

PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: EREK DİLDEKİ DİLBİLGİSİ KAVRAMLARININ ÖĞRETİMİNDE ANA DİL KULLANIMININ
ÖĞRENCİ BASARISINA ETKİLERİ

AUTHORS: Meliha R SIMSEK

PAGES: 142-169

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/63302>

THE EFFECTS OF L1 USE IN THE TEACHING OF L2 GRAMMAR CONCEPTS ON THE STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT

(EREK DİLDEKİ DİLBİLGİSİ KAVRAMLARININ ÖĞRETİMİNDE
ANA DİL KULLANIMININ ÖĞRENCİ BAŞARISINA ETKİLERİ)

Meliha R. ŞİMŞEK¹

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to indicate the effects of the use of L1 concepts in the teaching of the L2 grammar concepts on the students' achievement and the retention of their learning. For this reason, a language learning model, the L1-Assisted Language Learning (L1-ALL), was designed on the basis of the Minimalist Program as the theory of language along with Constructionism as the theory of learning. A pretest-posttest control group quasi-experimental design was used in this study. The research was performed with the intermediate students at the School of Foreign Languages (Dokuz Eylül University) in the Fall term of 2008-2009 Academic Year. During the course of the experiment, the control group was instructed monolingually, whereas the experimental group was instructed by making use of the grammar concepts in L1. According to the results of the study, there was a significant difference both between the posttest scores ($p=0.041$) and between the delayed posttest scores ($p=0.002$) of the two groups. Also, the difference between the delayed posttest-pretest mean scores ($p=0.001$) and the difference between the delayed posttest-posttest mean scores ($p=0.039$) were statistically significant in favour of the experimental group. In other words, the L1-ALL practices are more effective than the monolingual teaching in increasing the achievement of English grammar, and the grammar instruction through the L1-ALL practices is more lasting than the monolingual teaching.

Keywords: The Minimalist Program, Constructionism, L1-Assisted Language Learning

ÖZ

Bu araştırmanın amacı, erek dildeki dilbilgisi kavramlarının öğretiminde ana dildeki kavramlardan yararlanılmasının öğrencilerin dilbilgisi başarıları ve öğrenmenin kalıcılığı üzerindeki etkilerini saptamaktır. Bu nedenle, dil kuramı olarak Minimalist Programı ve öğrenme kuramı olarak Yapılandırmacılığı temel alan bir dil öğrenme modeli, Anadil Destekli Dil Öğrenme (ADDÖ), tasarlanmıştır. Bu araştırma öntest-sontest kontrol gruplu yarı-deneysel desendir. Araştırma 2008-2009 Güz yarıyılında Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'ndaki orta düzey öğrenciler ile yürütülmüştür. Deney süresince kontrol grubuna erek dildeki dilbilgisi kavramları tekdilli olarak öğretilirken deney grubuna ise ana dildeki kavramlardan yararlanılarak öğretilmiştir. Araştırmadan elde edilen sonuçlara göre, deney ve kontrol gruplarının sontest ortalama puanları arasında ($p=0,041$) ve izleme testi ortalama puanları arasında ($p=0,002$) anlamlı farklılık bulunurken deney ve kontrol gruplarının izleme testi-öntest ortalamaları ($p=0,001$) ile izleme testi-sontest ortalamaları ($p=0,039$) arasındaki farkın istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve deney grubu lehine olduğu saptanmıştır. Bir başka deyişle, ADDÖ uygulamaları tekdilli öğretime göre İngilizce dilbilgisi başarılarını arttırmada daha etkilidir ve ADDÖ ile gerçekleştirilen dilbilgisi öğretimi tekdilli öğretime göre daha kalıcıdır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Minimalist Program, Yapılandırmacılık, Anadil Destekli Dil Öğrenme

¹ Ins. Dr., Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language Education. E-mail: malliday@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The use of the mother tongue in the field of foreign language education has been debated for so long that Prodromou (2001; as cited in Gabrielatos, 2001: 33) resembles the place of the L1 in the foreign language class to a skeleton in the cupboard that we avoid talking about, whereas Gabrielatos (2001) states that it has always been a point of contention. When the historical development of the foreign language teaching methods is studied, it is observed that since the Reform Movement of the 1880's, all language teaching methods, whether they are called audio-lingual or communicative, or the Silent Way, have insisted that the instructional techniques shouldn't depend on L1 (Cook, 1999). According to this monolingual approach, the L1 acquisition and L2 learning are similar processes and the exposure to the comprehensible L2 input is enough for the mastery of a foreign language (Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009). Many educators believe that code-switching should be avoided, otherwise L1 transfer may inhibit L2 development and "...any notion of first language use in language teaching and learning connotes the dreaded grammar-translation methods that communicative language proponents loathe" (Dailey-O'Cain, 2009: 2). For this reason, in order to safeguard the island of the target language, foreign language teachers have to fight back the sea of the mother tongue, build dams against its invasion and stop the tide between the L1 and L2 (Butzkamm, 2003).

When this exclusive view of L1 from the foreign language class were supported by some studies that indicated a direct and positive correlation between learner achievement and teacher use of the target language, the L2-only class was accepted as "the best practice in foreign language education" by the governments, language school administrators, teacher educators, publishing houses and teachers (Dailey-O'Cain, 2009). However, according to Macaro (2005), no evidence has been found to show a causal link between the exclusion of L1 and better learning. On the other hand, in one study where he researched the code-switching behaviours of the candidate teachers, Macaro (2001) determined an insignificant relationship between the L1 uses of teachers and learners, and concluded that the amount of the students' L2 or L1 use wasn't related to the code-switching of the teachers. In another study where Arnett (2001; as cited in Turnbull and Arnett, 2002: 209) investigated how a ninth grade French teacher met the needs of his students with learning disabilities, the most prevalent type of modification strategy was found to be "the use of L1 for clarification". Swain and Lapkin (2000) also indicated that grade 8 immersion students completed a collaborative task more successfully with the help of the mother tongue use; that is, judicious use of L1 supports L2 learning. Therefore, "To insist that no use be made of the L1 in carrying out tasks that are both linguistically and cognitively complex is to deny the use of an important cognitive tool" (Swain & Lapkin, 2000: 268-269). The idea

which regards the foreign language class as the target country and forbids the L1 use as it has no pedagogical value has been defined as “the virtual position” by Macaro (2001). Although there is a growing body of research against the virtual position, it seems that their results have not yet reached the educators in the classrooms, as “Whether in primary, secondary, or higher education, whether in Canada, the United States, Europe or Asia, it is clear that the virtual position still enjoys significant support” (Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2009: 8).

The hegemony of the virtual position owes its continuity to the English-only policies. Such monolingual approaches, which ban the use of L1 as it hinders the acquisition of English, are not pedagogical but political in Auerbach (1993)’s view, because English has been transformed into a key element of English neo-colonialism by exercising the mechanisms of ideological control through language policy. When the methods which ban the use of L1 are studied, it is clear that all of them are born in the core countries, where English is spoken as the native language. For Phillipson (1990; as cited in Medgyes, 1994: 68), the Centre tries to strengthen its influence over the Periphery, where English is either the second or the foreign language, and to spread the English language. The Centre, which not only chooses what languages the other countries are to learn but also has a say in the choice of the means of teaching them, has exported Audiovisualism to francophone Africa and the British communicative teaching to the whole world (Cook, 2001). However, ELT experts in the Periphery must take action, because the Centre cannot cater for the specific needs of the Periphery, where English is taught as a foreign language, and they cannot respond to the individual demands of this multilingual community, which represents diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Medgyes, 1994). “An Englishman or an American has no more right to tell an Egyptian how to teach English than does a Japanese; the only one who can decide what is right for Egypt is the Egyptian...” (Cook, 2001: 165). Consequently, Medgyes (1994) makes a call for the non-native teachers to design more suitable teaching material for their students; for the local trainers to run the training courses on their own, and for those who believe that L1 use can facilitate L2 learning to develop an appropriate methodology.

