



JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLAGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND

LITERATURE

THE EFFECT OF USING FIRST LANGUAGE IN TEACING ENGLISH
GRAMMAR :

THE CASE OF GRADE NINE STUDENTS AT BECHO SECONDARY
SCHOOL.

By Girma Regassa

A Research paper Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the
Degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL)

Adviser Yohannes Tefera (PhD)

AUGUST, 2010

JIMMA, ETHIOPIA

THE EFFECT OF USING FIRST LANGUAGE IN TEACHING ENGLISH
GRAMMAR :

THE CASE OF GRADE NINE STUDENTS AT BECHO SECONDARY
SCHOOL

By

Girma Regassa

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillments of the Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Department of English Language and Literature

Collage of Social Sciences and Humanities

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

AUGUST, 2010

Declaration, Confirmation, Approval and Evaluation

The Effect of using first Language in Facilitating the Grammar Knowledge of grade nine students: The case of Becho Secondary School

Jimma University

Ethiopia

Declaration

The under signed declare that this thesis is my original work not presented from any degree in any university, and that all the sources used for it are duly acknowledged

Girma Regassa
Signature date

Confirmation and Approval

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

Principal advisor

Dr. Yohannes Tefera
Signature date

Co advisor Dr. Yemaneberhan Kelemewerk
Signature date

External examiner Dr.
Signature date

Internal examiner Dr.
Signature date

Chair person
Signature date

Acknowledgement

First of all, I would like to thank the Almighty Lord Jesus. My deepest and whole hearted gratitude go To My advisor, Dr, Yohannes Tefera, for his remarkable advice and critical comments from the very beginning of the research work to the end. His valuable advice support and constructive comments helped me a great deal in shaping this paper in to its present form.

I would also like to thank my co advisor Dr. Yemaneberhan Kelemework for His wise advice, insightful criticisms, and patient encouragement aided the writing of this thesis in innumerable ways. My deepest gratitude also goes to Ato. Birhanu Abdisa who kindly helped me on teaching of control group students and also the school principal, English teachers and students of Becho secondary school involved in this study by filling in the questionnaires administered to them and unreservedly responding to the questions I asked them during the interview.

In addition, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my wife w/ro Legesech Mammo, My sons, Bikila and Dame Girma My brother Teferi Regassa and all my family have supported me during the whole process and throughout my education career.

Finally, thanks to my colleagues particularly, I like to appreciate recently MA graduate, Habtamu G/silassie, for his valuable suggestion when I was writing the final research and others who have offered me suggestions, in giving comments and information for the study.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| 1.1. Background of the Study | 1 |
| 1.2. Statement of the Problem..... | 6 |
| 1.3. Objective of the Study | 8 |
| 1.4 Significance of the Study | 9 |
| 1.5 Scope of the Study | 9 |
| 1.6 Limitation of the Study | 10 |
| 1.7 Definition of key terms..... | 11 |
| 1.8 Organization of the study..... | 11 |

CHAPTER TWO

| | |
|--|----|
| 2. Review of Related Literature | 12 |
| 2. 1 The general Overview of Using L1 in Foreign Language..... | 12 |
| 2.2. Historical Background of Using L1 in Foreign Language Learning..... | 13 |
| 2.3. Advantages of using the mother tongue | 15 |
| 2.3.1 Humanistic element | 15 |
| 2.3.2 Preferred Learning Strategy | 15 |
| 2.3.3 Time saving device | 16 |
| 2.4 Factors Favoring L1 use in EFL classrooms | 16 |
| 2.4.1. Arguments forwarded to discredit the English-only Approach | 17 |
| 2.4.2 The impracticality of L1 Free Foreign Language Class | 17 |
| 2.4.3 Native Teachers Paradox | 17 |
| 2.4.4 Exposure alone not being sufficient for learning | 18 |
| 2.5. Major Arguments against L1 Use..... | 18 |
| 2.5.1. The L1 Acquisition/Learning Argument. | 19 |
| 2.5.2. The Language Compartmentalization Argument | 19 |
| 2.6. The Role of L1 in EFL classroom | 21 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 2.6.1 The Pedagogical Role | 21 |
| 2.6.2. The Psychological Role | 22 |
| 2.6.3 The Socio-cultural Role..... | 22 |
| 2.6.4 Attitudes of Teachers and Students towards the use of L1 in EFLclassroom..... | 23 |
| 2.7. Empirical Studies on Teachers’ and Students ‘Positions towards the Use of L1in the EFL Classes | 23 |
| 2.8. Judicious Use of Mother Tongue in the Young Learners’ EFL Classroom..... | 24 |
| 2.9. The Purposes for which teachers and students need L1 | 26 |
| CHAPTER 3 | |
| RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | |
| 3.1 Overall design of the study..... | 29 |
| 3.2 Description of the variable of the study | 30 |
| 3.3 Sample and Sampling Technique..... | 30 |
| 3.3.1 Selection of the School | 30 |
| 3.3.2 Selection of Grade Level | 30 |
| 3.3.3. Selection of Students..... | 30 |
| 3.3.4 Selection of Teachers..... | 31 |
| 3.4 Data collection Instrument..... | 32 |
| 3.4.1 Tests..... | 32 |
| 3.4.2 Piloting..... | 33 |
| 3.4.3 Questionnaires for the teachers of English department..... | 34 |
| 3.4.4 Students’ questionnaires | 34 |
| 3.4.5 Interview..... | 34 |
| 3.4.6 Unit feedback forms..... | 35 |
| 3.5. Ethical Issues..... | 35 |
| 3.6 Data collection procedures..... | 36 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 3.6.1 The implementation of the first Unit..... | 36 |
| 3.6.2 The implementation of the second Unit..... | 37 |
| 3.7 Data Analysis procedures..... | 37 |
| Chapter Four | |
| 4. Results and Discussion | 38 |
| 4.1 Achievement of controlled and Experimental group students | 38 |
| 4.2 Retention in both groups after the experiment..... | 42 |
| 4.3 Retention in each group when the post tests scores..... | 43 |
| 4.4 Interpretation of the test results | 44 |
| 4.5 Characteristics of the Respondents..... | 45 |
| 4.6 Analysis of the students' questionnaire..... | 46 |
| 4.7 Analysis of the teachers' questionnaire..... | 55 |
| 4.8 Analysis of Experimental students' feedback..... | 66 |
| 4.9 Summary of teachers' interview | 67 |
| Chapter Five | |
| 5.1 Conclusion and Recommendation..... | 71 |
| 5.1Summary..... | 71 |
| 5.2 Conclusion..... | 72 |
| 5.2 Recommendation..... | 74 |
| References..... | 75 |
| Appendix..... | 83 |

| List of tables | page |
|--|-------------|
| 4.1 Achievement of controlled and Experimental group students ----- | 38 |
| 4.2 Retention in both groups after the experiment----- | 42 |
| 4.3 Retention in each group when the post tests scores----- | 43 |
| 4.4 Interpretation of the test results ----- | 44 |
| 4. 5 Comparison of the gain scores of both passive and reported speech lessons----- | 41 |
| 4. 6 the retention test scores of experimental and control groups for the first unit (passive -- | 42 |
| 4. 7 The retention test scores of experimental and control groups for the second unit ----- | 43 |
| 4.8 Paired samples test results for the post and retention tests----- | 44 |
| 4.9 Students’ responses to the issue related to whether Oromo language is Present in L2--- | 46 |
| 4.10 Students’ perception towards teachers’ use of F1 in the English lesson period----- | 49 |
| 4.11 Learners’ opinion on the frequency of Afan Oromo in the EFL classes----- | 51 |
| 4.12 Teachers’ opinion on classroom use of A/Oromo and reasons for using it----- | 55 |
| 4.13Teachers’ suggestion on the amount of students’ native language used ----- | 59 |
| 4.14 Teachers’ suggestion the frequency of students’ native language----- | 61 |
| 4.15 Teachers’ perceptions and degree of agreement on the use of L1 Afan Oromo----- | 63 |
| 4.16 Experimental students’ feedback----- | 66 |

List of Abbreviations/ Acronomy

ALM Audio Lingual Method

BA Bachelor of Arts

CET Communicative English Teaching

CLT Communicative Language Teaching

EFL English as a Foreign Language

ELT English Language Teaching

ESL: English as a Second Language

FL Foreign Language

GTM Grammar Translation Method

L1 First Language

L2 Second Language

MA Master of Arts

MOE Ministry of Education

MT Mother Tongue

SLA Second Language Acquisition

TEFL Teaching English as a Foreign Language

TESL Teaching English as a Second Language

TESOL Teaching English to Speaking Other Language

TL Target Language

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to investigate the influence of using students' native language on teaching English as a foreign language grammar achievement and attitude of the ninth grade EFL Becho secondary school students towards learning English grammar. A pre – test post – test comparison group of experimental design was employed for the research. The sample population was 54 students from sections of Grade – 9 students at Becho Secondary School in Ilubabor zone. Data of the research were collected through grammar tests, questionnaire and interview. The statistical tools of the T – Tests, comprising independent samples test and paired samples test were utilized in data analysis to determine whether there were the impact of using students' mother tongue on the achievement of students' grammar knowledge at 0.05 alpha levels. Data analysis reveals that both the experimental and control groups were almost equal in their grammar knowledge at the beginning of the experiment. Nevertheless, after the treatment, the analysis of data indicated that the experimental group out scored significantly $p < 0.05$ the control group that those who studied grammar without translating everything into their first language were more successful in grammar subjects in the long run comparison with the students who were taught English through translating into their first language. Post – test result showed the supremacy of using the target language in EFL learning method over the usual method. At the end findings indicated a significant difference for the first unit $|t(51.91) = 3.04, p = .004$ |and $|t(42.95) = .47, p = .63$ for the second unit|. Therefore, the major findings of the study suggest that using the target language helped significantly to enhance Becho secondary school students' learning using more of the target language recommended to be used in the EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms to teach grammar.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the study

The debate over whether English language classrooms should include or exclude students' native language has been a contentious issue for a long time (Brown, 2000). The research evidence on the history of the English language teaching methods tells us that the idea of using L1 in the L2 classroom was a respected view during the period of the Grammar Translation Method (Howatt 1984) in which bilingual approach was practiced and learners were learning predominantly through translation (Meyer, 2008; Miles, 2004 Richards and Rodgers, 1986) and enjoyed widespread acceptance until the World War II (Bowen, Madsen & Hilferty, 1985).

The effect of using F1 was a phenomenon viewed by many scholars as, 'mother tongue influence', which has been an actual response to the applied results of the structural methods, known as audio-visual, audio-oral and structural-global, (Lekova, 2010). Liu, (2001) defines Language interference or transfer as, a persistent term and has led to diverse interpretations and researches. First language interference, in particular as Language transfer known as L1 interference, linguistic interference, and a cross meaning, which refers to teaches or students applying native language while teaching and learning a second language, (Viola, 2013). In fact, interference is the early step to integration perceived as a welcome process of using mother tongue or other languages in the using of a target language. This may be based on the facts that interference can appear in phonology, grammar, word formation, word and sentence sequence, etc, (Negeri, 2011).

However, the difficulties in L1 transfer, and its importance into second language acquisition (SLA), besides, the relationships between students' L1 and L2 linguistic resources always appear difficult, (Karim & Nassaji, 2013).

According to Richards and Rodgers, (2005) the Direct Method was quite successful in private language schools, but later declined in European noncommercial schools. It was criticized that

strict adherence to Direct Method principles was counterproductive, since teachers had to use long explanations to avoid using the mother tongue, when sometimes a simple translation would have been more efficient way to comprehension . “Banning the native language altogether is rejected by teachers who see much less harm in translating the odd word or phrase than in leaving pupils to flounder around.” (Howatt & Widdowson 2004, p.225). The fact was that the Direct Method was the first language teaching method that caught the attention of how the foreign language should be taught. Grammar-Translation Method did not prepare pupils to use the target language, whereas the goal of the Direct Method is communication in the target language.

According to Prodromou (2001), the mother tongue has been treated as a taboo subject (Cook, 2002; Deller, 2003), source of guilt (Auerbach 1993; Frankenberg -Garcia, 2000), and a hint of teachers’ weakness to teach properly (Cook 2002; Buckmaster, 2002). Furthermore, L1 has been considered as a waste of time (Januleviciene & Kavaliauskiene, 2002). As a result, the English only approach has become an influential and often assumed to be the hallmarks of good language teaching around the world (Atkinson 1995). Yet, back in the 1960’s, the cognitive psychologist David Ausubel (Ausubel, 1964) has made some sound criticism about the ALM. He pointed out, amongst other things, that the rote learning practice of ALM drills can benefit neither L1 nor L2 learners; that L2 learners can potentially benefit from learning grammar deductively, and that learner L1 can function as a facilitator in the process of L2 learning

Now a day, it is common for EFL teachers to use the students' mother tongue as a tool for conveying meaning as a means of interaction both in English language institutes and in the classroom regardless of the arguments against its role (Naiman et al., 1978).

Many English language teachers go to great lengths to avoid the use of their students’ mother tongue in the classroom. Nunan (1999) describes a situation where an EFL teacher in China imposed fines on his students when they speak Cantonese in the classroom.

The effect, unsurprisingly, is that the students just fall silent. The teacher get his wish of no Cantonese, but ironically he has not got any English from his students either! Atkinson (1987) contends that the “strategy of mother tongue avoidance” in ELT can be explained by the emergence of two major trends:

One of the most pioneering works in the constructive use of L1 was claimed “The potential of mother tongue, as a classroom resource is so great that its role should merit considerable attention and discussion in any attempt to develop a Post-communicative Approach to TEFL for adolescents and adults”(Harbord ,1992, p. 350).

He offers three general reasons for allowing a limited L1 use in the L2 classroom: as a learner preferred strategy, as a humanistic approach, and as an efficient use of time. Acknowledging the importance of the occasional use L1, Willis (1981: XIV) on her part indicates that there are times to drop English, for example, to explain the meaning or use of a new word, to explain the aim of the lesson or the next activity, to check students’ understanding after the presentation, and to discuss the main ideas after a reading passage in pairs. It is possible to learn from the scholars’ argument that L1 can have productive pedagogical, affective and socio-cultural roles to play in the L2 classroom.

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

In Ethiopia, after the Charter of Transitional Government has recognized the right of nationalities to use their language as an instructional media, the idea of translating English in to students’ mother tongue became one of the common classroom activities although the existing Ethiopian Educational training policy did not officially endorse the issue of using students’ first language in the target language classroom (McNabb, 1989). Following this, when the Ethiopian People’s Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) government replaced Derg in 1991, the new government recognized the rights of nations and nationalities to speak and write in their own languages and develop their languages.

Besides, a new educational and training policy has been established with the provision for choice of nationality languages as medium of instruction in the primary education system. As a result, over twenty nationality languages have been used as a medium of instruction in primary schools in different regions of the country (McNabb, 1989).

Meanwhile, in recent years, though, there have been a growing number of research interests in the analysis of MT interference all around the world, many researchers are determined to call for interested persons to further more studies (Wahba, 2009). However, the cases the researchers took, the focus areas of the language contents, the tools they approached with are totally different from one another. They couldn't generalize the various problems of EFL learning and the types MT interference items in time and spatial specifics.

With this respect, the teaching and learning of proper English language grammar and pronunciation have been loosely credited, even considered as almost saturated in Ethiopia, by many researchers. However, as languages of wider communication, Afan Oromo and English language are unilaterally interrelated, basically from the same origin of Latin alphabets (Getachew and Derib, 2002).

Equally, ever since the change of government in May 1991, due recognition has been given to the formulation of the New Education and Training Policy of 1994; brought about the use of mother tongues in schools in Ethiopia. Similarly, Afan Oromo has had the chance to become a medium of instruction in primary schools and has been taught as a subject in secondary schools in Oromiya, (Derib,2002;Getachew and Sharma, 2013). Above and beyond, Afan Oromo is the influential media of every day communication in the region but English language is foreign to both teachers and students. Moreover, Becho Secondary School in Ilubabor zone of Oromia region has dozens of Ethnic groups flourish along with their distinct languages that add up to the crunchy EFL grammar teaching.

In this thesis the researcher discussed the influence of mother tongue in teaching English as a foreign language. The researcher tried to find out to what extent the mother tongue can play its role in the process of teaching a foreign language grammar. On that account, the paper concentrated on the methods and approaches and their changing views on the use of mother tongue in a foreign language classroom.

The researcher focused on the term communicative competence as one of the most important goals of foreign language teaching. The theoretical part concluded with the mother tongue in foreign language classroom where the researcher deals with all the teaching skills as the base for successful English grammar teaching.

Hence, this study broke onto the influence of Afan Oromo interference into learning EFL grammar teaching in case of Becho Secondary School, 2017-2018 G.C. It also analyzed how mother tongue interference affects teachers and students into learning EFL, to say and write things in English, as a foreign Language. Expecting that, detecting the areas may add values into learning and teaching EFL, demonstrating these verities of Afan Oromo interference into EFL grammar teaching, may attract further studies from different perspectives. Besides, the results from findings can serve as a stepping stone for interested researchers in the area.

Generally, the researcher's own experience of first observing and then teaching English at a primary school proved over usage of Afan Oromo language in English lessons. What actually happened influence the choice of theme for my thesis? Generally, in lessons of English that I had a chance to observe as a department head, teachers used the mother tongue for all kinds of situations including giving instructions, doing translation or presenting foreign language structures.

This occurs mainly because some of the teachers feel that the use of mother tongue has always an active and beneficial role to facilitate foreign language learning. However, contrary is the case as the researcher will try to present in this paper. Moreover also the researcher's own experience during the last thirteen years of teaching experience confirmed his assumption of pupils' exposure to abundant mother tongue use in the classroom. After supervising English lessons while English teachers are teaching, the researcher felt that the mother tongue is used very often because of the temptation to facilitate the teacher's job but at the expense of pupils. This made the researcher think about other reasons why extra mother tongue is used while teaching EFL and about ways how to reduce the abundant use of it.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The use of L1 in L2 classes has always been controversial because different theories of L2 acquisition present different hypotheses about the value of L1 use in L2 classes. Some theorists have advocated an English only approach believing in the identical nature of the process of L2 and L1 learning, and arguing that maximum exposure to L2 and least to L1 are essential because interference from L1 knowledge obstructs L2 learning process (Cook, 2001; Krashen, 1981).

Despite the hot arguments experts hold in both sides, today, it seems that bilingual approach has received high attention for various reasons (Miles, 2004). For instance, one obvious truth is teachers and students have positive attitudes toward using L1 in L2 classrooms (Tang, 2002). Macaro (1997) and Prondromou (2002) found that low achiever students favor L1 than high achievers. Atkinson (1987) reported that L1 helps learners deal with word and sentence level problems, substantiate comprehension, and guess text structure and context. Other studies indicated that teachers like to use L1 to explain complex grammar items and meanings of new words, to give background information, to overcome communication difficulties and handle students' disciplinary problems (Garcia, 2006; Mohammed, 2005).

As far as the researcher's teaching experience and observation is concerned, teachers and students in the sample study area intuitively use L1 in EFL classes. That is, most teachers were seen making use of students' mother tongue in L2 classes so as to clarify some difficult and abstract concepts, to give instructions as well as to manage classes. Some others use L1 randomly and employ word by word translation intensively without having any theoretical background behind the impacts of its' over use.

Atkinson (1987), however, specifies that a ratio of 5% L1 use to about 95% L2 may be more profitable. Tang (2002) as well, suggests a five to ten percent of L1 use to be facilitative in the English classes.

As far as the previous local studies in relation to the present one is concerned, no study has been done on the utilization of L1 in the EFL classroom in the context of Afan Oromo in the selected research area. In fact, an issue related to the present study was addressed by Tafesse (1988) in the Amharic context and Kenenisa(2003) in Afan Oromo context. In his study, Tafesse concluded that there was an over use of Amharic in the English classroom (71% English to 29%

Amharic). Though the topics are related, differences exist between Tafesse's work and the present research in the area of research aims, tools and context.

Firstly, like Tafesse's, this study was merely aimed at investigating the proportion of L1 to L2 but at exploring teachers' and students' perception on using L1, the relative amount, frequency and purposes of L1 (Afan Oromo in this case) used in the English classroom. Secondly, Tafesse used audio recording lessons to collect his data but mine was experimental and descriptive method of assessing the problem.

However, the researcher used two sections which one of the two sections was teaching the selected/sample groups using only English and the other section was taught by translating the concept of the lesson into the students' native language in addition to questionnaires and interviews for the teachers. Thirdly, the participants in Tafesse's are students and teachers at primary schools but my participants were students and English language teachers in secondary schools. Fourthly, Tafesse conducted his research in the context of Amharic while this one is in the context of Afan Oromo.

Even though different scholars described as using first language while teaching English grammar is essential, the case which happened in Illubabor zone Becho woreda at Becho secondary school was identified that teachers were teaching English lessons as they were teaching Afan Oromo. Unless this condition changed to be a better implementation or the right way of teaching English lesson by correcting the proportion of the usage of English and Afan Oromo, the students in the school wouldn't achieve the expected grammar knowledge. The school supervisor observed while 6 (100%) teachers were teaching and identified as almost all of the teachers were using Afan Oromo while teaching English grammar.

Most of the teachers translate each and every word into Afan Oromo and encouraged as the students gave response to the questions in Afan Oromo. Concerning the problem no research was conducted in the woreda to solve the problem. The principal of the school and the internal supervision did not give attention for the feedback provided from the supervision and the woreda education office supervision expert.

Having these gaps in mind, the present study was carried out with the intention of bridging these gaps by answering the following questions.

Hypothesis

Through the present study, the researcher hypothesized that the students those taught their lesson in the target language would score more successful results than students those taught under the controlled group by translating into their first language.

The use of first language was not effective in teaching English grammar at Becho secondary school .

Research questions

To address the above gap, the following leading questions were used.

1. What are students' opinions about the mother tongue interference on their grammar learning lessons in EFL class?
2. How do using first language influence students' grammar knowledge in Becho secondary school of EFL classes?
3. How much of L1 (Afan Oromo) and L2 (English) was used by the English language teachers and students in EFL classes to make grammar knowledge effective?
4. Is there a significant difference between experimental and control groups in the achievement of students' test scores of grammar knowledge at the end of the experiment?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the effect of using students' native language on teaching English as a foreign language, grammar achievement and attitude of the ninth grade EFL Becho secondary school students towards learning English grammar.

