confirmed by experimental research.\(^2\) Those who do draw a clear distinction between quantitative and qualitative research or positivist and interpretive orientations\(^3\) offer a variety of ways in which they differ.

Quantitative research has been called obtrusive, controlled, objective, generaliseable and tending to assume the existence of facts external to the researcher which await discovery.\(^4\) The characteristics of qualitative research are that it is naturalistic, it uses descriptive data, it is concerned with process, it is inductive, and it is concerned with
meaning as seen by the participants. Nunan claims that qualitative research is grounded, meaning that theory is generated from data rather than being imposed on it, and that it is exploratory in nature, expansionist, descriptive and inductive.

Van Lier, writing specifically about applied linguistic research, offers a different perspective. He argues that research can be categorized according to where it lies on two parameters:

a. an interventionist parameter
b. selectivity parameter

These are represented visually as two intersecting axes. Such a representation gives four possible “modes” of research which Lier calls “measuring”, “controlling”, “watching” and “asking/doing” each exemplified by different research tools. The mode most relevant to the present study, for example, is ‘asking/doing’ which is characterized by interviewing, elicitation and action research, whereas the most interventionist and selective ‘mode’ involves experimental or quasi-experimental methods.

Most research experts agree that until the last two or three decades applied linguistics research has been of the positivist, quantitative, or interventionist/selective kind but those qualitative, interpretive studies are now well established in the field. This being so, some claim it is now unnecessary to justify or defend the use of qualitative method since they have already proved useful in cumulating substantial bodies of knowledge. Others, however, such as Edge and Richards and Pavlenko and Lantolf argue that the interrelated fields of applied linguistics and second language acquisition are still heavily dominated by a quantitative paradigm and many refuse to recognize the value of qualitative studies.

Many authors agree that while these two paradigms clearly exist, their boundaries are blurred rather than sharply delineated. For example, Grotjahn claims that the distinction between qualitative and quantitative research is an oversimplification and suggests that it is more fruitful to consider and analyze research studies on the basis of three questions: the method of collecting data, the type of data collected and the
method of analysis used for the data. Mixing these types gives us a possible eight research paradigms instead of a binary divide.

Glesne and Peshkin\textsuperscript{15} maintain that rather than argue about which approach is better, we should see that different approaches allow us to know and understand different things about the world. Chaudron,\textsuperscript{16} too, concedes that both quantitative and qualitative approaches have a role to play in second language research. Consequently, it is a question of selecting a research methodology, and contingent methods, which are most likely to prove fruitful for investigating a particular research question in a particular context.\textsuperscript{17}

The research questions for this study were most appropriately investigated using the exploratory tools of semi-structured interviews, questionnaire and classroom observations. These methods allowed for the gathering of rich data which was little constrained by the researcher’s anticipation of what might emerge. A descriptive, interpretive approach to the data was thus possible, in which the theory generated was firmly grounded in the data itself.\textsuperscript{18}

3.5 Characteristics, Problems and Benefits of Selected Research Methods

Research methodology which is generally thought of as qualitative include semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, text analysis, life histories, stimulated recall and journaling.\textsuperscript{19} The most appropriate research design for the present study was a combination of questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, classroom observations and the interpretation of the collected data. As with any research methodology, there are strengths and weaknesses contained in each of these tools, and these will be considered in this section.

Questionnaires are very cost effective when compared to face-to-face interviews. This is especially true for studies involving large sample sizes and large geographic areas. Written questionnaires become even more cost effective as the number of research questions increases. Questionnaires are easy to analyze. Data entry and tabulation for
nearly all surveys can be easily done with many computer software packages. Questionnaires are familiar to most people. Nearly everyone has had some experience completing questionnaires and they generally do not make people apprehensive. Questionnaires reduce bias. There is uniform question presentation and no middle-man bias. The researcher’s own opinions will not influence the respondent to answer questions in a certain manner. There are no verbal or visual clues to influence the respondent.

Qualitative research, which by its nature does not attempt to conform to scientific standards of reliability, validity, falsifiability or generaliseability, must still display the rigorous critical standards demanded of all credible research. It has often been criticized for not meeting the above standards, but there have been several attempts to show how non-quantifiable and non-randomly obtained data can still be used to make what we might call ‘truth claims’. This is expressed in the question posed by Edge and Richards: “What warrant do you have for the statements that you make?” In other words, they suggest it is the task of the researcher to convince readers that claims have substance and are credible. Lincoln and Guba suggest ways in which this can be done in naturalistic inquiry, by replacing the standard rationalist criteria with naturalistic criteria which reflect the same underlying concepts.

3.6 Method Choices in Similar Studies

Although no studies have been located which aim to discover the contribution of bilingualism in foreign language learning, there have been several studies which are pertinent in either content or method, and they will be outlined and commented on here.

The most common methods used to investigate the relationship of L1 with L2, are the observation of teachers’ regular lessons combined with semi-structured interviews. Observed lessons are usually audio taped, and in many cases, the tapes are then used in the interview to induce stimulated recall. Additional methods include audio-recording of teachers’ comments about videotaped lessons, the systematic collection of a wide range of curriculum materials, the keeping of journals by the subjects,
and the “shadowing” of teachers in order to gain additional data by conversational means inside and outside the workplace.26

Those studies which focus on a particular area of teaching/learning L2 or practice include metalinguistic awareness,27 the teaching of grammar,28 teaching beginning learners29 and the teaching of writing.30 Because classroom observation and semi-structured interviews are time-consuming and generate large amounts of data, the numbers of teachers studied tend to be small. Some took an ethnographic approach, with longitudinal collection of data over months or years, with data analysis taking a correspondingly long period of time.31

There are of course other studies with much larger samples, for example, Peacock’s32 study of the beliefs of pre-service teachers, but they tend to be based on surveys or other quantifiable instruments. The advantage of small-scale studies is that in-depth, rich data can be gathered and analyzed, but a disadvantage is that there is little likelihood that all the possible themes or issues can be uncovered. This reflects a permanent tension in research between achieving either breadth or depth of coverage of an issue or topic. All of the studies outlined in the previous paragraphs used a combination of interviews and class observation since their primary aim was to discover links between L1 and L2. The next Part of the chapter will describe the procedures followed of gathering and analyzing the data, and link them to the concepts of credibility, representivity and verifiability discussed above.

3.7 Design of the Study

Since the intention of this study was to find out whether bilingualism is a teaching aid while teaching and learning L2 and L1 does facilitate the learners, semi-structured interviews, questionnaires and classroom observations were used as the main research tools. It is incumbent on the researcher to clearly define the target population. There are no strict rules to follow, and the researcher must rely on logic and judgment. The population is defined in keeping with the objectives of the study. Sometimes, the entire population will be sufficiently small, and the researcher can include the entire population in the study. This type of research is called a census study because data is
gathered on every member of the population. Usually, the population is too large for the researcher to attempt to survey all of its members. A small, but carefully chosen sample can be used to represent the population. The sample reflects the characteristics of the population from which it is drawn.

The participants of this research work were 291 students studying Certificate and diploma Courses in English at National University of Modern Languages, H-9, Islamabad and King Abdul Aziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. The purpose and significance of selecting this institution is that it is the only established institution in Pakistan where English language skills are developed and polished. Presently, the researcher has been employed at King Abdul Aziz University to teach English Language. Hence, he is well aware of the situation at both places. Moreover, students from varied social and cultural backgrounds with diversity of interests and educational qualifications, come to develop English language skills. Therefore, as it has been observed by the researcher himself, that an English Language teacher who is to develop language skills, feels obliged and thinks it imperative to resort to bilingualism for communication, clarification and corrective purposes.

Thus, the participants who were part of this research were 291 students in particular, the researcher himself as a teacher, have been observing and experimenting with these situations. Moreover, along with these, ten teachers were selected from the same department who were engaged with EFL and teaching language skills to the abovementioned students. Their experience of EFL ranged from one year to twenty five years or above. This is significant in this respect that teachers with various EFL experience can display that they feel it imperative to resort to bilingualism while developing language skills amongst students. It might be argued that teachers with less experience of EFL proficiency may switch to mother-tongue more often than those who are well-experienced. Therefore, a diverse stratum of teachers with varied experience has been selected to argue that bilingualism is necessary to develop, strengthen and consolidate these language skills. This will be argued in detail at a later stage. Now, the various instruments employed in research are discussed over here.
3.8 Data Collection Instruments

A researcher requires data-gathering tools, which are suitable for the collection of relevant data. Since the intention of this study was to find out the perceptions and reactions towards the use of bilingualism as teaching aid, survey questionnaire was used as the main research tool. This survey questionnaire was designed around the research objectives and developed in consultation with the research supervisor. The questionnaire contained a combination of closed-ended questions with pre-determined responses and two short open-ended questions (see Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire).

A questionnaire is the main instrument in survey research, which consists of a number of open-ended and closed-ended questions usually printed and typed in a definite order and form. It may be defined as a systematic compiling of questions, which are submitted to a sampling population from whom the responses are elicited and are used for the study of research questions. It is a kind of written verbal stimulus and written verbal response. According to Bogdan and S. K. Biklen: 33 ‘a questionnaire is a list of questions sent to a number of persons for them to answer. It secures standardized results that can be tabulated and treated statistically.’ Barr, Davis and Johnson define questionnaire as a systematic compilation of questions that are submitted to a sampling of population from which information is desired. Lundberg says that, ‘fundamentally, the questionnaire is a set of stimuli to which literate people are exposed in order to observe their verbal behavior under these stimuli.’ Goode and Hatt are of the view that, “in general, the word questionnaire refers to a device for securing answers to questions by using a form which the respondent fills in himself.”

There were some general concerns over the level of comprehension and proficiency among the respondents and so the questionnaire was designed and arranged in such a manner so that the respondents would be required to do as little reading as possible. The questions were always read out to the respondents by the researcher himself or by the other trained research fellows. They had been briefed to be aware of situations where the respondents needed extra assistance.
3.8.1 Classroom Observations

Firstly, ten randomly selected Certificate and Diploma Classes were chosen for observation with ten teachers at both the places. These students, as described earlier were of different age groups, male and female (only at NUML) with varying educational background ranging from 15-26 years, with different social, cultural and linguistic backgrounds like that of Punjabi, Sindhi, Pashto, Kashmiri and Arabic, of course. And their educational qualification ranged from Higher Secondary School Certificate to Graduation from Pakistani Boards of Education and Universities. This is important and relevant that these students felt an urge to switch to bilingualism (because of Lingua Franca regarding their vernaculars) although their backgrounds were different in many respects.

Moreover, five teachers were picked up who were teaching different language skills like that of listening, speaking, reading and writing. This proved quite helpful in finding out that teachers using different language skills had to employ L1 while teaching EFL. It was recorded then, how frequently, and on what occasions L1 was used, by the teachers and when by the students. To obtain more authentic and solid classroom data, the teachers and students were not informed of the observation purpose beforehand, which otherwise would have proved difficult to obtain. These classroom observations were about 50 minutes’ duration.

3.8.2 Semi-Structured Interviews

The second technique employed was to conduct semi-structured interviews of the 10 teachers whose classes were observed. The purpose of this was to find the reasons why they had to switch to mother-tongue (L1) and preferred using it over English. These teachers, more or less, came up with almost the same kinds of reasons for justifying their use of L1 in an EFL class. The interviews of these various teachers were recorded and interpreted as well.
3.8.3 Questionnaires

The third method employed to collect the relevant data for the authenticity of the research was to distribute questionnaires. There were two different kinds of questionnaires. One was given to teachers and the other was given to the students. These both were designed to check and evaluate the attitudes and responses of both the classes. The questionnaire given to teachers was aimed at discovering their practice, of using bilingualism in the classroom, the need which presses them to use mother-tongue (L1) and lastly, their response as to what extent the use of mother-tongue (L1) was helpful in their teaching methods. Its purpose was also to get an idea how far teachers are conscious of or dependent on the use of bilingualism in their teaching learning methods. This technique helped a lot, especially to substantiate data with observation. In addition, it helped the researcher to get a firsthand knowledge of teachers’ awareness of this most serious subject.

The second questionnaire which was given to the students proved quite helpful and effective in many different ways. Firstly, it helped to know students’ reaction to the use of bilingualism in the class. Then it aimed to testify teachers’ data. And finally its purpose determined the use of bilingualism in the improvement of their language skills in L2 especially those areas in which they felt the use of bilingualism was effective.

Thus, questionnaires to students and teachers proved quite effective in gathering the data, to analyze and evaluate the results and lastly, to the correctness of the hypothesis. A total of 291 students participated in this activity selected randomly and 44 out of 50 teachers expressed their opinion who were selected from the milieu, who have been teaching language skills from the last 0-30 years. Thus newly inducted teachers and experienced language teachers were included in this research.

3.8.3.1 Characteristics of a Good Questionnaire

As with any research instrument, there are strengths and weaknesses contained in each of these tools. These will be explained and discussed in this section.
Questionnaires are very cost effective when compared to face-to-face interviews. This is especially true for studies involving large sample sizes and large geographic areas. Written questionnaires become even more cost effective as the number of research questions increases. Moreover, questionnaires are easy to analyze. Data entry and tabulation for nearly all surveys can be easily done with many computer software packages. Questionnaires are familiar to most people. Nearly everyone has had some experience completing questionnaires and they generally do not make people apprehensive. Questionnaires reduce bias. There is uniform question presentation and no middleman bias. The researcher's own opinions will not influence the respondent to answer questions in a certain manner. There are no verbal or visual clues to influence the respondent.

Questionnaires are also less intrusive than telephone or face-to-face surveys. When a respondent receives a questionnaire, he is free to complete the questionnaire in his own manner honestly. Unlike other research methods, the research instrument does not interrupt the respondent. Most problems with questionnaire analysis can be traced back to the design phase of the project. Well-defined goals are the best way to assure a good questionnaire design. When the goals of a study can be expressed in a few clear and concise sentences, the design of the questionnaire becomes considerably easier. The questionnaire is developed to directly address the goals of the study. In this part of the study the essential characteristic of questions are discussed as follows:

1. It evokes the truth, i.e. question must be non-threatening. When a respondent is concerned about the consequences of answering a question in a particular manner, there is a good possibility that the answer will not be truthful. Anonymous questionnaires that contain no identifying information are more likely to produce honest responses than those identifying the respondent. Therefore in the used questionnaire at the beginning the note was given that all the information that the respondent would give us will be treated in the strictest confidence. The answers will be combined with the results of all other respondents, so that no one will be able to trace the identity of the respondent.

2. Then a good question asks for an answer on only one dimension. The purpose of a survey is to find out information. A question that asks for a response on more than one dimension will not provide the information you are seeking. A good question asks
for only one “bit” of information. Thus, there are lots of questions that were asked but all these were clearly defined and precise.

3. It can accommodate all possible answers. Multiple-choice items are the most popular type of survey questions because they are generally the easiest for a respondent to answer and the easiest to analyze. Asking a question that does not accommodate all possible responses can confuse and frustrate the respondent. In the given questionnaire almost all the possible answers were detailed; however ‘any other’ option was also given which was to be specified.

4. It has mutually exclusive options. A good question leaves no ambiguity in the mind of the respondent. There should be only one correct or appropriate choice for the respondent to make. Worse than that, it could frustrate the respondent and the questionnaire might find its way to the trash.

5. A good question produces variability of responses. When a question produces no variability in responses, we are left with considerable uncertainty about why we asked the question and what we learned from the information. If a question does not produce variability in responses, it will not be possible to perform any statistical analyses on the item. Otherwise, very little information is learned. Design your questions so they are sensitive to differences between respondents.

6. It follows comfortably from the previous question. Writing a question is similar to writing anything else. Transitions between questions should be smooth. Grouping questions that are similar will make the questionnaire easier to complete, and the respondent will feel more comfortable. Question that jump from one unrelated topic to another feel disjointed and are not likely to produce high response rates.

7. A question should not presuppose a certain state of affairs. Among the subtlest mistakes in questionnaire design are questions that make an unwarranted assumption. One of the most common mistaken assumptions is that the respondent knows the correct answer to the question. It is important to look at each question and decide if all respondents will be able to answer it. Be careful not to assume anything. This has been looked at carefully so that the results of the survey are not thwarted.

8. It should also not imply a desired answer. The wording of a question is extremely important. Objectivity is a must in our surveys and, therefore, a researcher must be careful not to lead the respondent into giving the answer that he would like to receive. Leading questions are usually easily spotted because they use negative phraseology.
Therefore in the given questionnaire much care has been showered to avoid this kind of floppiness.

9. Emotionally loaded or vaguely defined words are avoided also. This is one of the areas overlooked by both beginners and experienced researchers. Quantifying adjectives (e.g., most, least, majority) are frequently used in questions. It is important to understand that these adjectives mean different things to different people; therefore it is necessary that these must be placed in ascending or descending order, which would help the respondents to come up with more accurate answers.

10. A standard question also does not ask the respondent to order or rank a series of more than five items. Questions asking respondents to rank items by importance should be avoided. This becomes increasingly difficult as the number of items increases, and the answers become less reliable. This becomes especially problematic when asking respondents to assign a percentage to a series of items. In order to successfully complete this task, the respondent must mentally continue to re-adjust his answers until they total one hundred percent. Limiting the number of items to five will make it easier for the respondent to answer. Thus in the given questionnaire only up to five categories have been used.

3.8.3.2 Problems with a Questionnaire

There are always some problems with a questionnaire, which has been tried to overcome in various ways as under:

1. One major disadvantage of written questionnaires is the possibility of low response rates. Low response is the curse of statistical analysis. It can dramatically lower our confidence in the results. Response rates vary widely from one questionnaire to another (10% - 90%); however, well-designed studies consistently produce high response rates. In the present study the response rate has been more than 95%.

2. Another disadvantage of questionnaires is the inability to probe responses. Questionnaires are structured instruments. They allow little flexibility to the respondent with respect to response format. In essence, they often lose the “flavor of the response” (i.e., respondents often want to qualify their answers). By allowing frequent space for comments, the researcher can partially overcome this disadvantage. Comments are among the most helpful of all the information on the questionnaire, and
they usually provide insightful information that would have otherwise been lost. This has been overcome by providing the respondents with open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire, which has helped in generating more responses.

3. Nearly ninety percent of all communication is visual. Gestures and other visual cues are not available with written questionnaires. The lack of personal contact will have different effects depending on the type of information being requested. A questionnaire requesting factual information will probably not be affected by the lack of personal contact. A questionnaire probing sensitive issues or attitudes may be severely affected. For this researcher own interaction with most of the respondents has provided him with much insightful views and a better understanding of the situation.

4. As a general rule, long questionnaires get less response than short questionnaires. However, some studies have shown that the length of a questionnaire does not necessarily affect response. More important than length is question content. A subject is more likely to respond if they are involved and interested in the research topic. Questions should be meaningful and interesting to the respondent. Items on a questionnaire should be grouped into logically coherent sections. Grouping questions that are similar will make the questionnaire easier to complete, and the respondent will feel more comfortable. Questions that use the same response formats, or those that cover a specific topic, should appear together. This has been followed more closely as it has been divided into different groups and sections with the similar content, which kept alive the interest of the researcher.