The L1-Assisted Language Learning

The L1-Assisted Language Learning (L1-ALL), developed in response to these summons, is the product of a local and native intellect, which aims to make use of the L1 (Turkish) concepts in the teaching of English grammar. Different methods that emphasize the key role of L1 in foreign language teaching have been developed before: the Bilingual Method, Reciprocal Language Teaching, the New Concurrent Method, and the Functional-Translation Method. In the first of these, the Bilingual Method, which was developed by C. J. Dodson to improve the audio-visual method of the 1960’s,

the most direct access to the meaning of the new words and structures were made by the L1 equivalents on the sentence level and “The Sandwich Technique” was used to prevent the negative transfer from the mother tongue (Butzkamm, The sandwich technique, ¶ 1, 4). This technique aimed to help each student grasp the meaning directly by inserting the translation between the repeated L2 sentences (Butzkamm, 2003). The goal of Eric Hawkins’ Reciprocal Language Teaching (the University of York) was to turn the learner of a foreign language into the teacher of his native language; for instance, a Russian learner of English and an English learner of Russian were paired and asked to alternate languages with regular intervals so that the learner was “a foreigner” trying to use L2 at one time and “a native speaker” expert at another (Cook, 1989, ¶ 1, 2).

Another alternative method that makes active links between L1 and L2 is Rodolpho Jacobson’s “The New Concurrent Method”: in a Spanish-speaking class, the teacher can make use of code-switching while teaching English at certain key points; for example, he can use L1 when he is teaching important concepts, when the students are getting distracted, when he is praising or punishing the students, or he can switch to L2 when he is revising a previous lesson taught in L1 (Cook, 2001). On the other hand, Weschler (1997, Part III, ¶ 10), who argued that modern communicative methods with an exclusive view of L1 may not be “communicative” at all, pointed out that English-only methods failed to provide the learner with the comprehensible input as in the case of the parrot-like repetitions of the Audiolingual Method. While learning a second language, the students search for the answer to the question “What does this mean?” in their mother tongue and suppressing this natural urge to translate will raise the affective filter, so capitalizing on the analytic power of the brain, which has already mastered one language, will increase their interest in learning the words and structures necessary for the expression of abstract concepts (Weschler, 1997, Part III, ¶ 3). Claiming that the students who have learnt to think in L1 cannot be forced to think in L2, Weschler (1997, Part II, ¶ 2) considered the mother tongue as the temporary “scaffolding” that would be used in the construction of a glorious and new edifice in the student’s mind, and thus, developed the Functional-Translation Method out of the blend of Communicative Language Teaching and the Grammar-Translation methods.

When these methods that support L1 use are studied, it is understood that what they meant by the use of L1 was the use of the students’ native language as the medium of instruction or the use of translation as the primary type of instructional activity. However, the medium of instruction in the L1-Assisted Language Learning is maintained as the target language (English). For this reason, a contrastive setting of instruction is designed on the basis of Chomsky’s Minimalist Program and Constructionism, and by means of the bilingual teaching activities, it is aimed to make the acquisition of the

grammatical concepts in the target language (L2) easier and more lasting by using the L1 concepts.

The Minimalist Program and Constructionism

The purpose of the Minimalist Program is to provide the simplest possible Universal Grammar; in other words “the minimal grammar that can account for language acquisition as well as for the differences among languages” (Pennington, 2002: 80). As for the Minimalist grammar, the most important source of cross-linguistic variation is the lexicon, for the features of the lexical items are the determining factor in the composition of the grammatical structures (Pennington, 2002). On the other hand, the Minimalist grammar also contains the basic principles that the grammars of all languages must satisfy and the ways in which they are realized in different languages (Pennington, 2002). As a result, according to Minimalism, language learning is simply setting the right value to the parameter on the basis of the linguistic input heard; that is, in the same way that “a series of cognitive switches” “trigger the setting of other switches”, language learning, too, involves the incremental setting of the parameters (Pennington, 2002: 80). From the minimalist perspective, the computational system is identical cross-linguistically and variation is morpholexical: “every adult who has acquired a single language has acquired the computational system and [general properties of] the lexicon that underlies every other language”; therefore, “differences among languages must be in the language particular lexicon and the morphology” (Freidin, 1996; as cited in Herschensohn, 2000: 81; Herschensohn, 2000: 80).

Since the Minimalist Program views the morpholexical differences as the locus of cross-linguistic variation, it is essential that both L1 and L2 acquisition should ensure the constant restructuring of the grammar morpholexically (Herschensohn, 2000). In consequence, Constructionism, which brings a morpholexical approach to L2 acquisition, is adopted as the theory of language learning. Supporting the view that cross-linguistic variation is morpholexical, Constructionism argues that the learning of vocabulary and morphology constitutes the substantial part of L2 learning (Herschensohn, 2000). Developing the target syntax involves the gradual mastery of morpholexical constructions; to put it another way, learning a second language in a constructional way means forming the parametric building blocks by setting the correct value for the morpholexical construction (Herschensohn, 2000). According to the constructionist model, there are three stages in L2 learning: i. initial state: where L1 values are preserved; ii. intermediate state: where L1 values are underspecified and L2 vocabulary with morphosyntax are learnt; iii. final expert state: where the morpholexicon is acquired and L2 values are set in the syntax (Herschensohn, 2000). Having been developed in line with the principles of the Minimalist Program, Constructionism ascribes a

key role to the mother tongue in the process of L2 learning: “the L1 provides the template that permits acquisition of L2”; “the L1 template provides both the point of departure for L2 learning, and the means of UG [Universal Grammar] constraints” (Herschensohn, 2000: 218, 222). By means of L1, the L2 input is processed; the L1 grammar analyzes the basic linguistic data; the L1 values are first set and reset in the parameters if the L1 values conflict with the L2 input. For this reason, “L1 provides the window onto linguistic universals” and constitutes the scaffolding necessary for the restructuring of L2; in short, “acquiring an L2 is relearning a language” (Herschensohn, 2000: 223). In summary, as no concept is created anew during L2 learning, the target language can be restructured by moving from the existing concepts already built by L1 and the cognitive load of L2 learning can be lightened by replacing the L1 forms with the L2 counterparts.

L1-Assisted Language Learning Activities

Since noticing the grammatical features consciously is considered prerequisite for the input to become intake in modern grammar instruction, focus-on-form is adopted in the teaching of English Modality in this study. As “language learners cannot process target language input for both meaning and form at the same time” (Skehan & Tomasello, 1998; as cited in Nassaji & Fotos, 2004: 128), in the teaching activities of this study, input-processing, enriched input and consciousness-raising are used to direct the selective attention to form. To draw the selective attention to meaning, L1 is used, because Thornbury (2001; as cited in Ferrer, 5) states that learners need to notice the gap by making comparisons between the current state of their knowledge and the target language system. That’s why, Cook (1999), who supports the development of links between the languages, suggests the use of L1 in presenting the meaning of a new word or grammatical structure, and the use of activities that deliberately involve both languages.