Specific objectives

- To investigate the effect of first language on students achievement and retention in English grammar.
- To find out source of interference of mother tongue to the students' of EFL grammar learning.

- To find out how frequently L1 was used by English teachers and students in Becho secondary school in the EFL lesson.
- Assess EFL Teachers' and students' attitude towards the use of Afan Oromo in EFL classroom.

1.4. Significance of the Study

It was hoped that the findings of the present study had the following significance.

- 1 It may enable educational personnel to recognize the actual practices.
- 2 Language teachers can make use of the findings and become aware of the role L1 plays in teaching and learning the target language grammar.
- 3 It will help teacher educators to re-examine their foreign language teaching methodology at the teacher training centers.
- 4 It might stimulate Language teaching methodology researchers to conduct further research in the area may open the way to the development of a new English language teaching method and techniques that work to incorporate L1 use in the EFL classroom.
- 5 This study will be helpful for English faculties who work in professional colleges as they will be able to understand the influence of mother tongue in learning English to communicate with the learners and help them to correct their mistakes in using English.
- 6 English language teachers become conscious of the role L1 in teaching and learning the target language and re examine their foreign language teaching methodology at different levels.
- 7 Teachers acquire awareness about the well judged and limited use of L1 in L2 classrooms.

1.5. Scope of the Study

As the study attempted to find out the effects using students' native language on teaching English as a foreign language grammar achievement in EFL, the researcher employed an experimental research.

The present study confined itself to grade nine students of Becho secondary school in grammar teaching in EFL class. The school was preferred because it was the working area for the researcher and hence creates a convenient environment in terms of proximity and likely cooperation from the students and teachers. Grade nine students were chosen because the researcher believed that most teachers did not expect to encounter this issue among students; they were supposedly/reasonably proficient in English.

1.6. Limitation of the study

The researcher also delimited the scope of the study to Becho secondary school and one grade level, (Grade 9) In Becho, Ilubabor- in Ethiopia. Of all Grade 9 sections in Becho secondary school, only two Grade 9 sections were selected for the purpose of the study. Hence, other general secondary schools and grade level were not included, the following limitation occurs in the study:

- 1 The findings obtained from this study were limited to the data received from 62 participants i.e 54 students and 6 teacher (One Who participated on teaching the control group from the six teachers who filled the questionnaires and interviewed) teachers at Becho secondary school. Since sample size is limited in to 54 ninth grade students and 6 teachers, it might not reflect the whole population.
- 2 As another limitation, each student might have different learning styles as a teacher might have different teaching styles which might also affect the achievement and motivation of the students.
- 3 Some participants in the experimental group might have dislike taking part in the experimental study which was based on only using the target language. To solve this problem as much as possible the researcher has help deep discussion as the research that has been held was to solve English language teaching problem.

But, the researcher believed that the result that was obtained would have been proved to be more comprehensive and reliable if the samples of the study were taken from more than one secondary schools of Oromia region.

1.7 Definition of key terms

First language

“Is being called: native language, primary language, and mother tongue” (Sinhano et al., 2009). These terms considered as a synonyms; the distinction between them is not clearly cut.

Second language

It is the language which is acquired after the first language (s). It was defined as following: “second language is typically an official or socially a dominant language needed for education, employment, and other basic purposes. It is often acquired by minority group members or immigrants who speak another language natively.” (Sinhanoet 2009, p. 174)

Mother Tongue

Sultan. B., (2013) says that: We use this term to refer to the first language of a child. Normally, a child is exposed to a language immediately after his/her birth.

Primary Language

A child may have more than one primary language if he or she acquires more than one language during the period of primary language development (Richards & Schmidt, 1988).

1.8 Organization of the Study

This thesis is organized into five chapters. The first chapter treats the introductory part that includes background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, and definitions of key terms. The second chapter focuses on literature reviewed. Chapter three deals with design of the study while chapter four is the presentation, analysis, interpretation, and discussions of the data. The last chapter treats the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter discussed the interference of mother tongue in learning English as second language and presented different scholars view on mother tongue interference in learning English as second language. First it discussed the historical backgrounds of using students' first language in the EFL classes. Secondly, it presented the major arguments against the use of L1 and other factors contributing to the avoidance of L1. Thirdly, it dealt with the supportive arguments of L1 use with respect to the pedagogic and psychological purposes for which students' native language could be employed in the L2 classroom. Fourthly, it gave an insight into the occasions in which teachers' and Students' use L1 in the EFL Classes.

2. 1 General Overview of Using L1 in Foreign Language

Teaching Karen Stanley (2002) in Teaching English as Second or Foreign Language discussed the use of mother tongue in learning second language and accepted the use of their mother tongue in the class room to teach English with some limitations. But there must be some limitations in using mother tongue in the language class because it could cause confusion in the minds of learners in some applications. Sometimes using of mother tongue in language class may help the low level students and slow learners to learn English easily and effectively. Some scholars suggest that the bilingual usage is a normal aid in learning English grammar.

Kelly (1969) in Socio politics of English Language Teaching mentioned that by the end of the 18th century the grammar of foreign tongue was introduced only by analyzing the L1 grammar rule. (Researcher's view) Though some scholars suggested using L1 in English classroom to learn, teachers do not allow the learners to use mother tongue inside the classroom because it may affect the learners' concentration. But using the mother tongue to explain the slow learners in the class with some limitations, works wonderfully. Simultaneously, there was opposition from other scholars for not permitting the use of mother tongue in the English class room. They said that the using of L1 in English class room led to wastage the time, distracted other language

students, disturbed the students who practiced English by speaking and decreased the opportunity in general for students to use the English language.

Some research scholars refused the interference of L1 while learning L2. They argued that by modifying the teaching methodology, there is no need to bring the mother tongue into the L2 class room. Some scholars say that teaching bilingually does not mean return to the grammar translation method, but the thinking, feeling, counting, etc. are very much rooted to their mother tongue while interacting with friends, relatives and neighbors. The original impulse to speak can only be found in the mother tongue.

Darcy (1953) in “a Journal of General Psychology, a Review” remarked that bilingualism is detrimental to the process of learning a foreign language and communication between two language systems is the main reason for the interference. When one has good command of the two languages (i.e.) his own mother tongue and foreign tongue, there is no interference. In the case of subordinate bilingualism, the second language is not mastered, and then the mother tongue dominated and influenced the second language and led to interference. When learners make mistakes in oral and written form of foreign language expression, interference is explicit. Then the learners transfer language habits from their native language to the foreign language and ignore the rules of L2 in speech. Interference on different language levels such as phonetic, lexical, grammatical, etc. may occur more often when teaching English.

Robert Paul in his “The Second Language Acquisition” said that when the learner learnt his first language i.e. his mother tongue he felt the universe directly and learnt to clothe it with speech but when he learnt a second language he tended to filter the universe through the language

2.2. Historical Background of Using L1 in Foreign Language Learning

A glance at the history of L1 use in the L2 classroom quickly reveals periodic but regular changes in how it is viewed (Auerbach, 1999). Several hundred years ago bilingual teaching was the “norm”, with students learning through translation.

The use of L1 to study L2 was almost universal and readily accepted, partially because L2 language teaching placed an emphasis on the written word above the spoken word. In the 19th Century, this trend slowly reversed itself towards a monolingual approach to some extent due to

a shift towards an emphasis on the spoken word. The impact of mass migration, colonialism and a large increase in research in the field would further strengthen the Monolingual Approach in the 20th Century. Thus, since the early twentieth century, utilization of L1 has been out of fashion and has little or no public support (Cook, 2002). Even, the use of L1 in the EFL classroom started to be seen as uncommunicative, boring, pointless and irrelevant (Harmer, 2001)

In other words, this method was challenged for doing virtually nothing to enhance students' communication ability in the language (Brown, 2000). This lack of public support seems to have led modern language teachers to associate the use of translation with the Grammar Translation Method (Edge 1986; Linder 2002 & Weschler, 1997).

The appearance of the Direct Method of teaching just over a hundred years ago also contributed greatly to the consolidation of the idea that all L1 should be excluded from the classroom (Harbord, 1992). The premise of the Direct Method was that second language learning mirrored first language acquisition: lots of oral interaction, little grammatical analysis and no translation. Advocates of the Direct Method and the Audio-lingual Method, thus, emphasized banning the use of L and viewed L1 and L2 as two different systems that should not be linked so as to avoid L1 interference. The Direct Method would soon be discredited when it failed in the public education system (Brown, 1994), but it would have a lasting influence on ESL/EFL classrooms.

Other scholars believe that the focus on foreign language can enhance communication and activate both conscious and unconscious learning. They added that learners could understand the message even when they do not know the exact meaning of words or structures, which indicates that they do not need to grasp all the words they read or hear. Subsequently, the total use of English to teach English as a foreign language was obligated, and throughout the 1970s and 1980s, according to the communicative approaches, the use of L1 was still considered as undesirable (Atkinson, 1993 ; Mahmoud, 2006 & Piasecka, 1988).

However, these days, the taboo against using L1 in the classroom is breaking down, and the attitude to L1 and translation in language classes has seemingly witnessed a positive change following the recognition that some learners use the L1 as a communicative as well as a learning strategy to learn and use the FL (Cook, 2001 & James, 1998).

2.3. Advantages of using mother tongue

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

2.3.1 Humanistic element

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

2.3.2 Preferred Learning Strategy

Another advantage of L1 use worth noting is that it is highly compatible with the learners' preferred learning strategy. According to Atkinson (1987), the use of mother tongue in L2 classroom is invaluable because it is consistent with the preferred learning strategies of the majority of learners in language classrooms around the world.

In other words, the needs of the students have to be considered in order for students to learn effectively. This is to mean that if students want something translated and can learn better, we have to provide them with such opportunity. In his study of Spanish use in EFL classrooms in Puerto Rico, Schweers (1999) found that 88.7% of students felt Spanish should be used in the classroom to explain difficult concepts, define new vocabulary items and to check for comprehension. It is difficult to ignore the wishes of the students when contemplating one's approach to teaching, but as teachers we need to know where to draw the line.

2.3.3 Time saving device

Roger Brown (1973 as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 2001) expressed his annoyance in watching a teacher try to explain new vocabulary through elaborate “verbal gymnastics” when in his opinion, “translation would have been a much more efficient technique.” As the anecdote suggests, translation, or mother tongue use, is often encouraged as an efficient, time-saving technique; supported by many ELT professionals (Atkinson, 1987; Green, 1970 & Tudor, 1987). Many instances of L1 use are associated with the need to save time, but as Harbord (1992) points out, saving time is not an effective use of translation or the mother tongue in general. He quotes in saying:

The mother tongue should be used to provoke discussion and speculation, to develop clarity and flexibility of thinking, and to help us increase our own and our students’ awareness of the inevitable interaction between the mother tongue and the target language that occurs during any type of language acquisition (Duff, 1989, p.174) .

2.4 Factors Favoring L1 use in EFL classrooms

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

One reason why monolingual teaching has been so readily accepted is due to the “language myths of Europeans” and the belief in their inherent superiority over non-European languages (Pennycook, 1994).

Indeed the stigma of bilingualism in the EFL context originates from the ardent belief of the importance of English, and the disrespect shown towards other languages (Pennycook, 1994). English-only has also come about through the blind acceptance of certain theories, which serve the interests of native speaking teachers (Weschler, 1997). However, there is now a belief by some that the use of L1 could be a positive resource for teachers and that considerable attention and research should be focused on it (Atkinson, 1987).

2.4.1. Arguments forwarded to discredit the English-only Approach

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

2.4.2 The impracticality of L1 Free Foreign Language Class

The biggest problem with the Monolingual Approach to teaching is that it is very impractical (Phillipson, 1992). One reason the exclusion of L1 is impractical is that the majority of English teachers are not native speakers (Hawks, 2001). Sometimes these teachers' own English is not very good, and by insisting on an English only policy, we can severely undermine their ability to communicate and consequently their ability to teach. Another reason it is impractical is that to enforce the sole use of the TL can often lead to a reduced performance on the part of the teachers, and the alienation of students from the learning process (Pachler & Field, 2001). What the researcher personally know from his working environment, particularly the college, is that teachers' exclusive use of the target language marginalizes the students making them passive listeners without understanding. Not only that, but excluding L1 can lead to a higher dropout rate in EFL schools, whereas when L1 is permitted, researchers and teachers alike report much more positive results (Auerbach, 1993).

2.4.3 Native Teachers Paradox

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

2.4.4 Exposure alone not being sufficient for learning

Another problem with the Monolingual Approach is its belief that exposure to language leads to learning. Excluding the students' L1 for the sake of maximizing students' exposure to the L2 is not necessarily productive. In fact there is no evidence that teaching in the TL directly leads to better learning of the TL (Pachler & Field, 2001). Obviously the quantity of exposure is important, but other factors such as the quality of the text material, trained teachers, and sound methods of teaching are more important than the amount of exposure to English (Phillipson, 1992). This is particularly obvious with struggling lower-level students. Increasing the amount of L2 instead of perhaps a simple explanation in L1 is likely to have a negative effect and simply add to the frustration on the students part (Burden, 2000). Teaching in the TL does have benefits but teaching in the TL alone, will not guarantee learning among the students (Pachler & Field, 2001), but excluding it, may impede teach (Auerbach, 1993).

2.5. Major Arguments against L1 Use

The issue of whether or not to use L1 in the L2 classroom has been touchy in language teaching. Two approaches have appeared with regard to using the L1 in EFL teaching: the Monolingual approach and the Bilingual approach.

Many linguists disapprove using L1 in EFL teaching on the ground that it hinders learning. In monolingual approach, for example, the inclusion of L1 in the L2 classroom is unacceptable (Tang, 2002) because it is considered that L2 facilitates (Richards and Rodgers, 2001) and maximizes exposure (Krashen, 1981) to the target language. The L1 use was considered as indirect and time-consuming (Nation, 1978), an obstacle to advance the study of L2 and thinking in the L2 (Hilton, 1974; Nazary, 2008) and a hindrance to develop fluency in an L2 (Tafesse, 1988). This view emerged with the introduction of the direct method around the turn of the 20th century (Harbord, 1992).

According to Sharma (2006) the rationale for using only the target language in the classroom is that the more students are exposed to English, the more quickly they will learn; as they hear and use English, they will internalize it to begin to think in English; the only way they will learn it is if they are forced to use it. He adds that when L1 is used, errors might emerge owing to negative L1 transfer.

2.5.1. The L1 Acquisition/Learning Argument.

This idea is chiefly advanced by Krashen and Terrell (1983). Krashen and Terrell, advocates of monolingual approach, argue that learners acquire FL following the same path they acquire their L1. They believe that L2 learning follows a process similar to L1 learning and claim that exposure is vital in the learning of L2 (Cook, 2001). In other words, learners of L2 should be exposed to an L2 environment as much as possible. Krashen(1985), a central advocate of the only-L2 use in the classroom states that comprehensible input is the only causative variable in second language acquisition. He means that success in a foreign language can be attributed to input alone (Brown, 2000).

Thus, he claims that the entire lesson as much as possible should be in L2, as using the mother tongue in the EFL classroom prevents students from acquiring the valuable input in the L2 since there was a definite relationship between comprehensible input in L2 and proficiency (Krashen, 1985).

In the same view, Deller and Rinvolutri (2002) do not support the random use of the native language and warn the language teachers of the negative effects of its over-use in the EFL classroom.

2.5.2. The Language Compartmentalization Argument

This view suggests that successful L2 acquisition depends on unscrambling L2 from the L1 and seeing the L1 and the L2 as a separate entities Cook (2001); Cook states that one main reason for thinking this way is the fear of L1 interference.

Even if the two languages are distinct in principle, they are interrelated in the L2 users' mind in many ways (phonology, morphology, syntax and pragmatics) so that L1 is affected by L2 and vice versa (Atkinson, 1987; Cook, 2001; Cook, 2002; Harbord, 1992 & Stern, 1992), for example, feels that switching and negotiation between languages is an essential part of everyday language use for the majority of the world population.

Likewise, Stern (1992) contends that the L1-L2 association is an inevitable fact of life, whether we like it or not the new knowledge is learnt on the basis of the previously acquired language.

The argument is that translation fosters a sense of false equivalence between the two languages resulting in the inter-language errors (Cook, 2002). In order to avoid and eliminate the errors caused by L1 interferences, students are encouraged to suppress the use of L1 as a means of learning the TL.

However, second language acquisition research (Dulay & Burt, 1973; Johnson & Newport, 1994) has revealed that the difficulties and errors of foreign language learning cannot be completely attributed to interference by the learners' first language. In an investigation analyzing the sources of errors among native-Spanish-speaking children learning English, Dulay and Burt (1973) found that only 3% of errors came from L1 interferences and 85% of errors were developmental in nature. These findings imply that the fear of using L1 in foreign language classrooms, which results in negative transfer, should be reduced.

Likewise, Stern (1992) argues that it is impossible to avoid the interference errors at any cost since L2 learners often use their L1 for reference; rather we need to acknowledge them as a psycholinguistic given. Stern proposes that we can help learners to gradually develop a new L2 reference system by demonstrating where the L1 and L2 are similar and different this in turn will aid learners to respond to the likely errors in advance. A study conducted by Tomasello and Herron (1989) in the context of Portuguese also seems to validate the importance of contrastive analysis (Lado, 1964).

2.6. The Role of L1 in EFL classroom

2.6.1 The Pedagogical Role

Even though the proponents of L1 use in L2 class strongly claim that L1 use jeopardizes the progress or effectiveness of L2 learning, the practice and results of many researches confirm that L1 has a role to play in L2 learning.

One of these basic roles it is believed to play is its pedagogic value in the L2 classroom. The major notion behind this argument is that learners use their L1 as a "reservoir" (to use Prodromou's 2001 term); L1 creates support for students. According to Bolitho (1983) as cited in Talking Shop' L2 learners do not come to the class with their mind empty. I.e. all L2 learners by default speak at least one other language. They use their L1 experiences or they fall back on; L1

knowledge to help them learn the target language. Stern (1992) also advocates a similar view in which he stated that L2 learners always make reference to the language they already know; therefore, whether we like it or not the new language is learned on the basis of the previously acquired language.

He goes on to explain that even when students have another L2 to fall back on; this language itself should be treated as an additional resource to learn the target language. Gabrielatos (2001) says that L2 learners tend to rely on their existing knowledge (L1 and other languages) to understand the logic and organizational principles of the target language. Swan (1985) went even to the extent of concluding that one should never learn a foreign language unless he/she keeps making correspondences between the elements of the two languages. Both Swan (1985) and Dajani (2002) conclude that learning a second language is the continuation of the already existing L1 knowledge. In fact, one bridging function of translation is its usefulness in creating opportunities for comparative analysis between the mother tongue and the target language (Murakami, 1999; Namushin, 2002). For example, by enabling the students' to relate form and function in their L1 to form and function in the L2 (Titford 1993).

Similarly, Ringbom (1987) also notes that L2 learners would make use of the existing knowledge in their native language to help them understand the new language. This possibility of transferring L1 knowledge to L2 learning is also a strategy used by most L2 learners in most of places (Atkinson, 1987; Harbord, 1992; Rubin, 1975& Stern, 1992).

2.6.2. The Psychological Role

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

Shamash (1990, as cited in Auerbach, 1993) believes that using the mother tongue allows learners to experiment and take risks in English. Building on Shamash's (1990) belief, Auerbach

(1993) herself concludes, “Starting with L1 provides a sense of security and validates the learners’ lived experiences, allowing them to express themselves”. According to her, the use of L1 reduces the psychological barriers to English learning and allows for a more rapid progression. It was claimed that “The ability to switch to a native language, even for a shorter time, gives learners an opportunity to preserve self –image, get rid of anxiety, build confidence and feel independent in their choice of expression” (Janulevicine & Kavlialiauskiene, 2002,p.53).

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

2.6.3 The Socio-cultural Role

In addition to the above mentioned roles, the use of first language in EFL class plays a socio-cultural role which links the L2 classroom and the students’ culture. Prodromou (2001), for instance, regarded the use of mother tongue as a means through which L2 learners bring their cultural backgrounds into the L2 classroom. To Prodromou, classroom ethnic cultures are indeed a starting point for a variety of classroom activities.

Mentioning the authenticity of the classroom, Widdowson (1996) also argued that contexts which would be meaningful for students have somehow to be constructed in the classroom out of the primary experience of the mother tongue culture.

Widdowson believes that the classroom culture and the culture of the society in which they live are a good starting point for supporting students to authenticate the target language.

What’s more, Linder (2002) claims that the use of classroom translation activities could promote the cultural transfer skills. Using students’ mother tongue is useful to evaluate cultural diversity (Dove, 1992 as cited in Auerbach, 1993).

2.6.4 Attitudes of Teachers and Students towards the use of L1 in EFL classroom

Naturally man has the tendency to interact with himself and things around him. While doing this he forms feelings and beliefs about the things he encounters, thereby forming either a positive or negative attitude towards the object.

According to Crow and Alice (1956) the term attitude is often used to express an individual's pattern of reaction toward himself, his physical environment, his associates and the situation in which he finds himself.

Findings from small number of studies (Burden, 2001; Schweers, 1999 & Tang, 2002) in Japanese, Spanish and Chinese contexts respectively showed that both university teachers and students had positive attitude towards the use of L1 in their English classroom. There were similar findings in an Ethiopian teacher college context (Kenenisa, 2003). The results of their studies further illustrated that a limited amount of L1 had a supportive and facilitating role in the English classes and thus it needed to be welcomed. Studying students' reactions to the use of the L1 in English classes, Terrence Doyle (1997), in his presentation at TESOL, reported that students in a study he conducted claimed that the L1 was used approximately 90 percent of the time in their classes. Some 65 percent of these students preferred the use of the L1 in their classes sometimes or often. Bearing many similarities to Schweer's study in Spanish context, Tang (2002) in his research in a Chinese EFL context indicated that students responded positively towards Chinese use. In particular, the vast majority of students (97%) liked it when their teachers used some Chinese. According to students, Chinese was most necessary to explain complex grammar points and to help define some new vocabulary items. A few students indicated that the L1 could be used to translate well-written paragraphs and to compare the two languages (Tang, 2002).

2.7. Empirical Studies on Teachers' and Students' Positions towards the Use of L1 in the EFL Classes

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 and teachers in the use of L1 in the EFL classroom. To see some of them: Tang (2002) studied the use of the L1 by 20 Chinese English teachers and 100 learners' perceptions towards it. The results showed that both teachers and learners responded positively to using the L1 as a supportive and facilitating teaching tool.