5. Each question should follow comfortably from the previous question. Writing a questionnaire is similar to writing anything else. Transitions between questions should be smooth. Questionnaires that jump from one unrelated topic to another feel disjointed and are not likely to produce high response rates. Most investigators have found that the order in which questions are presented can affect the way that people respond. One study reported that questions in the latter half of a questionnaire were more likely to be omitted, and contained fewer extreme responses. Some researchers have suggested that it may be necessary to present general questions before specific ones in order to avoid response contamination. Other researchers have reported that when specific questions were asked before general questions, respondents tended to exhibit greater interest in the general questions. This has been done with great care.
3.8.3.3 Validity of Research Instrument

Validity refers to the extent to which the results accurately reflect the reality of the respondents’ views and perceptions. Inaccuracies in a survey of this kind can occur because respondents may have forgotten some details of their experience, they may not have understood some of the questions, or some may have deliberately given false or misleading information. There is often in particular, a readiness to distrust respondents’ opinions.

A number of steps were taken to ensure the validity of the information we gathered. The questionnaire was pre-tested and piloted to ensure that the language was both appropriate and easy to understand. Respondents were also offered the option of being questioned in their native language, which almost all of the respondents availed. In addition, it was made clear to the respondents that their responses/answers shall be treated in strict confidentiality and shall have no legal or otherwise bearing over them. We will never know however, whether participants gave us their honest opinions, but this is probably as true in a survey of the general public as it is in a survey of the sample population selected.

As part of the preparation for the interviews, I was able to gain permission to observe a regular class for up to fifty minutes. This observation provided a rich and grounded context for questioning the teachers about their teaching practices and beliefs. The interview protocol was designed mindful of the fact that it is unlikely that all teachers would volunteer for a study which flagged its intentions as investigating the significance of bilingualism in EFL classrooms. The semi-structured interview was designed, and refined over time, to elicit first teachers’ views and reported practices in teaching EFL, and secondly aspects of their background which included language learning, education and professional development.

Questions were constructed about teaching practice and use of L1 in class which all teachers could answer. In the first half of the interview, the researcher elicited responses by using variety of questions from students as well as from teachers such as: “Is bilingualism a teaching aid in the classroom?” and “When do you think
bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?” followed by series of statements asking for the teachers’ and students’ approach to explain complex grammar points, to define some new vocabulary, to practice the use of some phrases and expressions, to explain difficult concepts or ideas, to give instructions etc. These aspects were chosen firstly because it was thought they may be revealing of meta linguistic awareness, and secondly, asking for specific instances related to one of these three topics was extremely generative of anecdotes about teaching which, as discussed below in the comparison with Woods34 study, are a useful way of finding out the role of L1 in EFL class. There followed a series of questions about the advantages and disadvantages of teaching English using bilingualism.

The first question in this section was: “How does bilingualism help as a teaching aid in the classroom?” Since the goal of the study was to find out whether bilingualism is a teaching aid and L1 facilitates learning L2. The interviews lasted between one and two hours, and were audio-recorded. They were structured in that the researcher worked from a list of questions but was highly flexible in permitting and indeed encouraging any digressions on the topics of language, language learning or personal experience in teaching, learning, or living in other cultures. When interviews were transcribed, it was common for there to be a whole page of teacher talk with only minimal responses from the interviewer. The advantage of this was that teachers’ knowledge and experience emerged reasonably spontaneously and the data obtained was both rich as well as varied. It is suggested that the data is therefore more likely to reflect teachers’ actual stances than responses more closely tied to questions, which may reflect what the teacher thinks is an “acceptable” answer. Sometimes discussion ranged in unplanned directions, which occasioned differential coverage of the planned questions, but resulted in natural, spontaneous data which reflected respondents’ own preoccupations rather than the researcher’s. It was recognized that underlying beliefs are not easy to elicit via direct questioning such as “do you believe?” or “what is your understanding of...?” As Woods35 points out, beliefs may not always be consciously accessible, and teachers may answer according to what they think they ought to, or would like to, believe. As he puts it:

When an assumption is articulated in the abstract as a response to an abstract question, there is a much greater chance that it will tend more
towards what is expected in the interview situation than what is actually held in the teaching situation and actually influences teaching practices. A belief articulated in the context of a ‘story’ about concrete events, behaviors and plans, is more likely to be grounded in actual behavior.

To this end, a range of questions were employed which were aimed at eliciting beliefs via accounts of actual classroom practice in a recent lesson, and eliciting anecdotes and narratives about the teachers’ language learning and language teaching experiences. So questions in different ways were formed and asked to collect the exact data.

### 3.8.3.4 Sampling

In order to make the process of data collection systematic, it is necessary to define the area that is included in a particular enquiry. In this section, the details of the sampling procedure adopted for the present study are given, which is divided into the universe and sample population.

### 3.9 Universe

The whole aggregate about which the research information is gathered is described as the universe. Encyclopedia Encarta defines the universe as, “the entire group of individuals or items from which a sample may be selected for statistical analysis.” The universe is the broad and vast group from which the researcher selects a sample. Wilson defines the term in these words that, “the entire group from which the sample is chosen is known as the universe.” The universe helps in controlling some of the intervening variables and brings homogeneity, which makes the observation more useful. The universe may be classified into:

(a) Definite and indefinite universe and
(b) Real and hypothetical universe.
The universe is said to be definite when the number of units falling within the universe can be established beyond any doubt. The people of a specific locality or district or city, for example, or students of a college or university, etc. when selected for some research work will form a definite universe, because in each case the number of units can be ascertained. When this number of units cannot be definitely learnt, the universe becomes indefinite. The number of listeners of a radio program, for instance, cannot be known for sure and hence would be called an indefinite universe. The universe is said to be real when the area or locality or group of people actually exists. When it is based on mere supposition, the universe is then called hypothetical. Hypothetical universe is not used in case of surveys but it has great value in statistical analysis. Most of the statistical generalizations are made from a purely hypothetical universe.

The universe for the present study was definite and real, which consisted of the students from NUML and KAAU. The respondents for the present study included male and female students and teachers belonging to these two different socio-linguistic and ethnic societies. The age group of the respondents varied from 15 to 25 years. The educational background ranged from higher secondary to graduation and among students and masters and PhD teachers. Within this universe, a sample population was drawn which has been detailed in the next section.

3.10 Population

It is both essential and imperative to select for sample population some individuals for securing relevant information rather than from each member included in the universe. It is because the numbers are usually large enough to fairly represent the universe and the population but also because it is seasonably easy and economical to handle in terms of its size, space and time available for the study. It is always incumbent on the researcher to clearly define the target population. There are usually no strict rules to follow, and the researcher may rely on logic and judgment. The population is defined in keeping with the objectives of the study. Sometimes, the entire population will be sufficiently small, and the researcher can include the entire population in the study. This type of research is called a census study because data is gathered on every
member of the population. Usually, the population is too large for the researcher to attempt to survey all of its members. A small, but carefully chosen sample can be used to represent the population. The sample reflects the characteristics of the population from which it is drawn.

The population of the study was the students and teachers of NUML and KAAU. The above-mentioned population comprises varied categories of socio-economic and educational backgrounds, age and income groups and the nature of nationality. It was hoped that a sample of 291 students and 44 teachers from this population would be fairly representative of the selected universe at large. Further division of this population into a fairly representative sample is detailed in the next part.

3.11 Sample

According to Goode and Hatt, “a sample is a smaller representation of the larger whole. The basic requirements for a sampling procedure are that it must be fairly representative and adequate as well.’ It may also be defined as ‘the true representative of the universe’, which had all the characteristics of the whole universe. It is a smaller representation of a large group. A sample contains primary sampling units and a slice of the population representing the universe. Every respondent who was available for the collection of information and whose responses are included in the study is the sampling unit. The purpose of sampling is to draw inferences concerning the universe. The procedure of selecting a sample differs according to the type of sample selected.

Sampling methods are classified as either probability or non-probability. In probability samples, each member of the population has a known non-zero probability of being selected. Probability methods include random sampling, systematic sampling, and stratified sampling. In non-probability sampling, members are selected from the population in some nonrandom manner. These include convenience sampling, judgment sampling, quota sampling, and snowball sampling. The advantage of probability sampling is that sampling error can be calculated. Sampling error is the degree to which a sample might differ from the population. When inferring to the population, results are reported plus or minus the sampling error. In non-probability
sampling, the degree to which the sample differs from the population remains unknown. Random sampling is the purest form of probability sampling. Each member of the population has an equal and known chance of being selected. When there are very large populations, it is often difficult or impossible to identify every member of the population, so the pool of available subjects becomes biased. Convenience sampling is used in exploratory research where the researcher is interested in getting an inexpensive approximation of the truth. As the name implies, the sample is selected because they are convenient. This non-probability method is often used during preliminary research efforts to get a gross estimate of the results, without incurring the cost or time required to select a random sample.

The sample for this study consisted of 300 students and 50 teachers selected from NUML and KAAU from Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. Thus each student and teacher served as a sampling unit for the study. Thus, from a total of 300 students 291 students answered questionnaires and out of 50 teachers only 44 responded with the answers; the data has been collected and analyzed. The sampling method used here is probability method with a combination of random and systematic sampling. Random sampling was used in the selection of population and systematic sampling technique was used in the selection of sample population. In the next part details are given about the collection of data.

3.12 Collection of Data

Here a detailed account is given about the way the data was collected by the researcher. This has been divided into pre-testing, selection of sites, date and time of data collection, response rate and field experience. These are explained separately as under:

3.12.1 Pre-Testing

The pre-testing was done in order to ensure the validity and accuracy of the interview schedule. Before collecting the field data interviewing schedule was pre-tested. Twenty interviews were conducted to pre-test the questions and semi-structured
interviews. Through this process, only the wording and arrangement of some of the questions was replaced to make the questionnaire more clear and accurate.

3.12.2 Date and Time of Data Collection

The major part of the fieldwork was conducted over a two years period. The researcher started collecting his data in NUML, Pakistan in January 2003 to March 2004. The second section of collecting data was conducted at KAAU, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia from November 2004 to June 2005. The collection of data was most difficult because of the extensity of the data. At times, it resulted in the non-availability or the unwillingness of the respondents. Therefore, time of data collection was adjusted for the convenience of both the teachers and students.

3.12.3 Response Rate

Since the objective of this research was to ascertain the aid and advantages of bilingualism in two different environments, therefore the focus has been on the students’ and teachers’ responses towards the issue. This is perhaps not surprising given that teachers and students reaction is often the most simple to access for research purposes. Research with students and teachers have generally shown high response rates of around 80% or higher, whereas studies where specific respondents are targeted have generally not succeeded in obtaining such high response rates. However, the few respondents are usually not necessarily representative of the whole population of people.

Researcher took a number of steps to encourage a high response rate among the teachers and students in both of the educational institutes. Respondents were briefed about the nature of the study and were informed about the confidentiality and privacy of the information they were to provide us before getting their responses. They were assured that nothing contained in the questionnaire would in any way be used or can be used to put them in any kind of trouble. They were given the choice of filling in the information themselves or by the researcher. The information sheets were available in English only. These initiatives contributed a lot to the achievement of a good response
rate, which was around 70-80%. The response rate was much higher in NUML, Islamabad but was lower in KAAU, Jeddah.

3.12.4 Field Experience

The researcher came across many experiences during interview, as it was a tedious job. The researcher spent almost two years in data collection and in the analysis of the data about a year. This proved quite helpful because of the natural personal interest and the experience of teaching young learners in a variety of contexts. Majority of the respondents were very cooperative, when they understood the importance of the research. The researcher tried his best to create a friendly air. Some respondents extended incomplete information about various variables. Some were very discouraging while a majority appreciated and extended their every possible help. It was therefore quite an educating life-long experience. The respondents were afraid of the information collected from them, that it might be used against them. The researcher ensured the respondents that the information collected from them will be kept confidential and be used for research purposes alone.

However any research about personal and professional experience and competence must be difficult because of its nature. In two or three cases residents demanded permission from universities authorities for providing the relevant information. It was ascertained that the people were living in an environment of insecurity and fear, in general. However, overall this proved to be a learning experience for the researcher from many different reasons.

3.13 Data Analysis

After data collection, tally sheets were prepared and data was further analyzed and interpreted. The data consisted of both quantitative and qualitative questionnaire with 291 students and 44 teachers. Respondents provided the information using standard closed and open-ended questions about their perception and reaction towards bilingualism. Responses to the closed-ended questions were loaded into an Excel spreadsheet, and frequency tables and cross tabulations were produced. Ten percent of
all questionnaire responses were verified to ensure that the data had been entered correctly.

Most of the findings that are reported in the body of the text are statistically significant. In some cases, findings, which are not significant, are reported, because they approximate significance and warrant further investigation.

The sample was not sufficiently large to undertake significance tests where the variable had more than two categories; this was the case with age, education level and income status. Therefore categories were collapsed into dichotomous variables to ensure sufficient sample size. In this part the data analysis techniques are given, which include a description of variables and statistical techniques.

3.13.1 Statistical Techniques

Percentages have been utilized for making comparison of various responses. Percentages were worked out by using the following formula:

\[ P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100 \]

Where

- \( P \) = Percentage
- \( F \) = Absolute frequency
- \( N \) = Total number of items

For the present study, the research has relied a lot on the Statistical Program for Social Sciences, briefly referred as SPSS and Microsoft Excel. Its introduction and working has been explained in the next section under.

This program allows you to analyze and describe data. It comes in several varieties:

a. for use on large mainframe computers
b. for use on personal computers in a text only environment
c. for Windows for use on personal computers in a Windows environment
The version that this document explains is SPSS for Windows (Version 13). All SPSS packages perform essentially the same range of statistical functions. The advantages of this program are:

1. entering and editing data are easier
2. larger data sets can be used
3. professional looking reports and graphs can be produced

This program works by taking a series of commands, supplied by you, and applying them to a set of data, also supplied by you. It will produce an output displaying the results of the commands. The commands you supply SPSS will determine what output results. There are a number of terms used to describe your data set in SPSS. The first term is Case. Cases are the people who participate in a survey or experiment, or the individual objects you are measuring. For instance, if you were performing an ecological survey of rivers, then the cases would be individual rivers. The second term is Variable. Variables are the different items of information you collect for your cases.

This program has a number of advantages and disadvantages which have been briefly explained for the purposes of clarity and functionality. Firstly, advantages of the program are given that:

1. Non-text data does not need to be entered by hand. Much time and tedious error-prone effort can be saved.
2. This program creates an Excel spreadsheet from scanned responses, including variable names and labels and missing values. It can do simple analysis on the data and give nice graphs.
3. It is easy to import the Excel spreadsheet into SPSS.
3.13.2 Four Scales of Measurement

There are four scales of measurement to which psychologists refer. Each variable which you choose will fall into one of the following four types (also known as levels of measurement).

1. **Nominal or Categorical** This type of data places cases into named categories - such as “male” or “female”; “smoker” or “non-smoker” etc.

2. **Ordinal or Ranked** This type of data tells us how the values of a particular variable are ranked from the smallest to the largest. For example, 1st, 2nd or 3rd place in a sprint-race. This information is less detailed than that of interval data in that it does not tell us how much longer the second person took compared to the first. Non-parametric tests such as Spearman’s Rank Correlation, the Mann-Whitney U, and the Wilcoxon T test are suitable for ranking data.

3. **Interval or Equal-Interval Measurement** This type of data measures in units of equal size. For example, when measuring in centimeters, there is clearly an interval of one unit between the measures 0 cm, 1 cm, 2 cm etc. The same is the case for other standard physical measurements such as temperature. Parametric tests, such as Pearson’s R, Independent and Paired t tests, ANOVA, are suitable for data which is at the level of interval data or above.

4. **Ratio** This type of data is the same as the Interval level of measurement in that it measures in units of equal size. The only difference is that Ratio data has an absolute zero value. For example, most physical measurements, such as length, or weight, this is the case. To know whether your data is ratio data or not, you should be able to say that 20 units of your scale is equivalent to 2 x 10 units of the scale. e.g. a length of 20m is exactly twice that of 10m. Temperature measure in degrees Celsius, or Fahrenheit, is one example of a scale which does not have an absolute 0. The zero point on this scale does not correspond to the lowest temperature that it is possible to have.
3.13.3 Entering and Defining Data

One needs to know how to enter data, define variables, and label variables after getting into the statistical program. You will always need to go through these three stages before you begin to perform your statistical analyses. This part also introduces a small and simple data set (happiness ratings for six people) to familiarize you with the basics of data, defining variables and labeling them.

This program as a general rule cannot process any information that is not in a numeric format. This means that any textual information must be converted into numeric format. To do this we must use a coding scheme. Imagine you have a questionnaire that records whether the subject is male or female. This is a nominal variable. You cannot type the words “male” and “female” into SPSS, so we must use a coding scheme. In this case we might use the number “1” to represent “male” and “2” to represent “female”. Similarly, if we have a four point scale:

a. Strongly Disagree  b. Disagree  c. Agree  d. Strongly Agree

We could use the following coding scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would use the numbers 1 to 4 to represent the four point scale in SPSS. It’s worthwhile thinking about which variables you are going to use and how you are going to represent them in SPSS before you finish your questionnaire or collect your data.

3.13.4 Numerical Values and Labeling Variables

Before you begin to type in the numerical values of your data set, it is always a good idea to define (i.e. name) the variable headings first. You should get into the habit of doing so. In this case, you want the first column to have the heading “id”; the second to have the heading “gender”, and the third to be have the heading “happy”.

As we noted earlier, the variables “gender” and “happy” are coded variables. We need to tell the computer that for the variable “gender” the values “1” and “2” represent
“male” and “female”; while for the variable “happy” the values “1”, “2” and “3” represent “happy”, “neither happy nor unhappy” and “unhappy” respectively.

If the simplest of studies is being carried out, you will rarely collect your raw data in a form which is immediately suitable for analysis. You will often need to derive new, and more meaningful, variables. You may also want to analyze certain sub-samples of your data. The commands compute, recode and select cases will allow you to do each of these things, giving you much greater flexibility in manipulating your data after it has been entered into SPSS.

The “compute” command allows you to create new variables which are derived from existing variables in your data file. It uses mathematical operators and functions some of which are described in more detail in the example below. This command is used to reclassify or condense your data into another set or subset of values. It is useful if you have a large range of values but you only need to classify the information into a small number of categories.

3.13.5 Selecting Cases

Sometimes when performing an analysis on your data you may not want to include all the cases in your data set. For instance, you may only want to include subjects under a specific age or only those people who answered “yes” to a certain question in your survey. To select a subset of data you would use the “Select Cases” command.

This program may have some disadvantages, which have briefly been mentioned below:

1. Surveys must be designed to meet the needs. This takes time and testing.
2. Surveys of more than one page must have each page treated as a separate survey. Many booklets cannot be scanned appropriately.
3. Text data must still be entered by hand.
4. Some kinds of marks cannot be identified.
5. Completed surveys must be returned in a condition good for scanning.
3.14 Conceptualization

Every word has specific meaning. When we listen or read any word like educated, socialization, victimization etc. its meaning which may be manifold and the concept which may carry a lot of related associated ideas, which is related to this word, comes into our mind. This requires clarification by the researcher, that in what manner and with what kind of association he uses it. A concept may be described as, ‘a short representation of a variety of facts.’ Concepts are the abstraction used by the scientists as building blocks for the development of propositions and theories, which explain and predict the social phenomena. In this section of the study some operative definitions for the present research study have been given which will be helpful in the clarification of various concepts.