In this context, some of the instructional activities used in this study are as in the following: “Parallel Sentences and Bilingual Texts, Dual-Language Tasks, Code-Switching and Consciousness-Raising, Lexicalisation/Affixation, Scaffolding, and Translation Session”. Through the use of the parallel sentences and bilingual texts, the students are asked to match the L1 and L2 forms of the modal verbs. By means of the enriched input, the saliency of L2 forms, which are highlighted by such typographical techniques as “bold facing, capitalizing, italicizing, underlining, using different fonts and colour”, is heightened in the written texts and noticing the grammatical forms becomes easier for the learners (Nassaji & Fotos, 2004; Larsen-Freeman, 2003). In the dual-language tasks, the students are requested to hear and write the English equivalents of the numbered Turkish sentences after reading the English transcription of the listening text. In this way, it is ensured that they associate the modal verbs from the auditory input with the Turkish forms in the visual

input at the same time. The goal of the code-switching and consciousness-raising activities is to help the learners to distinguish among the confusing modal verbs with the use of the distinctive Turkish expressions. Completing the Turkish sentences appropriately with respect to the situations in the accompanying pictures, the students infer the contextual differences of use among the English modals on the basis of the Turkish expressions. In order for the learners to formulate the grammatical rule, discovery questions are addressed and consciousness is raised through elicitation techniques. Lexicalisation/Affixation aims to draw the students' attention to the fact that modality is realized by the suffixes attached to the verb stem in Turkish, whereas in English, it is realized by the modal auxiliaries on the word level; and also to increase the awareness of the L2 form with the help of this morphological distinction. To this end, the modal verbs describing the different uses of the modal concept are presented in English sentences and in order to test whether the students have grasped the distinctions between them, they are asked to complete the ellipted verbs in the Turkish equivalents by using the correct affixes.

According to Larsen-Freeman (2003), verbal rules may sometimes prove impractical in capturing the linguistic generalizations and making the important relationships salient, because the learners first have to decode the language used in its expression to understand the grammatical rule itself. Consequently, bilingual scaffolding tables are used to concretize the different facets of modal concepts and to simplify the complex relationships among the types of modality. The students recall the verbs used in the English expression of the modality type by using the Turkish sentences in the scaffolding tables and fill in the gaps with the English examples. Finally, for the translation session, English sentences are selected from the worksheets used in the teaching of the modality and after the students write the Turkish equivalent of the English sentence on the back of the paper they have picked out of an envelope, they read it aloud to a friend of their own choice. The student who translates it back into English asks for the English original in order to check its accuracy, and if his translation is wrong, he looks for the closest expression with the help of the others. In this way, until all the students are engaged in the two-way translation, the turn-taking continues and the learners anchor the newly-learned modal verbs with the help of L1.

The Studies of the effects of L1 Use on the Students' Achievement

"The gap in the methodological literature", pointed out by Atkinson (1987; as cited in Eadie, 1999, ¶ 2), maintains its up-to-dateness as one of the culprits of "the uneasiness which many teachers feel about using or permitting the use of the students' native language". For this reason, here, the previous studies that researched into the effects of L1 use on the students' achievement will be categorized in terms of the subject field and presented in the

chronological order. One of the first studies on the L2 vocabulary learning was conducted in 1996 with 48 students enrolled at the Pharmacy Faculty of the University of Montpellier (Prince, 1996). Prince (1996)'s purpose in this study was to determine the relative advantages and disadvantages of two different methods – contextual learning and translation learning – in the recall of newly-learned words. At the end of the study, where the participants were divided into two as “weak” and “advanced” learners, it was found that both groups learned better through translation and that the recall of the words proved to be easier in the translation condition than the context condition (Prince, 1996). A similar study was carried out by Lotto and De Groot (1998, Abstract) with the participation of 56 Dutch adults and the effects of the learning method, word frequency and cognate status on the learning of 80 Italian words were investigated. In the first of the learning methods compared, the Italian word was presented with the Dutch translation, whereas in the second it was presented with a picture depicting its referent and during the measurement, either the pictures or the Dutch translations were used to recall the Italian words (Lotto & De Groot, 1998, Abstract). Lotto and De Groot (1998, Abstract) found out that vocabulary learning through L1 translation proved to be better than learning through the pictures; that performance was better when the learning and testing conditions were congruent, and that cognates and high-frequency words were learnt faster. In Taylor (2002)'s study, the results of 13 experimental studies were analyzed to determine the effectiveness of L1 glossing on L2 reading comprehension. As a result of Taylor (2002)'s meta-analysis, it was found out i. that L1 glossing was an effective vehicle for L2 reading comprehension in the short-term, ii. that it was necessary to capitalize on L1 glossing in the first and second year foreign language textbooks, iii. that L1 glossing was especially useful in the computer-assisted reading classes, iv. that the effects of L1 glossing on L2 reading comprehension were found to be best tested by the use of the recall protocols in L1.

Objecting to the use of the target language and implicit learning in vocabulary teaching, which was advocated by the communicative approach, Ramachandran and Rahim (2004) attempted to investigate the effectiveness of the translation method on the vocabulary learning of the elementary learners. The participants were 60 low-proficiency students enrolled in a secondary school in Malaysia (Ramachandran & Rahim, 2004). During four weeks and in eight sessions, the students learnt 20 lexical items; the experimental group studied through the translation method while the control group was given the synonyms or the definitions of the words (Ramachandran & Rahim, 2004). As a result of the study, the translation method was found to provide more retention for the elementary students in vocabulary learning (Ramachandran & Rahim, 2004). Discovering the fact that 45-50% of the prep-students at the Prince Sultan University of Saudi Arabia had to repeat the class every year, Bacherman (2007), too, advocated that the problem could be solved with the

integration of the students' native language (Arabic) into the English-only curriculum. Therefore, in this study the students in two groups were taught a set of English words by using similar Powerpoint presentations; the experimental group were given the L2 words with their L1 translations, while there was no translation in the control group (Bacherman, 2007). When the scores of the pretest, posttest and delayed posttest were compared, it was seen that there was no significant difference between the learning of the experimental and control groups (Bacherman, 2007).

Claiming that thinking in L1 can enhance L2 writing, Kobayashi and Rinnert (1992) studied the effects of direct and translated writing techniques on the writing achievements of the low- and high-proficiency students and the following results were acquired: while translated writing was more successful in terms of content, organization and style than direct writing in L2, there was a greater increase in the number of the total words in the case of the translated writing again; and according to the comparison with respect to the word choice and the number of mistakes in form, there was no significant difference between direct and translated writing modes (Kobayashi & Rinnet, 1992; as cited in Maxfield, 2002: 66-67). Since the students, who didn't have a mastery of the grammatical system although the medium of instruction was English at the International Islamic University in Malaysia, couldn't provide clear and coherent products in the writing lesson, Govindasamy (1994) advocated that their writings could be improved by drawing the students' attention to the differential properties of L1 and L2 grammar. Therefore, 61 repeat students taking the Advanced Writing course were divided into two groups: the experimental group received contrastive grammar instruction in one half of the class hour during 12 weeks, whereas the control group was given grammar exercises (Govindasamy, 1994). When the products of the students, who wrote compositions in the pretest, posttest and delayed posttest, were evaluated, the participants in the experimental group which received contrastive grammar instruction were found to be more successful (Govindasamy, 1994).