Prodromou (2002) carried out research to find out reaction and perceptions of 300 Greek students regarding L1 use in the monolingual classroom at three levels – beginner (elementary), intermediate and advanced. A relatively high percentage of beginner and intermediate students

(between 53% and 66%) answered that both the teacher and the students “should use the mother tongue and thus, showed more tendencies to accept the use of their mother tongue, while only a minority of advanced learners supported those views. This contrasts with the students’ opinions concerning the use of L1 in specific classroom situations (i.e. giving instructions, explaining new words and so on). Here, L1 use receives a small amount of support from the advanced level groups.

Prodromou concluded that his study presented a clear pattern: the more English students learn, the less reliant they are on the L1 and that on the whole, his students seem to have a varied opinion of L1 use in the classroom at different levels.

In a study involving the use of mother tongue in an EFL classroom setting of Chitwan high school students in Nepal, Sharma (2006) uses classroom observation of four teachers and questionnaire responses of one hundred students and twenty high school English teachers.

The results showed that both students and teachers believe the importance of L1 in explaining new vocabulary giving instruction, talking about tests, grammar instruction, checking for understanding and relaxing the students.

With regard to local studies, Kenenisa, B. (2003) accomplished a study with the aim of assessing teachers’ and students’ positions towards the use of the Oromo Language at the college level in the Adama College of Teacher Education in Ethiopian context. The study specified that both teachers and students have positive attitude towards using the Oromo language at the higher (college) level.

From this we can infer that the use of L1 in the L2 classes is accepted not only by lower level English teachers and students but also by intermediate and higher level instructors and students. Taken as a whole, there is some evidences showing that teachers and learners prefer to use their native language in English class lessons.

2.8. Judicious Use of Mother Tongue in the Young Learners’ EFL Classroom

A number of researchers agree that judicious and planned use of mother tongue can promote target language learning (Cameron, 2001&Ur, 1996) and enhance learners’ competence level in the target language. Deller and Rinvoluceri,(2002:10) contend that mother tongue is the womb

that the new languages are born. Atkinson(1987) emphasizes that to ignore the mother tongue in the monolingual classroom is almost certainly to teach with less than maximum efficiency.

Cook (2001) illustrates that MT avoidance promotes a pretend monolingual situation in the foreign language which diminishes classroom reality. She added that the students are pretend native speakers of the second language rather than true L2 users.

In Prodromou's (2000) survey in Greek students 65% and 66% of beginner students believe that teachers should know and use students' mother tongue. Here, we can infer that young learners not only need to use their mother tongue but also they need their teachers to employ L1 in the foreign language classroom.

The existing literature on L1 use puts together appropriate and effective L1 use into the following major categories (Chang, 2009; Macaro, 2001; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). The first category is for curriculum access such as conveying meaning of words or sentences, explaining grammar, etc).

It is possible that the students' ability to utilize the L1 input enable them to complete their reading tasks more successfully. This argument may be extended to include the fact that teachers can facilitate student learning by making the L1 available to them. However, Harbord (1992) cautions teachers to restrict the use of L1 explanations to abstract, complicated words or sentences that would otherwise confuse students if explained in the TL.

If a word or sentence is simple enough, it is advisable to take the time to define or explain it in the TL. When a teacher continues using L1 to explain simple vocabulary or sentences, they are using too much L1. In Harbord's opinion, students still require abundant exposure to TL unless instructions communicated in TL lead to miscomprehension and frustration.

Moreover, Atkinson (1987) proposes that teachers should explain grammatical rules in L1 and then develop TL dialogues that integrate rules enabling students to strengthen them.

Harbord (1992) suggests that teachers chat in L1 before class starts and tell jokes in L1 to reduce student anxiety. Furthermore Stern (1992) claims that it would be advisable to allocate some time in which L1 is used in order that questions can be asked, meanings can be verified,

uncertainties can be clear and explanations can be given which may not be possible to the students through the use of L2.

However, what exactly constitutes the appropriate mixture of L1 and L2 has not been well investigated (Stern 1992; Turnbull, 2001) and thus, further explorations need to be done to address this issue. Atkinson (1987) proposes, a “ratio of about 5% native language to about 95% target language may be more profitable at early levels”.

In a study of elementary Core French in Western Canada, Colman and Daniel (1988) specified 95% of the target language as the acceptable quantity by the teachers (cited in Turnbull 2001). Tang (2002) also reported a 5% to 10% of the L1 deemed to be appropriate in the EFL classrooms. While these findings are not overtly conclusive, they do, however, illustrate that there is a disparity between the reports with regard to the L1-L2 proportion. It seems from this that Turnbull (2001) recommends further studies to be carried out in this area. With regard to the level of students, Atkinson (1987); Hawks (2001) and Stern (1992) suggest that the mother tongue has a variety of roles at all levels.

But, as Stern (1992) and Hawks (2001) note that it may be more important to use mother tongue at lower levels judiciously and to gradually reduce that quantity of L1 as the students become more and more proficient in the target language. In general, though it is very difficult to quantify the possible amount of mother tongue required for effective second language learning, it seems that it would be at least important to be aware of the fact that L1 can be used systematically with varying intensities for learners at lower to advanced levels. On the other hand, as significant amount of literature claims (Medgyes, 1994; Murakami, 1999 & Reis, 1996) an attempt to employ 100% target language, especially, with students at lower levels of L2 proficiency appears to be impractical. If one does, it is to try to “teach the target language with almost less than the maximum possible efficiency” (Atkinson, 1987, p. 247).

2.9. The Purposes for which teachers and students need L1

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

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

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

Harmer (2001) believes that L1 use is quite acceptable, for example, when students are working in pairs studying a reading text. A study carried out by Anton and DiCamilla (1998) also shows that using L1 in pair/group work provides students with scaffold help.

So, allowing L1 during group/pair work ensures that there will be both productive collaboration and discussion among the fellow students as Choffey (2001) notes. However, students' use of L1 in collaborative activities is not without its problems. There, for example, could be the problem of differentiating between on-task talk and off-task chatting, and difficulty keeping some groups to the target language. The best way to control the problem, according to Harmer (2001), Harbord (1992), is to create awareness among the students of when using their mother tongue is permissible and when the use of the target language is absolutely important. Encouraging positive use of L1 empowers learners to know when they should use it and when not (Buckmaster, 2002). Therefore, it's the responsibility of the teachers to make students aware before they are engaged in any of the classroom activities, in order to promote a positive use of L1

Generally, it would possibly be concluded from the scholars' view that encouraging learners to relate L2 to L1 so as to help them discover the similarities and differences between the two languages likely reduces the possible occurrences of the transfer errors although L1 interference is there.

However, from my personal viewpoint as a teacher, the researcher believe that the use of L1 may interfere with and hinder the process of learners' inter-language development since their reasoning may become dependent on associations and thus, learners may not develop the necessary framework to establish sense relations in L2 due to mere dependence on L1 framework in spite of the fact that it shapes their learning of L2.

In general, the researcher support the proponents those agree against using more F1 language while teaching English.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presented the overall research design and the methodologies of the study. It provided detail information about the design, participants, the sampling techniques, the instruments used to collect data and finally data analysis techniques.

3.1 Overall design of the study

The current study was both descriptive and experimental in its nature. Its aim was investigating how mother tongue influence the development of grammar knowledge of ninth grade students as foreign language teaching in Comparison with limited first language used which mostly consist of the course and grammar books. At the retention test the data was compared with an independent samples t-test and the findings indicated a significant difference for the first unit $|t(51.91) = 3.04, p=.004|$. However it did not reveal a significant difference when the results of the second unit were considered $|t(42.95) = .47, p= .63|$.

To compare experimental and control groups in terms of achievement and retention in grammar units, a pre test –post test control group design were used. As Krathwohl (1998) stated, the strongest chances of reasoning were carried out through the experimental design. Experimental was the most effective way of proving cause and effect relationships. Jurs (1998) indicated that revealing the relationship between independent samples was realized by selecting sample classes from the total population and then randomly experimental dividing the subject into as an experimental group to which the treatment was implemented and a non experimental or control group to which no treatment was given. For the purpose of this study, grammar lesson was designed and developed .At the beginning of the experiment, questionnaires were given to the students of both control and experimental groups and teaches of EFL. At the beginning of each unit, an achievement test was given as pre test to both experimental and control groups.

As the treatment, the experimental group was taught by using the target language while the control group was taught by using mother tongue translation method of teaching EFL lesson. At the end of the unit an achievement test as posttest was implemented to the students of both

groups. The experimental groups also filled a unit feedback for both units. After the post test implementation, the achievement test was given to both groups as a retention tests.

3.2 Description of the variable of the study

There are three types of variables in the study

- I) Control variable -students pretest scores
- II) Dependent variables - students posttest score
- III) Independent variable -treatment (teaching using mother tongue or teaching without using mother tongue)

3.3 Sample and Sampling Technique

3.3.1 Selection of the School

There were 2 secondary schools and 1 preparatory school in Becho wereda of Ilubabor zone. As it was very difficult to include the two secondary schools which were far apart, the researcher decided to select one secondary school. Then, the researcher used lottery method to select the specific schools from 2 secondary schools in the wereda. Then Becho secondary was selected.

3.3.2 Selection of Grade Level

As mentioned above, the study was conducted at Becho secondary school. In this secondary school there were Grade 9 and Grade 10 students. Although the results of the study might be applied to any group of learners at different levels of learning, for this study, Grade 9 was selected for different reasons. The researcher, thus, selected Grade 9 because grade 10 students were busy to prepare themselves for EGSLC. In other word the researcher decided not to use any of their time.

3.3.3 Selection of Students

A number of the students attending at Becho secondary school in the year 2010 E.C were 480. From these 180 students were grade 10 and the rest 162 male and 138 totally 300 were grade nine students. From these 300 ninth grade students, 54 (26 Female, and 28 Male) Grade 9 students were selected by using lottery method from Becho secondary school. These 300 Grade 9 students were learning in 6 sections in this academic year. From these 26 experimental and 28

control group students were selected. The selection was by using the following procedure. First the name of each sections (e.g. A, B, C ...F) were written on pieces of papers, then, the papers were scrolled, mixed up and two lots were drawn. The pieces of papers (lots) which had the names of the sections occurring on the papers were taken as selected sections for the study. The same strategy was used to select both control and experimental groups. Finally the same strategy was used to select the participant of both control and experimental groups. For the class which assumed as experimental group 26 one (1) and the rest zero (0) were scrolled. Those got the chance of 1 participated and those got 0 didn't. The same mechanism was used to select the control group students. Since it was impossible to use the whole class students in the study, to select the participants from the class the above strategy was used. In the case of samples and sampling procedure, it was obvious that there was no conventional way of determining a sample size that was representatives of the target population as there were diverse views on this issue. However, Gay and Airasian (2003) assert that it was most likely to obtain a representative sample if random sampling technique was used. In addition, Gay and Airasian (2003) stated that the sample of 10% to 20% of target population is often used in descriptive research. They also suggest that a larger sample size increases the reliability of the findings of the study. Accordingly, this study was carried out on a randomly selected sample of 54 respondents out of 300 total populations which is 18% of the total population.

3.3.4 Selection of Teachers

There were experimental and control group classes. One of these classes was considered as the experimental group. The class which the researcher taught was assigned as the experimental group because the researcher had developed the implementation materials and activities. Another group which was considered as control group was taught by one of English teachers in the school. He was the teacher who has been teaching the class regularly. Because of that the teacher was selected purposely. After getting permission from the school administrators, the researcher began to investigate the effect of using students' native language on teaching English grammar achievement. It was also to investigate the attitude of the ninth grade Becho secondary school students towards learning English grammar that might affect the outcome of EFL students before investigating the effects of first language on the achievement of students' Grammar knowledge.

3.4 Data collection Instrument

In this study, data collection was conducted before and after the implementation of the materials and activities .Three instruments were used. These were tests, questionnaire and interview for English teachers in the school. Three parallel tests for each lesson were given for both experimental and control groups.

3.4.1 Tests

Pretest

Before the implementation of each lesson the students of both groups received a pre test measuring their prior knowledge about the grammar in a given unit. It was given to both groups before any teaching and learning was conducted. The researcher wanted to find out how similar these groups to each other in grammar knowledge. The pre test of the first lesson contains three items. Such as; fill in the blank spaces with the correct passive form of verbs given in bracket, multiple choice type and changing active voices in to passive voice. In the case of the post test of the first unit it contains three items .such as completing the given incomplete statements with correct phrase or word, error correction and changing direct speeches in to their reported speech.

Post test

A post test was given to both groups of students to provide quantitative data about their achievement after the teacher has taught the particular grammar knowledge with the target language and using the usual way or translation into the students' mother tongue. The post test of both first and second unit contains three items each. The items for the first unit were changing active voice in to passive voice and identifying errors given in the given text and multiple choices. In the case of the items for the second units were also changing direct speech into reported speech and identifying and correcting the incorrectly used phrases multiple choices.

Retention test

The third test was the retention test given three weeks after the students have taken the post test of passive voice and two weeks after the students have taken the post test on reported speech.

The purpose of giving this test for the two groups was to get information about how well they retained what they had learned of the grammar lesson.

Questionnaire

Two different questionnaires and feedback for experimental students were administered. The first questionnaire for teachers of English department and the aim of designing this instrument was to provide information about the teachers' views on grammar teaching method, attitude of using L1 and advantage and disadvantage of using L1. Another questionnaire was built for the students of control and experimental groups and aims to detect students' opinion and perception towards grammar teaching using first language in EFL class and learning process.

The third instrument which is a unit feedback form was administered only to the experimental group students. It was prepared so as to get the students' views about mother tongue limited teaching grammar. They are exposed to in learning particular grammar lesson. This was in order to get information about their feeling of learning English grammar without mother tongue interference in the experimental group. Each of the Data collection instruments was described in detail.

3.4.2 Piloting

Pre and post tests were piloted in 10th grade students where the whole implementation of research took place. Five students were arbitrarily selected from two section of grade 10 and students were made to complete the test in 40 minutes. The researcher believed that ten students were enough for that stage. A week later, a post test of the lesson was distributed and students were made to complete the test in 25 minutes. After the pilot study, some questions from the distributed test which were confusing for the students were clarified with the new wording.

3.4.3 Questionnaires for the teachers of English department

The questionnaires which were administered to English teacher offering various English lessons to students at Becho secondary school were developed as an open and close ended instrument by the researcher. This instrument were modified by the researcher and checked by teachers who have been teaching English for more than 25 years.

The questionnaires aimed to collect data on the teachers' perceptions and expectations as regards in L1 interference while teaching the English grammar. The first question aimed to find out how the teachers use first language to teach grammar, which methods and techniques, and activities they use to teach grammar to their students. The second is how the students react to the methods and activities they use in grammar teaching. The next question was dealt with the attitude of the students towards F1 and if the activities and methods they used were appealing and motivating their students. Finally, the last question was aimed at detecting if they ever use the students' first language while teaching the grammar lesson.

3.4.4 Students' questionnaires

This instrument was designed by the researcher and modified by experienced teacher. The purpose of giving this was to get information on the students' perceptions and expectations regarding learning English grammar and to find out their attitude towards the use of mother tongue while learning English grammar.

3.4.5 Interview

Semi-structured interview questions were set out to get pertinent data from the six English teachers of Becho secondary school. Semi-structured interview was preferred because it was thought that it gave relatively wider freedom to the interviewees to express their views and beliefs (Shohamy and Seliger 1989; Wallace 1998).

The interview would felt to be suitable for the study for two main reasons. Firstly, it was aimed to generate some information from the interviewees on matters related to the use and non-use of students' first language in the EFL classroom. Secondly, it was used as a follow-up to the questionnaires' responses. The interview was conducted before the experiment was took place. Another purpose of the interview was to use it as a follow-up to the data obtained through the questionnaires.

3.4.6 Unit feedback

This instrument was designed in line with the implementation of the materials. It was given only for the experimental group students. The aim of this unit feedback form was to obtain necessary data on the students' feelings and thought about what change they observed in grammar lessons.

This instrument was filled by the experimental group students at the end of all the teaching sessions. It was aimed to students' views about the retention of the grammar subjects. The form consisted of close ended questions about the effect of the using mother tongue in teaching grammar on students' motivation, eagerness achievement and retention.

3.5. Ethical Issues

As various scholars expressed, the major ethical dilemma in a research work was the requirement for researchers to strike a balance between the demands placed on them as professional scientists in pursuit of truth, and their subjects' rights and values potentially threatened by the research (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). Hence, participation in this particular project was on a voluntary and informed consent basis, with the right to withdraw at any time maintained.

Prior to their involvement in the data collection practice, each participant was given an explanation as to the purpose of the research in clear and simple language with an emphasis on how relevant their genuine responses would be to the study. Then research participants were assured that it was against professional ethics to disclose their identity in public without their consent, and were also reminded of their rights to quit participating at anytime during the course of their involvement. After, participants were left with their natural right to choose whether or not to participate in the study.

3.6 Data collection procedures

As explained before, pre test, post test controlled group design was conducted for this study

First the questionnaires were administered to both the experimental and control groups before the implementation of the obtained information about their perception of grammar teaching method and what they think about one of the alternative ways of grammar learning, using their first language.

Second six teachers of English department received the questionnaires and noticed their view about the ways and methods of grammar teaching and the way they use F1 in their lesson. To understand the difference between the use of first language and the target language two grammar lessons were chosen among the topics in the syllabus of grade nine English textbook. The reason for choosing two grammar lessons for this study was to obtain reliable and consistent results: the

implementation of only one lesson would not provide sufficient data for the research questions of the study. Furthermore, the reason for choosing the grammar lessons of active and passive and direct and Reported speech was the fact that the two grammar lessons have a vital place in English grammar. These grammar lessons were frequently used in a variety of contexts by both native and second language speakers of the language and also have probability of making mistakes for EFL learners in grammar lessons of English. EFL learners have serious problems and many difficulties in this grammar subject as experienced by most English teachers. Thus, the first phase of the implementation aimed at teaching passive voice while the second phase aimed at teaching reported speech.

3.6.1 The implementation of the first Unit passive and Active voice

At this stage it includes error correction, rewriting statements, sentence completion and changing from one form to the other types of questions.

A detailed lesson for experimental group was prepared based on the passive voice. Materials were selected for the lesson. A variety of activities and exercises were prepared based on the lesson. Passive voice was applied in the first of the whole implementation procedure to both groups and lasted six class hours. While the experimental group was learning passive voice by using the target language, the control group was following the explanation and exercises as usual way. The exercises in the text included list of charts about the grammar subject, different types of information and rules. It also included short reading texts. Just after the teaching session, the students of both groups took the post test. Three weeks after the students received the post test, they received another test which was retention test.

3.6.2 The implementation of the second Unit Direct and Indirect speech

As it was in the first of the implementation (passive and active voice) also in this phase a pre test was administered on the reported speech for both groups.

A similar lesson was also prepared for the experimental group, this time for teaching reported speech. The method of teaching was by using the target language rather than more of using translation. Different exercises to be practiced were designed by the researcher. Teacher of the control group did not need to make a different lesson plan other than the lesson plan designed in

the text book. He followed the text book activities while teaching the reported speech. Teaching reported speech lasted for two weeks for two groups.

Students of both groups received a post test just after the two weeks teaching procedure. Two weeks after having the post test, the students received the retention test.

Parallel forms of pretest and retention tests were prepared by the researcher to obtain information about the achievement of the students in grammar subjects. The test items were selected from the variety of books and also constructed by the researcher. To score the papers, the researcher prepared an answer key for each and these answer key for each test and these answer key were checked and modified by the two English teachers. The researcher scored the test paper of both experimental and control group by following the answer keys.

3.7 Data Analysis procedures

Data analysis was carried out based on the research questions stated in the research. The quantifiable data in the pre post and retention tests are analyzed by using descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. To indicate the differences between the experimental and control groups in consideration with achievement and retention independent sample t-test was conducted.

With regard to students' and teachers' questionnaire and teachers' interview perceptions the results were analyzed through descriptive statistics. They were described one by one. Finally, the conclusion about the influence of mother tongue in EFL grammar lesson was transcribed into meaningful wholes.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presented the discussion and interpretation of the results obtained from the data collected through tests, questionnaire to teachers and students and interview to English teachers on issues related to whether Afan Oromo being used in secondary school EFL grammar lesson or not, the preferred amount of Afan Oromo in the English classrooms, the purposes for which teachers and students use Afan Oromo in English classrooms and the overall attitude of the students and their English teachers toward the use of Afan Oromo in English classrooms were discussed.

As Schütz (2007) explained his ideas saying: “The only instance in which the teaching of grammar can result in language learning (and proficiency) is when the students are interested in the subject and the target language was used as a medium of instruction” (p.51). Very often, when this occurs, both teachers and students are convinced that the study of formal grammar is essential for second language learning, and the teacher is skillful enough to present explanations in the target language so that the students understand the chapter has dealt how the Grammar can be best taught.

This chapter included the results related to the research questions of the study. The results were obtained by some data collection procedures based on qualitative and quantitative research methods. In line with the research questions, first the findings pre and posttests were discussed: next the results of the retention tests were illustrated. Finally, the descriptive finding obtained from the questionnaires and unit feedback form that revealed the experimental students’ opinions about the grammar teaching and learning and the treatment of the study were presented.

4.1 Achievement of controlled and Experimental group students

Before comparing the Experimental and controlled groups an analysis was done to find out if there was any significant difference between the two groups (Experimental and controlled) at the beginning of the study.

Findings based on the pretests prior to the implementation showed that there was no significant mean difference in pretest scores between the experimental and control groups students result. The statistical finding for the first unit (passive voice) was $|t(51.79)=-.072, p=.94|$ at the significance level of 0.05, with a mean score of 24.54 for experimental group and 24.73 for the control group. For the second unit (reported speech), the mean score for the experimental group was found as 30.16 and for the control group as 31.26 $|t(44.6)=-.48, p=.63|$ as the significance level of 0.05. These test results showed that the difference of pre test means was not significant. Both the experimental and control groups were seen as similar in their knowledge about the particular grammar subjects (passive voice and reported speech) prior to the implementation. Table 1 and 2 reveal the scores of the students of both groups obtained in the pretests of both units.