Bilingualism: Being able to communicate effectively in two or more languages, with more or less the same degree of proficiency.

Communicative Competence: The ability to use the language effectively for communication. Gaining such competence involves acquiring both sociolinguistic and linguistic knowledge (or, in other words, developing the ability to use the language accurately, appropriately, and effectively).

Communicative Language Teaching: An approach concerned with the needs of students to communicate outside the classroom; teaching techniques reflect this in the choice of language content and materials, with emphasis on role play, pair and group work etc.

Feedback: The response learners get when they attempt to communicate. This can involve correction, acknowledgement, requests for clarification, backchannel cues (e.g. “Mmm”). Feedback plays an important role in helping learners to test their ideas about the target language.

Foreign Language: A language which is not normally used for communication in a particular society. Thus English is a foreign language in KSA and Spanish is a foreign language in Germany.
**Grammar-Translation:** A method based upon memorizing the rules and logic of a language and the practice of translation. Traditionally, the means by which Latin and Greek have been taught.

**L1:** The mother tongue.

**L2:** A term used to refer to both foreign and second languages.

**Language Awareness:** Approaches to teaching language which emphasize the value of helping learners to focus attention on features of language in use. Most such approaches emphasize the importance of learners gradually developing their own awareness of how the language is used through discoveries which they make themselves.

**Language Data:** Instances of language use which are used to provide information about how the language is used. Thus a corpus can be said to consist of language data.

**Language Laboratory:** A room equipped with headphones and booths to enable students to listen to a language teaching program, while being monitored from a central console. Labs may be Audio-Active (AA), where students listen and respond to a tape, or Audio-Active-Comparative (AAC), where they may record their own responses and compare these with a model on the master tape.

**Language Minority:** a student who comes from a home in which a language other than English is primarily spoken; the student may or may not speak English well

**Language Practice:** Activities which involve repetition of the same language point or skill in an environment which is controlled by the framework of the activity. The purpose for language production and the language to be produced are usually predetermined by the task of the teacher. The intention is not to use the language for communication but to strengthen, through successful repetition, the ability to manipulate a particular language form or function. Thus getting all the students in a class who already know each other repeatedly to ask each other their names would be a practice activity.
**Language Proficiency:** the level of competence at which an individual is able to use language for both basic communicative tasks and academic purposes.

**Language Use:** Activities which involve the production of language in order to communicate. The purpose of the activity might be predetermined but the language which is used is determined by the learners. Thus getting a new class of learners to walk round and introduce themselves to each other would be a language use activity; and so would get them to complete a story.

**Language Variety:** variations of a language used by particular groups of people, includes regional dialects characterized by distinct vocabularies, speech patterns, grammatical features, and so forth; may also vary by social group (sociolect) or idiosyncratically for a particular individual (idiolect).

**Lexical Item:** An item of vocabulary which has a single element of meaning. It may be a compound or phrase: bookcase, post office, put up with. Some single words may initiate several lexical items; e.g. letter: a letter of the alphabet / posting a letter.

**Linguistic Competence:** a broad term used to describe the totality of a given individual’s language ability; the underlying language system believed to exist as inferred from an individual’s language performance.

**Multilingualism:** ability to speak more than two languages; proficiency in many languages.

**Native Language:** primary or first language spoken by an individual.

**Natural Approach:** Pioneered by Krashen, this approach combines acquisition and learning as a means of facilitating language development in adults.

**Second Language:** The term is used to refer to a language which is not a mother tongue but which is used for certain communicative functions in a society. Thus English is a second language in Nigeria, Sri Lanka and Singapore. French is a second language in Senegal, Cameroon and Tahiti.
SLA: This is an abbreviation for Second Language Acquisition and is normally used to refer to research and theory related to the learning of second and foreign languages.

Target Language: This is the language that the learner is attempting to learn. It comprises the native speaker's grammar.

Variability: Language learners vary in the use they make of their linguistic knowledge. This can be systematic or unsystematic.

3.15 Summary

This study set out to contribute to the growing body of research on bilingualism as a teaching aid by considering the contribution of language teaching learning experience of the EFL teachers and L2 learners. The study used a qualitative, interpretive approach which was suited to uncovering unanticipated issues.

Data was gathered by using three main tools: classroom observations, questionnaires and semi-structured interviews provided a wide range of language backgrounds to analyze, in accordance with Kouritzin’s notion of “representivity”.

The researcher’s “credibility” was established via his “member’s competence” and the “verifiability” of the data by the open-ended nature of the interviews and the lack of a marked power differential. The “credibility” or “confirmability” of the data was established by the careful development of the instruments and by the iterative and rigorous approach to data analysis. The aim was to develop understanding so that “the decisions made and the conclusions reached are justifiable in their own contexts”. In this sense, it can be claimed that, for the teachers studied, the researcher has a “warrant” for the findings, and these are discussed in the next part of the chapter.
Works Cited


8 Ibid

9 Ibid


20 Ibid


42 Ibid
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA COLLECTION AND DATA ANALYSIS

In this chapter the researcher has tried to present the data collected, concerning the research topic. The data has been collected through classroom observations, questionnaires for students and teachers and lastly semi-structured interviews. Moreover, the researcher has represented his research through the presentation of tables, bar graphs and statistical annexations.

To collect the data relevant to the present study, the researcher observed the classes of Certificate and Diploma Courses in the morning and evening sessions at National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan. In the second part of this comparative study, the researcher collected data from English Language Proficiency Courses at GRC 111 (Certificate/Level-1) and GRC 112 (Diploma/Level-2) levels at JCC in King Abdul Aziz University, Jeddah, KSA. It has been done in order to ascertain this specific area as the pivot of bilingualism as teaching aid and hence linchpin of his research. The classroom observations were made during the academic semester, as has been detailed in the previous chapter.

The purpose of this chapter is to detail and evaluate the results, which were gathered through different strategies employed. The results have displayed a general tendency towards bilingualism in the classes employed by the teachers and the students as well. On the basis of these results, the researcher has aimed to testify his hypothesis as well as to make further recommendations (which shall be furthered in the next chapter) for the use of bilingualism in English language classes. Professionals in this field have already argued it that language acquisition L2 desperately needs the role of L1 in EFL classrooms, especially in the teaching of monolingual class. Here, I have discussed the results obtained through various sources separately.
4.1 Classroom Observations

In this section of data collection, the classes were observed by the researcher himself at certificate and diploma levels at NUML and KAAU for about a month. These classroom observations are teacher specific, for which each teacher’s class was observed three times in a week. These ten items were identified before the start of the classes and their frequency has been detailed and discussed here. To explain the results in an easy and understandable way, I have used the detailed explanation of tables and narratives.

4.1.1 Classroom Observations at NUML, Pakistan

Firstly, I observed classes at NUML, the results of which are given below:

Table 4.1

Classroom Observation Result (NUML)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. N0</th>
<th>Occasions on which L1 was used</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Giving Instructions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Defining New Vocabulary Items</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Explaining Idioms and Proverbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Explaining Colloquial Expressions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Explaining Prepositional Phrases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Explaining Slang and Taboo Words</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Explaining Grammatical Rules</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Explaining Complex Ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Creating Fun in Language Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Giving Suggestions to Learn Effectively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 4.1 firstly, shows the number of occasions on which L1 was used in five 45 minutes classes for various purposes. The table displays clearly that L1 has been resorted on by all the five teachers for various purposes, like that of giving instructions, defining new vocabulary items, explaining idioms and proverbs, explaining colloquial expressions, explaining prepositional phrases, explaining slang and taboo words, complex grammatical rules, explaining complex ideas, creating fun in language class, and giving suggestions to learn effectively.

In all, that there is a positive, although inhibited use of L1 in the class. The main use of L1 was employed when explaining the meaning of words for the correct/exact nature of things. These results are reflected in the fig 4.1 below as well. These will be discussed separately.

**Figure 4.1**

---

![Classroom Observation Result (NUML)](image-url)
Class 1

The first teacher (T1) used L1 in the class for giving instructions to the students for three times. This teacher had studied in Governmental educational colleges and schools where English is taught through GTM method for some years, therefore feels comfortable while employing L1 in the class. His reason is that language teaching must not always be communicative oriented. While defining new vocabulary items, he had resorted to L1 for four times. While explaining idioms and proverbs, the teacher used L1 only once. Probably the reason had been that he used less phrasal language and used plain English more. The teacher did not at all use L1 when he was explaining colloquial expressions, prepositional phrases and slang and taboo words. However, he did employ L1 three times while explaining complex grammar rules and when he was trying to create fun in the class.

Similarly, when he was to explain complex ideas or at the end of the lecture he was offering suggestions to the students about the use of English effectively, he made use of English once a while. All these proved quite effective, when judged from students’ point of views. They not only understood and grasped the ideas effectively but also enjoyed it when they found their L1 equivalents. Moreover, at times it appeared that the teacher was a little perplexed or got entangled in complex situations; therefore the use of Urdu became almost unavoidable.

Class 2

The second teacher (T2) used L1 in the class comparatively less than his counterparts were doing in other situations. It was because he was foreign qualified and had stayed and taught in England for good five years. His perception, training and experience gave him a different sort of understanding. Although he was much popular and liked by his students (this idea was formed by the researcher himself as students got over-excited when he got to the class). In spite of this his students also regarded him a little difficult because of his accent and fluency. He used L1 only once each time while giving instructions to the students, defining new vocabulary items, explaining idioms
and proverbs, explaining colloquial expressions, prepositional phrases and slang and taboo words. However, he did employ L1 twice while explaining complex grammar rules. However when he was trying to create fun in the class, he resorted to L1 and Punjabi jokes four times, maximum of all. He did not introduce any complex ideas, therefore no L1 was used. At the end of the lecture he was offering suggestions to the students about using English effectively, he made use of English and only occasionally used L1. All these proved quite effective, although teacher’s own philosophy betrayed his practice in the class. Therefore it is more suitable to say that bilingualism is carried own by the teachers, but not accepted or acknowledged by them.

Class 3

The third teacher (T3) was found to be more at ease and comfortable using L1 and other local languages in his class, because he was equally proficient in three local languages of Pakistan. His experience and learning has made him assert that GTM is more helpful or knowledge of languages comes only when one can study and learn these comparatively. Therefore he would not only welcome but himself would profusely use in the class. T3 used L1 in the class for giving instructions to the students for one time only.

While explaining idioms and proverbs, the teacher used L1 and other languages three times. Probably the reason had been that he used more phrasal language and used plain English less. The teacher used L1 twice when he was explaining colloquial expressions and prepositional phrases. He did not use any slang and taboo words in the class; therefore no exchange of language was made. However, he did employ L1 once while explaining complex grammar rules but when he was trying to create fun in the class he used L1 four times. When he was to offer suggestions to the students about the use of English effectively, he did not make use of English at all.

All this appeared to work when judged from students’ point of view. They not only understood and grasped the ideas effectively but also enjoyed it when they formed their L1 equivalents.
Class 4

The fourth teacher (T4) was the younger most from the rest of his colleagues. Although he did not appear to be more confident and proficient, yet he appeared prepared for the class. Observation showed that he had prepared his lecture quite minutely and was more bookish, therefore asserting the communicative technique. However when he had to present his lecture, he got seriously lost in linguistic quagmires, therefore resorting to L1 many times in different situations. He did not use L1 in the class for giving instructions to the students. While defining new vocabulary items, he used three times L1 to convey exactly the word and its connotations to the students. In explaining idioms and proverbs, and colloquial expressions twice he referred to L1 of the students. No L1 was used in presenting prepositional phrases and slang and taboo words in the class. However, he did employ L1 three times. While explaining complex grammar rules he resorted to L1 once. But when he was trying to create fun in the class, he used L1 four times. When he was to offer suggestions to the students about the use of English effectively, he used it not at all.

All these appeared to be more convincing, because one of the claims that advocates of language learners have been making is that it aids only when it is used judiciously. When it is employed unnecessarily and inappropriately, it creates problems more. Thus the use of L1 by this teacher was according to the claims made by the researcher himself and testified to the propositions.

Class 5

The fifth teacher (T5) has been teaching English for the last three years, although a well-read person, yet quite open to learning and flexible. His teaching techniques were more attractive as students had a lot of respect for his calculated and considerate attitude. His experience and learning has made him assert that communicative technique is more helpful or knowledge of languages comes only when one can study and learn these by using it more proficiently. Therefore, he would not only welcome but himself would profusely use in the class. He used L1 in the class for giving instructions to the students twice. In defining new vocabulary items, explaining
idioms and proverbs and giving colloquial expressions he used L1 only once in each situation. The obvious reason had been that he used more Standard English. The teacher used L1 twice when he was explaining prepositional phrases, but he used once L1 when explaining slang and taboo words in the class. However, he did employ L1 one times while explaining complex grammar rules but when he was trying to create fun in the class he used L1 two times. When he was to offer suggestions to the students about the use of English effectively, he used L1 twice in the class.

The important thing to stress here, is that during the lecture, it seemed quite natural and the need of the situation felt by both teachers and the students alike to consolidate their learning and knowledge of English language to be communicated at least once in L1 with its equivalents, therefore it could not be taken as failure or incompetence on the part of teachers.

Moreover, it needs to be stressed that the teachers whose classes were observed, were experienced, well-qualified and matured in their language skills. Therefore, their practice and experience testify the validity of the hypothesis.

### 4.1.2 Classroom Observation at KAAU, Saudi Arabia

It is an established practice in KSA that their local and foreign teachers, who had either Arabic or other languages, would extensively use Arabic. Both teachers and students were at ease in the use of L1 and no one wonders or feels disturbed in its use. The table given below shows the number of occasions on which L1 was used in five 50 minutes classes for different purposes.

The table displays clearly that L1 has been resorted on by all the five teachers in variety of situations, like that of giving instructions, defining new vocabulary items, explaining idioms and proverbs, explaining colloquial expressions, explaining prepositional phrases, explaining slang and taboo words, complex grammatical rules, explaining complex ideas, creating fun in language class, and giving suggestions to learn effectively.
In all that there is a positive, although inhibited use of L1 in the class. The main use of L1 was employed when explaining the meaning of words for the correct/exact nature of things. These shall be discussed separately.

Table 4.2

Classroom Observation Result (KAAU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Occasions on which L1 was used</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Giving Instructions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Defining New Vocabulary Items</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Explaining Idioms and Proverbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Explaining Colloquial Expressions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Explaining Prepositional Phrases</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Explaining Slang and Taboo Words</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Explaining Grammatical Rules</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Explaining Complex Ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Creating Fun in Language Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Giving Suggestions to Learn Effectively</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class 6

The first teacher from KAAU (T6) used L1 in the class for giving instructions to the students for at least three times. On this occasion, surprisingly, he first gave instructions in English, then in L1 and again switched to the target language. However, while defining new vocabulary items, he had to resort to L1 at least two times. He again made use of the L1 when he explained idioms and proverbs or when he explained prepositional phrases. To explain colloquial expressions and slang and taboo words, the teacher had to resort to L1 twice. In explaining grammatical rules he
had to resort to L1 for about three times. While explaining the complex ideas like “Greed is a Curse” once the teacher had to translate it in L1. He employed L1 while creating fun in the class three times and while giving suggestions he used L1 twice. All these proved quite effective judging from students’ responses. They not only understood and grasped the ideas effectively but also enjoyed it when they formed their L1 equivalents. This is a sort of universal practice in KSA for teaching English language. Otherwise a teacher may encounter the problems of handling a class well if he does not make things easy for the learners. Moreover, because of the monolingual nature of the society, the teacher feels impelled to resort to L1, because they do not have a flare of learning new languages.

Figure 4.2

Class 7

The second teacher from KAAU (T7) was from the United States and has been teaching English for more than sixteen years. He had a PhD degree from USA and
also had the experience of teaching English in USA, Canada and many Arab countries. He had been in Saudi Arabia for about ten years and was quite proficient in the use of Arabic. Although in his early forties he was fairly experienced from the rest of his colleagues. He used Arabic twice in the class for giving instructions to the students. While defining new vocabulary items and explaining idioms and proverbs, he used L1 once to convey the meaning of the word and its connotations to the students. In explaining colloquial expressions he referred to LI of the students twice, but in presenting prepositional phrases and slang and taboo words in the class, he had to move to L1 three times. While explaining complex grammar rules he resorted to L1 twice. But when he was trying to create fun in the class he used L1 three times. When he was to offer suggestions to the students about the use of English effectively and in explaining complex ideas, he used it once. All these appeared to be natural, because one of the claims that the advocates of language learners had been making was that it aids only when it is used judiciously. When it is employed unnecessarily and inappropriately, it creates problems more. Thus the use of L1 by this teacher was according to the claims made by the researcher himself and testified to the propositions. To him, only English may lead to disturbance for the language learning activity.

Class 8

The third teacher from KAAU (T8) was fairly less experienced from the rest of his colleagues, but was himself a foreigner. His mother tongue was Arabic. Although he did not appear to be more confident and well-prepared, yet he was liked among students because of his communicative attitude. He started by using Arabic in the first part of the lecture and used it in the class for giving instructions to the students twice. While defining new vocabulary items, he used three times. However, he did not use any idiomatic expression in the class, therefore no L1 in explaining idioms and proverbs, in presenting colloquial expressions and prepositional phrases, he resorted to it only once. He used four times slang and taboo words in the class and on each occasion he found an L1 expression to better explain the exact nature of the words. This was the major reason that students liked him, and every time he used and explained such words, all of them unanimously clapped and praised him. However, he
did not employ L1 while explaining complex grammar rules. But when he was trying to create fun in the class he used L1 four times. When he was to offer suggestions to the students about the use of English effectively, he used it once. Thus the use of L1 was commonly observed in their classes and the students openly and vociferously spoke in the favor of it. It was however not a one way traffic but that students liked it and at times asked for Arabic words and expressions or demanded the translation of particular parts of L2. Otherwise they would try to find the words in the Arabic-English dictionaries, which they often carry with them.

Class 9

The fourth teacher from KAAU (T9) was a young fellow who had come from Pakistan recently, however he had started learning Arabic from his colleagues and students. Because of the similarity of Arabic- Urdu script, most of the Arabic words are familiar to Urdu speaking population. Therefore it is comparatively easier to learn. This young colleague was more organized and was carrying his note book always with him, where he had written Arabic words, expressions to be conveyed to students when needed, although he asserted the communicative technique. He employed L1 in the class for giving instructions to the students three times at the start of the class. While defining new vocabulary items and in explaining idioms and proverbs, he used L1 twice to convey exactly the word and its connotations to the students. In explaining colloquial expressions he referred three times to LI of the students. Twice again L1 was used in presenting prepositional phrases and once while presenting slang and taboo words in the class. He employed L1 two times in explaining complex grammar rules. He again fell back upon the use of L1 once when he tried to explain complex ideas and when he was trying to create fun in the class. When he was to offer suggestions to the students about the use of English effectively, he used it again twice. This class observation again was fraught with the use of L1 in the class, emphasizing the current use of bilingualism in the class.