In their research with 39 intermediate French students at the University of Miami, Cohen and Brooks-Carson (2001) asked the participants to write directly in French and to write in L1 and translate it into French. At the end of each writing session, the participants completed a checklist of the strategies specific to the writing technique used in that session, and told the frequency of the techniques used during the writing activity (Cohen & Brooks-Carson, 2001). According to the results of the study, two-thirds of the students were successful in direct writing, while one-third succeeded in translated writing, and one student was equally successful in both types of writing (Cojen & Brooks-Carson, 2001). In addition, the fact that there was no significant difference between the grammatical scores of both writing types was attributed to the fact that the writer would focus on the same grammatical necessities while producing the French text; no matter how organized the text was or how

rich the word choice and the ideas were (Cohen & Brooks-Carson, 2001). Another striking result concerns the use of the mental translation: “while for the translated writing they were engaged in written translation on paper, they were nonetheless engaged in mental translation during the direct writing task”; so the direct and translated writing cannot be regarded as distinct processes, as “the connection between concepts and the L1 is much stronger than between concepts and the L2” (Cohen & Brooks-Carson, 2001: 181). Replicating Kobayashi and Rinnert’s study with 15 low-proficiency Chinese students, Maxfield (2002) found out that there was no significant difference between direct and translated writing in terms of the quality and syntactic complexity, but the length of the texts through translated writing was significantly bigger than that of the texts through direct writing. As opposed to Kobayashi and Rinnert’s findings, Maxfield (2002)’s students found translated writing better and easier, and Maxfield (2002) interpreted this in the following way: translated writing is i. an opportunity for the students to identify themselves with the writing proces, ii. a vehicle for capitalizing on the universal reasoning processes; iii. a serious form of scaffolding, and iv. a chance for performing metalinguistic analysis.

In the field of teaching speaking, Kanatlar (2005)’s two-phase study with 65 beginner students at the School of Foreign Languages, Anadolu University, attracts attention with its results that support the literature on the use of L1 in foreign language teaching: in the first phase, the data derived from seven instructors of speaking and 266 students through the techniques of observation, questionnaire and semi-structured interview indicated that the instructors and the students used Turkish at different times and the most important factor in both the instructors’ and the students’ use of Turkish was the limited knowledge of English. The purpose of the second phase involving a nine-week treatment was to find out the effects of the instruction, which allowed L1 use at specific points defined by the students in the first phase, on the speaking performances of the beginner students. Thus, there were two experimental groups and one control group in the study: in the second experimental group English-only approach was adopted whereas the instructor in the control group wasn’t informed of the purpose of the study and L1 use was free (Kanatlar, 2005). In conclusion, neither L1 use nor English-only was found to be effective on the performances of the beginner students; and the instruction in the control group was also ineffective; and since avoiding L1 use didn’t influence the students’ performance of speaking, it was seen once again in Kanatlar’s study that teaching speaking through English-only policy isn’t advantageous as opposed to the suppositions (Kanatlar, 2005).

In his study, which led the demise of the English-only policy at Chaucer College (University of Kent) enrolling merely Japanese students, Miles (2004) carried out two experiments with three weak classes of freshmen: in the first experiment one of the classes banned L1 use while the

other allowed it and the third used L1. At the end of the five-month treatment, it was found that the speaking performance of the class that used L1 had a significantly greater development and the relaxing atmosphere in the class increased the students' confidence (Miles, 2004). The second experiment was performed with one class: two of the four different grammar topics were taught by using L1 and the others were taught by using only L2 and confusing results were acquired (Miles, 2004). When the first lesson using L1 was compared with the third lesson using only L2, L1 use was more successful, but when the second lesson using only L2 was compared with the fourth lesson using L1, L2-only was more successful (Miles, 2004). It was thought that the comparison of the lessons where four different grammar topics were taught led to this situation (Miles, 2004).

Advocating that focus-on-form involves the medium of instruction as well as the grammar instruction, Rell (2005) stated that there was no study in the literature indicating the effect of the language choice on form-focused instruction and that the question of L1 use or ban during focus-on-form was ignored. Therefore, Rell (2005) carried out an experimental study at the University of California in order to determine the effect of language choice on the acquisition and retention of some grammatical features. In this study, which was carried out with 76 participants from the two departments following "Spanish-only" policy, the students were divided into four classes, so that they would learn two different grammar topics both in L1 and in L2 (Rell, 2005). While the L2-only teaching of "hace...que" structure was more successful in the short- and long-term, the teaching of the direct and indirect object pronoun in L1 was more successful than its L2-only instruction (Rell, 2005). When the scores of the delayed posttest were studied without attention to the students' language choice, it was observed that the similar number of participants showed more than 90% achievement and that the instruction in L1 could be more useful in the short-term (Rell, 2005). Consequently, the mother tongue has a place in the target language classroom and the benefits of the use of a language instead of another depends on the grammar topic to be taught (Rell, 2005).

In another similar study, which Viakinnou-Brinson (2006) carried out with 63 beginner students of French, the aim was to measure the effects of grammar instruction through "French-only" and "French/English code-switching" on the students' grammar achievements in the short- and long-term. For this reason, four of the eight grammar topics were taught through French-only, and the other four were taught through French/English code-switching and thus, all of the participants were instructed in both conditions (Viakinnou-Brinson, 2006). The absence of a significant difference between the posttest means showed that the students were equally successful in both instructional settings, whereas the results of the delayed posttest proved that the grammar instruction through French-only was more successful than

French/English code-switching (Viakinnou-Brinson, 2006). In other words, the contextualized grammar instruction through French-only was both effective and lasting (Viakinnou-Brinson, 2006). Finally, Vaezi and Mirzaei (2007, Methodology, ¶ 6, 7, 15) used the translation technique with the purpose of increasing the linguistic accuracy: in this study with 72 students four grammar topics were taught in a total of 16 sessions; the experimental group learnt 24 Persian sentences by translating them into English and the control group studied merely the grammar exercises in their textbooks. The posttest results showed that the experimental group was more successful than the control group in terms of the linguistic accuracy and it was concluded that the translation technique could be used to reinforce the new structures (Vaezi & Mirzaei, 2007, Abstract).

The national and international studies draw attention to the importance of L1 use in the teaching of grammar, vocabulary and skills. However, the primary teaching activity, the effects of which are investigated in these studies, is “translation” and even though it provides higher gains in the short term, the retention is found to be more lasting in the monolingual approaches. Unlike these studies, which are mostly carried out with beginner and advanced students of higher education, this study is performed with the intermediate students of English in the preparatory class and the effects of the use of L1 concepts (not the use of L1 as the medium of instruction) in the teaching of the L2 grammar concepts on the quantity and retention of the learning are investigated here.

The Purpose and the Significance of the Study

This study aims to indicate the effects of the use of L1 concepts in the teaching of L2 grammar concepts on the students’ achievement and the retention of their learning. A closer study of the foreign language teaching methods reveals that there is a lack of information about the use of L1 and also a ban on L1 use in the majority of them; and even in the methods that advocate the use of L1, it is solely “translation” that is understood by L1 use. In this regard, it is considered that the teaching of L2 grammar concepts through L1 concepts will bring novelty into the field of foreign language education.

The Statement of the Problem

What are the effects of L1 use in the teaching of grammar concepts on the learning and retention of the L2 items by the learners of English?

The Research Questions

1. Is there a significant difference between the achievements of the experimental group and the control group?
2. Is there a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in terms of the retention of their learning?

METHOD

The Research Model

In this study, the Pretest-Posttest Control Group design was used. The Pretest-Posttest Control Group design is a two-factor experimental design, for it involves repeated measures (pretest-posttest) and participants of different categories (experimental-control groups) (Büyüköztürk, 2007). For this reason, this study was carried out with two groups, and the experimental and control groups were determined by chance (heads or tails). The same English grammar test was used to measure the experimental and control groups both before and after the treatment, because the pretests enable us to define the degree of similarity between the groups before the experiment and help to correct the results of the posttests with respect to the pretest (Karasar, 1995). After the experiment, the posttest was administered to measure the achievement of the students and the delayed posttest was used to measure the retention of their learning. The research model of the study is as in Table 1.