Table 1 Pre test scores of experimental and controlled groups for the first unit (passive voice)

| Group | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>t-</i> | <i>Df</i> | <i>P</i> |
|--------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Experimental | 26 | 24.54 | 8.94 | | | |
| | | | | .072 | 51.79 | .94 |
| Control | 28 | 24.73 | 10.55 | | | |

Table 2 pre test scores of experimental and control groups for the second unit (reported speech)

| Group | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>t-</i> | <i>Df</i> | <i>P</i> |
|--------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Experimental | 26 | 30.16 | 8.97 | | | |
| | | | | -.48 | 44.6 | .63 |
| Control | 28 | 31.26 | 7.45 | | | |

As for the results obtained based on the first research question, is there significant difference between experimental (exposed to teaching EFL class in English and controlled (exposed to mother tongue translation groups in the achievement tests at the end of the experiment?

Descriptive analysis in the posttest results illustrated that the experimental group that was subjected in using the target language approach in EFL class “passive voice” and “reported speech” had a higher level of achievement compared to the controlled group that received the use of mother tongue or translation of the lesson into students’ first language. An independent sample t-test was used to understand whether the difference in the achievement was significant. While the findings for the post tests of the implementation of the first unit showed a significant difference between the experimental ($M = 37.2$) and control group ($M= 32.20$) $t(50.46) = 2.36$, $p=.022$, the findings of the posttests of the second unit did not reveal a significant difference between the experimental ($M= 38.75$) and the control groups ($M=35.33$) | $t(37.63) = 1.60$, $p = .11$

The following tables 3 and 4 showed the data analysis results obtained from the post data.

Post-test was administered in order to see whether using the target language has brought a difference on the students (of experimental group) or not. The following results were found (registered).

Table 3 The post test scores of experimental and control groups for the first unit (passive voice)

| Group | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>t-</i> | <i>Df</i> | <i>P</i> |
|--------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Experimental | 26 | 37.25 | 7.62 | | | |
| | | | | 2.36 | 50.46 | .022 |
| Control | 28 | 32.20 | 8.04 | | | |

Table 4 The posttest scores of experimental and control groups for the second unit (reported speech)

| Group | n | M | SD | t- | Df | P |
|--------------|----|-------|------|------|------|-----|
| Experimental | 26 | 38.75 | 9.05 | | | |
| | | | | 1.60 | 37.6 | .11 |
| Control | 28 | 35.33 | 5.85 | | | |

Since students of both experimental and controlled groups knew the grammar subjects at the beginning of the experiment (relatively high pretest mean scores especially for the second unit were the mean 30.16 and 31.26 comparing the gain scores between the pretest and posttest scores of each group would be more meaningful .As shown in 4.5 the gain scores between the pretest and posttest for the first and second units respectively for the experimental group were 12.71 and 8.58 while the gain scores for the control group were 7.47 and 4.06 which revealed a significant difference at the significance level $\alpha < .05$ | ($t (51.21) = 4.18, p=.000$: $t (31.44) = 2.56, p=.016$ |. Hence, the difference between the gain scores for both units were significant, in favor of the experimental group, hypothesis one was rejected. Because the p-value was below .05 that means the p-value for the first lesson was $p=.000$.

Table 5 Comparison of the gain scores of both passive and reported speech lessons

| Unit | Group | n | M | SD | t- | Df | P |
|------|--------------|----|-------|------|------|-------|------|
| 1 | Experimental | 26 | 12.71 | 3.8 | | | |
| | Control | 28 | 7.47 | 5.41 | 4.18 | 51.21 | .000 |
| 2 | Experimental | 26 | 8.58 | 7.95 | | | |
| | Control | 28 | 4.06 | 3.82 | 2.56 | 31.44 | .016 |

4.2 Retention in both groups after the experiment

The next analysis was based on the retention test results in line with research question which said, “Is there a significant different between experimental and control groups in grammar knowledge retention three weeks (for the first unit or passive voice) and two weeks (for the second unit or reported speech) after the experiment?”

The retention test scores indicated a significant different in descriptive statistics for both passive and reported speech units. The mean scores were different in favor of the experimental group in both treatments .It was found as $M= 39.16$ for the experimental group while it was $M=31.73$ for the control group after the first unit results were obtained. For the second unit they were found as $M= 35.16$ for the experimental group and $M=33.96$ for the control group. The following tables 6 and 7 indicated these points.

When the data was compared with an independent samples t-test, the findings indicated a significant difference for the first unit $|t (51.91) = 3.04, p=.004 |$.However it did not reveal a significant difference when the results of the second unit were considered $|t (42.95) =.47, p= .63|$.

Before the analysis, no significant difference was expected between retention test groups’ retention test scores. As a result of this analysis there was no hypothesis (significant difference between experimental and control groups in knowledge retention three weeks of passive voice and two weeks of reported speech after the experiment) was conducted for the first unit while it was accepted for the second unit.

Table 6 Retention test scores of experimental and control groups for the first unit (passive voice)

| Group | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>t-</i> | <i>Df</i> | <i>P</i> |
|--------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Experimental | 26 | 39.16 | 7.78 | | | |
| | | | | 3.04 | 51.91 | .004 |
| Control | 28 | 31.73 | 10.17 | | | |

Table 7 Retention test scores of experimental and control groups for the second unit (reported speech)

| Group | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>t-</i> | <i>Df</i> | <i>P</i> |
|--------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Experimental | 26 | 35.16 | 10.07 | .47 | 42.95 | .63 |
| Control | 28 | 33.96 | 7.89 | | | |

4.3 Retention in each group when the post tests scores

Retention in each group when the post test scores of the groups were compared to their retention test scores, it was seen that they were not significant. The mean scores the experimental students got from the posttest for the first unit was 37.25 and for the second unit was 38.75 while the retention test mean scores were 39.16 (for the first unit) 35.16 (for the second unit) | $t(23) = -1.92, p = 0.067$; $t(23) = 1.558, p = .133$ |. There was an increase in their scores from 37.25 to 39.16 for the first unit whereas there was decrease from 38.75 to 35.16 for the second unit.

As for the results of control group, it was seen that the mean scores of the control group students for the first unit post test was 32.20 and for the second unit post test was 35.33 and the mean scores for the retention tests were 31.73 for the first unit and 33.97 for the second unit | $t(29) = .339, p = .737$; $t(29) = 1.133, p = .267$ |.

Different from the experimental group students, control group students had a decrease in both retention tests. (Table 8)

Table 8 Paired samples test results for the post and retention tests

| Group | Test | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>t</i> - | <i>df</i> | <i>P</i> |
|--------------------|-------------|----------|-----------|------------|-----------|----------|
| | Post 1 | 37.25 | | | | |
| Experimental Group | Retention 1 | 39.16 | 4.89 | -1.92 | 23 | .067 |
| | Post 2 | 38.75 | | | | |
| Control Group | Retention 2 | 35.16 | 11.27 | 1.558 | 23 | .133 |
| | Post 1 | 32.2 | | | | |
| | Retention 1 | 31.73 | 7.53 | 29 | .339 | .737 |
| | Post 2 | 35.33 | | | | |
| | Retention 2 | 33.97 | 6.61 | 29 | 1.133 | .267 |

4.4 Interpretation of the test results

The Comparison of the mean scores of the pretests of both experimental and control groups indicated that they had similar level of achievement in the grammar subjects before the implementation of each of the lessons.

After the experiment, however, the post test scores of the two groups showed significant differences, the students in the experimental group scored higher than those in the control group. The Comparison of these score revealed that the students who were taught the lesson (passive voice) in English or without more translations in to students' mother tongue were more successful than those who were taught by translating the lesson into their first language.

When the gain scores were considered a significant difference was found in achievement of experimental and control groups both for the first and second units.

There are literatures which support what happened in the experiment “Every second spent using the L1” writes Atkinson “Is a second not spent using English! And every second counts!” (Atkinson, 1993, p.12). This quotation might explain the feelings of the septic teachers who wanted and some of them still want to avoid the mother tongue in the classroom. They are probably convinced that if they use the L1 in the lesson the English will never be acquired properly. Butzkamm (2003, p.29) reminds a simile written by Prodromou which says that the question of involving the mother tongue in their lesson is for many a “skeleton in the cupboard“. Some of the teachers really see the switching into the learners’ first language as a kind of failure. The results of the retention tests like the posttest scores also showed that those who studied grammar without translating everything into their first language were more successful in grammar subjects in the long run comparison with the students who were taught English through translating into their first language. As it was also observed, in the posttest results the retention test results showed significance in the end of the first unit while it did not reveal a significant difference at the end of the second unit.

In this study the researcher has investigated the influence of using the native language (Afan Oromo) on grammar achievement and learning attitudes of basic stage EFL on the students. So the related literature included some of the studies which investigated specific purposes were shown. Ho (1985) reserved a four- month diary of her own different secondary L1 remedial English classes of the same school. In which she insisted on using English and proper amount of L1 in class while allowing Cantonese in class whenever she felt necessary. What she got at the end the students those learned their grammar with proper amount of Cantonese has scored more result.

4.5 Characteristics of the Respondents

This study generally focused on 54 students and 6 English teachers. The students were all Grade nine of Becho secondary school. Twenty six (26) experimental group students of which were 13 male and 13 females make (48.14%) of the sample population were selected. Equal numbers of male and female students were used in the experimental group. Twenty eight (28) control group students of whom 15 were males and 13 were females comprised (51.86%) of the total sample. From the total student sample population, female students made 48.14% while the remaining 51.86% were male students. The students’ ages were within the range of 14-16 years. Because

the respondents' age had little to contribute to the subject of the study, not much attention was given to them in the analysis even though age was part of the information collected.

The other respondents were teachers who were offering English courses to the groups at the time of the study. Six teachers completed the questionnaire. One of them was female and the rest were male.

The work experience has been sought because there was an assumption that experience helps to notice the classroom realities. Regarding their academic performance, all of them were Bachelors

4.6 Analysis of students' questionnaire

Table 9 Students' responses to the issue related to whether Oromo language is Present in L2 classroom or not

| No | Item | Alternatives | Sex | Control group | | | Experimental Group | | |
|----|---|-------------------------------------|-----|---------------|------|------|--------------------|------|------|
| | | | | Freq | Tota | % | Freq | Tota | % |
| 1 | Do you use Afan Oromo in your English lesson? | Yes | M | 15 | 28 | 100 | 13 | 26 | 100 |
| | | | F | 13 | | | 13 | | |
| | | No | M | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | F | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| 2 | If you responded "yes" for item 1, how often do you use Afan Oromo? | Always | M | 5 | 11 | 39.3 | 3 | 6 | 23.1 |
| | | | F | 6 | | | 3 | | |
| | | Most of the time | M | 10 | 17 | 60.7 | 9 | 16 | 61.5 |
| | | | F | 7 | | | 7 | | |
| | | Sometimes | M | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15.4 |
| | | | F | 0 | | | 3 | | |
| 3 | In what occasions do you use Afan Oromo in your English classroom | During pair or group work | M | 8 | 14 | 50 | 7 | 13 | 50 |
| | | | F | 6 | | | 6 | | |
| | | When asking and answering questions | M | 5 | 11 | 39.3 | 8 | 15 | 57.7 |
| | | | F | 6 | | | 7 | | |
| | | When chatting with peers | M | 9 | 20 | 71.4 | 8 | 15 | 57.7 |
| | | | F | 11 | | | 7 | | |

Note: participants chose more than one answer for item 3, total add up to more than 100%.

Table 9 represents the data obtained in response to the 3 items (i.e. 1, 2 and 3) in the questionnaire. Item 1 was designed to recognize whether or not students use Afan Oromo during their English lesson. Accordingly, all of the students (100%) told that they use Afan Oromo during the English lesson.

From this we can thus, conclude that students want not only as their teachers use the language but also they themselves used it. No student responded as H/She didn't use only the target language in his/her EFL grammar lessons.

In the case of the second item, which is an extension of the first item, seek information on how frequently students prefer to use their native language in the English class. With regard to this,

Some of the respondents 11(39.3%) and 6(23.1%) from both controlled and experimental groups respectively replied that they always used Afan Oromo while learning English lesson .The majority of the respondents 17 (60.7%) and 16(61.5%) of the respondents from control and experimental groups respectively preferred to use Afan Oromo most of the time in the English language learning lesson. No student from control group replied as they use Afan Oromo some times and from experimental group 4(15.4%) responded as they used Afan Oromo some times. These figures showed that most of the students interested to use Afan Oromo most of the time in their English classes. As the questionnaires completed by students indicated, the majority of the students were using or practicing Afan Oromo rather than the target language. It was nonetheless indicated that there are disadvantages of overusing mother tongue in foreign language classrooms. Overusing L1 causes using L2 less. The students felt dependent on their mother tongue. Rolin-Ianziti & Vrshtney(2008,p.31) emphasized that “without continuous L2 input students tend to lose confident in using the L2 and as a result, lose interest in or are discouraged from participating in future of L2 grammar endeavors” (cited in Jones 2010).

In the case of response to the last item in the same table, concerning the situations in which the students used Afan Oromo, majority of learners 14 (50%) and 13 (50%) respondents from control group and experimental groups respectively replied to the questionnaires that they used Afan Oromo in EFL classes grammar lesson when their English teacher gave them a group work or pair work in the classroom. The other students 11(39.3%) and 15 (57.7%) from control group and experimental groups respectively responded that they used Afan Oromo when chatting or discussing with their friends. The other students 20(71.4%) and 15 (57.7%) from control group and experimental groups respectively said as they use during discussion.

The three items provided above were designed with the aim of investigating whether Afan Oromo was used in Becho secondary school or not.

To arrive at a conclusion regarding the issue the items were sought to investigate, Item 1 was designed to see whether or not students use Afan Oromo during their English grammar lesson periods.

The implication was that Afan Oromo was widely used by students in EFL classroom. This was because each of the scores of the three items was well beyond the assumed result with a narrow degree of variability of the individual scores from the scores of the group. The responses cumulative scores indicated that students agreed to the points raised. These indicated us that the majority of the students reacted to the items positively and would like to use Afan Oromo in their EFL grammar classroom. It was better for students to be in a group to guess the meaning of new words rather than depending up on the translation.

Literature supported as students to be in a group for good grammar teaching and learning. When students work in pair or group it is expected, especially lower levels, to use the L1 because its use improve their understanding of English (Atkinson,1987). Sometimes, peers are more successful in providing more justification among them when teachers' clarifications have failed (Atkinson, 1987).

Though the students expressed their positive feelings towards the use of L1 (Afan Oromo) in pair or group work, there are contradicting views in the literature on the students' use of L1. Some like Ur (1996) oppose the idea mainly because it is difficult to keep the students to the target language once they started talking in their L1 language.

In addition to what the scholars like Cook (2001); Harmer (2001), the researcher believes that rather than giving more time in using Afan Oromo or students' mother tongue, the teacher had better encouraged as the students used the target language during pair/group work and other situations, he/she had better give the students considerable amount of advice on when to use and when did not. In addition to that as Atkinson, 1987 said the grade level which the researcher was conducting his research on was not where as much mother tongue was needed. Because they are grade nine students were all the subjects were given in English.

To sum up, it seemed that students have declared to use L1 in EFL classroom without any reservation. Students uniformly witnessed the presence and continuously usage of Oromo in their EFL grammar learning classroom.

The unequivocal statement made by students and teachers about the fact that they were engaged in its use reflects that, Afan Oromo is widely used in EFL grammar lesson at secondary school level and hence present. But what language experts said is different from this: they said learners' knowledge of the target language is much worse, especially at the elementary and secondary schools, so they were not able to notice most of the mistakes.

It is more useful for learners to hear imperfect English rather than no English and he also advised teachers not to take too much care of their accuracy because such an exaggerated care often leads to more and more mistakes (Atkinson, 1993, p. 17).

The good strategy could be to make a list of most frequent sentences, phrases and commands because in this way the role of the L1 in classroom management should be minimized and the role of the L2 increased (Nation, 2003)

Table 10 Students' perception towards teachers' use of A /Oromo in the English lesson period.

| No | Item | Alternatives | Sex | Control group | | | Experimental | | |
|----|---|---|-----|---------------|-----------|------|--------------|----------|-------|
| | | | | Freq ue | To tal | % | Freq u | Tot a | % |
| 4 | In your opinion should English teachers use Afan Oromo in the English classroom? | Yes | M | 15 | 28 | 100 | 13 | 25 | 96.15 |
| | | | F | 13 | | | 12 | | |
| | | No | M | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.75 |
| | | | F | 0 | | | 1 | | |
| 5 | If Yes for item 4, why do you think the use of A/Oromo important in the English classroom? Because it helps me: (You can choose more than one option) | To make clear the meaning of new words | M | 10 | 19 | 67.8 | 8 | 17 | 65.4 |
| | | | F | 9 | | | 9 | | |
| | | To explain difficult concepts | M | 5 | 12 | 42.8 | 7 | 13 | 50 |
| | | | F | 7 | | | 6 | | |
| | | To ask peers for clarification | M | 4 | 9 | 32.1 | 6 | 12 | 46.1 |
| | | | F | 5 | | | 6 | | |
| | | Feel at ease, comfortable and less stressed | M | 10 | 20 | 71.4 | 11 | 21 | 80.76 |
| | | | F | 10 | | | 10 | | |

Note: participants chose more than one answer for item 5, total add up to more than 100%.

As clearly observed from the students' responses on teachers' usage of Afan Oromo occasional in the EFL classroom (28(100%) and 25 (96.15%) of the respondents from control and experimental groups respectively supported as their EFL teachers should use Afan Oromo

that helps them a lot to learn English grammar. Only a respondent 1 (3.75%) of them from experimental group responded as he didn't support his EFL teachers to use Afan Oromo while teaching English grammar. Concerning item 5 of the same table, most of the students 19 (67.8%) and 17 (65.4%) of the students from both control and experimental groups respectively indicated that they need as their English teacher use Afan Oromo to make clear the meaning of the new words for them. Another respondents 12 (42%) and 13 (50%) of the students from both the control and experimental groups respectively indicated that they wanted as their EFL teachers use their first language to explain difficult concepts while teaching the lesson. From the some item, 9 (32.1%) and 12 (46.1%) of the students from both control and experimental groups respectively became interested to use Afan Oromo in English lesson to ask their friends for clarification. The rest students 20 (71.4%) and 21 (80.76%) of the students from both control and experimental groups respectively responded as their teacher use Afan Oromo to create comfortable and less stressed while teaching the lesson.

As the response of the students indicated that they preferred as their teachers use L1 most of when explaining grammar concepts. There was no disparity among the groups as far as reflecting their high need for L1 is concerned. Put differently, the groups' responses were in agreement with regard to the item that stipulated whether they wanted the grammar concepts to be explained for them in L1 always. Similarly, students demanded Afan Oromo use while explaining the differences between Oromo language and English Grammar. Schweers (1999), in a report of the outcomes of his research on the use of the mother tongue in English classes, concludes that a second language could be learned through raising awareness to the similarities and differences between the L1 and L2. Cole (1998) if students have little or no knowledge of the target language, L1 can be used to introduce the major differences between L1 and L2, and the main grammatical characteristics of L2 that they should be aware of. This gave them a head start and saves a lot of guessing.

As suggested by Cole et al. in Japanese context study, he concluded that students were benefited from appropriate teachers' use of L1, especially in order to explain new words, explain grammar concepts, and to facilitate explanation of complex instructions. Critchley (1999) also reported that the situations where L1 used was desirable were specified as when students couldn't understand, and when learning difficult words or grammar. Students showed high interest for the mentioned purposes in this study too.

Table 11 Learners' opinion and purposes of teachers' use of A/ Oromo in the EFL classes

| No | Item | Alternatives | Sex | Control group | | | Experimental | | |
|----|--|--|-----|---------------|----------|------|--------------|-----------|-----|
| | | | | Fre q | To ta | % | Freq u | Tot al | % |
| 6 | If Yes, how often do they use Afan Oromo? | Always | M | 1 | 3 | 10. | 1 | 3 | 11. |
| | | | F | 2 | | 7 | 2 | | 6 |
| | | Most of the time | M | 13 | 22 | 78. | 10 | 19 | 73 |
| | | | F | 9 | | 5 | 9 | | |
| | | Sometimes | M | 1 | 3 | 13. | 2 | 4 | 15. |
| | | | F | 2 | | 4 | 2 | | 4 |
| 7 | About what percentage of the English lesson period (of 40 minutes) do you think should English teachers use Afan Oromo? | 5% | M | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | F | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | 6% - 10% | M | 7 | 13 | 46. | 6 | 11 | 42. |
| | | | F | 6 | | 5 | 5 | | 3 |
| | | 11% - 20% | M | 8 | 15 | 53.5 | 7 | 15 | 57. |
| | | | F | 7 | | | 8 | | 7 |
| | | 21% - 30% | M | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | F | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| 8 | How difficult do you think it would be for you to understand the English lessons if your English teacher exclusively used English? | very difficult | M | 10 | 20 | 71. | 9 | 20 | 77 |
| | | | F | 10 | | 4 | 11 | | |
| | | difficult | M | 5 | 8 | 28. | 4 | 6 | 23 |
| | | | F | 3 | | 6 | 2 | | |
| | | not difficult | M | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | F | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| 9 | For what purposes do Your English teachers use Afan Oromo in English lesson (you can choose more than one option) | To explain new words | M | 9 | 19 | 67. | 9 | 20 | 77 |
| | | | F | 10 | | 8 | 11 | | |
| | | to explain difficult concepts | M | 8 | 18 | 64. | 8 | 18 | 69. |
| | | | F | 10 | | 3 | 10 | | 2 |
| | | to explain the aim of lesson | M | 7 | 12 | 42. | 5 | 13 | 50 |
| | | | F | 5 | | 8 | 8 | | |
| | | To maintain discipline (tell us the instruction) | M | 10 | 21 | 75 | 10 | 22 | 84. |
| | | | F | 11 | | | 12 | | 6 |

Note: participants chose more than one answer for item 9, total ads up to more than 100%

As indicated out from the responses given to item 6 in the table concerning the frequency of teachers' use of Afan Oromo, 3(10.7%) and 3 (11.6%) of the students from both control and experimental groups respectively responded as their English teachers used Afan Oromo always in English lesson while teaching the grammar lesson. 22 (78.5%) and 19 (73%) of the respondents from both control group and experimental groups respectively responded that as their English teachers used Afan Oromo most of the time. The rest students 3 (13.4%) and 4 (15.4%) from both control and experimental groups explained that their English teachers used Afan Oromo sometimes.