Class 10

The fifth and the last teacher from KAAU (T10) was a Saudi national who was comparatively less used to bilingualism in the class, although he did use it on several
occasions in the class. He started using L1 for giving instructions and defining new vocabulary items to the students. In explaining idioms and proverbs, he moved on to Arabic words once, in giving colloquial expressions twice he referred to L1 of the students. One time each, L1 was used in presenting prepositional phrases, and slang and taboo words, complex ideas and grammatical rules in the class. However, he did not employ L1 when he was trying to create fun in the class. When he was to offer suggestions to the students about the use of English effectively, he used it once again for one time. All these situations and occasions point to the fact that the teaching of English as a foreign language is faulty if not assisted by L1. Therefore it can be safely argued that the use of L1 by this teacher was indispensable. This is acknowledged and favored by language teachers continuously and is according to the claims made by the researcher himself.

Thus, it could be concluded that teachers although used communicative techniques and not the usual Grammar Translation Method, resorted to the use of L1 for better communication and consolidation of the language skills. Especially in the situations when abstract or ultimately specific words or explanations would ask for these. All of the above teachers first attempted to explain the words, grammatical points and meanings of complex ideas in English, but resorted to Arabic, when they felt and thought the students did not or could not understand their English explanation. At two or three occasions, it was the demand of the students’ themselves to the teachers to explain the difficult and complex points in their mother tongue. As referred earlier that the fifth teacher (T10) used Arabic frequently to give instructions. In the first five or six instances, the teacher used Arabic only after first giving instructions in English, apparently to ensure that every student was clear about what was said. Because it was last class of the day, the teacher used Arabic instructions alone on two occasions to hold the students’ attention and make them follow him. This way, he was able to control class and maintain the disciplined teaching learning process. More or less same was the case with other students learning English in various parts of the world.

To conclude, it can be emphasized that the results from classroom observations indicate and refer to the point that L1 (Urdu/Arabic) is used on occasions when English instructions, words and explanations fail to work; hence the L1 plays a supportive and facilitating role in the class, without which the language teaching
process can not be made effective and purposeful in the first place and secondly, it can not be strengthened and consolidated well to the learners. Hence the need and use of L1 in the language classes is a facility for the learners at certificate level.

4.2 Semi Structured Interviews

After classroom observations, the five teachers from NUML, Islamabad and five from King Abdul Aziz University whose classes had been observed were interviewed about their occasional use of L1 (Urdu in case of Pakistan and Arabic in KSA) in the classroom and how they viewed the common criticism that using L1 (Urdu/Arabic) reduces the students’ exposure to English. The important point, that during classroom observations, teachers and students were not informed in advance about the research. This point helped the researcher to conduct his research in an objective manner. Moreover, the authenticity and validity of research was ensured through this. Students and teachers were not conscious of their use of L1 (Urdu/Arabic) in the class. Unlike Pakistani teachers and students, it is worth mentioning that Arab learners expressed their concern bravely and without reluctance; teachers shared their feelings and experiences very frankly. After this when they were interviewed, they were able to rationalize and justify their use of L1, which was observed. Their interviews have been analyzed and discussed hereunder (see the appendix “D” for the interview scripts):

4.2.1 Interviews of Teachers from NUML

In this section, the researcher interviewed, five teachers from NUML. Below is given the detailed summary and discussion on the views of these teachers as recorded by the researcher (see appendix “D” for interview script).

4.2.1.1 Teacher 1

This teacher has the experience of teacher English at all levels from certificate, diploma, and advanced diploma to the masters’ level. He has been supervising research for the last five years. His experience of teaching English includes both the
language and the literature. His research and analytical skills are well-admitted in Pakistan and abroad where he has been presenting papers on the teaching of English language. He has also been the member of higher education commission for designing syllabi for Pakistani students at college and university levels.

4.2.1.2 Discussion and Analysis

From this interview it can be safely argued that for over the years teachers have been employing bilingualism for a variety of purposes, therefore its importance cannot be simply over-emphasized or overlooked. It has been one of the most effective ways of not only developing an understanding of the language but also as a major facilitator. As has been asserted by the teacher himself that bilingualism can help in understanding a situation it serves as a facilitator both to the teacher as well as to the student. In our previous sections it was observed that during a language class, at times teacher feels impelled to use L1. It is, thus, a backbone of language teaching. At another place the experienced teacher with reference to the learning of L2 that it improves one's comprehension; it helps opening new horizons/windows for the learner through L1 also. Therefore, it is not simply learning a new language; it leads to the opening of a new window for the learner. For the need of using bilingualism he stresses that it is necessary to establish a rapport between the teacher and the student which is not possible without bilingualism. Thus in language learning process the most significant issue that has been observed is that teacher-student relationship must be based upon understanding and cordiality, otherwise learning a new language remains a dream only. This rapport that the teacher has emphasized leads to the confidence in the learner that he can learn a new language, otherwise it would lead to least-effective of all processes.

4.2.1.3 Teacher 2

Although young, yet this teacher has the experience of teaching English in Saudi Arabia. He found that it would be very difficult if language teacher does not share the linguistic background or the language of the learners. He has done his masters in English language and linguistics and is presently writing a research paper for the
partial fulfillment of the degree of teaching of English as a foreign language. His total teaching experience is not more than 5 years but he has earned a good repute from his students for being a competent and effective language teacher.

4.2.1.4 Discussion and Analysis

The second teacher was quite vocal advocating the case for bilingualism as a teaching aid. The level he stressed was beginners’ class at which the use of L1 can not be eliminated at all. The reason he gave for his assertion was that the instructions should be very clear and unambiguous. Moreover other researchers in the field of bilingualism have been arguing that bilingualism saves time and minimizes confusion, similar is the argument presented by the teacher from his practical experience of teaching a second language. It is also to be understood that this teacher has taught two different linguistic communities i.e. Pakistanis and Saudis. The teacher has chosen different words from Arabic to support his line of argument like جمیل and سیارہ. At the same time he felt no inhibition to admit that not all the vocabulary items can be taught through the direct or audio-lingual or any other method. So, when the other methods fail or impede the process, the use of L1 can be very handy. Lastly, the teacher denounced excessive use of L1 which can mar the fluency of the learners. Their continuous and constant switching over to L1 may even be disruptive regarding fluency. Therefore, it should be used sparingly. Thus judicious use of bilingualism is emphasized by him which is the main argument of the present research study.

4.2.1.5 Teacher 3

The third teacher had a varied experience of teaching English language in different colleges and the universities of Pakistan and abroad. He is a renowned linguist of Pakistan who had the honor of being the student of David Crystal, the world’s renowned linguist and research scholar. Moreover, he has not only been teaching language but literature especially comparative study of oriental and western literatures.
4.2.1.6 Discussion and Analysis

The distinguished professor begins by stating that bilingualism is absolutely necessary at the lower level. However, he has also emphasized that bilingualism should be used at initial stages because the assimilation of the message of idiomatic expressions in particular and explanation of difficult words in general, co-supersonic and supra cortical words are difficult for the L2 learners. This observation was identified by the researcher himself by observing different classes himself where class teachers more frequently switched to L1 in explaining idiomatic phrases and words along with complex grammatical rules. This view has been substantiated by professor’s reference to his start of teaching career way back in 1960. Although the professor was affirmative in referring bilingualism to be a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning, however, he has mentioned that the solitary drawback is that from the pronunciation point of view, students learn virtually nothing whereas students should not aspire for RP as it is not potentially achievable and they should aspire for three things i.e. international intelligibility; second, international communicability and third international acceptability. Unfortunately, they cannot reach even this standard. So bilingualism must be supplemented by a laboratory in which proper pronunciation is taught as elaborated by this teacher. Similarly, he disagreed with the concept that a learner could achieve fluency in the foreign language if he is taught first in L1 simply because the genius of both the languages almost poles apart. Moreover, he differed from the contention that the competency in L2 is possible if we first master our language. According to him, first language would definitely improve the written expression but when it comes to spoken, the help is almost negligible. In this interview, although the professor was very critical about the use of bilingualism at an advanced level, yet he admitted the role of bilingualism that it is unavoidable at elementary/certificate level.

4.2.1.7 Teacher 4

The fourth teacher from NUML is in his mid career teaching for about ten years, however, he has conducted various research studies on linguistic issues. He is a well
organized and well read teacher in the department. His main area of study is phonetics and phonology which he has been teaching for all these years at different levels.

4.2.1.8 Discussion and Analysis

The teacher agreed with bilingualism as teaching aid, however, he emphasized the importance of using bilingualism in the classroom only when the abstract concepts are to be taught or the essence of an idiom or axiom is to be conveyed because many idioms generally easily can’t be conveyed and translated from one language to another language word for word. So in such situations, L1 can help the students to understand it. Similarly, he agreed that learning of a text becomes easier when somebody learns or reads a text in his L1. They understand better in L1. However, he disagreed that if learners want to achieve fluency in the foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant us of L1. He is of the opinion that fluency is strictly linked with and fully depends on the practice of L2. Similarly, he didn’t agree that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1. To him, it depends on the family background of L1 and L2. For example, if L1 and L2 belong to the same language family, the learning of L2 is going to be easier for the learners because these languages share many common properties. In the final analysis, it can be accepted that bilingualism is usable though not so frequently in different situations and at different occasions.

4.2.1.9 Teacher 5

This teacher has been teaching English for the last fifteen years. However, his teaching of English is more diverse as he has also been teaching in schools at elementary, secondary and college level. Presently, he is teaching at postgraduate level in the university. His experience is significant in this respect that his interaction in teaching has been with foreigners coming from China, Japan, Middle East, Central Asia and Africa. Therefore his views will carry more weight in the light of his above mentioned profile.
4.2.1.10 Discussion and Analysis

This teacher appears to be a staunch advocate of bilingualism as he considers bilingualism helpful to a greater extent. According to him, bilingualism is necessary in the classroom because there are many such situations in the classroom when he feels that bilingualism or use of L1 is important and necessary as well when there are difficult nouns, abstract nouns in particular, otherwise teachers are unable to explain however, they have very good equivalents in L1. So in order to save time and make students convenient, we just translate them into L1. Switching to L1 can help us explain those expressions in certain cases, certain idiomatic expressions, nouns or some other vocabulary items. So it is important for that to resort to bilingualism. Moreover, he opines that bilingualism facilitates not only the teacher but also the students because it saves extra efforts. He has also mentioned a typical situation in which bilingualism ought to be implied. It is useful that time when students are unable to speak or hesitate to speak, so the teacher has to switch to mother tongue/L1 to trigger the learners to speak. This way, the teachers can help the learners overcome their hesitation by taking a start in L1 and then switching to the target language or L2 because it also encourages students, removes hesitation and explains everything which is difficult. However, like other language teachers, he has disregarded the constant use of L1. To him again, there must be a fair and judicious use of L1, only then, it can help. Constant use of L1 can hamper, hinder or stop the acquisition of fluency in L2. It is the job of a teacher to decide where to use and where to avoid its use to the maximum, not all the time and no constant use. If the teachers use L1 constantly, there may be a stage where it affects the learning or gaining fluency in L2. At the same time, he agreed that bilingualism can result in greater competency in L2. He believes that the use of L1 basically will be an aid apart from other audio visual aids the teacher is using in class. It can be another teaching aid for the teacher as well. When students are stuck and where the situation gets difficult, the use of bilingualism or L1 can help students in gaining competency in L2 but constant use of L1 is not recommended by this teacher. Lastly, he also disagreed that if a foreign language learner is in L2 only class, he will learn it better. Thus again we see that bilingualism is being acknowledged as a facilitator and an indispensable aid in second language teaching/learning.
4.3 Interviews of Teachers from KAAU

In this part, the interviews analysis and discussion of five teachers from KAAU are detailed based on their views as expressed in their interviews (see the appendix “D” for the interview scripts).

4.3.1 Teacher 6

The first teacher from KAAU (T6) holds a PhD degree from USA. His experience is quite diverse and varied. He has been teaching in various institutions in America and Middle Eastern Countries like Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Nigeria. His views carry more weight and authenticity based on his academic qualification and professional experience in the field of Applied Linguistics.

4.3.2 Discussion and Analysis

The first teacher (T6) from KAAU emphatically says that bilingualism is helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom. This teacher says with firm conviction that bilingualism is an asset for the learners and should be fostered. It is not only helpful but it has also cognitive, cultural and economic advantages. Learners who have the opportunity to come across such teachers, who know the L1 of the learners, will prove very helpful for the learners unlike that teacher who is monolingual. Moreover, he believes that bilingualism is indispensable in a number of situations, especially where the learners come from a very poor educational background. This points to the fact that bilingualism ought to be used because the teacher is forced to do so due to its unavoidability. He also suggests that bilingualism relieves teacher from problematic situations and confusion. Thus bilingualism becomes a facilitator and a contributor. However, the teacher agreed that overall comprehension of the language at the initial stages is necessary and this is one area which can not be facilitated without the aid of first language. About the question of fluency, he is of the opinion that it depends upon the situation. To him, if it is a very weak group academically, the teacher needs the constant use of L1. Otherwise, he says that he would not suggest constant use of L1 because it would impair linguistic competence and fluency. This would lead to the
practical advantages in learning L2 and results in the competency. Lastly, his argument is fairly diplomatic as he time and again uses the urgency of situations. Overall, his views testify his personal experiences where he has been using L1 in teaching L2.

4.3.3 Teacher 7

This teacher has been teaching in Saudi Arabia for the last ten years. He got his Masters in English language and later on improved his professional qualification by attending advanced level ELT courses. His performance over the years has been quite commendable because the students were more than satisfied with him. Another reason for his being popular was his Arabic speaking background.

4.3.4 Discussion and Analysis

While commenting on the role of bilingualism, this teacher acknowledged frankly at the very outset that it is helpful as a teaching aid. He explains that the concepts learners have formed in their native language are not to be completely washed out or not completely locked. If teachers are teaching in such circumstances, bilingualism facilitates their conceptual learning. He also believes that the abstract concepts compel teachers and learners to employ bilingualism. Moreover, his idea is that bilingualism is necessary because of L1 interference in learning L2 or studying literature in the L2, which is not perhaps easy. It is, therefore, necessary that the teachers in stead of feeling shy or embarrassed in using L1, they should use bilingualism for these reasons when the concepts are not clear to the students. Thus he believes that bilingualism is a facilitator and a contributor as it is a blessing for the young learners. He asserts that it is a bridge between the teacher and the learners. Moreover, he says that it is, for sure, motivates and facilitates the learners. However, he does not agree that fluency can be achieved through L1. Similarly, about achieving competency in L2 through bilingualism, he believes that it does to a small extent. He also regards that if learners are deprived of their L1 it may cause inferiority complex. Overall, the teacher was in favor of bilingualism as a teaching aid which he has emphasized at many different places along with some of the reservations as far as the
competency of language learners is concerned. This is exactly what researchers and scholars in the field of bilingualism claim and assert.

4.3.5 Teacher 8

This teacher (T8) has been teaching English for the last five years. He doesn’t have any more professional training but Masters in Language and Literature. He is comparatively less communicative and average teacher according to the students ranking. However, his teaching career has been fraught with difficulties and administrative problems.

4.3.6 Discussion and Analysis

This teacher concedes the role of bilingualism as a teaching aid but accentuates that it is only desirable when there is no other option left for the teacher to define or explain the meanings and connotations of a word or a phrase. He is convinced that bilingualism is essential for a productive teaching learning process for the language learners. However, he says that learning subject matter in L2 is not important but the language itself. Then he disagrees with the contention that if learners want to achieve fluency in L2, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1. According to him, the constant use of L1 would reduce the spoken aspect of language fluency but it would definitely improve the reading and writing fluency of the learners. Similarly, he believes that L1 helps learners learn L2 at initial stages but it would start reducing the learning abilities at advanced stages of language learning. In the same way, he refers that at initial stages, complete reliance on L2 is not feasible in any way. The general idea you draw from this interview is that bilingualism is essential only in some situations, contexts and levels. Therefore, indirectly, stressing the validity of the argument that the use of bilingualism ought to be fair and judicious.
4.3.7 Teacher 9

This teacher is a novice in the field of teaching. Although energetic and communicative yet he is usually obtuse and confused. He has done his Masters from India and has taught for a very short time in his native country.

4.3.8 Discussion and Analysis

Almost all the answers provided by him are short and crispy which are devoid of any intellectual depth or academic strength. Whatever he states, is based upon his personal experience and casual observation. He agrees that bilingualism is helpful to a great extent and it may be used when it is necessary in the classroom.

He also comes up with a confused answer that he does not believe that learning subject matter in L2 helps learners learn subject matter when he studies them in L1. Again he comes up with a confused statement where he himself negates his earlier statement that fluency does not come with practice where bilingualism does not have any role to play.

He states that bilingualism has advantages but does not understand what the advantages are. Similarly he agrees whatever is said to him; however he fails to understand what he says.

4.3.9 Teacher 10

This teacher has the experience of teaching at different levels for seven years. He has completed his Masters in English from a foreign university and is working for his PhD degree. His experience as English language teacher restricted to teaching general English language courses.
4.3.10 Discussion and Analysis

Fifth Teacher (T10) from KAAU states that bilingualism is fairly helpful in many situations and he deems it to be necessary when either the teacher or the learner feels that the use of L1 has become imperative. Moreover, he emphasizes that the use of bilingualism must not be discouraged or restricted; rather it should be allowed to help the learners. He explains that it is his personal experience that at times, students are unable to use the target language because they don’t go with ease.

Therefore, he asserts that the teacher must switch over to L1 so as to help the learners better. He also alerts that bilingualism must be used judiciously to achieve fluency in the target language and he claims it to be his personal experience.

However, at the end he is not sure that in a foreign language learning class where only L2 is used, it is possible to learn it better. Here, he mentions the learners’ demographic features which may affect his learning of L2. He concludes that bilingualism is useful as a teaching aid and as a teaching methodology. He maintains it can be and should be employed but the frequency of its use is critical as it does not take into account the other situation, occasions, levels, contexts and demographic features. Thus its use must not be blind and subjective but must include restraints and objectivity.

4.4 Questionnaires

In this section on data collection, the researcher used closed-ended questions on the issue of bilingualism. These questions were given in the form of questionnaires which were distributed to both teachers and students. There was a different questionnaire for the teacher and student groups.

The purpose of the questionnaires was to determine the efficacy of bilingualism in class. The researcher has discussed these questions separately. A total of three hundred questionnaires was given to the students out of which one hundred and fifty were distributed among NUML students, and the remaining 50 percent amongst
KAAU students. Of the three hundred given to the students, 291 were returned. Of the 50 given to the teachers, 44 were returned. The presentation of findings in response to these two questionnaires follows hereunder:

4.4.1 Results of the Questionnaire for Teachers

The first questionnaire was given to the teachers. It consisted of a total of 24 questions. It centered round the practice of the using bilingualism as a teaching aid in class by the teachers. Part of the questionnaire dealt with common perceptions against the use of bilingualism in the class. The next part was related to practical value and application of bilingualism.