Tablo 1. The Research Model

<i>Group</i>	<i>Before Pretest</i>	<i>The experiment</i>	<i>After</i> Posttest	Delayed Posttest
Experiment	Achievement Test	The teaching of grammar concepts in L2 by using L1	Achievement Test	Achievement Test
Control	Achievement Test	Monolingual grammar instruction	Achievement Test	Achievement Test

During the experiment, the grammar concepts in L2 were taught to the control group without using L1 concepts, whereas they were taught to the experimental group by using L1 concepts.

Participants

This study was carried out with two classes of C level students, who were reported to have received 40-59 points from the placement test of the School of Foreign Languages, Dokuz Eylül University, in the 2008-2009 Fall term. In the study, in which the researcher took part as the class teacher, the experimental and control groups were determined by chance between the classes allocated by the school administration. Unlike the true experimental designs, where the participants are assigned randomly, the two classes chosen as the experimental and control groups were taken as they are (intact groups)

(Büyüköztürk, 2007). Due to the researcher's lack of control over the assignment of the groups, such experiments are called "the non-equivalent group design" and "quasi-experimental", as the aim is to compare the performances of two naturally-occurring groups (Brown, 1998; Volz, 1996). In this context, there were 24 participants (10 female, 14 male) in the experimental group and 23 participants (10 female, 13 male) in the control group.

Data Collection

In this study, a 40-item achievement test of English grammar was written to measure the participants' achievements of Modality. 25 target-behaviours were defined and three multiple-choice items were written for each. To calculate the test and item statistics, the trial test was administered to 201 prep students in the 2007-2008 Spring term of the School of Foreign Languages, Dokuz Eylül University. Out of the 75 items in the trial test, 35 were removed and a 40-item final test was formed. The arithmetic mean of the final test is (\bar{X}) 26.303, the standard deviation (S_x) is 6.657, and the variance (S_x^2) is 44.311, while the reliability of the final test is 0.841 (KR-20).

The Experimental Procedure

The experimental processes of this study were done in the below order:

1. Before the experiment, content analysis was performed to categorize the modality concept into five main titles and the relevant target behaviours were defined.
2. The contrastive instructional model was designed in line with the L1-Assisted Language Learning, the instructional materials and lesson plans were prepared, and the instruments of data collection were developed. As a result of the four-week piloting in the 2007-2008 Spring term, the instructional materials were revised and the duration of the experiment was extended to five weeks.
3. Before the experiment, the English grammar test was administered as the pretest to the experimental group on 30.10.2008, and to the control group on 03.11.2008.
4. In both groups, focus-on-form was adopted in the teaching of grammar. However, during the form-focused instruction in the experimental group, contrastive instructional techniques and bilingual activities of L1-ALL were used to teach the English modal verbs by using Turkish concepts. On the other hand, during the form-focused instruction in the control group, the English modal verbs were taught by merely using English; and the traditional monolingual exercises of grammar were used.
5. After the experiment, the English grammar test was administered as the posttest to the experimental group on 27.11.2008, and to the control group

on 01.12.2008. After 20 days of the posttest, the same test was given as the delayed posttest to the experimental group on 18.12.2008, and to the control group on 21.12.2008.

The Experimental Processes

Form-focused grammar instruction when directed at “simple morphological features” provides better results than when directed at “more complex syntactic structures” (Ellis, 2002: 232). For this reason, focus-on-form was adopted in the teaching of the English modality and a structural syllabus was designed. The concept of modality was held under five main titles: “ability, necessity, permission, advisability and logical probability”, these five concepts were taught in five-hour sessions (in 25 hours) during five weeks. In both the experimental and control group, the grammar instruction was realized in the “form-focused” mode, so that the two different approaches to focus-on-form – “monolingualism and bilingualism” – can be compared in grammar instruction. In the experimental group, the L2 concepts of modality were instructed via the L1 concepts during the focus-on-form, whereas L1 was not consulted during the focus-on-form in the control group. To put it another way, the concepts of L2 grammar were taught to the control group traditionally through English-only practices – with no reference to Turkish.

Data Analysis

The techniques of data analysis used are as in the following:

1. *Shapiro-Wilk test* was used to indicate whether the data collected by the English grammar test had a normal distribution. Since there were 47 participants ($n < 50$) in this study, Shapiro-Wilk test was preferred to determine the normality of the scores (Büyüköztürk, 2006).

Tablo 2. The Results of Shapiro-Wilk Normality Test

<i>Measurement</i>	<i>Shapiro-Wilk</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Significance (p)</i>
Pretest	0.952	47	0.050
Posttest	0.974	47	0.361
Delayed Posttest	0.958	47	0.091

* $p < 0.05$

Because the null hypothesis of the Shapiro-Wilk test is worded as “the distribution of the scores doesn’t have a significant difference from the normal distribution”, if the calculated p value is higher than $\alpha = 0.05$, it is interpreted that the scores do not have a significant deviation from the normal distribution (Büyüköztürk, 2006). According to the results of Shapiro-Wilk test in Table 2, the p value of the pretest was equal to 0.05 ($p = 0.05$), while the p values of the posttest and the delayed posttest were greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$).

Consequently, the pretest scores didn't have a normal distribution, whereas the data derived from the posttest and the delayed posttest had a normal distribution.

2. Since the data from the pretest were not normally distributed, Mann-Whitney U test was used to indicate whether there was a significant difference between the pretest scores of the experimental and control groups (Büyüköztürk, 2006).

3. Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was used to test whether there was a significant difference in the achievements of the groups before and after the experimental treatment. Since the pretest measurements are taken as the covariate in ANCOVA, the effect of the pretest on the posttest scores can be controlled and the posttest corrected scores of the groups can thus be compared (Büyüköztürk, 1998; Büyüköztürk, 2007).

4. In the pretest-posttest control group design, with the purpose of determining the effectiveness of the experimental treatment, the Independent Samples t-test was used to indicate whether the difference between the mean scores, derived from the difference scores, was statistically significant (Büyüköztürk, 2007). Because the independent samples t-test requires the fulfillment of the assumption that "the variances that belong to the distributions of the measurements in both groups were equal" (Büyüköztürk, 2006: 39), Levene test was also used.

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

The Achievement Level of the Participants in English Grammar

The first hypothesis of the study was that "The posttest scores of the experimental group, where L1-ALL is used, are higher than those of the control group, where monolingual grammar teaching is applied". In Table 3, the descriptive statistics of the pretest-posttest-delayed posttest of both groups are displayed.

Tablo 3. The Descriptive Statistics of the English Grammar Test

Measurement	Group	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Pretest	Experiment	24	47.395	10.412	2.125
	Control	23	36.847	8.989	1.874
	Total	47	42.234	11.011	1.606
Posttest	Experiment	24	71.979	10.241	2.090
	Control	23	57.934	13.199	2.752
	Total	47	65.106	13.642	1.990
Delayed Posttest	Experiment	24	72.291	12.044	2.458
	Control	23	51.413	14.690	3.063
	Total	47	62.074	16.942	2.471

Firstly, the pretest scores of the experimental and control groups were studied and the results of Mann-Whitney U test are shown in Table 4.