When students' response supported with literature the scholars, Even if it is not possible to find an exact ratio of L1 and L2 everyone will agree that the English should be the prevailing language in the foreign language lesson. "We do not learn any language by using another one" says (Butzkamm, 2003, p. 30) and Atkinson confirms his words in the following statement:"If English is not the main language used in the classroom, the learners are not going to learn very much English. Atkinson justifies this idea in the following arguments:

Listening to English is learning English.

Listening to English gives learners an ideal opportunity to check the knowledge of the target language. Therefore it is necessary for pupils to be exposed to as many spoken L2 as possible and to listen to their teacher speaking the target language or talking with their classmates in L2 can be one of the best ways to hear the use of the target language in the natural communication.

If you want to learn to play the piano, you have to play the piano.

Atkinson uses this analogy in order to explain that if we want to learn something new we need to practice. Without appropriate training nothing can be acquired properly. And this rule is the same for all kinds of learning and for learning foreign language, too.

If English is the normal means of communication in the classroom, it is easier for learners to see that it's a real communication and not just another subject." Atkinson points out the danger of the overuse of the mother tongue in the English lesson which can make learners feel that they are learning about a new language and not learning it. Atkinson (1993, p. 12).

Regarding the relative amount of Afan Oromo to be used in one English lesson, it was clearly observed from the above table (in 40minutes), when we came to the point, no student from both experimental and control group responded as he or she favored only English to be used by his English teacher. 13 (46.5%) and 11 (42.3%) of the respondents from both controlled and experimental groups respectively explained as they favored if their English teachers used Afan Oromo for 6%-10% of the normal teaching period (40 minutes) . The majority of the students 15 (53.5%) and 15 (57.7%) from both control and experimental groups responded as they favored if their English teachers use Afan Oromo for 11%-20% of the normal English period. No student from both control and experimental groups favored If his /her English teachers use Afan Oromo for 21%-30% and above of the normal English lesson period.

Eleven to twenty percent of the class time L1 used, though, appears to be quite acceptable by the majority of respondents from both controlled and experimental groups. Perhaps by implication, this percent may describe what students signify the ' most of the time ' use of Afan Oromo. This figure is completely mismatched with what Tang (2002) reported i.e. 5 to 10 percent of the class time in Chinese context. Except few recent studies, as Turnbull (2001) notes, what exactly should the shared of L1 in the L2 class time has, in fact, not been well studied.

Davies and Pearse (2000, p. 6) confirmed this thought when they said “If you simply speak English all the time you will quickly drive beginners, and even more advanced learners, to despair”. From the previous parts of this chapter it is clear that using a limited amount of the mother tongue in the lesson can be beneficial and but English must necessarily be the dominating teaching language. But the question is how big should that dominance be and what is the right proportion between L1 and L2.

Nobody is able to give the correct answer because it didn't exist, at least not yet. For instance, Atkinson recommends an optimal ratio of 5 per cent to L1 and 95 per cent to L2 (Atkinson, 1989, p. 90). But this is highly individual and anybody else could disagree with him

As evident from the table about the difficulty of the lesson if it was given only in English, the majority of the students 20(71.4%) and 20 (77%)of the respondents from both the experimental and controlled groups responded as the subjects taught by English without translating into their native language would be very difficult for them to understand if the teachers teach entirely in English and another group of the students 8 (28.6%) and 6 (23%) from control and experimental groups respectively responded as if the EFL teachers teach the subjects, the exclusive use of

English is difficult to understand the concept of the lesson and no student from both control and experimental groups responded as it was not difficult if the EFL teachers taught the grammar lesson without translating into mother tongue.

The result clearly signals that using all English was not feasible. Medgyes (1994, p.66) also argues that the “monolingual approach to English language teaching is unsound on any grounds, be it psychological, or pedagogical”. Hence, it is advisable for teachers to resort to the students’ native language in certain situations.

In connection with the purposes for which teachers utilize Afan Oromo in the last item of the same table, students reported a number of dominant cases as in which teachers used Afan Oromo: 19(67.8%) and 20 (77%) Afan Oromo of the respondents from control and experimental groups of the research respectively explained that as their English teachers used Afan Oromo to explain the meaning of new words for their students. Others 18 (64.3%) and 18 (69.2%) control and experimental groups describe as their EFL teachers use Afan Oromo in order to explain difficult concepts of the lesson. Other students 12 (42.8%) and 13 (50%) from both controlled and experimental groups responded as their English teachers used Afan Oromo when explaining the aim of the lesson. 21 (75%) and 22 (84.6%) of the respondents from both control groups and experimental groups responded that as their teachers used Afan Oromo to maintain discipline in the classroom or to tell them the instruction . But what Parrott about this was different from teachers view. Parrott (1993, p. 106) writes that giving instructions in L1 could “deprives them of a crucial opportunity for learning”. For that reason instructions should definitively be given in the target language. But this usually does not work effectively with young learners or with total beginners. The whole activity will completely lose its original sense if children did not know what they were supposed to do.

Atkinson (1989, p. 92) recommended using the mother tongue in the lower levels and replacing it with the target language gradually. Prodromou (1995, p. 63) shares similar view when he says that hearing instructions in English can serve as an effective source for learning the target language but, on the other hand, teachers should be aware that some complex tasks required higher level of English which learners in some lower levels might not be able to understand.

4.7 Analysis of Teachers' Questionnaire

Table 12 Teachers' opinion on classroom use of Afan Oromo and reasons for using it

| N | Item | Alternatives | Sex | Freq | Tot | % | |
|---|--|--|-----|------|-----|------|------|
| 1 | In your opinion, should Afan Oromo be used in the English classroom | yes | M | 5 | 6 | 100 | |
| | | | F | 1 | | | |
| | | No | M | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | F | 0 | | | |
| 2 | If Yes, how often should it be used? | frequency | M | 2 | 3 | 50 | |
| | | | F | 1 | | | |
| | | Sometimes | M | 2 | 2 | 33.3 | |
| | | | F | 0 | | | |
| | | Rarely | M | 1 | 1 | 16.7 | |
| | | | F | 0 | | | |
| 3 | Why do you think is the use of Afan Oromo important? (You can choose more than one option) | It creates cooperation among students | M | 3 | 3 | 50 | |
| | | | F | 0 | | | |
| | | It helps learners to ask for clarification | M | 2 | 3 | 50 | |
| | | | F | 1 | | | |
| | | It facilitates teacher-student interaction | M | 2 | 2 | 33.3 | |
| | | | F | 0 | | | |
| | | It is less time consuming | M | 3 | P | 4 | 66.7 |
| | | | F | 1 | | | |
| | | It helps pupils feel confident and at ease | M | 2 | 2 | 33.3 | |
| | | | F | 0 | | | |
| | | It reduces language anxiety | M | 4 | 5 | 83.3 | |
| | | | F | 1 | | | |

Note: participants chose more than one answer for item 3, total adds up to more than 100%.

As table 12 showed, all of the teachers 6 (100%) responded as they welcomed the use of Afan Oromo in to the English classroom in order to create cooperation among the students. Literature also support as the students discuss using their native language.

Atkinson (1993, p. 54) refuses the fact that translation always has to be dull and boring. He argues that every kind of activity can be boring because it depends on how it is prepared so it means that if teachers were creative they could invent an activity which can bring a lot of adventure and excitement.

No teacher from the six respondents responded as he /she didn't use Afan Oromo in his/he grammar teaching lesson. In the case of the frequency of using Afan Oromo in item 2 of the

same table, 3 respondents or 50% of the respondents replied as they use Afan Oromo frequently in their English lesson. Two teachers or 33.33% of the participated teachers on the questionnaires responded that they used Afan Oromo in their English lesson sometimes. The rest one teacher (16.7%) of the responded teacher replied as he used Afan Oromo rarely in his in their English lesson. Despite the positive influence of the mother tongue it was important to be aware of its possible negative impact. Atkinson claims that the biggest danger of the use of L1 in the lesson is its overuse. "It's so easy to start by using the L1 'now and again', because it was easier or more convenient.

But any teacher has to be careful, because 'now and again' can quickly become a routine where, before you know it, the L1 becomes the main language of the classroom." (Atkinson, 1993, p. 12). In order to illustrate this kind of problem Butzkamm (2003, p. 29) presented an opinion of the students from New York who were dissatisfied with their lecturer who wants them to translate everything they learn and to parrot phrases and answers. It was obvious that even this approach cannot work effectively. The overuse of the L1 in the classroom can result in the following problems:

Learners become lazy and they use their mother tongue even in simple communicative tasks which they are able to discuss in the target language.

Learners do not understand the essential role of the target language in some of the activities. (Atkinson, 1989, p. 97)

Concerning the teachers opinion on why they used Afan Oromo in reply to item 3, Three teachers (50%) of them said they use F1 to create corporation among both the teachers and the students and also among the students themselves .Another 3 teachers (50%) of the participated teachers gave their response as they used Afan Oromo in order to help the students as they ask for clarification. Other teachers respondents 4 (66.7%) gave their response as they used Afan Oromo to consume less time or to make things clear for their students in the short period of time. Moon (2000, p. 63) agreed that long explanations in the target language could take too much time and finally children could lose interest and concentration.

Other two respondents (33.3%) gave their justification as they used Afan Oromo in their English lesson to facilitate their approach with their students. The other response that the participated teachers replied was that to create confidentiality in the mind of the students. Two teachers (33.3%) respondents gave their justification reduce anxiety.

Harmer explained several interesting reasons but there is at least one more which he does not mention. Many learners switch to L1 just because they are lazy. It is much easier for them to express something in L1 and if there is not any punishment from the teacher they will not see any reason why to torment themselves by finding appropriate English equivalents and will continue in using the mother tongue whenever they get a chance. This should be a warning for all benevolent teachers. Once teachers let their students do what they want they will have a big problem with removing their vices. Therefore each teacher should set a list of the rules at the beginning and insist consistently on its adherence during the whole course. “For pupils who are not highly motivated, it may involve too much effort to try to understand”(Moon, 2000, p. 63).

The reason which the majority of the respondents gave their justification on it was in order to reduce language anxiety. The teachers believed that using L1 reduces language anxiety and made students feel more comfortable and confident in learning English. Five teachers (83.3%) of the respondents replied as they used Afan Oromo in their English lesson for this purpose. Even though the school teachers used Afan Oromo, a literature which raised by Paul Nation (2003) claims that learners often avoid using the target language because they didn't want to feel embarrassed about the mistakes they make. It can be useful to assure the students that mistakes were essential part of learning that was no need to feel embarrassed (Harmer 2009).

In general teachers have forwarded their own justification why they inclined to support the use of students' native language in the EFL classroom. Harmer explains, “We try to make sense of a new linguistic (and conceptual) world through the linguistic world we are already familiar with” (Atkinson, 1989, p.17). The first place belongs probably to those teachers who claimed that they recur to L1 in the classroom communication because pupils did not understand them. This was true because learners really did not understand immediately. But each teacher should realize that this was not the matter of a moment but it was a long-lasting process which has to be gradually developed.

Atkinson (1993, p. 16, 17) admits that in this case translation could be the useful tool but it should be used only when it is really necessary. It was better to try some other methods at first, like L2 definitions or demonstrations, and only when nothing of that works the teacher should use translation. Hence; it is advisable for teachers to resort to the students' native language in certain situations. What had been arrived at in this research convinced me to accept or share the

contentions of Atkinson (1987) and Auerbach (1993) who argue for the inclusion of L1 particularly at lower proficiency levels. Burden (2001) in a Japanese context also found that lower level proficiency students were more likely to favor more L1 by teachers. The researchers didn't recommend that the L1 become the dominant language in the classroom, but rather that L1 be used judiciously in particular instances to promote language learning. Atkinson (1993, p. 54)

Table 13 Teachers' suggestion on the amount of students' native language and pedagogic purposes of Afan Oromo to be used in the English classroom

| No | Item | Alternatives | sex | Freq | Total | % |
|----|--|--------------------------------|-----|------|-------|-------|
| 4 | What percentage of Afan Oromo, do you think should be used in one English lesson (for example, in 40 minutes lesson)? | 5% | M | 1 | 1 | 16.7 |
| | | | F | - | | |
| | | 6- 10% | M | 1 | 1 | 16.7 |
| | | | F | - | | |
| | | 11-20% | M | 3 | 4 | 66.7 |
| | | | F | 1 | | |
| | | 21-30% | M | - | | 0 |
| | | | F | - | | |
| | | 31-40% | M | - | | 0 |
| | | | F | - | | |
| 5 | Whatever your response to item 4, for what purposes do you think Afan Oromo should be used in the EFL classes? (You can choose as many alternatives as you think is appropriate) | explain the aim of the lesson | M | 2 | 2 | 33.33 |
| | | | F | - | | |
| | | explain new vocabulary items | M | 4 | 5 | 83.33 |
| | | | F | 1 | | |
| | | explain difficult concepts | M | 3 | 4 | 66.7 |
| | | | F | 1 | | |
| | | Check-students' understanding | M | 2 | 2 | 33.33 |
| | | | F | - | | |
| | | maintain classroom discipline | M | 5 | 6 | 100 |
| | | | F | 1 | | |
| | | give instructions | M | 3 | 4 | 66.7 |
| | | | F | 1 | | |
| | | As students' learning strategy | M | 3 | 4 | 66.7 |
| | | | F | 1 | | |

Note: participants chose more than one answer to item 5, total adds up to more than 100%.

Concerning item number 4 of the above table 4.13, the majority of the respondents (66.7%) of them agreed on that 11 to 120% normal English lesson classroom time use of Afan Oromo was supported by the teachers which may possibly show what teachers average by 'most of the time' used of Afan Oromo. From replied as the respondents a teacher (16.7%) gave his justification as he used only 5 % of Afan Oromo from the given normal was essential. One left teacher (16.7%) from the respondents replied that 5-10% of the given 40 minutes had better covered by Afan Oromo. No teacher from the respondents replied as he used more than 20% of the given time. The same question was raised for the students to identify their interest of first language in the English lesson. The response which the researcher got from the students questionnaire was nearly similar with teachers'. The majority of the students interested as their teachers use 11-20% of the normal teaching period in their mother tongue. Even though there is the idea of giving more attention for first language in the mind of the students, the occasional use of the students' mother tongue was also favored by the majority of teachers and students in Tang (2002) study. The findings showed that both teachers and learners responded positively to use the L1 as a supportive and facilitating teaching tool. That is, limited and judicious use of the mother tongue in the English classroom did not reduce students' exposure to English, but it more readily assists the teaching and learning processes of the target language (Tang, 2002)

As the teachers expressed their feeling Afan Oromo was useful to note that most pedagogic tasks attracted the attention of most of the teachers which indicated that Afan Oromo may serve purposes listed in the table with varying intensities.

The teachers' data indicated that the response for all items given to teachers to check the purposes for which they use Oromo language in their English language teaching were found to be above the ideal mean implying that teachers used Afan Oromo for all classroom purposes they were asked to respond.

From the questionnaires distributed for teachers and students the researcher got the point as both of them in some cases in agreement about when L1 should be used or when a teacher should use L1. They both believe that L1 is important in pairs and or group works and helps a lot to teach new vocabulary, explain grammar concepts, and explain difficult concepts and to explain the differences between Oromo and English grammar. Both teachers and students believed that L1 was important in pairs and or group works and helps a lot to teach new vocabulary, explain

grammar concepts, and explain difficult concepts and to explain the differences between Oromo and English grammar. Atkinson (1989, p. 92)

Table 14 Teachers’ suggestion the frequency of students’ native language

| No | Item | Alternatives | Sex | Freq | Total | % |
|------------|---|---------------------------------|-----|------|-------|------|
| 6 | How often do your students use English in the EFL classes | Always | M | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | F | 0 | | |
| | | Most of the time | M | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | F | 0 | | |
| | | Rarely | M | 4 | 5 | 83.3 |
| | | | F | 1 | | |
| Not at all | M | 1 | 0 | 16.7 | | |
| | F | 0 | | | | |
| 7 | If you responded “Rarely” or “Not at all” for item 6, how difficult do you think it would be for your students to understand your English lesson if you use only English? | Difficult | M | 2 | 2 | 33.3 |
| | | | F | 0 | | |
| | | Very difficult | M | 3 | 4 | 66.7 |
| | | | F | 1 | | |
| | | Not difficult | M | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | F | 0 | | |
| 8 | If you responded “Very difficult” or “difficult” for item 7 what mechanism do you use when your students do not understand the lesson that you are teaching your EFL classes? (You can choose more than one option) | More explanations in English | M | 2 | 2 | 33.3 |
| | | | F | 0 | | |
| | | Gesture and actions | M | 2 | 3 | 50 |
| | | | F | 1 | | |
| | | Translate English to Afan Oromo | M | 5 | 6 | 100 |
| | | | F | 1 | | |
| | | Pictures/photographs/drawing | M | 2 | 2 | 33.3 |
| | | | F | 0 | | |

Note: participants chose more than one answer to item 8, total adds up to more than 100%

As is evident from the above table, when teachers were asked about the frequency in which their students use the target language in the classroom, five teachers (83.3%) of them replied as the students used the target language rarely since their competence level is too low.

The rest one teacher (16.7%) replied as the students didn’t use the target language even if the teacher encourage them to use the language

In the case of item number 7, which stated the difficulty of the lesson if the teachers used only English in the classroom lesson, the participants or the teachers have given their justification. Two of the teachers (33.3%) of them responded as the lesson was difficult for the students if they use only English as media of communication in teaching grammar lesson. The majority of the respondents (66.7%) of the teachers gave their justification as it was very difficult for the students if they used English without translating into students' first language. No teacher from the six replied as using only English in EFL class was simple. From this what we can conclude is that not only the students but also the teachers themselves have given the priority for students' first language.

In item 8 of the same table, when the teachers were asked regarding the mechanisms they applied when their students fail to understand English, two of the respondents (33.3%) told that as they used more explanation in the target language to make things clear for their students. Others three teachers (50%) of the respondents described that as they used facial expression or gesture in order to make the lesson clear for their students. The mechanism on which all the teachers that means 6(100%) agreed on to used when their students failed to understand was translating the lesson into students first language. The result clearly indicated that paying attention for the target language was not practicable to teach English especially in secondary school levels. Teachers have to find ways to modify their English input. For example, they could use gesture, visual aids such as pictures, flash cards and gestures to make their input understandable (PolioDuff, 1994). Hence, they didn't depend too much on Afan Oromo, and students will benefit from this increased exposure to English.

In addition to this other researcher has expressed his idea as teachers should use other objects rather than translation saying the use of demonstration, objects, pictures, drawings and miming was common for this method. It stressed out the importance of active use of the target language in the classroom and oral communicative skills. Classroom instructions were given only trough the target language. For practicing new items the form of exchanging questions and answers between teacher and students was recommended.

Table 15 Teachers’ perceptions and degree of agreement on the use of Afan Oromo

| No | Statements | Responses | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------|------|----|------|------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | I want to create English atmosphere in my classroom and establish English as the only media class room language, but whenever I want to maintain discipline when the class is noisy, I use Afan Oromo instead of English | Freq | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| | | % | 0 | 0 | 16.7 | 66.7 | 16.7 |
| 2 | I decide to promote as much English as possible in my class, but I also use effective bilingual techniques. | Freq | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| | | % | 0 | 0 | 16.7 | 50 | 33.3 |
| 3 | Translating the foreign language (L2) form into the native language(A/ Oromo) is an excellent way to reduce further redundant grammatical explanation and to save time | Freq | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| | | % | 0 | 0 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 66.7 |
| 4 | Students sometimes try to say something in English but I can’t understand what they mean. so I often get them to say it in Afan Oromo and then I will help them say it in English. | Freq | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| | | % | 0 | 0 | 33.3 | 50 | 16.7 |
| 5 | Sometimes, I check if my students have understood my English lesson by asking them to give me Afan Oromo equivalent as evidence of understanding. | Freq | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| | | % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| 6 | I’m still not satisfied with my English. I think I often make mistakes while I use only English in the class. So, I wouldn't use it too much. Instead, I use Afan Oromo. | Freq | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | | % | 16.7 | 50 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 0 |
| 7 | Using only English for grade 9-10 won't work in Ethiopian secondary schools context. | Freq | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| | | % | 16.7 | 50 | 33.3 | 0 | 0 |

Table15 Teachers’ perceptions and degree of agreement on the use of Afan Oromo

According to item 1 that the researcher wanted to differentiate whether the subject teachers created conducive atmosphere as the students use more of the target language and the teacher him/herself broke the rule in the case of this item One student (16.7%) of the respondents said that he didn’t decide whether to make English as the target language for the class or not. Four teachers (66.7%) of the participated teachers gave their responses as they agreed to create conducive environment as English was the popular language to be used in the class room and this rule was broken by the teachers themselves. The rest one teacher (16.7%) replied as he strongly agree with the idea of making the class conducive for the students to use the target language This implied that most of the teachers in the study area have positively perceived facilitative role

of English as it was the target language for the classroom. Language experts say the more motivation is used in the lesson the more learners speak the target language. Such a motivation can be reached by creating conducive environments and exposing learners to spoke in English as much as possible. Teachers can use different mechanisms; visual aids can help in creating English atmosphere. We can use pictures of different places in the Great Britain or any other English speaking countries, various English souvenirs, etc(Harmer, 2009).

In the case of item number 2 which says deciding to promote as much English as much as possible bilingual techniques a teacher from those participated on the questionnaires (16.7%) responded as he was in dilemma to decide what to and as they agreed with the raised idea of using bilingual when necessary and two of the respondent (33.3%) replied as they strongly agreed on the idea raised. According to the point raised on item 3, that translating English in to the students native or first language the respondents (66.7%) of the students said they strongly agreed on using translation. the rest one teacher (16.7%) responded as he didn't decide whether to use or not to use English in order to minimize their translation in teaching English and agreed to use translation respectively. From this one can understand that not only the learners but also the teachers have language problems to employ only English in the EFL classes. Horst et al., (2010), investigated how native language instruction helped learners to build their knowledge in acquiring a new language. Even though translation was taken as a means of language learning mechanism it has its own drawbacks. The critics can argue with some strong arguments which should not be omitted. The disadvantage translation was listed by (Kaye, 2009):

- It is not suitable for all learners because it depends on individual.
- Learners can see the translation as difficult and boring activity.
- To prepare translation activities is demanding and time-consuming.
- In order to be effective the class has to be sufficiently motivated
- The use of L1 during the translation activity can disrupt the English environment in the classroom.
- It is based on the text so that it can practice only two skills, writing and reading.
- It is time-consuming and it requires highly professional translation skills of the teachers.