The results of the responses from both the teacher and student groups are presented and analyzed with the help of tables and bar graphs in the following pages:

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25-35 years</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>36-45 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46 years and above</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows data about the age group of the respondents. The data was divided into three categories of age groups. In the first age group (25-35 years), there was 55% from NUML and 29% from KAAU.
The second category (36-45 years) shows 20% and 58% from NUML and KAAU respectively. In the third category (46 years and above), there was 25% from NUML and 12% from KAAU.

It is interesting to note that in the NUML group, the majority of respondents fall in the 25-35 years category. From the KAAU group, the majority of respondents come from the older year category (36-45 years).

Table 4.4

Teachers’ Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 gives a comparison of NUML and KAAU teachers teaching English language at Certificate and Diploma levels. Their level of education spans MA and PhD. The table reflects that 100% teachers at NUML are simple MA, however, majority of the teachers have acquired relevant professional qualification in the
teaching of English as a second language. Most of these teachers have done Masters in TEFL as they revealed during the informal discussion. Although PhD holders at NUML were given questionnaires, none of these were returned due to their busy work schedules. The percentage of MA and PhD qualifications at KAAU was 70.8% and 29.2% respectively.

**Figure 4.4**
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The experience of Teachers at NUML with local and foreign students is vast and can therefore be more valuable. Thus, both academic environments are exclusive to some extent with reference to the teacher’s qualification and therefore the views of academicians in these institutions bring insightful reflections on these research issues.
Table 4.5 reflects the teaching experience of teachers from the two universities. It has been divided into four different categories. In the first category (0-2 years), the percentage of teachers from NUML totaled 15% whereas from KAAU, 4.2% of teachers fall in this category.

In the second category (3-5 years), NUML and KAAU have more or less the same percentage with 30% and 29.2% respectively.

The third category (6-15 years) shows KAAU with a higher percentage of 54.2% as opposed to NUML’s 30%. The figures for this category are significant because they indicate that the preponderance of teacher respondents was, broadly speaking, in their mid careers. In the last category (6-15 years), NUML had 25% of teachers compared to KAAU’s 12.5%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>NUML</th>
<th>KAAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16-25 years or above</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A cursory look testifies to this point that at KAAU, teachers are better qualified and more experienced. This could have been more significant if the researcher has devised another category of foreigners and locals. This would also point to the fact that teachers at KAAU have a wide range of overseas experience which would have made their opinions, experiences and judgments more reliable.

Table 4.6

Is Bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this question, the responses were divided into 3 categories (Table 4.6). The three categories pre-defined by the researcher were “yes” “no” and “not sure”. In these,
75% testified and 25% of NUML teachers rejected the proposition contained in this question. From KAAU the responses were 83.3% yes, 12.5% no and 4.2% were not sure.

**Figure 4.6**
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An overwhelming majority of teachers confirmed the proposition that bilingualism is helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom. Only a small number of teachers refuted the proposition who could most probably be the inexperienced or less qualified teachers.

In case of KAAU, need of bilingualism appears to be more emphatic. That is why percentage of disagreement is so low. The reason appears to be that the foundation of English in KSA in general is very poor. English has been taught from class 6th onward, and that too with not much sincerity especially at school level as it was revealed by the teachers during informal discussion with them. Therefore, the teachers at the universities have to do from the scratch hence bilingualism becomes indispensable in class. Whereas in Pakistan by the time a student passes his secondary school examination, he has a considerable knowledge of L2. That is why the negative
response at NUML is so high as opposed to KAAU. This result would be drastically different if a case study of teaching L2 in school is considered in Pakistan.

Table 4.7

When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>to help define some new vocabulary items</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>to practice the use of some phrases and expressions</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>to explain complex grammar points</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>to explain difficult concepts or ideas</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>to give instructions</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>to give suggestions on how to learn more effectively</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>If any other, please specify</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table 4.7 shows, the respondents were given the choice that more than one option, are available. Although the teachers were given the choices “yes”, “no” and “not sure”. However, the results and the data taken from both the universities were similar.

The first response was “to help define some new vocabulary items” in which 20% from NUML and 33.3% from KAAU fell in this category. The next given response was to practice the use of some phrases and some expressions in which 45% from NUML and 41.7% from KAAU selected this.
This response from all the seven given responses was selected by the majority. This clearly points out that to learn useful expressions and phrases in L1 is the most necessary component of learning the target language. The next response was to explain complex grammar point in which 10% were from NUML and 4.2% were from KAAU. The 4th response to explain difficult concepts or ideas shows that 15% of NUML teachers used L1 to aid their teaching of L2 and 16.7% of KAAU teachers used L1 for teaching English.

The next category to give instruction, none of the KAAU teachers used mother tongue in this situation whereas only 5% of NUML teachers used L1 to give instruction. It means that teachers really resort to L1 while giving instructions.

The 6th category to give suggestions on how to learn more effectively was selected again by a very small number of 5% teachers from NUML and 4.2% from KAAU.
However the last option given to the respondents was if any, please specify, not used by any of the respondents.

The areas given in this table are real problematic situation for a teacher of L2 to cope with. Hence, bilingualism is unavoidable in these situations. The teacher uses various techniques for this purpose in the classroom owing to be handicapped regarding the use of L1. For example:

a. Use of bilingual dictionary, carrying more than one meaning or shades of meaning, the teacher points to the students with the help of English equivalents

b. The teacher employs a two-tier methodology. First he explains the term in a simple way so that the students of upper level are able to understand it, and then they reunite to the rest through L1.

c. For explaining complex grammar points, the teacher profits by the use of bilingualism. He uses the comparison and contrast technique with that of the grammar of L1. It makes the teaching and learning process very easy clearly exemplifying the complexities. For example, sentence structure in English is SVO (Subject+Verb+Object) and in Arabic is SOV(Subject+Object+Verb).

d. Use of double subject in Arabic for one and the same thing is very common whereas in English it is a blunder.

e. Adjectives have their plurals and feminine gender too in Arabic unlike English.

f. Use of 2\textsuperscript{nd} conditional in classroom practice by giving equivalents in Arabic makes the course easy.

g. Similarly, the use of “Let”, if its equivalent is given in Arabic, it expedites the learning process.
Table 4.8

Why do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It aids comprehension greatly</td>
<td>NUML 40% KAAU 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is more effective.</td>
<td>NUML 15% KAAU 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is less time-consuming</td>
<td>NUML 45% KAAU 41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>NUML 0% KAAU 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 asks the question on the necessity of bilingualism in the classroom. There were 4 options given to the respondents which were further subcategorized yes, no and not sure. However the table shows only the yes number of respondents.

Therefore, the first response it aids comprehension greatly was affirmed by 40% of NUML and 50% of KAAU teachers. In the 2\textsuperscript{nd} response, it is more effective, only 15% of NUML teachers and 8.3% of KAAU teachers selected yes option. The next option it is less time consuming was opted by majority of NUML and KAAU teachers i.e. 45% and 41.7% respectively. The last option “Other, please specify”, and was again not selected by any of the respondents.
Figure 4.8 again points to the fact already established that bilingualism aids comprehension of the L2 greatly and is relatively less time consuming. In this section, 10 questions have been designed to ascertain about the intensity or the degree to which educationists, researchers and teachers agree or disagree. The degrees include strongly agree, agree, not sure, disagree, and strongly disagree. This section will therefore provide us the true extent to which the respondents place themselves on the issue of using L1 in an L2 class.

It is quite obvious that the use of bilingualism in classroom would facilitate greatly in learning and teaching process as reflected through the responses in table 4.8. But on the other hand, it clearly shows that the proportion in which L1 will be used in the classroom. In same proportion, the chances of practicing L2 would be diminished. The term “less time consuming” speaks very clearly of that. Language is not a matter of understanding. It comes through practice. However, bilingualism must be taken as a last resort.
Table 4.9

Mother tongue (L1) is losing ground to other languages in the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>NUML</th>
<th>KAAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 displays the data of existing status of L1. To this statement, NUML teachers 30% strongly agreed, 50% agreed, 5% were not sure, 10% disagreed and only 5% strongly disagreed. On the other hand, the data shows that only 4.2% of KAAU teachers strongly agreed to this statement, 12.5% agreed, however, 25% were not sure, 41.7% disagreed and 16.7% disagreed. The responses given by both the university teachers did not match.

Figure 4.9
It can be maintained that in Pakistan where about 80% teachers were in the favor of this statement because Pakistani society is multilingual and multicultural. Therefore the whole nation or its component ethnic communities are in search of a common language.

Therefore they agreed that mother tongue is losing ground to other languages in the country. On the other hand, a large majority of KAAU teachers which includes 25%, 41.7% and 16.7% respondents disagreed. It is because that KSA and for that matter, other Arab countries are strongly rather rigidly conservative and monolingual society. It is very unlikely that L1 or the Arabic would ever lose ground to any other language in that region.

The response in this table shows a big difference between KAAU and NUML which reflects the common trend in these countries i.e. Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. The reason may be that in case of Pakistan, learning English is essential for success in academics and business or in other spheres of life. Therefore, people try to learn English language even at the cost of L1. This trend is quite evident in the proliferation of English medium schools even in villages. Whereas in KSA, L1 is taken as a part of faith which, at no cast, people are ready to lose. Notwithstanding, the advantages of L2 people take all sort of pains to keep abreast with L1 in daily life. During my stay at KSA for several years, I have never seen any true Saudi professor talk in English whereas back in Pakistan it is a taboo to use any language other than English. The data shown in category 1 and 2 of 4.9 regarding KAAU and NUML speak of this fact.
Table 4.10

There is a difference between L1 acquisition now and in the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>NUML</th>
<th>KAAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 4.10 are more or less the same as discussed in the previous table 4.9. About 30% of NUML teachers strongly agree, 45% agree whereas 10% were not sure, 10% disagree and 5% strongly disagreed. In KAAU, the respondents 12.5% strongly agreed, 25% agreed. However, 37.5% were not sure and 25% disagreed.

Figure 4.10

In the following table (4.11), the analysis corresponds to the multilingual society of Pakistan and monolingual society of KSA. In Pakistan about 75% teachers agreed that new generation is learning L1 slowly than the previous generation because of their
growing interest in L2. On the other hand, Saudis monolingual society about 64% teachers did not hold the statement true.

The data received in this table shows that in NUML, L1 is more affected than in case of KAAU. Nevertheless, the data shown regarding KAAU is also startling taking into consideration. The previous table (4.9) in which it was observed that L1 is a part of their faith owing to global phenomenon - exposure to media. Never before was the young generation so badly exposed to the media as it is today. This includes all sorts of programs i.e. healthy, unhealthy, propagandists or culturally offensive things. These all tend to make up a global culture at the cost of native one, and language is also a victim of it. It boils down to the fact that the learners weak at L1, will not be able to do good at L2 in the absence of L1.

Table 4.11

The best way to learn English language is through communicative approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>NUML</th>
<th>KAAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table shown above, a more explicit statement about learning English language is made that the best way to learn English is through communicative approach. The data shows us that 20% of NUML teachers strongly agreed and 15% agreed whereas 35% were not sure, 30% disagreed and none of the respondents strongly disagreed.
From KAAU, the responses gathered were that only 4.2% strongly agreed, 12.5% agreed whereas 4.2% were not sure, 50% disagreed and 29.2% strongly disagreed.

The data testifies that in communicative approach towards learning a language, the main emphasis is on the complete exclusion of L1. This is neither used by the teachers nor allowed by the teachers for the students to speak.

Thus students as well as the teachers find it hard to learn the L2 more competently and less painfully. Therefore, the teachers at KAAU, about 80% of them disregarded the statement that the best way to learn English language is through communicative approach.

In category four and five of the responses, the data is very striking. Nearly eighty percent disagree with the idea of using communicative approach as the best method. This shows the heavy reliance on the use of bilingualism in class in case of KAAU whereas in case of NUML the responses are not as vehement as that of KAAU. It can
be attributed to the bilingual society of Pakistan which as a natural corollary necessitates the learning of L2 and consequent upon which background of L2 is completely better.

Table 4.12

Children learning English are retained too long in bilingual classrooms owing to L1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.12 claims that children learning English are retained too long in bilingual classrooms. Only 10% of NUML teachers strongly agreed, 25% teachers agreed to it and 10% were not sure and 55% disagreed. At KAAU, nobody strongly agreed to it, 50% agreed, 20.8% were not sure, 8.4% disagreed and 20.8% strongly disagreed.
Figure 4.12

Children learning English are retained too long in bilingual classroom owing to L1

Now this data corresponds again to the basic assumptions of the present research study. This means that without the use and assistance of L1, it is difficult to teach the target language more accurately. Although, the difference of linguistic background of Pakistani and Saudi society remain conspicuous in the different opinions and experiences of the two different university teachers. However, both of them remained consistent in the use of L1 in the classroom.

The data in this table shows that learning and teaching process becomes easy in bilingual classroom. This is why in case of KAAU, the strong agreement to the proposition is zero and in case of NUML, it is only 10%. However, the ratio of disagreement in case of NUML is 55% owing to their least reliance on bilingualism, and that too is due to the monolingual society which automatically takes them to the use of English in learning activities.
Table 4.13
The Government institutions provide bilingual instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table 4.13, the statement is that Government institutions provide bilingual instruction.

None of the NUML teachers strongly disagreed, however, 79.2% agreed to this claim but 8.3% were not sure and 12.5% disagreed and none of the respondents selected strongly disagree. On the other hand, 30% of the KAAU teachers strongly agreed and 70% agreed but none of the respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Figure 4.13
The situation in both of the countries is therefore comparatively favorable. In KSA, 100% teachers agreed that the Government provides bilingual instructions whereas in Pakistan, around 80% teachers held that Government provides bilingual instructions. It is because in elementary and secondary school level, English is taught through L1 therefore the use of it is not forbidden. However, in colleges and universities, the new approach stresses the exclusion of L1 which is reducing the comprehension and competency in English language.

The data shows that there is excessive use of bilingualism in government institutions leading to the very slow achievement of learning L2; whereas in private institutions bilingualism is used sparingly yielding a better result regarding learning L2. It is a common fact in both KSA and Pakistan.

**Table 4.14**

**Bilingualism means the judicious use of mother tongue in teaching and learning a foreign language.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 4.14, the claim is that bilingualism means the judicious use of mother tongue. 55% of NUML teachers strongly agreed, 30% agreed, only 5% were not sure, 10% disagreed.

However, none strongly disagreed. On the other hand, in KAAU, about 29.2% of teachers strongly agreed to this proposition, 62.5% agreed but 8.3% were not sure. None of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed to this proposition.
Bilingualism means fair and judicious use of mother tongue in teaching and learning a foreign language

This data confirms that bilingualism does not mean the exclusive use of and complete reliance on bilingualism rather it means the judicious and balanced use of L1 in a language class. This would make it more facilitating and helpful to learn in a less harmful manner.

The data shows that all the respondents are in agreement with the proposition. But category 1 and 2 of responses in this table show a big difference between KAAU and NUML. This may be attributed to monolingual and multilingual background.

**Table 4.15**

Bilingualism makes instruction easier for the teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>NUML</th>
<th>KAAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the table 4.15, the proposition presented is that bilingualism makes instruction easier. 30% of the NUML teachers strongly agreed, 50% agreed, 10% were not sure whereas 10% disagreed with it.

At KAAU, 50% of the teachers strongly agreed, 37.5% agreed, 4.2% were not sure and 8.3% disagreed. None of the teachers from NUML and KAAU strongly disagreed with this statement.

**Figure 4.15**

This overwhelming majority of university teachers from two different countries with different socio-cultural and linguistic background have testified as 80% of NUML and 88% of KAAU teachers endorsed that only through bilingualism or only through the use of L1, English language can be taught effectively and efficiently.

The data appearing in this table is quite natural. In case of KAAU, the responses are more vehement than NUML because of the fact that level of the students learning L2 is very low.
Table 4.16

Cultural associations favor bilingualism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>NUML</th>
<th>KAAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 is built on the presumption of cultural associations with bilingualism as it is very important for the learners simultaneously to learn L2 and to maintain L1.

25% of NUML teachers have strongly agreed with this whereas 65% responses agreed, 5% were not sure, 5% disagreed and none strongly disagreed. 62.5% of KAAU teachers strongly agreed, 20.8% agreed, 4.2% were not sure, 8.3% disagreed and 4.2 strongly disagreed.
These data findings strongly support bilingualism without which it will not be very easy for the learners to learn English language and to maintain L1. Language is a product of a particular culture. Without having assimilated, cultural associations which are attached with the language competency and fluency is far more difficult to be achieved.

Language is culture and vice versa. It does not exist in a vacuum. It is the vehicle of culture. At times, languages fail to communicate because of cultural gap. These are the moments when parallels of cultural associations drawn to establish a rapport. These cultural associations help a great deal to bilingualism in learning L2. The data in this table is quite in agreement with this view.
Table 4.17

Bilingualism is a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>NUML</th>
<th>KAAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 presents the data on bilingualism as a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning. 40% each at NUML strongly agreed and agreed to this statement, 10% each were not sure and disagreed whereas nobody strongly disagreed with this statement.

At KAAU, 54.2% strongly agreed, 37.5% agreed, 4.2% were not sure and 4.2% disagreed whereas nobody was there to strongly disagree with the statement.

Figure 4.17
This 80% majority from Pakistan and over 90% majority from KSA have favored the use of L1 in learning a language which has been termed as a facilitator and a contributor to second language learning.

The reason for strong agreement in both the cases is that use of bilingualism makes the process of teaching and learning much more convenient. It may further be attributed to the poor background of L2 in case of KAAU where the respondents have agreed most vehemently to the proposition.

Table 4.18

Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learner learn subject matter better when he/she studies it in L1?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table 4.18, the respondents were asked to respond to learning subject matter in L2 when they study it in L1. The respondents from NUML overwhelmingly said “yes” 75%, 15% rejected and said “no” whereas 10% were not sure of the authenticity of the statement. From KAAU teachers, 95.8% said “yes” whereas there was nobody to select “no” as their response and only 4.2% of them were not sure about the statement.
The table again confirms the use and the practice of L1 in L2 classes where the comprehension of the students greatly increases in this particular situation. This is the same point which was asserted previously that use of L1 is more facilitating and less time consuming.

The strong positive response in this table in case of NUML and KAAU is due to the fact that understanding in L1 becomes much easier. This is why any typical thing requires the help of L1 to put across in the classroom. The negative response in case of KAAU is nil. It shows that understanding level would be very low without the help of L1 whereas in case of NUML, the background knowledge of L2 is a little better, this is why the negative response is considerable.
Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in L2, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table 4.19, the respondents were asked how to achieve fluency in the foreign language. This table shows that NUML and KAAU teachers have an overlapping point of view.

About 75% NUML teachers and 79.2% of KAAU teachers were affirmative. There were 20% from NUML who selected the option “no” and 4.2% from KAAU followed them. 5% and 16.7% from NUML and KAAU respectively were not sure of their response.
Do you think that if the learners want to achieve fluency in L2, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?