Tablo 4. The Pretest Achievements of the Groups

<i>Group</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean Rank</i>	<i>Rank Sum</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>
Experiment	24	30.29	727.00	125.000	*0.001
Control	23	17.43	401.00		

*p<0.05

As in Table 4, there was a significant difference between the experimental and control groups before the experimental treatment in terms of the pretest scores derived from the English grammar test ($U=125.000$, $p<0.05$). When the mean ranks were considered, the pretest scores of the experimental group were found to be higher than those of the control group. This means the achievement of the experimental group in English grammar was higher than that of the control group before the experiment. For this reason, to control the effect of the pretest on the posttest scores, ANCOVA was used and the posttest corrected mean scores were compared. In order to compare the posttest corrected means by ANCOVA, the assumption of homogeneity of variances must be satisfied. Therefore, Levene test was used and Table 5 shows that the p value of the posttest scores ($p=0.346$) was higher than 0.05 and thus, the variances were homogeneous.

Tablo 5. The Results of Levene's Test

Measurement	F	df1	df2	Significance (p)
Pretest	1.168	1	45	0.286
Posttest	0.905	1	45	0.346
Delayed Posttest	1.511	1	45	0.225

*p<0.05

Since the posttest scores of the students, who learnt by L1-ALL in the experimental group were found to be higher than those of the students, who received monolingual grammar instruction in the control group, the pretest scores were defined as the covariate in order to find out the true effect of the experimental treatment and the corrected mean scores for the posttest were calculated. The posttest corrected mean scores were presented in Table 6.

Tablo 6. The Posttest Corrected Mean Scores of the Experiment and Control Groups

Group	n	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Posttest Corrected Mean
Experiment	24	47.395	71.979	68.506
Control	23	36.847	57.934	61.559

Even when the posttest scores were corrected for the pretest scores as in Table 6, it was observed that the achievement of the experimental group was higher than that of the control group. Therefore, to test the significance of the difference between the posttest corrected mean scores of the experimental and control groups, covariance analysis was undertaken. In Table 7, the ANCOVA results of the posttest scores are presented.

Tablo 7. The ANCOVA Results of the Posttest Corrected Mean Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance (p)
Corrected Model	4250.386	2	2125.193	21.688	*0.000
Covariate PRETEST	1933.810	1	1933.810	19.735	*0.000
GROUP	434.016	1	434.016	4.429	*0.041
Error	4311.582	44	97.991		
Corrected Total	8561.968	46			

*p<0.05

As a result of the covariance analysis, whereby the pretest mean scores of the experimental and control groups were controlled, it was found that the pretest measurements, which were taken as the covariate, had a main effect on the level of achievement ($F=19.735$, $p<0.05$). According to Table 7, there is a significant difference between the posttest corrected mean scores of the experimental and control groups ($F=4.429$, $p<0.05$). In other words, there is a relationship between the posttest scores of the two groups and the teaching method in use. When the posttest corrected means were studied, the posttest mean score of the experimental group ($\bar{X}=68.506$) was higher than that of the control group ($\bar{X}=61.559$). Then it can be concluded that the students of the experimental group, who learnt by L1-ALL, were more successful than those of the control group, who received monolingual grammar instruction.

The Participants' Level of Retention

Since the delayed posttest scores of the students, who learnt by L1-ALL in the experimental group, were found to be higher than those of the students, who received monolingual grammar education in the control group, the pretest scores were defined as the covariate in order to find out the true effect of the experimental treatment on the delayed posttest scores and the corrected mean scores for the delayed posttest were calculated. The delayed posttest corrected mean scores were presented in Table 8.

**Tablo 8. The Delayed Posttest Corrected Mean
Scores of the Experiment and Control Groups**

Group	n	Pretest Mean	Delayed Posttest Mean	Delayed Posttest Corrected Mean
Experiment	24	47.395	72.291	67.765
Control	23	36.847	51.413	56.137

According to Table 8, when the delayed posttest mean scores were corrected for the pretest scores, the students of the experimental group had a higher level of achievement than those of the control group. As a result, to test the significance of the difference between the delayed posttest corrected mean scores of the experimental and control groups, covariance analysis was undertaken. In Table 9, the ANCOVA results of the delayed posttest corrected mean scores were presented.

**Tablo 9. The ANCOVA Results of the Delayed Posttest Corrected
Mean Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups**

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance (p)
Corrected Model	8404.509	2	4202.255	38.525	*0.000
Covariate PRETEST	3284.804	1	3284.804	30.114	*0.000
GROUP	1216.082	1	1216.082	11.149	*0.002
Error	4799.480	44	109.079		
Corrected Total	13203.989	46			

*p<0.05

As a result of the covariance analysis, whereby the pretest mean scores of the experimental and control groups were controlled, it was found that the pretest measurements, which were taken as the covariate, had a main effect on the level of achievement in the delayed posttest ($F=30.114$, $p<0.05$). According to Table 9, there is a significant difference between the delayed posttest corrected mean scores of the experimental and control groups ($F=11.149$, $p<0.05$). That's to say, there is a relationship between the delayed posttest scores of the two groups and the teaching method in use. When the delayed posttest corrected means were studied, the delayed posttest mean score of the experimental group ($\bar{X}=67.765$) was higher than that of the control group ($\bar{X}=56.137$). Then it can be concluded that the learning of the experimental group, where L1-ALL was applied, was more lasting than that of the control group, where monolingual grammar instruction was used.

Table 10 presents the mean differences between the delayed posttest and the pretest, which were obtained by subtracting the pretest means of both groups from their delayed posttest means.

Table 10. The Mean Differences Between the Delayed Posttest and the Pretest Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups

Group	n	\bar{X}_{pretest}	\bar{X}_{delayed}	$\bar{X}_{\text{dif}} (\bar{X}_{\text{delayed}} - \bar{X}_{\text{pretest}})$
Experiment	24	47.395	72.291	24.895
Control	23	36.847	51.413	14.565

According to Table 10, the mean difference between the delayed posttest and pretest of the experimental group ($\bar{X}_{\text{dif}} = 24.895$) is higher than the mean difference between the delayed posttest and pretest of the control group ($\bar{X}_{\text{dif}} = 14.565$). However, to test the significance of the difference between the delayed posttest and pretest means of the experimental and control groups, t-test was used. Table 11 shows the results of the t-test undertaken.

Table 11. The t-test Results of the Difference between the Means of the Delayed Posttest and the Pretest

Group	n	\bar{X}_{dif}	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	t	Significance (p)
Experiment	24	24.895	10.746	2.193	3.405	*0.001
Control	23	14.565	10.018	2.089		

*p<0.05

According to Table 11, the difference between the means of the delayed posttest and the pretest is significant ($t=3.405$, $p<0.05$). Since the difference between the delayed posttest and pretest means of the experimental group ($\bar{X}_{\text{pretest}} = 47.395$, $\bar{X}_{\text{delayed}} = 72.291$) was higher than the difference between the delayed posttest and pretest means of the control group ($\bar{X}_{\text{pretest}} = 36.847$, $\bar{X}_{\text{delayed}} = 51.413$), the significant difference between the delayed posttest and pretest means can be said to be in favour of the experimental group.

In the same way, the mean differences between the delayed posttest and the posttest were calculated by subtracting the posttest means of both groups from their delayed posttest means. Table 12 shows the mean differences between the delayed posttest and the posttest scores of the experimental and control groups.

Table 12. The Mean Differences Between the Delayed Posttest and the Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups

Group	n	$\bar{X}_{\text{posttest}}$	\bar{X}_{delayed}	$\bar{X}_{\text{dif}} (\bar{X}_{\text{delayed}} - \bar{X}_{\text{posttest}})$
Experiment	24	71.979	72.291	0.312
Control	23	57.934	51.413	-6.521

According to Table 12, the mean difference between the delayed posttest and posttest of the experimental group ($\bar{X}_{\text{dif}} = 0.312$) is higher than the mean difference between the delayed posttest and posttest of the control group ($\bar{X}_{\text{dif}} = -6.521$). However, to test the significance of the difference between the delayed posttest and posttest means of the experimental and control groups, t-test was used. Table 13 shows the results of the t-test undertaken.