In short I can say that the attitudes to the use of the translation in the foreign language teaching are similar to the attitudes towards the mother tongue.

In the case of the point raised on item number 4, about students' interest to use English in order to express their idea in English and English teachers' direction to express their feeling in Afan Oromo, two of the respondent (33.3%) didn't give direction whether their students express their idea in English or Afan Oromo. Fifty percent of the respondents replied as they agree with the idea that make the students as they use their native language rather than expressing their feeling in English. An individual (16.7%) of the teacher responded as he strongly agrees with the idea as the students express their feeling in Afan Oromo. Thus, this indicates that teachers accept their students' limited use of their mother tongue to elicit language in the English classes.

But learners' knowledge of the target language was much worse. It was more useful for learners to hear imperfect English rather than no English and he also advised teachers not to take too much care of their accuracy because such an exaggerated care often leads to more and more mistakes (Nation, 2003). The good strategy could be made a list of most frequent sentences, phrases and commands because "in this way the role of the L1 in classroom management can be minimized and the role of the L2 increased" (Atkinson, 1993, p. 17).

For item 5 on the idea that they sometimes checked if their students understood their English lesson by asking them to give Afan Oromo equivalent as evidence of understanding. In line with this, two teachers (33.3%) responded as they agreed with mentioned point and the rest four teachers (66.7%) strongly agreed with the point.

In the case of teachers satisfaction with their English they use in the class, one respondent (16.7%) replied that he strongly disagree with the point raised by the researcher, three of them (50%) disagree with the idea raised by the researcher, one of the respondent (16.7%) in between to agree with or disagree and the rest respondent (16.7%) agree with the question raised by the researcher.

They used L1 rather than getting themselves into the embarrassing situation by making errors when talking in the target language. Such a situation when teachers those didn't master the language which they have to teach can be very unpleasant. Betáková (2006, p.10) explains that the conviction about the weak L2 communicative abilities can result in the feelings of inferiority. These teachers didn't even take part in any further education in order to avoid an embarrassment. In line with this, in item 6, concerning the usage of only English for grades 9-10 the respondents have raised their responses. One of the teachers (16.7%) strongly disagrees with the raised

question, Three of the respondents (50%) of them disagree and the rest two teachers (33.3%) of them were in the dilemma in between to agree with or disagree.

4.8 Analysis of Experimental students' feedback

Table 16 Experimental students' feedback

| No | Statements | Response | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |
| | | | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| 1 | I support EFL teachers' to minimize the amount of Oromo language in EFL classrooms to make grammar lesson of the target language more tangible. | Fre | 4 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | | % | 33.3 | 16.6 | 41.6 | 50 | 16.6 | 25 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | I think using or giving more attention to the target language made as I learn grammar lesson interestingly. | Fre | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | % | 41.6 | 33.3 | 41.6 | 41.6 | 16.6 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | I like an EFL teacher who teaches English through translation | Fre | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| | | % | 0 | 0 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 33.3 | 50 | 33.3 | 16.6 |
| 4 | I support English teachers those do not use Afan Oromo while teaching English grammar. | Fre | 5 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | % | 41.6 | 25 | 33.3 | 50 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | I can't avoid using Afan Oromo while learning grammar even if EFL teachers prevent me | Fre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| | | % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16.6 | 25 | 16.6 | 50 | 41.6 | 25 | 8.3 |

5-strongly agree, 4-Agree, 3- Neutral, 2- Dis agree, 1- Strongly disagree

When we come to discuss experimental group students' feedback about their teaching learning process, they have expressed their feeling in the following way.

In the case of item 1 which indicated the target language usage of teachers, 4(33.3%) and 2 (16.6%) boy and girl respectively strongly agree to support as the teacher should use the target language. 5 (41.6%) and 6(50%) of boys and girls respectively agree to support as their English teacher use the target language. 2(16.6%) and 3(25%) of the students responded as they in dilemma to support or not. The rest 1(8.3%) and 1 (8.3%) of students were disagree as the English teacher use the TL only rather they preferred translation. When we came to the

conclusion the majority of the experimental group students became feeling interested at learning in English rather than giving attention for translation. In the case of item number 2 students responded 5(41.6%) and 4(33.3%) of boys and girls respectively said that they strongly agree to support TL because it made the lesson interesting and understandable. 5(41.6%) and 5(41.6%) boys and girls respectively told as they agree to learn the lesson in target language. The rest 2(16.6%) and 3(33.3%) boys and girls respectively were the only students in the dilemma. So, this result indicated as the students learnt the lesson interestingly, the majority of the students supported the method which their experimental teacher used. In the case of the preference of translation, 4(33.3%) and 2(16.6%) boys and girls respectively strongly disagree with the idea of translation while learning grammar. 4(33.3%) 6(50%) of the respondents of boys and girls respectively told as they disagree with translation while learning grammar. Only 2(16.6%) and 2(16.6%) of the students said as they agree if their teacher used translation method of teaching system. Question No 4 was the continuity of No 3, 5(41.6%) and 3(33.3%) of the students strongly support teachers those didn't use translation and 4(41.6%) and 6(50%) of the respondents support the TL user teachers while teaching grammar. The rest 3(25%) and 3(25%) boys and girls respectively in the dilemma to support or not. In the case of trying to minimize Afan Oromo while learning English Grammar, 3(33.3%) and 1(8.35) of boys and girls were strongly agree to minimize the usage of translation, 6(50%) and 5 (41.6%) of boys and girls respectively agree to minimize using F1. The rest 2(16.6%) and 3 (33.3%) boys and girls respectively in the middle to minimize mother tongue usage or not.

Learners' exposition to the target language activities in grammar lesson was found to be relatively effective not in the achievement of grammar subjects but also in their attitude of the usage of the target language while learning English lesson.

4.9 Summary of teachers' interview data

To analyze the validity of the information collected through the questionnaire, all the six teachers for those the questionnaire data distributed were interviewed. The purpose of the interview was to realize teachers' responses to the questionnaire and to get further points on their belief system or the teaching method they used for so long regarding the students' native language and the target language dilemma and to realize whether that had influenced their classroom practice. According to this, six interview questions were prepared and administered. From the six questions some of the questions were prepared to seek information on the use and non-use of students' first language while the remaining the rest were inference questions designed to obtain additional points on teachers' belief systems. Since the ideas raised by the interviewee were more or less similar, thematic approach was followed to compose the summary.

In the case why they use Oromo language in their EFL classroom, all the participants said that they use L1 in order to solve students' English language proficiency, to reduce learner anxiety and to create a more conducive learning environment and in general for the sake of helping the students got the point of the lesson. Depending up on the justification they raised, all the teachers believed that using L1 is necessary since students couldn't understand the target language exclusive lesson because of the students' poor English background. So, resort to L1 on certain occasions is a must. Owing to his research report, Wharton (2007, p. 12) described L1 as a "time saving device". He also shared the ideas of Atkinson (1987); Green (1979) & Tudor (1987) that "translation, or mother tongue use, is often encouraged as an efficient, time-saving technique; supported by ELT professionals." (Cited in Wharton, 2007, p. 12)

Another teacher stated that Afan Oromo should be used to give complex instructions, whenever students face comprehension problems and as a part of the students' main learning activities. In addition he said explanation by students to peers who have not understood (the case advocated by Atkinson, 1987) and giving individual help to weaker students during pair or group work could be carried out using L1 (Afan Oromo) in the English classroom.

Almost all the teachers interviewed stressed the importance of making the complex instructions clear using L1 as they thought this was the key to unlocking the door that facilitate the way to classroom interaction. A teacher said if students didn't understand the instructions they confused and sit idle. According to the interviewee, using Afan Oromo in their classroom facilitate the

way for good classroom interaction based on mutual understanding which thereby facilitates L2 learning. The interviewees' view exactly perfectly matches with (Harbord, 1992) conclusion that there are three reasons for using L1 in the classroom. These are: facilitating communication, facilitating teacher-student relationships, and facilitating the learning of L2. By using L1, teachers contended, they can save time, energy, avoid confusion and facilitate interaction. A case in point is (Harbord, 1992) who reported that the biggest reason for using L1 in the L2 classroom was that it can save a lot of time and avoid confusion. Another reason why teachers argue, they were involved in its use was that there were concepts which were better explained using L1 than L2. In general teachers said they used L1 in their classrooms to help as their students learn better.

In the case whether L1 reduces learners' L2 exposure, they gave their evidence on the criticism giving different practical realities when it can affect and when it can't affect the students' EFL proficiency in the classrooms. All the teachers preferred if their students' use only English in English classroom but the practical classroom reality in the school didn't allow doing so. Even though, in their situation it was not possible to use English only they argue against the exclusive use of L2 and believe that the English-only view couldn't be implemented in their case. But they discussed the danger that the extreme case of L1 might cause to L2 learning in their assertion. They all believed that overuse of Afan Oromo highly harms L2 practice time. That was why most teachers partly shared the concern of English-only proponents.

If used properly, according to the teachers, L1 can easily clear doubts, develop confidence, motivate and increase students' engagement. Nevertheless, Afan Oromo can affect the target language if the teacher uses it for almost every classroom activity. In their response they said, students didn't benefit when teachers inclined on using their students' MT, especially the EFL teacher should be the best model and main source of F1 input. Classroom situations can create various experiences for students such as real-life situations through simulations if the teacher uses the MT to a great extent, students may lose the chance to benefit from these situations. In addition, teachers who overuse their students' MT deprive these learners of an important language process in which students try to make sense of what is being said in class (Ellis, 1994). One teacher replied it would be difficult to distinguish the target language from the other. But, we should discuss with our teachers to adopt the habit of using the right proportion of L1. We have to minimize it even if resorting to it happens to be inevitable. So, all teachers seem to be

persuaded that L1 is essential in the L2 classroom and thus strongly stated that the English-only view is impractical and invalid. According to the interviewee, teachers should have purpose for L1 use and should be able to determine its amount accordingly. To sum up, it appears that the English-only proponents' view was reasonably objected.

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

To the question they were asked about whether they use a similar amount of Afan Oromo language for their students in different semesters, the majority of teachers responded that they don't use the same amount. i.e teachers contended that they vary the amount of L1 they use together with the language proficiency level of the students.

The reasons the four teachers forwarded for varying their L1 amount were roughly similar. They all believe that first semester students deserve more L1 compared to second semester students whom they believe are well accustomed to the ninth grade learning and teaching process. For them, first semester was difficult because they are the new comers from elementary school where they have been learning in their mother tongue. The remaining two teachers gave a response that somehow different from the other teachers. One of the two said that he uses L1 not necessarily following the students' interest and semester he said as he focused on the difficulty of the lesson and language proficiency of the students in the class. According to his view from the same grade and the same semester there is the probability when he used more F1 for a section and less for the other sections." When he felt learners understood him, he didn't use L1. But if he found them unable to understand after several attempts, he used L1 until they got the point whatever the level might be", he said. The other teacher said that he didn't vary his L1 amount together with the proficiency level of the students. He used L1 where he thought necessary regardless of the

students' L2 proficiency. He didn't believe in the idea that the amount of L1 teachers use in L2 classroom should be in accordance with the learners need. Besides, one should make sure that the amount he/she used didn't suppress L2 learning.

Lastly, teachers were asked if they feel guilty for using L1 in L2 classroom. All of them replied as they didn't feel guilty so long as they use it meaningfully. Yet, only few of the teachers (2) claimed that they were happy to use it. Four of them said that they were in fact not comfortable with the situation they were in even if they didn't consider it as a feeling of guilt. They said they use L1 because the classroom situation was compelling and they were not quite comfortable in doing so. Because it was used properly it concentrates attention of the students in L1, It decreases motivation of the students toward L2, and It was out dated and non communicative Even if teachers did not take L1 as a suitable methodology for teaching L2, L1 use proved itself to be an unavoidable reality in the foreign language classroom that persuaded the teachers to indulge in its use (Atkinson, 1987).

CHAPTER FIVE

5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

The current study contains five chapters. The first chapter deals with the nature of the problem under study. It also entertains the basic questions that the study has attempted to answer. In addition, it includes the application, the scope of the study and the limitation of the study.

The second chapter discussed the interference of mother tongue in learning English as second language and presented different scholars view on mother tongue interference in learning English as second language. First it discussed the historical backgrounds of using students' first language in the EFL classes. Secondly, it presented the major arguments against the use of L1 and other factors contributing to the avoidance of L1. Thirdly, it dealt with the supportive arguments of L1 use with respect to the pedagogic and psychological purposes for which students' native language could be employed in the L2 classroom. Fourthly, it gave an insight into the occasions in which teachers' and Students' use L1 in the EFL Classes.

The third chapter discussed the methods of the study. The study was both descriptive and experimental in its nature because these two designs are helpful in seeking response for the basic research questions stated under section 1.2. The researcher used lottery method to select the specific school from 2 secondary schools in the wereda. Grade 9 students were purposely taken because grade 10 students were busy to prepare themselves for EGSSLC. Fifty four (26 Female, and 28 Male) Grade 9 students were selected by using lottery method from Becho secondary school from 300 Grade 9 students those were learning in 6 sections in this academic year. From these 26 experimental and 28 control group students were selected. Three instruments were used. These were tests, questionnaire and interview for English teachers in the school. The class which the researcher taught was assigned as the experimental group. Another group which was considered as control group was taught by one of English teachers in the school. The teacher was selected purposely because he has been teaching the class regularly. All English teachers in the school were participated in the research. Data analysis was carried out based on the research questions stated in the research. The quantifiable data in the pre post and retention tests are analyzed by using descriptive and inferential statistical analysis.

The fourth chapter includes the presentation, discussion and interpretation of the data gathered. Accordingly, the data were tabulated in sixteen tables and interpreted. The fifth chapter contains the summary, conclusion and recommendation.

5.2 Conclusions

In the light of statistical analysis and the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn: The achievement in the post – test of the grammar knowledge of the experimental group significantly exceeded that of the control group. On the basis of this finding, it was possible to conclude that the effects of using the target language or English while teaching grammar were better than that of using students’ mother tongue frequently in the EFL class at Becho secondary school. Therefore, students where the target language or English was used more in teaching grammar were more successful in grammar subjects in the long run comparison with the students who were taught English through translating into the their first language.

It may be possible to conclude that both English teachers and students were interested in using Afan Oromo at secondary school levels in the study areas. That is, the data which indicated in the selected secondary school students need their teachers to translate and use their own mother tongue in the English classroom. The study also indicated that teachers and students believe in the various pedagogic uses of A/Ormo the major ones being: explaining new words, explaining difficult concepts, giving instructions, maintaining classroom discipline and telling them different instructions. However, it seems they did not apply it properly. That is, teachers in the target school were observed relatively over using Afan Oromo. Majority of them tend to translate English words in to Afan Oromo randomly before they attempt to explain ideas using the target language which may in turn negatively affect the English language proficiency of students as well as teachers’ competence in the target language. In fact, the data tend to suggest that the over use of L1 could result in development of the unprincipled translation habit on both students’ and teachers’ and reducing students' skill of using contextual clues to guess word meanings.

According to the study result, students and teachers did not only believe that L1 is important or has a role to play in L2 classroom if used occasionally, but also actively choosing to use L1 in their EFL classrooms for certain functions. Both teachers and students agreed that using L1 is important for functions like in pair and/or group work, to explain grammar concepts, to

teach/learn the meanings of new English words, to explain difficult concepts, and to see differences between L1 and L2 grammar.

The data obtained from the students and from the teachers indicated almost the same result. Most of them inclined to use 10-20% of their 40 minute English lesson in Afan Oromo. This indicated that “most of the time” of the regular English period was covered by the students’ first language based on the data obtained through the questionnaire.

This figure was inconsistent with the amount Atkinson (1987) suggested. Atkinson recommended the use of the mother tongue not to exceed 5 percent of the total language use in the English classroom as well as it is beyond the figure suggested by Tang (2002): 5 to 10% in the Chinese case.

Second, there was a significant difference in the experimental group students, those who studied grammar without translating more into their first language were more successful in grammar subjects in the long run comparison with the students who were taught English through translating into the their first language This again indicated that Learning the lesson in target language seems to have enhanced more significant effects on the experimental group.

In order to use the target language or English effective in language classroom, the students and the teachers should believe in the importance of the language. Accordingly, the study revealed that both teachers and students agreed on the importance of using the students’ first language while teaching and learning English lesson. Even the ability of guessing the meanings of unfamiliar words during the lesson should be encouraged rather than translating every new word in to students’ first language.

The inconsistency may possibly be due to the influence of students’ inability to understand English on condition that teachers frequently use English. In fact, the idea of total prevention of L1 (Afan Oromo) in the English classroom was not supported by the majority of teachers and students which implies that the exclusive use of English during the English lesson periods could probably negatively affect the effectiveness of students’ learning of English.

After all, it should be taken into account that the findings from this limited data might not be generalized to ascertain the limitations to be observed in other similar schools of Ilubabor Zone.

5.3 Recommendation

Depending on the findings of the study and conclusion, the following recommendations are forwarded:

- All research questions were answered successfully but it is necessary to admit that the research had several drawbacks. The first problem is that research group is quite small and therefore the conclusions cannot be generalized to the whole country. It could be a good idea to carry out the similar research among larger number of teachers and learners in order to find out what is the situation in the whole country.
- For students who are not mastered enough in English, Afan Oromo can be sometimes used as a facilitating tool. However, teachers should modify their English input, for example, using visual models such as pictures, flash cards and gestures to make their lesson understandable. Afan Oromo should be used as a final resort only when all means of conveying meanings become unsuccessful. In other words, teachers need to identify when translation may be desirable, and employ it thought fully in such a way that using L1 should not deprive students of FL exposure.
- Teachers should make their own personal efforts to plan before hand when and why to use students mother tongue in order to address the need and preferences of the students. Likewise, it is good to consider the students' level and to create an English environment along with choosing suitable tasks.
- Teachers should use English where possible and the L1 where necessary. That is, L1 should be a consciously chosen option with a supportive role since using it randomly likely impedes the target language learning.
- Teachers ought to be provided with appropriate on job training on when, why and how much L1 should be in the EFL classroom.
- This study showed that using the target language when teaching grammar is not given due attention that it should deserve in English language classes. Therefore, it is important to put F2 (the target language) at the center of language teaching-learning process if we want learners to be on the beneficiary end. Depending on translation can kill interest and achievement of the students' grammar knowledge.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, D. (1987). The Mother Tongue in the Classroom-a Neglected Resource? *ELT Journal*, 44(4), pp. 241-247
- Atkinson,D. (1989).The Mother Tongue in the Classroom: A Neglected Resource?.
In LENOCHOVÁ, A. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Selected*
- Atkinson, D (1993). *Teaching Monolingual Classes*. London: Longman
- Auerbach, E.(1993). Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom, *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), Pp.9-32
- Ausubel, D.(1964). Adults vs. Children in second language learning: Psychological Considerations. *Modern Language Journal* 48, 420-424.
- Betakova, L.(2006) . *Angličtina učitele angličtiny*. 1. vyd. Plzeň: Fraus,. 203 s.ISBN 80-7238-550-X.
- Bhela, B. (1999). Native language interference in learning a second language: Exploratory case Studies of native language interference with target language usage. Accessed at <http://ehlt.flinders.edu.au/education/iej/articles/v1n1/bhela/bhela.pdf> on 12/1/2010.
- Bolitho, R.(1983). The Communicative Teaching of English in Non-English Speaking Countries, *ELT Journal*, 37(3), pp. 235-242
- Bowen, J. D. Madsen, H., & Hilferty, A. (1985). *TESOL techniques and procedures*. Rowley, MA: New bury House Publishers.
- Brown, H. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Longman: San Francisco.
- Brown, P.M. (2006).Using the mother tongue to teach another tongue. Accessed at <http://languageinstinct.blogspot.com/2006/11/using-mother-tongue-to-teachanother.html> on 10/1/2010.
- Buckmaster, R. (2002). Using L1: What Kind of Sin? On-line internet. Available:

<http://iatefl.org.pl/nletter18/nlet18-2.html>.

- Burden, P. (2000). The use of the students' mother tongue in monolingual English "conversation" Classes at Japanese universities, *The Language Teacher Online*, 24(6). Retrieved April 15, 2011 from <http://www.jaltpublications.org/tlt/articles/2000/06/burden>
- Burden, P.(2001). When do native English speaking teachers and Japanese college students Disagree about the use of Japanese in the English conversation classroom?, *The Language Teacher Online*, 25(4).
- 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 May 15, 2008 from <http://www.jaltpublications.org/tlt/articles/2001/04/burden>
- Cameron, L.(2001). *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chang, M. (2009). EFL teachers' attitudes toward communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college. *Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles*, 53, 17-34.
- Choffey, (.2001). The L1 Culture in the L2 Classroom, *Modern English Teacher*,10(2),pp.54- 58.
- Cohen, L. (2000). *Research methods in education*. Rutledge Falmer 29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001. 5th ed.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K.. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cole, S. (1998). The Use of L1 in Communicative English Classroom. *The Language Teacher Journal*, 4-10. <http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/files/98/dec/cole.html>.
- Cook, G. (1997). "Key Concepts in ELT: Schemas." *ELT Journal*. V.51/1 p. 86.
- Cook, V.(1999). *Creating Second Language Users*. On-line internet. Available: <http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~Vcook/OB519.htm>.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using The First Language in The classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language*

Review.