The figure 4.19 indicates another aspect of bilingualism which is related with attaining fluency in second language. In this question, the teachers from both the universities were unanimous that fluency in second language is difficult to achieve if it is not supported, assisted and facilitated with the constant use of L1. Thus learners achieve fluency when they are able to practice and comprehend L2 with the help of L1.

Table 4.20

Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.20 displays the data on practical advantages of bilingualism in learning L2. The teachers in both the universities hold this opinion strongly that the use of bilingualism brings practical advantages for the learners as 70% of NUML teachers and 87.5% of KAAU teachers selected the option. There were 30% of NUML teachers and only 8.3% of KAAU teachers who rejected this proposition. None of the teachers at NUML used the option “not sure” and only 4.2% of KAAU teachers did this.

**Figure 4.20**

This refers to a famous thesis in ELT that language is a living phenomenon. Therefore, the true expertise in language comes when learners are able to use the practical vocabulary in living language, not the use of archaic or obsolete words which the literature of the language carries.

Thus the learners with the help of L1 are able to comprehend and use the language which is needed most in practical life. Therefore, the result tallies with major theories in English language teaching.

The respondents seem to have at the back of their mind the modern trend that bilinguals have an edge over the monolinguals even if they are the native English teachers. This is true of every country, be it Arabia, England, America, China or
Russia. Of late Chinese and Japanese have also realized the importance bi/multilingualism and they have started intensive teaching programs of other languages.

Table 4.21

Do you think that use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.21 shows that from NUML, 90% of the teachers accepted this statement in 87.5% of KAAU teachers said “yes” and only a small number of teachers from NUML that is 5% said “no” but there was nobody at KAAU who ticked this choice. 5% of NUML teachers and 12.5% of KAAU teachers were not sure of this statement.

Figure 4.21
The results contained in this data speak out for itself that competency can be achieved in a language even if L1 has been used extensively to learn concepts and develop comprehension of L2. Although a lot of researchers in ELT and practitioners in this field deny the use of L1 in their language teaching. However, the ground realities’ meaning the language teachers in well established and renowned language centres in the world are of this opinion that the use of L1 improves and results in the competency of L2.

Table 4.22

Do you think it is possible for the learners to learn L2 and maintain their competence of L1?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22 shows that 85% of NUML teachers gave their opinion in the favor of maintaining L1 while learning L2 and 87.5% from KAAU used “yes” option. There were 10% from NUML and 8.3% from KAAU who used “no” option. 5% and 4.2% from NUML and KAAU were not sure.
The data again refers to the experience of the teachers that L1 has a positive impact on the personal and professional growth of the learners as it does not disturb the language and the cultural significance of the learners but it also exposes to them better learning of L2.

Table 4.23

Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 reflects the results of the data collected from this question. The comparison of the data between NUML and KAAU teachers shows more or less the
same contentions taken in this thesis as 75% and 87.5% of NUML and KAAU teachers agreed with the statement by selecting the “yes” option. 15% of NUML teachers and 8.3% of KAAU teachers selected “no” option whereas only 10% and 4.2% were not sure from these universities respectively.

**Figure 4.23**

The argument which gets more support with this data is that the learners are able to learn L2 as quickly as possible even with the help of L1. it means that L1 does not hamper the learning of L2 rather it speeds up the language learning process and at the end of the day, the students who have made use of L1 are better equipped and more proficient than those who did not resort to the support of their L1.
Table 4.24

Do you think that a learner will grasp L2 better if the teacher uses only the target language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table 4.24, the question which was given to the respondents, 25% of NUML teachers and 16.7% of KAAU teachers selected the “yes” option whereas 75% of NUML and 79.2% of KAAU teachers denied the viability of this question. There was nobody among NUML teachers who was not sure of this and among KAAU, only 4.2% of the teachers were not sure of this statement.

Figure 4.24

![Bar chart showing the percentage of teachers' responses to the question regarding the effectiveness of using only the target language in teaching L2. The chart compares NUML (Pakistan) and KAAU (Saudi Arabia).]
These results again on one hand strengthen the main argument of the present research study as in a L2 only class, the students learning capabilities and performance shall be comparatively less and it would increase and accelerate the process of learning L2 if it is used in a L1 class. Thus the communicative approach in spite of its many advantages is faulty and less productively than the use of bilingualism.

4.4.2 Results of the Questionnaire for Students

In this part of data collection, the researcher has given the data collected through the questionnaire given to the students. It contained 15 closed-ended questions which were filled in by the students at the faculty of English language, Literature and Applied Linguistics at certificate and diploma levels and at King Abdul Aziz University. Out of 300 questionnaires, distributed among the students of these universities, 291 were returned. That data has been detailed, discussed, tabulated and shown graphically with the help of bar charts.

Table 4.25

Age Group of the Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21-26</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.25 shows the age group of the students who participated in this research. The sample has been taken from the NUML and KAAU. This variable has been divided into 2 categories. The first category is 15 to 20 years and 2nd category is from 21 to 25 years. The comparison of 1st categories shows that 69.7% students from NUML and 73.3% students fell in this category. The 2nd category included 30.3% from NUML and 26.7% from KAAU fell in this category.
The difference between two categories is significant because in both the universities, the students came after the completion of their SSC Examination and few of them were the ones who have completed their HSSC examination.

**Table 4.26**

**Gender of the Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>NUML</th>
<th>KAAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.26 details the data about the gender of the students from these two universities. At NUML, 55.2% of the total respondents were of male gender and 74% from KAAU participated in this study. The percentage of females was 44.8% from NUML and 26% from KAAU.
The difference of male and female students is important because at KAAU the number of female students to males was comparatively less than those of NUML. It is because the Saudi society is tightly segregated and females do not generally have an open and easy access within the society. However, although this segregation is present in Pakistani society as well yet the opportunities to education are favorable to the females to a large extent in cities. Therefore, the sample collected from NUML was more or less the same.

Table 4.27

Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>NUML</th>
<th>KAAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HSSC</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next variable selected for the present study was the level of education completed. In this variable, two categories were devised that is SSC and HSSC. From NUML,
58.6% students fell in SSC category whereas 41.4% students fell in HSSC category. On the other hand, at KAAU, because of the nature of the education system, 100% of the students were from SSC category.

**Figure 4.27**

SSC is awarded in Saudi Arabia after completing 12 years of education at school. The SSC is divided into three different sub levels of education which are “Ibtaadia (Elementary, six years duration)”, “Mutwassit (Intermediate, three years duration)” and “Thanwiya (Secondary, three years duration)”. In Pakistan, the system of education is patterned on British style. SSC is awarded after 10 years of education at school which is divided into three different levels i.e. Primary, Middle and Secondary.
Table 4.28

Years of Learning a Foreign Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Years of Learning L2</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-6 years</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next variable is years of learning a second language. This variable is further subdivided into 0-6 years and 7-10 years. In the first category 0-6 years, 68.3% from NUML and 87.7% from KAAU and in the 2nd category, 31.7% from NUML and 12.3% from KAAU comprised the categories.

Figure 4.28

The difference in these 2 variables is because of the system of education prevalent in both the countries which have been given in detail in the previous table. Majority of the students in Pakistan had studied English from class 6 in government schools therefore, after the completion of their secondary school, they had studied English for about 5 to 6 years but in English medium schools and in some of the schools which
follow the Cambridge School Certificate which comprises “A” and “O” level. The students had studied English for about 8 to 10 years. Similarly in Saudi Arabia, English language begins in schools after the elementary level. Then for about six years they study English. However, some of the students who had access to and could afford it, they start studying English much earlier. Therefore, the years of learning English for them is more than seven years. This is exactly what our data displays as about 88% had studied English for six years and only 12% of them studied English for more than 6 years.

Table 4.29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>With Family</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>With Friends/Classmates</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>With Neighbors</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>With Teachers</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.29 shows the data gathered from respondents through this question. 21.4% of the respondents from NUML and 4.8% respondents from KAAU respectively selected the option “with family”, 67.6% of the respondents from NUML and 28.9% from KAAU respectively selected the option “with friends/classmates”. However, 10.4% of the respondents from NUML selected the third option “with neighbors” and only 2.2% of the respondents from KAAU did this. The last option “with teachers’ was selected by 91.7% of the respondents from NUML and 79.7%.
The figure 4.29 shows that most of the students speak English with their teachers in Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. It is because the medium of instruction is mostly English at post-secondary level in these countries. Therefore they communicate with their teachers most of the time in English.

Another situation is where the students have to speak English is with their friends. Although it is not a very common occurrence, still it is where they speak or try to speak English for a variety of social and psychological reasons. With family in Pakistan it is usual in cities where parents seek to teach youngsters English. However in Saudi Arabia it is not common, where because of the rigid and strong influence of Arabic, the students do not frequently speak English. Again with neighbors it is not common in Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, however in Pakistan it is a little more frequent than Saudi Arabia.
Table 4.30

When do you most often come across English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Watching TV</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading Books</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>If any other, please specify</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table 4.30, it reflects that 84.1% respondents from NUML and 94.6% of the students from KAAU selected the option “watching TV”.

However, 62.8% of the students from NUML and 42.7% of the students from KAAU marked the option “reading books”; whereas 92.8% of the students from NUML and 77.3% from KAAU responded to “classroom” option respectively. The fourth option “if any other, please specify” 19% the students from NUML and 9% responded to it from NUML and KAAU.

Figure 4.30
The data displays those situations where the students have to come across English language. The most common situation is watching TV, because of the influence of media from which none can escape. It is where 84.1% and 94.6% students from both the Universities come across English.

The other place is the classroom where 92.8% and 77% come across English. The third highest category is reading books. These three situations are which have almost become inescapable and completely unavoidable. Everybody feels that he must study English and therefore the need to learn it becomes highly desirable. The purpose of this question was to ascertain about the need to study English.

Table 4.31

How important is it for you to know English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table 4.31, the respondents were asked this question. 69% of the respondents from NUML and 24% of the students from KAAU respectively responded to “very important” option and 29% of the students from NUML and 69.1% of the respondents from KAAU selected “important” option. Moreover, 2% of the students from NUML and 4.8% from KAAU selected the “not important” option whereas 2.1% of the students from KAAU and none of the students from NUML responded to the last option “not at all important”.

235
The next question required to ascertain the importance of learning English. In Pakistan majority of the students declared it ‘very important’ whereas in Saudi Arabia the majority of the students said that it was ‘important’ but not ‘very important’. However, a very small minority regarded it that it is ‘not important’. This again confirms that learning English has become indispensable.

Table 4.32

How do you feel about English used in your daily life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Excited</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not much Excited</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not at all Excited</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.32 reflects the data collected from the question about English used in their daily life. 24.1% of the students from NUML and 38.4% from KAAU responded to
the “very excited” option respectively and 54.5% students from NUML and 37.3% from KAAU selected “excited” option.

11.1% from NUML and 18.1% from KAAU marked “not much excited” option whereas 10.3% from NUML and 6.2% from KAAU selected “not at all excited” option.

Figure 4.32

The data shows the level of interest that the students have about the use of English in their lives. They are overexcited if they themselves resort to the use of English or if they are in a situation where they can understand English. This is a general feeling all over the world.

People wish to learn English even if it is not used in their daily lives. This is also because English has acquired the status of lingua franca of the world. With the advent of globalization everybody envies the use of English, be it their home, or work place, or entertainment area or conferences etc. where English is used extensively.
Thus their general interest about English and learning is comparatively more. This applies to multiple and diverse fields where it is being overemphasized. To know and learn English has become a world craze.

Table 4.33

Do you feel comfortable with English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>NUML (%)</th>
<th>KAAU (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Comfortable</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Comfortable</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not at all Comfortable</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.33 shows the data gathered from the question on the feelings of the respondents towards English. 2.1% of the students from NUML selected the “very comfortable” option and none of the students from KAAU did this. Similarly, only 17.2% NUML students expressed their opinion that they feel comfortable with English and only 10.2% students from KAAU agreed to this. 46.2% of the students from NUML and 67.8% from KAAU respectively selected “not comfortable” option; whereas 34.5% of the students from NUML and 22% of the respondents from KAAU respectively marked “not at all option”.
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The data confirms that exclusive use and reliance on English in a language class creates problems for the students, because their comfort level decreases with more use of English. However, if it is used more, then their interest in learning increases. This shows that students want bilingualism as a teaching aid in the class.

Table 4.34

Is Bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table 4.34, the same question which was asked from the teachers, was usefulness of bilingualism in the classroom. It was asked from the students of both the universities. The responses were divided into three categories. The three categories pre defined by the researcher were “yes” “no” and “not sure”.
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In these, 73.8% testified and 15.9% of NUML students rejected the proposition contained in this question. From KAAU the responses were 97.9% for “yes”, none of the students from KAAU selected “no” option and 2.1% were not sure. An overwhelming majority of students confirmed the proposition that bilingualism is helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom. Only a small number of students refuted the proposition.

Figure 4.34

This data argues that bilingualism is not only liked but is needed most in a language classroom, even for those students who had studied the language for some years. At times it is argued by the linguists that the use of L1 may be used at elementary levels, but not at advanced or middle stages.

The argument appears to be logical, but the reality is that the students who are the major stake holders are in deed more interested in the assistance of L1 by their teachers. Therefore the teachers need to cater for their needs. A cursory glance at the data shows that Pakistani students’ majority i.e. 73% and Saudi Students
overwhelming majority about 98% desire this in their response to the use of bilingualism as a teaching aid.

**Table 4.35**

When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUMUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>to help define some new vocabulary items</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>to practice the use of some phrases and expressions</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>to explain complex grammar points</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>to explain difficult concepts or ideas</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>to give instructions</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>to give suggestions on how to learn more effectively</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>If any other, please specify.</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this part, the students from both the universities were given the choice that more than one option is available. Although the students were given the multiple choices, “yes”, “no” and “not sure”, yet the results and the data taken from both the universities were amazingly similar. The first response was “to help define some new vocabulary items” in which all the respondents from NUML and KAAU unanimously selected “yes” option, i.e. 100%. This response from all the 7 given responses was selected by everybody. The next given response was to practice the use of some phrases and some expressions in which 80.6% from NUML and 92.5% from KAAU selected this. This response from all the 7 given responses was selected again by most of the students. This clearly points out that to learn useful expressions and phrases in L1 is the most necessary component of learning the target language. The next response was to explain complex grammar point in which 54.4% were from NUML and 32.2% were from KAAU. The 4th response “to explain difficult concepts or ideas” shows that 37.2% of NUML students used L1 to aid their teaching of L2 and 21.9% of KAAU students used L1 for teaching English. The next category “to give instruction” none of the KAAU students used mother tongue in this situation whereas only 1.4%
of NUML students used L1 “to give instruction” option. It means that students really learn quickly if L1 is used to some extent while giving instructions. The next category “to give suggestions on how to learn more effectively” was selected again by a very small number of 24.8% students from NUML and 32.9% from KAAU. However the last option given to the respondents was “if any, please specify,” none of the respondents selected this option from both the universities.

**Figure 4.35**

The answers given here, point to the fact that use of bilingualism indeed helps the students in learning L2. However the aspects which are more important to be learnt in a language class are given here. The important aspects where the students need the use of L1 more are, firstly to define the new vocabulary items. In fact, what has been observed more is that, students are unable to categorize the vocabulary items just because they either are unable to get the true shade of the word or are unable to comprehend it completely. However, L1 does help overcome these impediments, thereby reducing the negative risks. The second major area is to practice the use of useful phrases and expressions. However students from KAAU wanted the use of L1
more in this area. The other area is to comprehend the complex grammatical items. This is also where the learners need more assistance of L1. Thus, experienced teachers usually resort to the use of L1 more when they are in difficult or awkward situation. However the point is the language teachers must not feel disturbed or perplexed in the use of L1, because learners gain more than otherwise.

Table 4.36

Do you think bilingualism in the classroom help you learn the target language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 4.36, this question has been classified into four different categories of ‘a lot’, ‘sometimes’, ‘a little’ and ‘never’. The results gained in the study show that 24.8% from NUML and 57.7% from KAAU selected the option ‘a lot’; 71% and 37.9% from NUML and KAAU respectively selected ‘sometimes’, 4.1% and 4.4% opted for ‘a little’ from NUML and KAAU, whereas none from these universities selected ‘never’ category.
This data again refers to the long-established opinions of most of the language teachers that bilingualism is unavoidable in a language classroom. At times, it so happens that if the teacher and the learner are from two different linguistic backgrounds, the communication gap increases, which may, rather would, lead to the wrong, misappropriate and incorrect learning of language. The students will learn these incorrect and misappropriate use of language which they carry throughout their lives. Thus, the whole process and exercise of learning a language becomes futile.

**Table 4.37**

**How often do you think bilingualism should be used in the classroom?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A lot of times</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.37 presents the data on the question use of bilingualism in classroom. This question has also been categorized in four different categories of ‘a lot’, ‘sometimes’, ‘a little’ and ‘never’. The results display that 0.7% from NUML and 31.5% from KAAU selected the option ‘a lot’; 40.7% and 37% from NUML and KAAU respectively selected ‘sometimes’; more than half from NUML, i.e. 51% opted for ‘a little’, whereas 22.6% from KAAU were in this favor. However a small number of students selected 7.6% from NUML and 8.9% from KAAU used ‘never’ category.

This data points out another aspect of the bilingualism problem that the use of L1 is necessary, but it should not be used profusely and constantly, because this would also hamper the process of language learning to a great extent. The learners may become too relaxed, may not be very actively involved in it or lose the interest because of too much reliance on the use of L1. Thus, as has previously been pointed out the fair and judicious use helps but frequent and persistent use leads to the end of learning a foreign language.
Table 4.38

What percentage of the time do you think mother tongue should be used in the class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10-20%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>61% and above</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.38 presents the data about the percentage of the time consumed using mother tongue in class. The responses are arranged in these four categories, ‘10-20%’, ‘21-40%’, ‘41-60%’ and ‘61% and above’. The first category 10-20% from NUML got 43% and KAAU 9.6% of the total responses. In the second category 21-40% 34.5% and 39.9% attracted the respondents, whereas in the third category the same 15.5% from NUML and 32.3% from KAAU got the answers. In the last category ‘61% and above’, only 7% from NUML and 18.3% from KAAU selected this option.

Figure 4.38
This question is related with the previous one, in which the use of bilingualism in a language class is asked. Here the question is about the percentage of the use of time in language class is given.

The students in NUML were interested in bilingualism comparatively less than the KAAU students. This shows that the NUML students want relatively less time for L1use otherwise it would just provide them less chance for L2 learning and using. Thus they need the assistance and facilitation of L1 but not at the expense of L2.

On the other hand at KAAU the students wanted more time for the use of L1. The argument, which has been presented previously, is that Saudi society because of mono-lingualism relies more on the use of L1, because this would facilitate them more. Otherwise, their interaction and exposure to the outside world is less in comparison with Pakistani society where an ordinary person is exposed to and thus is capable of using or at least understanding more than L1.

Thus the language learning capability is better than those who had to learn only the mother tongue. The conclusion of this question therefore is that a little more time is to be given to the use of L1 in the class, so that the fluency and competence of language capability is enhanced.