Table 13. The t-test Results of the Difference between the Means of the Delayed Posttest and the Posttest

Group	n	\bar{X}_{dif}	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	t	Significance (p)
Experiment	24	0.312	11.962	2.441	2.123	*0.039
Control	23	-6.521	9.964	2.077		

*p<0.05

According to Table 13, the difference between the means of the delayed posttest and the posttest is significant ($t=2.123$, $p<0.05$). Since the difference between the delayed posttest and posttest means of the experimental group ($\bar{X}_{\text{posttest}} = 71.979$, $\bar{X}_{\text{delayed}} = 72.291$) was higher than the difference between the delayed posttest and posttest means of the control group ($\bar{X}_{\text{posttest}} = 57.934$, $\bar{X}_{\text{delayed}} = 51.413$), the significant difference between the delayed posttest and posttest means can be said to be in favour of the experimental group.

In the light of these findings, the conclusion arrived at is as follows: "As for both the quantity and the retention of learning, L1-Assisted Language Learning is superior to monolingual grammar instruction".

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In effective foreign language learning, bilingual form-focused instruction is by no means less important than monolingual message-oriented communication because it should be considered that formal accuracy lies at the foundation of effective communication in a foreign language if what is

intended by communication is “more than low-level skill-getting” (Klapper, 1998: 26). As a result, one of the major shortcomings in foreign language teaching is the “indiscriminate application of the Direct Method”: it is misleading to identify L2 learning with the monolingual L1 acquisition, and the denial of learners’ access to L1 is harmful while the teacher’s ignorance of L1 as a common resource is negligent in the foreign language classroom (Klapper, 1998: 24). Even though the Communicative Language Teaching does not fully approve its value as a resource, L1 can be used in every level of the monolingual classes (Cole, 1998, Conclusion, ¶ 1). According to one of the early defenders of L1 in foreign language teaching, Chapman (1958; as cited in Cole, 1998, Mixed Views, ¶ 4), there is no method that excels over the others and “... plain commonsense should indicate that the mother-tongue has its place among these methods”. Therefore, it is high time we broke loose from the hegemony of the monolingual approaches and moved on to “a methodology which acknowledges the crucial role of L1 for the developing FL [Foreign Language] learner” (Klapper, 1998: 25).

In this context, though embodying the primary and sole instructional activity of the preceding bilingual methods, “translation”; the L1-Assisted Language Learning, which takes its theoretical roots in Chomsky’s Minimalist Program and Constructionism, maintains that the medium of instruction is English. The goal of the grammar instruction through L1-ALL is to restructure the L2 grammar concepts by moving from the L1 concepts. That is to say, unlike the traditional monolingual focus-on-form, where a knower explains the unknown with another (English-only), learners move from the known to the unknown. “The FL learner must build upon existing skills and knowledge acquired in and through the MT [mother tongue]”, because “rather than reconceptualise the world, we need to extend our concepts...” and if we cannot associate the new with the old – exclude the L1 links – we would be deprived of “the richest source for building cross-linguistic networks” (Butzkamm, 2003: 31, 35).

In his article entitled “We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma”, Butzkamm (2003: 30-31), too, described the mother tongue as “the strongest ally” of the foreign language lessons and expressed the crucial importance of L1 in the teaching of L2 grammar as in the following: “The mother tongue opens the door, not only to its own grammar, but to all grammars, inasmuch as it awakens the potential universal grammar that lies within all of us”. These views are further supported by the findings of Ferrer (The research: interviews, ¶ 2), who investigated the place of cross-linguistic comparisons in grammar instruction: all of the seven teacher educators interviewed stated that cross-linguistic comparisons could be useful in consciousness-raising; especially the question “How do you say this in Spanish [L1] ?” could be used as “a concept checking technique”, and learners were trying to make the foreign language more

comprehensible and memorable by comparing it with their native language. According to Scott Thornbury, the famous teacher educator and materials writer; by means of cross-linguistic comparison, ambiguities can be resolved and learners can be led to notice the differences, because “Students are going to make these comparisons mentally or between one another anyway constantly. It’s better I think to make it explicit” (as cited in Ferrer, The research: interviews, ¶ 2’deki alıntı).

Being designed against this theoretical backdrop, the L1-Assisted Language Learning aimed to make the acquisition of the L2 grammar concepts easier and more lasting by using the L1 concepts. For this reason, in the experimental study undertaken, the effects of the use of L1 concepts in the teaching of the L2 grammar concepts on the students’ achievement and the retention of the learning were determined. Since a concept-based approach, where L1 use goes beyond the use of simple and sentence-based translation, is followed in L2 grammar instruction; the study is a precursor and the conclusions drawn from the findings of the study are as in the following:

1. As a result of the analysis of the data derived from the achievement test of English Grammar, it was found that the practices of L1-Assisted Language Learning were more effective at increasing the students’ achievement of English Grammar than monolingual grammar instruction. The significant difference between the posttest means of the experimental and control groups showed that the teaching of grammar through L1-ALL was more successful than the monolingual teaching of grammar.

2. As for the retention of the learning, L1-ALL was found to be more effective than monolingual grammar instruction. The significant difference between the delayed posttest means of the experimental and control groups indicated that the teaching of grammar through L1-ALL was more lasting than the monolingual grammar teaching. Not only the difference between the delayed posttest and pretest means, but also the difference between the delayed posttest and the posttest means was both statistically significant and in favour of the experimental group.

On the basis of the above conclusions, the following recommendations were made for the methodologists, coursebook writers, curriculum designers, teachers and researchers:

1. A modern language teaching method must capitalize on the students’ mother tongue, their most fundamental resource. The methodologists should be in quest for novel methods of teaching that make active use of L1 concepts in the EFL classes. Although the English-only policies have banished the use of L1 from foreign language education, local and native methods that build an L1 scaffold for the restructuring of L2 concepts should be developed and its dignity should be returned to L1 in the field of foreign language teaching.

2. Within the scope of this study, diverse materials like parallel sentences, bilingual texts, dual language tasks, bilingual scaffolding tables

were designed. In order to improve the quality of learning and to increase its retention, the coursebook writers need to develop such contrastive materials of instruction.

3. The L1-ALL practices framed in this study were confined to grammar instruction; however, they can also be applied to skills instruction. Therefore, curriculum designers should analyze learner needs and transform the main course into an L1-assisted mode.

4. Teachers, who have always been hesitant about L1 use, must observe the principle of moving from the known to the unknown and build L2 competence on the basis of L1 concepts. As in the case of the L1-ALL practices, they need to determine the crosslingual similarities and differences through contrastive analysis and enable the students to develop crosslingual strategies as well as increasing their linguistic awareness.

5. The researchers may design other methods that support the teaching of L2 through L1 concepts, but they may also apply the L1-ALL practices to skills instruction or carry out a similar research on the teaching of the English tenses and conditional sentences as well.