- Cook, G. (2002). Breaking Taboos, *English Teaching Professional*, Issue23, pp.5-7.
- Critchley,M. (1999). Bilingual support in English classes in Japan: *A survey of student opinions of L1-use by foreign teachers*. *The language teacher*, 23(9), 19-13
- Crow L.D and Alice. (1956). *Human Development and learning*. New York, American book Company
- Cunningham,C.(2000). Translation in the Classroom. A Useful Tool for Second Language Acquisition. On-line internet. Available: [http:// www.cels.bham.ac.uk /resources /essays/cindyc2.pdf](http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/cindyc2.pdf).
- Dajani, J. (2002).*Using Mother Tongue to Become a Better Learner: Why and How*, *Modern English Teacher*, 11(2), pp.65-67.
- Davies, P. and Pearse, E. *Success in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 221 s. ISBN 0-19-442171-6.
- Deller, S. and Rinvolutri, M. (2002). *Using the Mother Tongue*, Delta Publishing: London.
- Deller, S.(2003). The Language of the Learner, *English Teaching Professional*, Issue 26, pp.5-7.
- Duff, A. (1989). *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Dulay, H. & Burt,M (1973). Should we teach children syntax? *Language Learning*, 23,245-258
- Edge,J.(1986). Acquisition Disappears in Adultery: Interaction in the Translation Class, *ELT Journal*.40 (2), pp.121-125.
- Frankenberg-Garcia, A.(2000). Using Portuguese in the Teaching of English. *On- line internet*. Available: [http://www. Portuguese mct.pt/ Repositories/ Franken burg-Garcia 2000b.doc](http://www.Portuguese mct.pt/ Repositories/ Franken burg-Garcia 2000b.doc).
- Gabelatos,C.(2001). L1 Use in ELT: Not a Skeleton But a Bone of Contention. *A Response to Prodromou*. On-line internet. Available: <http://www.tesolgrece.com/nl /70/700/.html>.

- Getachew Anteneh and Derib Ado. (2002). Language Policy in Ethiopia: History and Current Trends. Addis Ababa: Mega Publishing Enterprise. Vol 2, No/ 1
- Girmaw Allene. (2007). Assessment of Teachers' Performance in Teaching Using Awngi as a Medium of Instruction in the First cycle Primary School in Awi Administrative Zone. MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University. (Unpublished)
- Green, J. F. (1970). The Use of the Mother Tongue and the Teaching of Translation. *ELT Journal*, 24: 217-223.
- Harbord, J. (1992). The Use of Mother Tongue in the Classroom, *ELT Journal*, 46(4), pp.350-355
- Harmer, J. (2001). The Practice of English Language Teaching. Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Hawks, P. (2001). Making Distinctions. A Discussion of the Use of Mother Tongue in the Language Classroom, *Hawks Kang Journal of TEFL*, Online internet. Available: [http://www. Geocities.Com/HawksTongue, html](http://www.Geocities.Com/HawksTongue.html).
- Horst, M., White, J., & Bell, P. (2010). First and second language knowledge in the language Classroom. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 14 (3), 331-349.
- Howatt. A.P.R. (1984). A History of English Language Teaching. *Oxford: Oxford University press*
- Howatt, A.P.R., and H.G. Widdowson.. (2005). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press. ISBN 0-19-442185-6
- Husain, K. (1996). Translation in the history of language teaching. *International Journal of Translation*, 8(1-2), 111-120.
- James, C. (1998). Errors in Language learning and Use: Exploring error analysis, London: Longman
- Kenenisa, B. (2003). Using L1 in the EFL classroom: The case of the Oromo language with Particular reference to Adama Teachers Colege. *AAU*, unpublished MA thesis.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon .
- Krashen, S and Terrell, T. (1983). *The Natural Approach: Language acquisition in the*

Classroom, Pergamon

Krashen, S.D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: issues and implications*. London: Longman

Lado, R.(1964). *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach*. New York Pergamon .

Langer, S.L. (2001). *The Effect of Home Language Use in the ESL Classroom: Additive or Subtractive? On-line internet. Available: A:/the effect of home language use in the ESL classroom.5-langer.htm*

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 2000. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*.

Oxford University Press. ISBN 0 19 435574 8

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). Grammar. In Carter, R. & Nunan, D. (Eds.), *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee,(2000).Authenticity revisited:*Text Authenticity and Learner Authenticity.ELT Journal,49(4),323-328*

Lekova (2009). Language interference and methods of its overcoming in foreign language

Teaching. *Rakia Journal of Sciences*, Vol. 8, Suppl. 3, pp 320-324, 2010, Abu Trakia

University. <http://www.uni-sz.bg>

Linder, D.(2002). *Translation, English Teaching Professional*, Issue 23, pp39-41

Macaro, E.(1997). *Target language, Collaborative Learning and Autonomy*. Cleve don: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' code switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making, *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 531-548

M. and Herron.(1989). *Feedback for Language Transfer Errors: The Garden Path Technique*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, pp.385-395

Mahmoud, A. (2006). Translation and foreign language reading comprehension: A neglected didactic procedure, in *English Teaching Forum*, 44 (4) , 28-33

McNabb, C. (1989). *Language Policy and Language Practice: Implementation Dilemmas in Ethiopian Education*. Stockholm: Stockholm University

- Medgyes, P.(1994). *The Non-native Teacher*. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Meyer, H. (2008). The Pedagogical Implications of L1 Use in the L2 Classroom. Retrieved November, 2012 from [Http://www.kyoai.ac.jp/ College/ ronshuu /no08/meyer1.pdf](Http://www.kyoai.ac.jp/College/ronshuu/no08/meyer1.pdf).
- Miles, R. (2004). *Evaluating the Use of L1 in the English language Classroom*. School of Humanities. Centre for English Language Studies Department of English. University of Birmingham
- Mitchell, R. (1988). *Communicative Language Teaching: in Practice*. CILT: London
- MOON, J. *Children Learning English*. Oxford: Macmillian Education, 2000.184 s. ISBN 043524096X.
- Murakami, I.(1999). The Bridging Strategy: Active Use of Learners' First Language in Second Language Teaching. On-line internet. Available: [http:// www.hltmag.co.uk/nov01/ martnov 013.rtf](http://www.hltmag.co.uk/nov01/martnov_013.rtf).
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H. & Todesco, A. (1978). The good language learner. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
- Naimushin , B.(2002). *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching*, Modern English Teacher, 11(4),pp. 46-49
- Nation, P. The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *Asian EFL Journal* online□. 1978, June. [cit. 2010-01-23]. Dostupné na WWW: <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/june_2003_PN.php>.
- Nation, P. (2003). *The role of the first language in foreign language learning. Asian Inviting Students to use their L1 in the EFL classroom*. (Joice. Alison. Hans)
- Nazari, A. 2007. EFL teachers' perception of the concept of communicative competence. ELT Journal 613. pp. 202-210.
- Negeri Jl. Gejayan Yogyakarta, (2011). Interference: It's Role in the Target Language Mastery to Indonesian Learners. Win Listyaningrum Arifin Universities nurarifin_my@yahoo.com, Vol. 4, No. 1, June 2011, REGISTER- 99,

- Nunan, D. and Lamb, C. (1996). *The Self-Directed Teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Onike, R. (2009). Interference phenomenon in Yoruba - English bilingual context.
 Accessed at <http://searchwarp.com/swa556725-Interference-Phenomenon-In-Yoruba-English-Bilingual-Context.htm> on 11/1/2010.
- Pachler, N & Field, K. (2001). *Learning to Teach Modern Foreign Languages in the Secondary School*. Routledge: London.
- PARROTT, M. *Tasks for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. 325 s. ISBN 0-521-426669.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Longman: London & New York.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Polio, C. (1994). Comment on Else Roberts Auerbach's "Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom." *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (2):153-161
- Piasecka, K. (1988). The bilingual teacher in the ESL classroom. In: Nicholls, S.; Hoadley-Maidment, E. (eds.), *Current Issues in Teaching English as a Second Language to Adults*. London: Edward Arnold, pp.97-107.
- Prince, P. (1996). Second language vocabulary learning: The role of context versus translation as a function of proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80, 478- 93.
- Prodromou, L. (2001). From Mother Tongue to Other Tongue, *On-line internet*. Available: <http://www.Tesolgreece.com/mother.html>
- Prodromou, L. (2002). The Great EFL Textbook Debate: The Teacher not the book. *Model English Teacher*. 11(4), 25-33.
- Reis, L.A.V.P. (1996). The Myths and the Practical Needs of Using L1 in the EFL Classes: A Learner Training Experiment, *English Teaching Forum*, 34(4), pp. 61-62
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 2nd RICHARDS J. C.; RODGERS T. S. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (A Description and Analysis)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

- Press, 1986. ISBN 0521312558. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press
- Ringbom, H. (1987). *The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the Good Language Learners can Teach Us, *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), pp.41-51
- Schweers, C.W. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 Classroom, *English Teaching Forum*, 37(2), pp.6-13
- Shamash, Y. (1990). Learning in translation: Beyond language experience in ESL. *Voices*
- Sharma, K. (2006). Mother tongue use in English classroom. *NELTA*, 11 (1-2), 80-87.
- Stern, H.H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swan, M. (1985). A Critical Look at the Communicative Approach (2), *ELT Journal*, 39(2), pp.76
- Tang, J. (2002). Using L1 in the English Classroom, *English Teaching Forum*, 40(1), pp.36- 43.
- Titford, C. (1983). Translation for Advanced Learners, *ELT Journal*, 37(1), pp 52-57.
- Tomasello, Towel, R. and Hawkins, R. (1994). *Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*. UK, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd
- Tudor, I. (1987). Using Translation in ESP. *ELT Journal*, 41/4, 268-273.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a Role for the L1 in Second and Foreign language Teaching, *But...*, *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(4), pp.531-540. 77
- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press
- Voila! c'est Alin! (2013). Language Interference. Bienvenue au monde d'Alin! Posted on April 2, 2013 by Marlin Dwinastiti Standard
- Wallace, M.J. (1998). *Action Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge. Cambridge University
- Weschler, R. (1997). Uses of Japanese (L1) in English Classroom: *Introducing the Functional-Translation Method*, *The Internet TESL Journal*, [On-line]3(2). Available: <http://www.aitech.ac.jp/~iteslj/>
- Widdowson, H.G. (1996). Comment: Authenticity and Autonomy in ELT, *ELT Journal*, 50(1), pp. 67-68. 2 1
- Willis, J. (1981). *Teaching English Through English*. Essex: Longman.

Appendixes

Appendix A

Unit plan one (experimental group)

Name of the teacher Girma Regassa

Grade Nine

Subject English

Topic Passive voice

Specific learning outcome of the unit; after the lesson the students will

- A. Identify the active and passive structures in texts
- B. Re write sentences by changing the active voice structures into their passive voice.
- C. Convert the shortened passive sentences into full sentences
- D. Use the rule of passive in their passive construction

Teaching learning activities

Different sentences will be jotted down on the blackboard.

Lesson one

- Students will identify the difference between the active and passive Structures and meaning.

Procedure: 1. Arrange students in pairs or groups of three or four, and give a copy of the worksheet to each group.

2. The students are to choose two related words on the worksheet and make a passive sentence using them. They will have to supply their own verbs and other words.

Words chosen: **a boy, glass**

Possible sentence: **glass is broken by a boy**

Words chosen: **dogs, bones**

Possible sentence: **Bones are eaten by dogs.**

3. As a follow-up the next day the students will correct worksheet of inappropriate passive sentences

From both active and passive structures and asks the students two questions “What happens” and “who does it “

Lesson two

The teacher asks the students which focuses on the action happened and which focuses on the doer.

The teacher gave them sentences to identify and underline the verbs which give attention on what happened.

The flowers were planted by my mother.

My mother planted the flowers

Lesson three

The students underline the verbs and identify the difference between the two.

The teacher gives the students to convert active sentences into their passive forms and also vice versa.

Active: My friend sent me a letter.

Passive: I was sent a letter by my friend.

Active: We saw them come. She made him do it.

Passive: They were seen to come. He was made to do it.

Lesson four

Students will identify the grammatical difference between the two voices and convert active sentences into their passive forms. Students read the gives texts and identify the mistakes in the construction of active and passive voices and try to correct the errors.

A new house is build our street. (error.)

A new house is built in our street. (Correct .They are building it these days, it is not finished.)

Lesson five

The teacher summarizes the rules of passives like the usage of proportion ‘by’ and the verb + (be past participle form of the main verb)

Uses of passive

1. If the action is more important than the agent.

A demonstration has been held. This theatre was built in 1868.

The important thing is what happened, not who did it.

2. If the agent is not known.

He was offered a job. (Someone offered him the job)

Lesson six

The teacher gives the students' material organized using active and passive sentences as the students identify passives and actives in the given texts.

Students will identify active and passive sentences in the text.

Students will use the rule of passive voice in their sentences construction.

Finally different exercises will be given for the students as summary of the lesson.

While passing through all these activities the teacher doesn't as students use their first language or A fan Oromo.

Activities for experimental group students

I Complete the following charts with the correct forms of actives voices

| Tenses | Active | Passive |
|-----------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|
| Present simple | | The car is repaired. |
| Present continuous | | The car is being repaired. |
| Past simple | | The car was repaired. |
| Past continuous tense | | The car was being repaired |
| Present perfect | | The car has just been repaired |
| Past perfect | | The car had been repaired |
| Future simple | | The car will be repaired |
| Present conditional | | The car would be repaired. |
| Perfect conditional | | The car would have been repaired. |
| | | |

II Identify in the following chart the doer of the action and the affected thing or person.

| Sentences | The performer of the action | The thing affected by the action |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| The secretary typed the report. | | |
| The man posted the letter. | | |
| Thomson discovered the electron. | | |
| They're building a new house. | | |

Structures in passive

- a Simple tenses (simple form of *be* + passive participle)
- b The perfect (perfect of *be* + passive participle)
- c The continuous (continuous of *be* + passive participle)
- d Will and be going to (future of *be* + passive participle)

Uses of passive

The passive voice is used:

1. If the action is more important than the agent.
2. When we do not know the identity of the agent

My car was stolen.

- 3 The agent may not be relevant to the message.

A large number of Sherlock Holmes films have been made.

- 4 When we do not mention the agent because we do not want to.

Mistakes have been made.

- 5 To describe industrial and scientific processes

If sulphur is heated, a number of changes can be seen

- 6 Empty subjects

Nothing can be done about it.

7 Verbs which cannot be passive

The cat **ran** away.

Post Activities

I. The following sentences are not written in the correct tense form of the passive voice. Correct the tense mistakes in the statements.

A. The first football World Cup won by Uruguay.

B. James Bond creates by Ian Fleming.

C. The electron discovers by Thomson.

D. 'Hamlet' writes in 1601.

E. Nelson Mandela birth in 1908.

II The following short text is taken from a material Read the text carefully and underline the passive structures and explain the doer and the affected thing or person

The lowest monthly death toll on French roads for 30 years was announced by the Transport Ministry for the month of August. The results were seen as a direct triumph for the new licence laws, which led to a bitter truck drivers strike in July. Some 789 people died on the roads last month, 217 fewer than in August last year.

(from Early Times)

Cocaine worth £290 million has been seized by the FBI in a case which is being called 'the chocolate connection'. The 6,000 lb of drugs were hidden in blocks of chocolate aboard an American ship that docked in Port Newark, New Jersey, from Ecuador.

(from The Mail on Sunday)

III Turn the active sentences in the following texts in to their passive form.

DAY IN THE LIFE OF THE WORLD

Every day your heart pumps enough blood to fill the fuel tanks of about 400 cars. The population of the world increases by about 200,000. Nine million people smoke cigarette every day. 740,000 people fly off to foreign countries.... In America 10,000 crimes are committed, and in Japan twenty million commuters cram into trains.

In Russia merchants sent 1.3 million tons of 200,000 tons of cigarette. Russians caught fish and they used as food. All over the world, the need of cigarette is increasing from day to day.

Write your own sentences five each from both active and passive

Active

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Passive

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

IV Circle the word that shouldn't be in the sentence

- 1 All the silvers was disappeared without trace.
- 2 We should have be informed about the situation.
- 3 The scientists were being had elected because of their success.
- 4 The film star is expected that to give a press conference this afternoon.

Appendix B

Unit plan Two (Control group)

Grade Nine

Name of the teacher Birhanu Abdisa

Topic Passive voice

Grade Nine

Specific learning outcome of the unit; after the lesson the students will

- A. Identify the active and passive structures in texts
- B. Re write sentences by changing the active voice structures into their passive voice.
- C. Convert the shortened passive sentences into full sentences
- D. Use the rule of passive in their passive construction

Teaching learning activities

Lesson 1-2

The teacher starts the lesson by writing many sentences in the passive form down the blackboard, each of which is an example to different tense .The teacher asks the students to look at the examples on the board and lets them discover the rule in forming passive voice structures. Students elicit the rule down the board and each examined carefully on the example.

After the introduction of grammatical point, the teacher follows the explanation and information about the passive voice in the book The teacher makes the students examine the sample sentences in the book ;students compare and contrast the active and passive structures .They also compare and contrast samples given in Afan Oromo with samples given in English

The teacher gave them sentences to identify and underline the verbs which give attention on what happened.

The flowers were planted by my mother.

Abaaboon harmeen dhaabame.

My mother planted the flowers

Harmeen Abaaboo dhaabde.

Following these samples the students do the exercises

Lesson 5-6

Finally the teacher distributes some exercises to the students; some worksheets will be done in the class and some as home work. The teacher gives the students explanation in the students' native language

Appendix C

Unit plan Two (experimental group)

Name of the teacher Girma Regassa

Grade Nine

Subject English

Topic Reported speech

Specific learning outcome of the unit; the students will

- 1 Identify the grammatical mistakes in the reported speech sentences
- 2 Re write the incorrect sentences in the correct reported speech form
- 3 Identify the reported speech sentences in the context
- 4 Change direct speeches into their reported speech forms.

Teaching and learning activities: A number of activities are provided for the students. By means of variety of activities, the specific learning outcomes of the unit are aimed to be achieved.

Lesson 1 (warm up)

The teacher jotted down activities in the form of dialogue on the black board and the students being in pair read it.

A.I like football,' Emma said.

B.Emma said she likes football.

A.Emma: I won't be at the club next week.

B.You: Nick said he won't be here this week.

Students will be asked to answer some questions as follow

1 "Almaz went to Rome," I thought. - I thought that who had gone to Rome?

2Selam: "I will never go to work." - Selam says she will -----.

Lesson 2 (presentation of the lesson)

The teacher writes the rules and their examples on the blackboard. Using the examples the students are asked to write the information in the chart o their exercise books.

Adverbials of time

Direct speech

indirect speech

Now

then/at that time/immediately

today

yesterday/that day/on Tuesday etc

yesterday

the day before/the previous day/on Monday etc

| | |
|-------------|---|
| tomorrow | the next day/the following day/on Wednesday etc |
| this week | last week/ that week |
| last year | the year before/the previous year/in 1990etc |
| next month | the month after/the following month/in August etc |
| an hour ago | an hour before/an hour earlier/at two o'clock etc |

The form of the tense change

A The tense change in indirect speech is a change from present to past.

'I **feel** ill.' Kay said she **felt** ill.

B If the verb is past, then it changes to the past perfect.

'I **bought** the shirt.' He told us he **had bought** the shirt.

C The past perfect in indirect speech can relate to three different forms.

'I **ve seen** the film.' She said she **'d seen** the film.

'I **saw** the film last week.' She said she **'d seen** the film the week before.

'I **d seen** the film before, but I She said she **'d seen** the film before.

D We can report a question by using verbs like ask, inquire/enquire, wonder or to know

Where did you have lunch? I asked Elaine where she had lunch.

E Reporting orders, requests, offers et

We can use tell/ask + object + to-infinitive

'Please wait outside.' The teacher told us to wait outside.

Lesson 3

- *Students will rewrite dialogue by changing direct speech into their indirect speech statements.*
- *Teachers distributed direct speech to the students and asks them to report what people said to their classmate by considering the rules.*

Jemal: I feel really sad today. Temima

Temima: "what is the matter?"

Jemal: I have a deadful headache and I feel a better recover now."

Temima: "Oh, dear that sounds quite serious "

Jemal :Iwonder what is wrong with me,I have been feeling like this for the last few days.

Lesson 4

Students will rewrite the given reported speech into their direct speech forms

Students will identify the grammatical mistakes in the reported speech sentences.

Following this the students are asked as they will be in a group of two students and create their own dialogue .One of them will report what some says .finally, they identify the grammatical problems in their speech.

Look at the following statements and try to correct the errors in the statements.

1 Could you please tell me how can I go to the train station?

.....

2.My teacher asked am I studying hard for the exam.

.....

3 The nurse exclaimed how rude some patients.

.....

Lesson 5

Next, the teacher give the students an extract taken from different materials and divided the students into small groups of three students. The change the interview into reported speech and report to the class by representing an individual from the group.

Activities for the experimental group

A Look at the following statements and write direct in front of it if the statement is direct speech and reported if it is reported speech.

1. 'I'm afraid not,' the woman replied
2. The police ordered the men to lie down.
3. Celia **said** she's fed up.
4. Michael said he is thirsty.
5. He said what time it was.

B Read the following short text and underlines the reported speech in the text and circle the direct speech

Andrews said Wilson had stolen a gold wedding ring and credit card and had used the card to attempt to withdraw money from a bank. In the second offence Wilson had burgled premises and taken a briefcase containing takings from a shop. Police recovered the bank notes from his home

Appendix D

Unit plan Two (control group)

Name of the teacher Birhanu Abdisa

Grade Nine

Subject English

Topic Reported speech

Specific learning outcome of the unit; the students will

- 1 Identify the grammatical mistakes in the reported speech sentences
- 2 Re write the incorrect sentences in the correct reported speech form
- 3 Identify the reported speech sentences in the context
- 4 Change direct speeches into their reported speech forms.

Teaching and learning activities: A number of activities are provided for the students. By means of variety of activities, the specific learning outcomes of the unit are aimed to be achieved.

Lesson 1

Students are asked to complete the given question in short time .Then, the questions are answered and some explanations in both English and Afan Oromo are made by the teacher.

The teacher jotted down activities in the form of dialogue on the black board and the students Example.

Alemu: "I eat my breakfast."

Alamu : "Ani ciree koon nyaadhe."

Alemu said that he ate his breakfast.

Alamuun ani ciree koon nyaadhe jedhe.

Lesson 2

Next some reporting verbs and their uses are introduced. Punctuation in reported speech is explained, how to quote people's thought is shown. Following this reporting statements, questions, suggestions, commands and offers are introduced

Lesson 3

The change showing the rule the change in time and tenses in the text book is explained,

Lesson 4-5

Practicing exercises in the book are done with the students. Detailed information about reporting questions are given by the teacher following the grammar book explanation.

Lesson 6

Practice exercises on reporting questions are first done by the student then they discuss the answer with the teacher.

Appendix E

Becho secondary school Academic year – 2010

Pre test on active and passive voice. (Time allowed 20 minutes)

Name-----Grade-----

General direction: There are three parts from I-III in the test .Please read the direction for each part carefully and answer the questions.