To conclude it may be said that the data collected and analyzed in this chapter has been discussed in detail. On the basis of these findings the researcher aims to discuss the results in the next chapter. In the light of final analysis, the recommendations have been forwarded.
CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This dissertation set out to investigate the use of bilingualism in the teaching of English as a foreign language which facilitates the learning of L2 at Intermediate/Certificate level in general English language classes. The main research question for the present study has been: How does bilingualism in the teaching of English as a foreign language aid and facilitate the learning of L2 at Intermediate/Certificate level in general English classes?

Besides the main research question, the researcher has divided various sections of the study into these sub-questions to prove the hypothesis:

1. What is the role of L1 in teaching L2 effectively?
2. How frequently should L1 be used in teaching L2 in classes?
3. What is the attitude of the learners towards using L1 in a class?
4. Why is it desirable that the students and teachers use L1 in an EFL class?
5. How do teachers look at this issue of bilingualism in their teaching methodology?

The hypothesis for the present study has been that bilingualism in English language classes does not reduce learners’ exposure and capacity to communicate well in L2; rather it assists, aids and facilitates the teaching and learning process. On the basis of this hypothesis it was contended that the use of mother tongue/first language (L1) in the class proves the argument that people learning foreign languages follow basically the same route which they follow to acquire their mother tongue (L1); hence the use of mother tongue or L1 in the language learning process should be channelised and recommended.
The study sought to testify whether bilingualism should be used in classrooms or be banned. My argument being that proper, moderate and judicious use of L1 in EFL class can aid and facilitate the learning and teaching of the target language. This view is shared by many of my colleagues, who are in this field and by many expert researchers who have recommended the case. However, the value of using L1 is a neglected topic in TEFL methodology literature. This omission together with the widely advocated principle that bilingualism should not be used in the foreign language classroom makes most teachers, experienced or not, feel uneasy about using L1 or permitting its use in the classroom, even when there is a need to do so.

### 5.1 Main Findings of the Study

1. Present study shows that bilingualism has a small but important role to play in communicating meaning and content. This role is important while teaching integrated skills of different courses at intermediate/certificate level. Moreover, this research has shown that the first language of learners can play a useful role in teaching these skills at this level. It clearly identifies those parts of a language course where there is value in using L1.

2. Where learners have little opportunity to meet and use L2 outside the classroom, L2 use is maximized in the classroom. One obvious way to do this is to carry out classroom management in L2, English. Classroom management involves things like telling the class what to do, controlling behavior, explaining activities. This requires a careful thought by the teacher so that the vocabulary and structures used in the language of classroom management are also generally useful. If the use of English in classroom management is done in a planned, consistent way, then classroom management can be a very effective opportunity for learning through meaning focused input. A very useful piece of classroom-based research would be to identify through observation the functions and forms of the language of classroom management, and then devise a classified list of useful sentences that make use of generally high frequency words and grammatical structures. In this way the role of L1 in classroom management can be minimized and the role of L2 increased.
3. Bilingualism has been employed as a teaching technique. In classrooms where the learners all share the same L1, there is a tendency for tasks which should be done in the L2 such as conversation activities, discussion of intensive reading, preparation for writing etc to be done in L1. There are many reasons for L1 use. Firstly it is more natural to use the L1 with others who have the same L1. Secondly, it is easier and more communicatively effective to use L1. Thirdly, using the L2 can be a source of embarrassment particularly for shy learners and those who feel they are not very proficient in L2.

4. This research study has clearly shown that L1 is being used, although its use may not be found advisable in TEFL methodology literature. And the use of L1 in the class is generally aiding and facilitating the language learning experience. The teachers participating in the research indicated that the translation of many words, complex ideas or even the whole passages is a good way to learn a foreign language. My observation of the ten classes suggests that without the aid and facilitation of L1, learners would be likely to make unguided and often incorrect translations at an early stage of their learning experience.

5. This study also reveals that in the EFL classes, which were observed, bilingualism has played only a supportive and facilitating role. The chief medium of communication remains, no doubt, English only. As with any other classroom technique, the use of the mother tongue is only a means to the end of improving foreign language proficiency. I agree with the majority of the student participants that no more than 10% of class time should be spent using L1. In my experience, this percentage decreases as the students’ English proficiency increases. Of course, a translation course would be an exception.

6. Moreover, this resort to language learning does not decrease the motivation level of students learning English. As English majors in the university, their English language proficiency is regarded as a symbol of their identity as well as of academic brilliance. It is a route to future academic and employment opportunities. There are some students who feel that English is being imposed on them or regard it as a threat to their identity. Instead, they generally prefer greater or exclusive use of English in the
classroom. In their view, L1 should be used only when necessary to help them learn English better.

Following conclusions can be associated with the findings of the research study:

1. The first language (L1) and the target language (L2) are complementary rather than mutually exclusive.

2. There is no empirical support for the view that time spent on the first language detracts from the development of the foreign language. If anything, greater elaboration of the native language results in more efficient acquisition of the foreign language. The fact that “older children are more efficient foreign language learners than younger children” is seen as further evidence that stronger first-language proficiency translates into better foreign language learning.

3. As it was revealed by some teachers during their informal discussion with the researcher, the structural patterns of the first language (L1) have minimal influence on the patterns of foreign acquisition, especially at the syntactic level. Although prevailing theory in the 1960’s predicted that the bulk of the difficulty in foreign language learning consisted of overcoming the previously learned habits of L1, current researchers no longer hold this view.

4. All foreign language learners of English, for example, have much in common in terms of the difficulties they face in learning a foreign language regardless of their native languages. Studies generally show measurable but not overwhelming impact of native language structures in foreign language acquisition.

### 5.2 Recommendations

In order to aid and facilitate the language learning process with the help of first language, there are certain recommendations for the teachers, which have been /can be drawn from the current research study.

1. The first recommendation for the teachers is that they should maintain and improve the motivation level of the students. The students feel more motivated when they learn in a familiar environment. If the use of first language is
strictly prohibited, the students would feel alienated and apprehensive while in a familiar environment, they feel more communicative with the teachers. It is, therefore, stressed that the teachers may not only be allowed but they need to prefer bilingualism while explaining difficult words, phrases and complex structures of the target language. The motivation level can thus be achieved, maintained and improved enormously.

2. The second recommendation is that the use of bilingualism must be moderate and judicious. It is important that the major medium of instruction must be English. The students ought to be made familiar with the target language with its pronunciation, structural, socio-cultural and semantic contents to learn clearly and appropriately different contours of the target language. However, the first language (L1) is to be used for different purposes. It can be utilized when difficult words, proverbs and sayings need to be explained to the students. L1 can also be employed while explaining difficult and complex ideas are being conveyed to the students. To explain complex grammatical structures, it ought to be resorted to. In explaining difficult phonological points, L1 sounds can be produced, so that the students can grasp the sounds with constructive and comparative techniques. However, in all these, the use of L1 should be appropriate and judicious. As stated earlier, the students are to be made familiar with the various contents of the target language L2 English. In the current study, majority of the students and the teachers have suggested that 20-30 percent of the total time should be allocated for the use of L1. But the teachers have to take decision in allocating the time to cope with the needs of the learners.

3. The third recommendation is that in foreign language learning/teaching, it has often been observed that the loss of social and cultural identity of the learners results in a monolingual class. This is not a much-favored condition. The important thing is that some of the teachers and students think that learning the target language involves the absorption of the social and cultural context. It need not be aimed at. The learners must create a balanced and mature attitude, that they are learning the language only; they are not changing their identity. They have to pick the sounds, structures and meanings of the target language,
but not the culture. This situation can be dealt with a proper fashion, if students are being familiarized with the use of their mother tongue/L1 especially in the third world countries, under the compelling forces of globalization, the communities are losing their native culture along with the language, which results in the death and loss of such a diversified and rich heritage of world cultures.

4. The fourth recommendation is that the teacher should emphasize the similarities and contrasts of both the languages thereby making the learners more familiar with the grammatical components of L1 and L2. It would be helpful for the learners to grasp, comprehend and master various language items in their language learning process. As a result, learners very quickly explore their mistakes that occur advertently or inadvertently. Therefore, curriculum needs to be shaped in such a manner where teacher can effectively take up such a deal.

5. The fifth recommendation would be that the language learning process would become more purposeful and meaningful. In contrast to language analysis, language-learning experience is the use of target language for real and immediate communicative goals. However, if the teachers resort to English only, for those learners who are accustomed to being taught exclusively in their mother tongue may at first be uncomfortable if their teachers speak to them in English only, expecting them not only to understand but perhaps even to respond. Thus, it needs to be supplemented more at early stages.

6. Sixthly, the use of bilingualism wherever required, may prove to be an important tool for the learners to understand L2 with ease, hence to assess their own learning progress. As a matter of fact, the usefulness of self-assessment for learning purposes seems to be widely accepted although it is far less common and many actively resist its implementation. However, it is an important and effective technique to know one’s own worth through these techniques. Thus, the use of bilingualism is recommended for language learning process.
7. Lastly, in classes where all learners share the same L1, teachers need to use a range of options to encourage learners to use L2 as much as possible. The following range of options is based on the idea that there are several reasons why the learners prefer the use of bilingualism most frequently while learning L2. These reasons include low proficiency in L2, the least eagerness to use L2 while interacting with teacher in performing the class activities, shyness in using L2 or simply a lack of interest in learning L2.

Here are some of the remedial measures dealing with these obstacles (Recommendation 7) in L2 use.

a. Choose the teaching materials well suited to the needs of the learners for their proficiency.
b. Prepare learners for tasks with the help of warm-up activities and skills needed.
c. Use systematic and graded tasks to mark learners’ progress step by step to bring them up to the required level.
d. Motivate learners to pretend to be English speakers.
e. Make L2 an unavoidable part of the task. Retelling activities, strip stories, completion activities, and role plays all require the use of L2.
f. Repeat language games and classroom activities for learners’ better comprehension to ease and facilitate the learning process.
g. Inform learners of the significance of language-specific activities in class. This will help learners achieve their learning objectives.
h. Discuss with learners the value of using L2 in class.
i. Discuss the reasons why learners avoid using L2 and provide them with appropriate remedy so that they should overcome their aforesaid shortcoming in the use of L2.
j. Set up a monitoring system to motivate learners to use L2 frequently. In group work speaking tasks this can involve giving one learner in each group the role of reminding others to use L2.
k. Use learners-friendly and popular situational activities. Learners can choose their own groups, the teacher can stay out of the groups allowing learners to prepare well for the situation, don’t use such situations that embarrass
learners, and choose easy and interesting tasks.

If encouraging L2 use is a problem, several of these different solutions may need to be used. These solutions cover a range of affective, cognitive, and resource approaches and thus can be seen as complementary rather than as alternatives.

In some countries, English and L1 are in competition with each other and the use of English increases at the expense of L1. Teachers need to show respect for the learners’ L1 and need to avoid doing things that make L1 seem inferior to English. At the same time, it is the English teacher’s job to help learners develop their proficiency in English. Thus, a balanced approach is needed which sees a role for L1 but also recognizes the importance of maximizing L2 use in the classroom.

In a nutshell, in order to recapitulate, it is argued that the research shows that limited, moderate and judicious use of L1 in the English classroom in Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, and in the world in general, does not reduce students’ exposure to L2, but rather can assist in the teaching and learning process. This is not to overstate the role of L1 or advocate the greater use of L1 in EFL classroom but to classify some of the misconceptions along with the effectiveness of L1 in this process that have troubled foreign language teachers for years, such as whether they should use the mother tongue when there is need for it and whether the often mentioned principle of no native language/L1 in the class is justifiable. It is hoped that these findings and recommendations will help make more people acknowledge the role of bilingualism in the foreign language classroom and stimulate further studies and insights in this area.
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APPENDIX ‘A’

QUESTIONNAIRE
(For Teachers Only)

Note: This questionnaire aims to find out your attitude towards using Bilingualism as Teaching Aid in the English classroom at Certificate and Diploma level. Kindly answer honestly, because your answers will be used for research purposes only. The answers you give us will be combined with the results of other respondents; therefore no one will be able to trace your responses.

Circle the relevant choice (1-5)

1. Age
   a. 25-35 years
   b. 36-45 years
   c. 46 years and above

2. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female

3. Qualification
   a. M. A.
   b. PhD

4. Institution
   a. NUML
   b. KAAU

5. Teaching Experience
   a. 0-2 years
   b. 3-5 years
   c. 6-15 years
   d. 16-25 years or above
Check (✓) the relevant box:

6. Is Bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom?
   a. □ Yes                      b. □ No                      c. Not Sure

7. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom? (More than one choices are possible. For Yes, write ✓, for No X, for Not Sure, leave blank).
   a. □ to help define some new vocabulary items (e.g. some abstract words)
   b. □ to practice the use of some phrases and expressions (e.g. doing translation exercises)
   c. □ to explain complex grammar points
   d. □ to explain difficult concepts or ideas
   e. □ to give instructions
   f. □ to give suggestions on how to learn more effectively
   g. □ If any other, please specify

8. If you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom, why? (Check One Choice)
   a. It aids comprehension greatly.  i. □ Yes   ii. □ No   iii. □ Not Sure
   b. It is more effective.         i. □ Yes   ii. □ No   iii. □ Not Sure
   c. It is less time-consuming.    i. □ Yes   ii. □ No   iii. □ Not Sure
d. Other, please specify. i. □ Yes ii. □ No iii. □ Not Sure

Check (✓) the relevant choice (only one) that summarizes your reaction to each statement

9. Mother tongue (L1) is losing ground to other languages in the country.
   a. □ strongly agree   b. □ Agree   c. □ Not sure   d. □ Disagree   e. □ Not disagree

10. There is a difference between L1 acquisition now and in the past.
    a. □ strongly agree   b. □ Agree   c. □ Not sure   d. □ Disagree   e. □ Not disagree

11. The best way to learn English language is through communicative approach.
    a. □ strongly agree   b. □ Agree   c. □ Not sure   d. □ Disagree   e. □ Not disagree

12. Children learning English are retained too long in bilingual classrooms owing to L1.
    a. □ strongly agree   b. □ Agree   c. □ Not sure   d. □ Disagree   e. □ Not disagree

13. The Government institutions provide bilingual instruction.
    a. □ strongly agree   b. □ Agree   c. □ Not sure   d. □ Disagree   e. □ Not disagree

    a. □ strongly agree   b. □ Agree   c. □ Not sure   d. □ Disagree   e. □ Not disagree

15. Bilingualism makes instruction easier for the teacher.
a. □ strongly agree  b. □ Agree  c. □ Not sure  d. □ Disagree  e. □ Strongly disagree

16. Cultural associations favor bilingualism.
a. □ strongly agree  b. □ Agree  c. □ Not sure  d. □ Disagree  e. □ Strongly disagree

17. Bilingualism is a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning.
a. □ strongly agree  b. □ Agree  c. □ Not sure  d. □ Disagree  e. □ Strongly disagree

18. Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learner learn subject matter better when he/she studies it L1?
a. □ Yes  b. □ No  c. □ Not sure

19. Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in the foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?
a. □ Yes  b. □ No  c. □ Not sure

20. Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2?
a. □ Yes  b. □ No  c. □ Not sure

21. Do you think that the use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2?
a. □ Yes  b. □ No  c. □ Not sure

22. Do you think it is possible for the learners to learn L2 and maintain their competence of L1?
a. □ Yes  b. □ No  c. □ Not sure

23. Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1?
a. □ Yes  b. □ No  c. □ Not sure

24. Do you think a learner will grasp L2 better if the teacher uses only the target language?
a. □ Yes  b. □ No  c. □ Not sure
Thank you for your cooperation.
Muhammad Aslam Sipra

APPENDIX ‘B’

QUESTIONNAIRE
(For Students Only)

Note: This questionnaire aims to find out your attitude towards using Bilingualism as Teaching Aid in the English classroom at Certificate and Diploma level. Kindly answer honestly, because your answers will be used for research purposes only. The answers you give will be combined with the results of other respondents; therefore no one will be able to trace your responses.

Circle the relevant choice (1-5)

1. Age
   a. 15-20 years
   b. 21-25 years

2. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female

3. Level of Education Completed
   a. SSC
   b. HSSC

4. Institution
   a. NUML
   b. KAAU

5. Years of Learning a Foreign Language
   a. 0-6 years
   b. 7-10 years

6. With whom do you speak English?
   a. □ With family
   b. □ With friends/classmates
   c. □ With neighbors
   d. □ With teachers
7. When do you most often come across with English?
   a. □ Watching TV        b. □ Reading books     c. □ Classroom
   d. □ If any other, specify please. __________________

8. How important is it for you to know English?
   a. □ Very important     b. □ Important        c. □ Not important
   d. □ Not at all important

9. How do you feel about English used in your daily life?
   a. □ Very excited       b. □ Excited         c. □ Not much excited
   d. □ Not at all excited

10. Do you feel comfortable with English?
    a. □ Very comfortable   b. □ Comfortable  c. □ Not comfortable
    d. □ Not at all comfortable

11. Is Bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom?
    a. □ Yes                 b. □ No           c. □ Not Sure

12. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?
    (More than one choice is possible. For Yes, write √, for No X, for Not Sure, leave blank)
    a. □ to help define some new vocabulary items (e.g. some abstract words)
    b. □ to practice the use of some phrases and expressions (e.g. doing translation exercises)
    c. □ to explain complex grammar points
    d. □ to explain difficult concepts or ideas
e. □ to give instructions

f. □ to give suggestions on how to learn more effectively

g. □ If any other, please
   specify____________________________________

13. Do you think bilingualism in the classroom help you learn the target language?
   a. □ A lot  b. □ Sometimes  c. □ A little  d. □ Never

14. How often do you think bilingualism should be used in the classroom?
   a. □ A lot  b. □ Sometimes  c. □ A little  d. □ Never

15. What percentage of the time do you think mother tongue should be used in the class? (Choose one)
   a. □ 10% ___ 20 %  b. □ 20% ___ 40%  c. □ 40% ___ 60%
   d. □ 60% ___ 80%

   Thank you for your cooperation.

Muhammad Aslam Sipra
Note: This semi-structured interview aims to find out your attitude towards using Bilingualism as Teaching Aid in the English classroom at Certificate and Diploma level. Kindly answer honestly, because your answers will be used for research purposes only. The answers you give us will be combined with the results of other respondents; therefore no one will be able to trace your responses.

Age: ___________________________

Gender: ________________________

Qualification: ______________________

Teaching Experience: ________________________________

Institution: __________________________________________

1. Is bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom? Discuss.

2. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

   Elaborate it please.

3. Why do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom? Explain with examples.

4. Can bilingualism be a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning? Analyze and argue with examples.

5. Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learners learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in L1? Discuss in detail.
6. Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in the second/foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1? Support your answer with example.

7. Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2? Discuss.

8. Do you think that use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2? If yes, how?

9. Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1? Substantiate your answer with some examples.

10. Do you think that if a foreign language learner is in L2 only class, he will learn it better? Discuss.
APPENDIX ‘D’

Semi-Structured Interview
(Answer Script)

Teacher 1

1. Is bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom? Discuss.

Answer: Yes, it is very helpful in the classroom. This has been my personal experience over the years teaching at various levels and teaching to students coming from different socio-economic and cultural backgrounds.

2. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom? Elaborate it please.

Answer: It is necessary all the time because it contributes to understanding complex situations in human interaction and linguistic problems faced by the student and the teacher. Most often than not, when teachers and students are both at a loss to convey and understand the exact nature of the words, grammatical points, etc. They need to revert to bilingualism.

3. Why do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom? Explain with examples.

Answer: Though the previous answer can also serve it is necessary to establish a rapport between the teacher and the student which is not possible without bilingualism.

4. Can bilingualism be a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning? Analyze and argue with examples.
Answer: For the very reason that bilingualism can help in understanding a situation it serves as a facilitator both to the teacher as well as to the student.

5. Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learners learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in L1?

Answer: As far as learning of L2 through the use of L1 is concerned, it helps improve one’s comprehension, by opening new horizons/windows for the learner.

6. Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in the foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?

Answer: Though the question appears to be contradictory yet I believe the use of L1 should not be constant because it should leave some space for improving L2.

7. Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2?

Answer: Yes, there is no doubt about it.

8. Do you think that use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2?

Answer: With the passage of time, the use of L1 may be progressively reduced for better proficiency and fluency in L2.

9. Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1?

Answer: Yes. In practice it has been observed that L2 is learnt more speedily if the teacher employs L1 also.

10. Do you think that if a foreign language learner is in L2 only class, he will learn it better?
Answer: The only conclusion one can draw is in the negative though the theory may be proceeding in the other direction.

Teacher 2

1. Is bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom? Discuss.

Answer: yes, of course, bilingualism is of great importance as far as teaching second/foreign language is concerned.

2. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: I think there are various occasions when it becomes a necessity. Particularly in the class of the beginners, the use of L1 can not be eliminated at all. Especially before the teacher conducts any activity, he has to give instructions which should be very clear and unambiguous. Moreover, it is used at times of prime necessity when the students are unable to grasp the language item, structures or any vocabulary item that is being discussed.

3. Why do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: It is necessary because it is time saving and it minimizes confusion while giving instructions to the second language learners.

4. Can bilingualism be a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning?

Answer: Of course, its occasional use can be a positive factor but its overuse can increase the students’ dependence on the equivalents in their own language.

5. Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learners learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in L1?
**Answer:** It is of great help e.g. when the Arab students are explained the word “beautiful” which is an abstract word, they might not understand it but a word ( جميل) from their language can serve the purpose quite easily. Moreover, "سياره" can be a judicious choice for the word “car”. And it makes the learning process very convenient. In addition, it can also be said that not all the vocabulary items can be taught through the direct or audio-lingual or any other method. So, when the other methods fail or impede the process, the use of L1 can be very handy.

**6. Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in the foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?**

**Answer:** It is otherwise. The excessive use of L1 can mar the fluency of the learners. Their continuous and constant switching over to L1 may even be disruptive regarding fluency. Therefore, it should be used sparingly.

**7. Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2?**

**Answer:** It can be answered by an example. Suppose that the Pakistani students are being taught “the hyperbolic use of language”, as it happened to me, many times I had to teach literature to the Pakistani students at Masters Level, and I experienced it myself, they might not be able to grasp the concept when explained in L2.

**8. Do you think that use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2?**

**Answer:** Yes, it can increase their communicative competence by making their concepts about L2 clear and they can use it with more ease. However, their communicative performance is dependent on how much and how effectively they have learnt to use L2.

**9. Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1?**

**Answer:** I do agree that the use of L1 hastens the learning process of L2.
10. Do you think that if a foreign language learner is in L2 only class, he will learn it better?

**Answer:** Of course, it will be a long and lengthy process. The results may be better but the process of learning may stretch to a longer span of time.
Teacher 3

1. Is bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom? Discuss.

Answer: At the lower level, bilingualism is an absolute must, not only a must I repeat but an absolute must.

2. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: Bilingualism as I did say in answer to the first query becomes essential at elementary level. More so, for Pakistani students who have not been exposed to foreign teachers at all, nor the elitist teachers.

3. Why do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: It is an absolute must for students whose English is at the elementary level because the assimilation of the message of idiomatic expressions in particular and explanation of difficult words in general co-supersonic and supra cortical words.

I came across such situation during my career when I started my teaching way back in 1960, I did find some students finding English more Greek than English. By that I mean their assimilation of English was at the lowest achievable angle because the city was Rahim Yar Khan.

4. Can bilingualism be a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning?

Answer: Yes to these questions, I am answering in affirmative as the question implies, bilingualism is definitely a facilitator and contributor to second language learning. Its solitary drawback is that from the pronunciation point of view, students learn virtually nothing whereas students should not aspire for RP is not potentially achievable and they should aspire for three things i.e. international intelligibility; second, international communicability and the third one is international acceptability.
Unfortunately, they cannot reach this standard. Bilingualism must be supplemented by a laboratory in which proper pronunciation is taught.

5. **Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learners learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in L1?**

**Answer:** When at early level, things are taught in Urdu, and then are literally translated into English; the time consumed is too substantial to warrant this approach. As such, I would very strongly recommend that whereas different passages be explained in mother tongue, the reliance on the mother tongue should not be all embracing.

6. **Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in the foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?**

**Answer:** I don’t agree with the concept that a learner could achieve fluency in the second language if he is taught first in L1 simply because the genius of both the languages are poles apart.

7. **Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2?**

**Answer:** In this regard I will say that mastery of the mother tongue is a pre requisite not for speaking but definitely for writing. The reason being that nobody can dream in English at the dream level. You have got to have recourse to your mother tongue. Secondly, a very simple test of the mastery of L2 is this: can we retain English when we are very, very emotional or we are very very angry. In both extreme cases, we have got to resort to our mother tongue. The corollary of being that English can not be fast mastered even at the advanced level. It is potentially unmasterable. As such, we ought to punctuate our teaching with Urdu expression as well.

8. **Do you think that use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2?**
**Answer:** I beg to differ with this contention that the competency in L2 is possible if we first master our language. As I did say before that first language would definitely improve your written expression but when it comes to spoken, the help is almost negligible.

9. **Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1?**

**Answer:** Well, regarding the speed of the acquisition of L2 as compared with L1, is just not possible. L2 is very, very slow almost passive approach whereas we speak our national language with instinctive ease.

10. **Do you think that if a foreign language learner is in L2 only class, he will learn it better?**

**Answer:** When a student being taught exclusively in L2, he is learning language in oriental background i.e. our background, will be slow, tardy, the work will be more harmful than helpful.
1. Is bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom? Discuss.
   
   **Answer:** Yes it is.

2. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

   **Answer:** It is important when an abstract concept is to be taught or the essence of an idiom or axiom is to be conveyed because many idioms generally easily can’t be conveyed and translated from one language to another language word for word. So in such situations, L1 is used to help the students.

3. Why do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

   **Answer:** For more successful teaching and for better understanding of the learners.

4. Can bilingualism be a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning?

   **Answer:** Yes certainly.

5. Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learners learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in L1?

   **Answer:** According to my point of view, learning of a text becomes easier when somebody learns or reads a text in his L1. They understand better in L1.

6. Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in the foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?

   **Answer:** No, fluency is strictly linked with and fully depends on the practice of L2.
7. Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2?

Answer: Yes, especially in grammar.

8. Do you think that use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2?

Answer: Yes, if the use is appropriate and according to the real needs of the learners.

9. Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1?

Answer: I think not as it depends on the family background of L1 and L2. for example, if L1 and L2 belong to the same language family, the learning of L2 is going to be easier for the learners because these languages share so many things.

10. Do you think that if a foreign language learner is in L2 only class, he will learn it better?

Answer: No, L1 should be used to some extent.
Teacher 5

1. Is bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom? Discuss.

Answer: Yes it is helpful to a great extent. In many cases and many situations, we see that it is helpful especially when we have to explain some difficult terms which sometimes are difficult to explain otherwise, we translate or explain it in mother tongue. It becomes easier.

2. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: There are many such situations in the classroom when I feel that bilingualism or use of L1 is important and necessary as well because especially when there are difficult nouns, abstract nouns or other certain cases which we are unable to explain but we have very good equivalents in L1. So in order to save time and make students convenient, we just translate them into L1. Switching to L1 can help us explain those expressions in certain cases, certain idiomatic expressions, nouns or some other vocabulary items. So it is important for that to resort to bilingualism.

3. Why do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: Bilingualism is necessary and important in the classroom because it facilitates the teacher. It facilitates not only the teacher but also the students. Sometimes it saves some extra efforts when we try to explain certain concepts directly in the target language but they won’t have better effects as compared to when we explain them in L1 or the mother tongue. So it is important. Sometimes when students are unable to speak or hesitate to speak, we have to switch to mother tongue/L1 so that we can trigger them to speak. This way, we can help them overcome their hesitation by taking a start in L1 and then switching to the target language or L2.

4. Can bilingualism be a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning?
Answer: Yes, bilingualism can be a facilitator and a contributor to the second language learning in many ways as I discussed earlier. By helping students sometimes by encouraging students, removing hesitation and explaining something that is very difficult.

5. Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learners learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in L1?

Answer: Sometimes, not always. Sometimes, it helps the students to understand the subject matter in a better way if we explain it to them in L1. At certain occasions, we, as teachers, feel that L1 will be a greater aid than L2.

6. Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in the foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?

Answer: No it is not constant use. It’s only fair and judicious use of L1 that can help. The constant use can hamper, hinder or stop the acquisition of fluency in L2. At certain times, it is the job of a teacher to decide where to use and where to avoid to the maximum, not all the time and no constant use. Yes, if we use it constantly, there may be a stage where it affects the learning or gaining fluency in L2.

7. Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2?

Answer: Yes, use of bilingualism can be of certain practical advantage if you talk of certain vocabulary items especially when students hesitate to speak. At certain occasions, it can be of advantage in learning L2.

8. Do you think that use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2?

Answer: Yes, by use of bilingualism, it can help us achieve competency in L2 in many ways as I have discussed earlier. So the use of L1 basically will be an aid apart from other audio visual aids the teacher is using in class. It can be another teaching aid for the teacher as well. When students are stuck in and where the situation gets
stuck in, the use of bilingualism or L1 can help students having competency in L2 but not constant use of L1, however, fair and judicious use of L1 only.

9. **Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1?**

**Answer:** Yes, to some extent but not the constant use of L1. They learn quickly especially those difficult concepts which we are unable to explain or which find it hard e.g. abstract ideas or when we feel that it is very difficult to explain in L2, we use bilingualism to facilitate the learners. Otherwise, they are at loss to understand them. In stead of making the situation difficult, it is always suggested that use of L1 can help us get out of that situation where we want to explain certain abstract ideas in particular. So they are given equivalents or translations of those concepts in L1 for better understanding for the students. This way, use of L1 will help learners learn L2 faster.

10. **Do you think that if a foreign language learner is in L2 only class, he will learn it better?**

**Answer:** No, it is not necessary that the learner learns better if he is in L2 only class. Use of bilingualism will definitely help the learners.
1. Is bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom? Discuss.

**Answer:** Yes of course. It is an asset and should be fostered. It is not only helpful but it has also cognitive, cultural and economic advantages. Learners who have the opportunity to come across such teachers, who know the L1 of the learners, will prove more helpful for the learners as opposed to a teacher who is monolingual.

2. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

**Answer:** I believe there are a number of situations in which bilingualism becomes indispensable. Most often, it occurs in those situations where the learners come either from a very poor educational background. The teacher is forced to use L1 because otherwise the students will be learning incorrect English or will be unable to comprehend what they are being taught.

3. Why do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

**Answer:** Bilingualism, I think, is necessary in the class because it relieves teacher from the confusions and problematic situations. Usually, confusions arise because of the inability of the teacher or of the learner to get a clear idea about the syntactic and semantic aspects of the language.

4. Can bilingualism be a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning?

**Answer:** Yes of course, bilingualism definitely helps and contributes largely to second language learning. Its common use can improve students’ reliance on learning the equivalents from various languages which leads to the solid foundations of the second language along with the first language.
5. Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learners learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in L1?

Answer: Again this is related with the previous question. I do agree and understand that the overall comprehension of the language at the initial stages is necessary and this is one area which can not be facilitated without the aid of first language. This is what I have come to realize after my stay in Saudi Arabia. The learners who come from a background which is overwhelmingly monolingual and they usually do not have any easy or common access to learning any other language. Thus when you start explaining the meaning of “come here” you need to give them Arabic equivalent “ta’al hina”. Only then, they will be able to understand imperative syntactic structure.

6. Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in the foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?

Answer: Well, what I believe is that it depends upon the situation. If it is a very weak group academically, you need the constant use of L1. Otherwise, I would not suggest the constant use of L1 because it would impair linguistic competence and fluency.

7. Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2?

Answer: Again I have the same two opinions. You need to take into account the ground realities being a teacher. You need to be able to be flexible and have to develop conditions where you can teach in a better and productive manner and at the same time the learners on the receiving end, must be satisfied with this that they have learned something.

8. Do you think that use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2?

Answer: Yes of course, it does result in the competency in L2 by making their concepts clear and understandable.
9. Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1?

**Answer:** Well, as I have told you already that it completely depends upon the learners’ personal academic performance.

10. Do you think that if a foreign language learner is in L2 only class, he will learn it better?

**Answer:** Well, what I believe and the experience that I had with these Arabic speaking students is that it is simply impossible.
Teacher 7

1. Is bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom? Discuss.

Answer: Yes, I think bilingualism is helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom because the concepts learners have formed in their first language, that is not to be completely washed out or not completely locked because all the time, when we teach, we are in a situation where that is for facilitating their conceptual learning. The bilingualism helps i.e. L1, in our case, for example, in Arabic if we explain something that would definitely help the learners better.

2. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: As far as this question is concerned, as I have just pointed out when we find that the students and the teachers especially in reading skills classes, there are certain abstract concepts and for making them to learn better and effectively, I think bilingualism is necessary.

3. Why do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: As I just pointed out that this is because of L1 interference in learning L2 or studying literature in the L2, which is not perhaps easy. It is, therefore, necessary that the teachers in stead of feeling shy or embarrassed in using L1, they should use bilingualism for these reasons when the concepts are not clear to the students e.g. when I was teaching unfamiliar words to the students especially the abstract words, for example, you can’t define what is “justice” you can’t define what is “honesty”, you need L1 as substitute.

4. Can bilingualism be a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning?

Answer: It is absolutely true. It is a blessing for the young learners. I think, it is a kind of bridge between the teacher and the learners. It is, for sure, motivates and facilitates the learners.
5. **Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learners learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in L1?**

**Answer:** It is true, I believe but it should become the habit in class. Only limited use of bilingualism should be allowed in classes.

6. **Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in the foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?**

**Answer:** No it is not true. As I mentioned earlier, only restricted use of L1 is useful but it has nothing to do with the fluency.

7. **Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2?**

**Answer:** Of course, this way the learners improve their vocabulary, expression and finally enrich their language in general.

8. **Do you think that use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2?**

**Answer:** I must say, to some extent.

9. **Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1?**

**Answer:** I think it is true only in the beginning when the learners start learning L2.

10. **Do you think that if a foreign language learner is in L2 only class, he will learn it better?**

**Answer:** I believe that the learners can be deprived of their L1 as it is an asset for them. It may cause inferiority complex.
Teacher 8

1. Is bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom? Discuss.

Answer: Yes, bilingualism is quite helpful as a teaching aid.

2. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: I think bilingualism is only necessary when there is no other option left for the teacher to define or explain the meanings and connotations of a word or a phrase.

3. Why do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: It is essential for a productive teaching learning process for the language learners.

4. Can bilingualism be a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning?

Answer: Of course, it is a facilitator for a teacher and an important contributor to a language learner.

5. Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learners learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in L1?

Answer: As far as my point of view is concerned, it is not the question of learning subject matter in L2 which is important but it is the language which is important to learn. Therefore L1 does not help learning the subject matter in L2 but the language itself.

6. Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in the foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?
Answer: I don’t think so. Constant use of L1 would reduce the spoken aspect of language fluency but it would definitely improve the reading and writing fluency of the learners.

7. Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2?

Answer: Yes, as I have said, it would increase the reading comprehension and written expression of the learners.

8. Do you think that use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2?

Answer: I have already answered it that L1 increases the reading and writing competence but would reduce the spoken competence of the learners.

9. Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1?

Answer: I think initially it helps learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1. However, it would start reducing the learning abilities at advanced stages of language learning.

10. Do you think that if a foreign language learner is in L2 only class, he will learn it better?

Answer: No, L1 should be implied at the initial stages so that learners can prepare the ground on which they would initially learn to walk and then could run.
1. Is bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom? Discuss.

Answer: Yes, to a great extent.

2. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: I use it when it is necessary in the classroom.

3. Why do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: Because without it, there are problems especially in Saudi Arabia.

4. Can bilingualism be a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning?

Answer: No I don’t think so.

5. Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learners learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in L1?

Answer: I don’t believe in it.

6. Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in the foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?

Answer: I can say with conviction that fluency comes with practice but not through bilingualism.

7. Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2?
**Answer:** Yes, there are many practical advantages of bilingualism.

8. **Do you think that use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2?**

**Answer:** Yes, I think so.

9. **Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1?**

**Answer:** Yes, it is true to some extent.

10. **Do you think that if a foreign language learner is in L2 only class, he will learn it better?**

**Answer:** Yes, he will learn it better than others.
Teacher 10

1. Is bilingualism helpful as a teaching aid in the classroom? Discuss.

Answer: In many situations, we see that it is fairly helpful as a teaching aid.

2. When do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: I think it is necessary when either the teacher or the learner feels that the use of L1 has become imperative. For example, the teacher is unable to foster the idiomatic expressions on learners’ mind like that of “a blue stockings”.

3. Why do you think bilingualism is necessary in the classroom?

Answer: As I have already mentioned that the use of bilingualism must not be discouraged or restricted, rather it should be allowed to help the learners. At times, it is my personal experience that students are unable to use the target language because they don’t go with ease. Therefore, the teacher must switch over to L1 so as to help the learners better.

4. Can bilingualism be a facilitator and contributor to foreign language learning?

Answer: yes, no doubt!

5. Do you think that learning subject matter in L2 helps learners learn subject matter better when he/she studies them in L1?

Answer: Yes, it helps in a variety of ways to learn the subject matter in L2.

6. Do you think that if learners want to achieve fluency in the foreign language, it will be facilitated with the constant use of L1?
Answer: Not always but as the language learners claim that bilingualism must be used judiciously to achieve fluency in the target language.

7. Do you think that use of bilingualism can lead to practical advantages in learning L2?

Answer: Yes, I have personally experienced it that it leads to better advantages like that of comprehension and competence.

8. Do you think that use of bilingualism can result in the competency in L2?

Answer: Yes, by use of bilingualism, competency in L2 can be achieved comparatively easily.

9. Do you think that the learners learn L2 as quickly as possible with the help of L1?

Answer: In most of the situations, it does happen but there may be some instances when it does not help. For example, if the learners are at an advanced stage, it might create hurdles for them.

10. Do you think that if a foreign language learner is in L2 only class, he will learn it better?

Answer: Again, I would say that it may and may not be possible when we will be thinking in terms of their age, educational background, experience etc.