REFERENCES

- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3586949>
- Bacherman, D. M. (2007). *The Use of Students' First Language in Second-Language Learning in a Computer-Based Environment*. Ph.D. dissertation, Walden University, United States -- Minnesota. Retrieved November 9, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT 3240051).
- Brown, J. D. (1998). *Understanding Research in Second Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Butzkamm, W. (2003). We Only Learn Language Once. The Role of the Mother Tongue in FL Classrooms: Death of a Dogma. *Language Learning Journal*, (28), 29-39. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from <http://www.itmfl.org.uk/modules/teaching/1a/paper1a4.pdf>
- Butzkamm, W. *The Bilingual Method: An Overview*. Retrieved December 29, 2008, from <http://www.fremdsprachendidaktik.rwth-aachen.de/Ww/bilmethod.html>
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (1998). Kovaryans Analizi (Varyans Analizi İle Karşılaştırmalı Bir İnceleme). *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(1), 91-105. Retrieved May 1, 2009, from <http://www.education.ankara.edu.tr/ebfdergi/pdfiler/1998-31-1/91-105.pdf>

- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2006). *Sosybilimler için Veri Analizi El Kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2007). *Deneyisel Desenler*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Cohen, A. D. & Brooks-Carson, A. (2001). Research on Direct versus Translated Writing: Students' Strategies and their Results. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 169-188. Retrieved December 29, 2008 from <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118976360/PDFSTART>
- Cole, S. (1998). The Use of L1 in Communicative English Classrooms. *The Language Teacher*. Retrieved December 29, 2008, from <http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/files/98/dec/cole.html>
- Cook, V. (1989). Reciprocal Language Teaching: Another Alternative. *Modern English Teacher*, 16(3/4), 48-53. Retrieved January 2, 2009, <http://homepage.ntlworld.com/vivian.c/Writings/Papers/ReciprocalLT.htm>
- Cook, V. (1999). Going Beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209. Retrieved December 29, 2008, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3587717>
- Cook, V. (2001). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold.
- Eadie, J. (1999). A Translation Technique. *English Teaching Forum*, 37(1), Retrieved December 28, 2008, from <http://draft.eca.state.gov/Forum/vols/vol37/no1/p2.htm>
- Ellis, R. (2002). Does Form-Focused Instruction Affect the Acquisition of Implicit Knowledge? *SSLA*, 24, 223-236. Retrieved December 29, 2008 http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FSLA%2FSLA24_02%2FS0272263102002073a.pdf&code=60c328038b94d5c779829c68c457666d
- Ferrer, V. *The Mother Tongue in the Classroom: Cross-linguistic comparisons, Noticing and Explicit Knowledge*. Retrieved December 28, 2008, from http://www.teachenglishworldwide.com/Articles/Ferrer_mother%20tongue%20in%20the%20classroom.pdf
- Ferrer, V. *Using the Mother Tongue to Promote Noticing: Translation as a Way of Scaffolding Learner Language*, 1-6. Retrieved January 2, 2009, http://www.teachenglishworldwide.com/Articles/Ferrer_mother%20tongue%20to%20promote%20noticing.pdf
- Gabrielatos, C. (2001). L1 Use in ELT: Not a Skeleton, But a Bone of Contention. *Bridges*, 6, 33-35. Retrieved December 31, 2008, from <http://www.gabrielatos.com/L1UseInELT-Bridges.pdf>
- Govindasamy, S. (1994). *The Effect of Contrastive Grammar Instruction on Clarity and Coherence in the Writings of Malay ESL College Students*. Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers The State University of New Jersey - New

- Brunswick, United States -- New Jersey. Retrieved November 9, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT 9514120).
- Herschensohn, J. (2000). *The Second Time Around Minimalism and L2 Acquisition*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Kanatlar, G. M. (2005). *L1 Use In Beginner Level EFL Speaking Classes And Its Effect On Elementary Level Students' Oral Performances*. Doktora Tezi. T.C. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No. 1654; Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Yayınları No. 3. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Karasar, N. (1995). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. Ankara: Sim Matbaası.
- Klapper, J. (1998). Language Learning at School and University: the Great Grammar Debate Continues (II). *Language Learning Journal*, 18(1), 22-28. Retrieved December 29, 2008, from <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all?content=10.1080/09571739885200211>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching Language: From Grammar to Grammaticing*. Boston: Heinle.
- Lotto L. & De Groot, A. M. B. (1998). Effects of Learning Method and Word Type on Acquiring Vocabulary in an Unfamiliar Language. *Language Learning Journal*, 48(1), 31-69. Abstract. Retrieved December 28, 2008, from <http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsidt=2458654>
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing Student Teachers' Codeswitching in Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 531-548. Retrieved December 29, 2008, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1193074>
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 Classroom: a Communication and Learning Strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-Native Teachers, Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*, 5, (63-84). Retrieved December 29, 2008, from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/p595301320268941/>
- Maxfield, J. (2002). *Using L1 to Write in L2: an Investigation into the Effects of Translation versus Direct Composition among "Low-Proficiency" ESL Writers*. M.A. dissertation, University of Toronto (Canada), Canada. Retrieved November 9, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT MQ73917).
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. Hong Kong: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Miles, R. (2004). *Evaluating the Use of L1 in the English Language Classroom*. M.A. Thesis, University of Birmingham. Retrieved December 28, 2008, from <http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Milesdiss.pdf>

- Nassaji, H. & Fotos, S. (2004). Current Developments in Research on the Teaching of Grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 126-145. Retrieved December 30, 2008, from <http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FAPL%2FAPL24%2FS0267190504000066a.pdf&code=4965c639ba5e2efc79829c68c457666d>
- Pennington, M. C. (2002). Grammar and Communication: New Directions in Theory and Practice. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms* (77-98). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Prince, P. (1996). Second Language Vocabulary Learning: The Role of Context versus Translations as a Function of Proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80, 478-493. Retrieved December 30, 2008, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/329727>
- Ramachandran, S. D. & Rahim, H. A. (2004). Meaning Recall and Retention: The Impact of the Translation Method on Elementary Level Learners' Vocabulary Learning. *RELC Journal*, 35(2), 161-178. Retrieved December 30, 2008, from <http://rel.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/35/2/161>
- Rell, A. B. (2005). *The Role of the First Language (L1) in the Second Language (L2) Classroom*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, United States -- California. Retrieved November 9, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT 3175179).
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-Based Second Language Learning: the Uses of the First Language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 251-274. Retrieved December 28, 2008, from <http://ltr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/4/3/251>
- Taylor, A. M. (2002). *A Meta-Analysis on the Effects of L1 Glosses on L2 Reading Comprehension*. Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, United States -- Indiana. Retrieved November 9, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT 3099215).
- Turnbull, M. & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' Uses of the Target and First Languages in Second and Foreign Language Classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204-218. Retrieved December 30, 2008, from <http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FAPL%2FAPL22%2FS0267190502000119a.pdf&code=46f4cae58a5342ea535dff80e4f96db5>
- Turnbull, M. & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2009). Introduction. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*, (1-14). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Vaezi, S. & Mirzaei, M. (2007). The Effect of Using Translation from L1 to L2 as a Teaching Technique on the Improvement of EFL Learners' Linguistic Accuracy - Focus on Form. *HLT Magazine*, 5. Retrieved December 28, 2008, from <http://www.hltmag.co.uk/sep07/mart03.htm>
- Viakinnou-Brinson, L. (2006). *To Teach or Not to Teach in the Target Language Only? The Effect of Target Language Only and Code-Switching on the Grammatical Performance of Elementary Level French Students*. Ph.D. dissertation, Emory University, United States -- Georgia. Retrieved November 9, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT 3234055).
- Volz, A. (1996). *Tutorial Series: Quasi-Experimental Designs*. Retrieved December 30, 2008, from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/tutorial/Volz/page2.htm#negd>
- Weschler, R. (1997). Uses of Japanese (L1) in the English Classroom: Introducing the Functional-Translation Method. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 3(11). Retrieved December 20, 2008, from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Weschler-UsingL1.html>