I complete the following sentences by using the correct past simple form of the verbs in the bracket

- 1 A dog ----- by Abera (kill)
- 2 The books ----- (steal)
- 3 Zebene -----burgling a house . (arrest)

II choose the best answer from the given alternatives

- 1 The correct passive form of the sentence “ **We opened the boxes**” is-----
 - A We were opened by the boxes C **The boxes were opened by us**
 - B The books are opened by us D **We were opening the boxes**
- 2 The correct passive form of the sentence “ **Berhanu has taught this class**” is -----
 - A This class has been teaching Berhanu B **This Class has been taught by Berhanu**
 - C This class has been taught by Berhanu D **This class have been teaching Berhanu**
- 3 The passive form of the sentence “**The boy is kicking the ball** ” is-----
 - A The ball was kicking by the boy B **The ball was kicking the boy**
 - C The ball is being kicked by the boy D **The ball is kicking the boy**

III Re write the following sentences in to their passive form

- 1 Somebody has cleaned the room.

- 2 They are building a new hospital.

- 3 Kidane killed the lion.

Appendix F

Becho secondary school Academic year – 2010

Name-----Grade-----

Post Tests on passive voice time allowed 20 minutes.

I choose the best answer for the following statements.

- 1 New medicine for malaria-----by American scientists
A .find B was found C finding D is finding
- 2 Which one is different? A. The problem is solved B. The book will be published.
C The man is reading D the door was opened.
- 3 10 My favorite TV program -----by a power outage.
A was interrupted B will interrupt C is interrupting D am interrupted

II Directions: Select the correct voice between the choices provided and underline the correct verb.

- 4 A new book (will publish / will be published) by that company next year.
- 5 A prize (will be given / will be giving) to whoever solves this equation.
- 6 The morning paper (reads / is read) by over 200,000 people every day.
- 7 The books (are donating /were donated) by Code Ethiopia.
- 8 The garbage (won't collect / won't be collected) tomorrow.

III Rewrite the following sentences as complete sentences using the correct forms of their passive construction.

- 9 They greet me cheerfully every morning.

- 10 The students answered all the questions.

Appendix G

Becho secondary school Academic year – 2010

Name-----Grade-----

Retention Tests on passive voice time allowed 20 minute

Rewrite the following sentences in to their past passive

- 1 The school principal bought ten reference books.

- 2 Ethiopian prime minister visited Kenya.

- 3 The students sing the song several times

- 4 The policeman arrested the bank robbers yesterday.

- 5 Scientists discovered new medicine for HIV /AIDS.

Read the following text and underline the passive construction with to be

Midnight, Earlier the city was blanketed by a nearly impenetrable mist, the perfect environment for a crime to be committed .Now the streets are getting pelted by violent rain drops. No one is found on the seventh floor of a massive office building; the door to an executive suite of offices lays a jar. Inside the main room is dimly lit. An hour ago a perfect crime has been made .Phantasmal knows all.

Appendix H

Becho secondary school Academic year – 2010

Pre test on Direct and reported speech. (Time allowed 20 minutes)

Name-----Grade-----

General direction: There are three parts from I-III in the test .Please read the direction for each part carefully and answer the questions.

I choose the best answer from the given alternatives

----1 Guta said, **I listen to the radio**. Can be reported as-----

- A** Guta was listen to the radio **B** Guta said that he listened to the radio
C Guta said that he is listening to the radio **D** Guta listen to the radio

----2 He said to me what are you doing? Can be reported as-----

- A** he asked me you were doing? **B** he asked me what I was doing
C he asked me what you are doing **D** he asked me what he was reading

----3 The teacher to the student: Go away! Can be reported as-----

- A** the teacher ordered the student to go away **B** the teacher ordered go away to the student
C the teacher asked if the students go away **D** the teacher ordered the student not to go

II Change the following direct speech in to their reported speech form

1 Lemma: “ **I am reading the book**” can be reported

Lemma said that -----

2 Bontu : “ I write my home work.” can be reported

Bontu said that -----

3 “Do not shut the door.” Can be reported as

The teacher told me -----

III There are some mistakes in the following reported sentences .Re write each sentences in the correct form in the provided space.

1 Megertu ordered me close the door.

2 Guta : I am happy to be here. Can be reported as Guta said that I was happy to be here.

Appendix I

Becho secondary school Academic year – 2010

Name-----Grade-----

Post Tests on Reported speech time allowed 20 minutes

There are some mistakes in the following sentences. Rewrite each sentence in the correct form in the provided space.

- 1 The girl shouted how rude some boys.

- 2 The policeman asked the men to lie down.

- 3 Bula: "He will leave tomorrow." (reported as Bula said he would leave tomorrow).

- 4 "Don't smoke," the doctor warned my father. (reported as The doctor warned my father *to smoke.*)

B Choose the correct reported speech form of the following direct speech

- 5 "Where have you been?" Abebe said. Reported as.
Abebe.....

- A admitted where he has been C asked me where I had been
- B replied where has he been D answered me where he have been

- 6 "He was thinking of buying a new car," she said. Reported as he-----
A was thinking of buying a new car C has been thinking how to buy new car.
B was thought buying new car. D had been thinking of buying a new car.
- 7 Mandela: Have you bought your ticket? Can be reported as Mandela-----
A had better guy ticket B asked you to bought your ticket
C wants **to know if** Sadam has bought his ticket. D asked why Sadam has bought his ticket

Turn the active voice sentences in the following short text into their passive form.

Doctors experimentally taste 20,000 volunteers in Kenya. The government funded 119 million dolas. The scientists say volunteers are receiving a crude cocktail made of two antiquated AIDS vaccines.

.....
.....
.....

Appendix J

Becho secondary school Academic year – 2010

Name-----Grade-----

Retention test on Direct and reported speech.

Turn the following sentences into reported speech by using the most appropriate reporting verb

1“Is Gelane still having a party next Saturday? She asked me.

2“Don’t talk,” he said to me.

3“I am the best player of all,” Lema told the reporters.

4 Bontu : “ I write my assignment.”

5“Do not shut the door. ‘’ said the teacher.

II Change the following direct speech in to their reported speech form

1 Lemesa: “ **I am reading the book’**” can be reported

Lemma said that -----

2 Debela : “ I write my home work.” can be reported

Debela said that -----

3 “Do not shout in the classroom .‘’ Can be reported as

The teacher told me -----

II There are some mistakes in the following reported sentences .Re write each sentences in the correct form in the provided space.

1 Megersa ordered me don’t to close the door.

2 Guta : I am a student. Can be reported as Guta said that I have a student.

APPENDIX K

Answer Key

Unit one Pre test

Pre test on passive

I Fill in the blank space

1 was killed

2 were stolen

3 was arrested

II Multiple Choice

1 c

2 c

3 c

III The passive form of the given actives

1 The room has been cleaned/by somebody

2 A new hospital is/was being built by them.

3 The lion is/was killed by kidane.

Answer Key

Unit one Post test

I Multiple choice

1 B

2 C

3 A

II The correct passive form of the verb

4 will be published

5 will be given

6 is read

7 were donated

8 won't be collected

II The passive form of the statements

9. I was greeted cheerfully every morning/by them.

10 All the questions were answered by the students.

II The correct passive form of the verb

5 will be published

- 4 will be given
- 5 is read
- 6 were donated
- 7 won't be collected

Unit One

I Key answer for retention tests

- 1 Ten reference books are/were bought by the school principal.
- 2 Kenya was visited by Ethiopian prime minister.
- 3 The sing was sung by the students several times.
- 4 The bank robbers were arrested by the policeman yesterday.
- 5 New medicine for HIV/AIDS was discovered by the scientists.

II The passive structure in the text.

- 1 The city was blanketed.
- 2 A crime to be committed
- 3 Streets are getting pelted
- 2 No one is found on the seventh floor.
- 3 A perfect crime has been made.

Answer Key

Unit two

Pre test on Reported speech

I multiple choice

- 1 B
- 2 B
- 3 A

Reported form of the given direct speech

- 1 He was reading the book
- 2 She wrote her home work
- 3 not to shut the door.

Write the correct passive form

- 1 Megertu ordered me to close the door.
- 2 Guta said that he was happy to be there

Answer Key

Unit two

Post tests

A Answer for the incorrectly constructed sentences.(8%)

- 1 The girl shouted how rude some boys are/were
- 2 The policeman ordered the men to lie down.
- 3 Bula said he would leave the following day.
- 4 **The** doctor warned my father not to smoke.

B Choose the correct reported speech form of the following direct speech (6%)

5 C

6 D

7 C

C Turn the direct speech into reported speech (6%)

One hundred sixteen thousand volunteers were trained in Kenya. Two hundred million dollars were funded by the government. Scientists said, crude cocktail made of two anti quated AIDS vaccines were receipt by the volunteers.

Unit two

Retention test

I The correct reported speech form of the statement.

- 1 She asked me if/whether Gelane has been celebrating a party the following Saturday.
- 2 He ordered me not to talk.
- 3 Lema told to the reporter that he was the best player.
- 4 Bontu said she wrote her assignment.
- 5 The teacher ordered me not to shut the door.

II

- 1 He was reading the book
- 2 Debela wrote his home work
- 3 not to shout in the class room

III Different types of reporting

- 1 Megersa ordered me not to close the door.
- 2 Guta said that he was a student.

Appendix L

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLAGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Questionnaire for Teachers

The objective of this questionnaire is to explore the use of Afan Oromo in the English classroom at Becho secondary school. The questionnaire is mainly aimed at assessing teachers' and students' perceptions towards using Afan Oromo, the frequency, the purpose and amount of using Afan Oromo during English lessons. Your answers will be confidential and used for research purpose only. Thus, you are kindly requested to respond the questions sincerely and thoughtfully. Please indicate your responses by circling the letter (s) of your choice or filling in the blank spaces as required. In case you have more than one answer, you can circle more than one option. You need not write your name.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Part I: Background information

1. 1. Background: a. Gender M F Education a certificate b. Diploma. c. Degree
2. Years of teaching experience
a. 1-5 b. 5-10 c. 10-15 d.15-20 e. more than 20

Part II: Questions Related to Afan Oromo use in the English Classroom

1. In your opinion, should Afan Oromo be used in the English classroom?
a. Yes b . No
2. If „Yes“, how often should it be used
a. Frequently b. Sometimes c. Rarely
3. Why do you think is the use of Afan Oromo important? (You can choose more than one option)
a. It creates cooperation among students
b. It helps learners to ask for clarification
c . It facilitates teacher –student interaction
d. It is less time consuming
e. It helps pupils feel more confident and comfortable
f. It aids English comprehension

g. It reduces language anxiety

h. Others (specify)_____

4. What percentage of Afan Oromo do you think, should be used in the English lesson period (for example in, 40 minute's lesson)?

a. 5% b. 6%-10% c. 11%-20% d. 21%-30% e. 31%-40%

5. Whatever response to item 4 is, for what purposes do you think Afan Oromo should be used in the EFL classes? (You can choose as many alternatives as you think is appropriate) It should be used to:

a. Explain the aim of the lesson

b. Explain new vocabulary items

c. Explain difficult concepts

d. Check students' understanding

e. Maintain classroom discipline

f. Give instructions

g. As students' learning strategy

i. Others (please specify)_____

6. How often do your students use English in the EFL class?

a. Always b. Most of the time c. rarely d. Not at all

7. If you responded "Rarely" or "Not at all" for item 6, how difficult do you think it would be for your students to understand your English lesson if you use only English?

a. very difficult b. Difficult c. Not difficult

8. If you responded "Very difficult" or "difficult" for item 7 what technique(s) do you use when your students unable to understand the meaning you are trying to convey in your EFL classes?

(You can choose more than one option)

a. More explanations in English b. Objects

c. Gesture and actions

d. Pictures/photographs/drawings

e. Translating English in to Afan Oromo

f. If others (please specify)

9. Did you take any training on the role of local languages in the English classroom?

a. Yes b. No

10. If your response to " item 9 is 'No', how has this influenced your present use of students' first language (L1) in the English classroom? It made me:

- a. use more L1 than L2
- b. balance the use of L1 and L2
- c. use less L1 than L2
- d. not use L1 in the L2 class at all

How much do you agree with each of the following statements? Put a (√) mark in the space provided below.

Note: 5= Strongly Agree, 4= Agree 3= Undecided 2= Disagree 1=Strongly Disagree

| | Statements | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Using only English for lower level students will not work in Ethiopian schools | | | | | |
| 2 | I'm still not satisfied with my English. I think I often make mistakes when I use only English in class. So, I do not use it too much ;yet, I switch to Afan Oromo | | | | | |
| 3 | I want to promote as much English as possible in my classes, but I also use effective bilingual techniques. | | | | | |
| 4 | Sometimes I check if my students have understood my English explanation by asking them to give me Afan Oromo equivalent as evidence of understanding | | | | | |
| 5 | I try to create an English atmosphere in my classroom and establish English as a general classroom language, but whenever I have to restore order in class and maintain discipline when the class is loud and noisy I use Afan Oromo | | | | | |
| 6 | Students obviously feel that what they are trying to say is important, but I really can't understand what they mean .So, I'll get them to say it in Afan Oromo, then I'll help them say it in English. | | | | | |
| 7 | Translating the foreign language (L2) form into the native language (Afan Oromo in this case) is an excellent way to reduce further redundant grammatical explanation and to save time. | | | | | |

Appendix M

Teachers' Interview Questions

1. Do you use of Afan Oromo when you teach English grammar?
- 2 You said that you use Afan Oromo in your EFL grammar lesson. Why do you do so?
3. Do you use the same amount of Oromo language for your students?
- 4 How often do you and your students use Afan Oromo in a period of English lesson?
5. How difficult do you think it would be for your students to understand your English lesson if you use only English?
- 6 How do you feel about using Afan Oromo in English classroom

Appendix N

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLAGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Questionnaire for Students

The objective of this questionnaire is to explore the use of Afan Oromo in the English classroom at Becho secondary school .The questionnaire is mainly aimed at exploring teachers' and students' perceptions towards using, Afan Oromo the frequency, the purpose and amount of using Afan Oromo during English lessons. Your answers will be confidential and used for research purpose only. Thus, you are kindly requested to respond the questions sincerely and thoughtfully. Please indicate your responses by circling the letter (s) of your choice or filling in the blank spaces as required. In case you have more than one answer, you can circle more than one option. You need not write your name.

Thank you in advance.

1. Do you use Afan Oromo in your English lesson periods?

a. Yes b. No

2. If you responded 'Yes', for item 1, how often do you use it?

a. frequently b. Sometimes c. rarely

3. In what occasions do you use Afan Oromo in your English classroom?

a. during pair or group work

b. when asking and answering questions

c. when chatting with peers

d. other occasions (please specify)_____

4. In your opinion, should English teachers use Afan Oromo in the English classroom?

a. Yes b. No

5. If Yes for item 4, why do you think the use of Afan Oromo important in the English classroom? Because it helps me:(You can choose more than option)

a. understand new words b. understand difficult concepts

c. ask teacher or peers for clarification d. feel at ease, comfortable and less stressed

other reasons (please specify)_____

6. Do your English teachers use Afan Oromo in your English class?

a. Yes b. No

7. If 'Yes' how often do your English teachers use Afan Oromo?

a. Always b. Often c. Sometime

8. About what percentage of Afan Oromo do you think should be used in the English lesson period (for example in 40 minutes)?

a. 5% b. 6%-10%

c. 11%-20% d. 21%-30% e. 31%-40%

9. Whatever your response item 8, for what purposes do your English teachers use Afan Oromo?

They use it to:(you can choose more than one option)

a. explain new words d. maintain classroom discipline

b. explain difficult concepts e. chat with students

c. explain the aim of the lesson f. give instructions

g .others (please specify) _____

10. If your English teachers use only English, how difficult do you think it would be for you to understand the English lesson?

a. very difficult b. quite difficult c. difficult d. Not difficult

Students' questionnaire Translated in to their Mother tongue

Yunversiitii Jimmaa

Kolleejii Saayinsii Hawaasaa fi Namoomaatti

Muummee Afaan Ingiliffaa fi Og-barruu

Gaafannoo barattootaaf dhiyaate

Kaayyoon gaafannoo kana akkaataa itti fayyadama afaan dhalootaa ykn Afaan Oromoo wayitii barnoota Afaan Ingiliffaa irratti qabu mana barumsa sad.2ffaa Bachoo keessatti adda baasuudha. Gaafannich irra caalaatti kan inni sakatta'u ilaalcha barataan itti fayyadama afaan oromoo yeroo Ingiliffa baratuuf qabu, baay'inaan ammam wayitii tokko keessatti akka fayyadamuu fi faayidaa inni qabu xiinxaluudha. Wanti waadaa isinii galuu baarbaadnu gaafannoon kun kan inni fayyadu qorannoo kana qofaaf ta'uu hubattanii deebii sirrii akka itti nuuf laattanu isin gaafanna. Gaaffiiwwan itti aananuuf akkaataa gaaffiisaaniitti isa itti maramuu qabuuf itti maruun isa mallattoo barbaaduuf mallattoo barbaachisaa akka nuuf keessanu isin gaafanna. Maqaa keessan barreessuu isin hin barbaachisu.

Galatoomaa!

Haala Filannoo

1 saala-----2 umurii----- 3 kutaa-----

1 Yero wayitii Afaan Ingiliffaatti Afaan Oromoo ni fayyadamtaa?

A Eeyyee B Lakkii

2 Yoo gaaffii 1 ffaadhaaf deebiin kee eeyyee ta'e akkaataan fayyadama ammam

A Ammaaa ammaa B Al tokko tokko C darbee darbee

3 Wayitii Afaan Ingiliffaatti haalli akkamii yoo si muudate Afaan Oromoo fayyadamta?

A yeroo hojii cimtii ykn garee C Yeroo hiryaawaliin taphadhu/haasa'u

B yeroon gaaffii gaafadhuu fi deebii laadhu.

D kan biraa yoo jiraate.....

4 Akka yaada keetiitti barsiisonni Afaan Ingiliffaa barsiisanu yeroobarsiisanu Afaan Oromoo fayyadamuu qabu jettaa?

A Eeyyee B Lakkii

5 Gaaffii 4ffaadhaaf deebiin kee yoo eeyyee ta'e Afaan Oromoo fayyadamuun barsiisaa yeroo Ingiliffa barsiisuu maaliif si fayyada. Filannoo lamaa ol filachuu dandeessa.

A jecha haaraa hubachiisuuf B qabiyyee barnootichaa qabsiisuuf
C Ibbsa dabalataa kennuuf D akkan natti tolaa baradhuuf

6 Barsiisaan Ingiliffaa yeroo isib barsiisuu dhufu gidduutti afaan oromoo ni fayyadamaa

A eeyyee B lakkii

7 Deebiin kee gaaffii 6^{ffaa}dhaaf eeyyee yoo ta'e barsiisonni Ingiliffaa haala kamiin Afaan Oromoo fayyadamuu qabu?

A Yeroo hunda B Yeroo baay'ee C al tokko tkko

8 Daqiiqaa 40 wayitii Afaan Ingiliffaa keessaa Afaan Oromoo peersantaa meeqa barsiisaan barsiisu fayyadama jettee yaadda?

a. 5% b. 6%-10%
c. 11%-20% d. 21%-30% e. 31%-40%

9 Deebii geffii 8 ffaa kee irratti barsiisaan yeroo akkam akkamii afaan oromootti fayyadama deebiin kee tokkoo ol ta'uu ni danda'a.

A yeroo hiika jechoota haaraa ibsu C Yeroo kaayyoo barnootichaa ibsu

B Yeroo hubannoo laatu D Yeroo namuusa irratti gorsa laatu

E Yeroo barataa waliin mar'atu F Ajaja yeroo laatu

G Kan biroo-----

10 Osoo barsiisaan Afaan Ingiliffaa barsiisu guutummaan Ingiliffa qofaa fayyadamee barnoota kana hubachuuf hamman sitti ulfaata ?

A Baay'ee ulfaata B ni ulfaata C Hin ulfaatu

Appendix O

Experimental students' feedback

The aim of this feedback is to collect data on your feelings and thought about the grammar teaching method used in both lessons. It is absolutely essential that you reflect your real options.

Thank you for participating in the study.

A Please choose one degree from 1-5 and tick the appropriate box for the following statements.

5-strongly agree

4-Agree

3- Nuetral

2- Dis agree

1- Strongly disagree

| Statements | Strog agree | Agre e | Nuet ral | Dis Agre e | Strog Dis Agre e |
|---|----------------|-----------|-------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| I support EFL teachers' to minimize the amount of Oromo language in EFL classrooms to make grammar lesson of the target language more tangible. | | | | | |
| I think using or giving more attention to the target language made as I learn grammar lesson interestingly. | | | | | |
| I want an English teacher who speaks Oromo language | | | | | |
| I like an EFL teacher who teaches English through translation | | | | | |
| I eager to learn English grammar by the target language or with less translation | | | | | |
| I support English teachers those do not use Afan Oromo while teaching English grammar. | | | | | |
| I can't avoid using Afan Oromo while learning grammar even if EFL teachers prevent me | | | | | |

Duub deebii barattootaa qofaatti baratani

Kaayyoon duub deebii kana isin irraa sassaabuun barbaachiseef yaadaa fiwaan afaan kana irra caalaa osoo afaan Ingiliffaa itti hin makin barachuu irratti qabdanu sakkii fi soda tokko malee akka ibsitanuuf. Waan hiraattaniif galatoomaa.

Ibsituu 5-cimseen morma, 4-nan morma
 3-giddu galan jira 2-nan deeggara ,1-cimseen deeggara

| Yaada | Cims morm | Nan morm | Gidd galee | Nan deegg | Cimse Deegg |
|---|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| Barsiisaan Ingiliffa barsiisu afaanich akka barruuf kutaa keessatti akka inni Afaan Oromoo hin fayyadamnen barbaada. | | | | | |
| Seer luga Ingiliffaa yeroo barsiisanu ingiliffaan barsiisuu irratti yoo xiyyeeffatan afaanich akka namaaf galu taasisa. | | | | | |
| Yeroo Ingiliffa barsiisu ani barsiisaa afaan Oromoo beekuun barachuun barbaada. | | | | | |
| Ani seer-luga Ingiliffaa yeroon baradhu barsiisaan gonkumaa Afaan Oromoo osoo ittihin makin yoo na barsiise fedha. | | | | | |
| Utuma barsiisaan koo akkam na dhowwee yeroon Ingiliffa baradhu Afaan Oromoo fayyadamuu dhiisuu hin danda'u. | | | | | |