Global Social Sciences Review (GSSR)
URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2021(VI-II).03

DOI: 10.31703/gssr.2021(VI-II).03

Discovering the Impact of National Language use in L2 learning on the Proficiency of Learners

Muhammad Ahsan [*] Muhammad Saeed Nasir [†] Noshaba Younus [‡]

Abstract *Discovering the impact of national language use in L2 learning on the proficiency of learners at degree level was the focus of this research; in order to find out a clear comprehension of the current subject matter, the research aimed at 577 learners who were learning English at graduation level in different public sector colleges and universities of the Southern Punjab, Pakistan. For this study, the researcher used a questionnaire as a data collection tool. The data analysis was done using SPSS (statistical package for social sciences) version 23. The researcher analyzed the data using descriptive analysis, analysis of variance (ANOVA), T-Test and Cronbach's alpha. The findings of the present research depicted that the students exhibited extremely positive and constructive perceptions regarding the use of national language in the second language classroom. The majority of the respondents gave preference using Urdu in specific situations for enhancing their proficiency in specific reasons such as while discussing course policies, learning about grammar and its usage in L2 classroom, attendance, and other administrative information.*

- Vol. VI, No. II (Spring 2021)
- Pages: 17 – 29
- p- ISSN: 2520-0348
- e-ISSN: 2616-793X
- ISSN-L: 2520-0348

Key Words: National Language, L2, Learners, University, College

Introduction

The subject matter of the use of learners' first language (National Language) in the target language (L2) classroom has been the topic of concern for several years. It is propounded by Steven Krashen in his Natural Approach to Language Acquisition that students learn their L2 much similarly that they learn their L1, and that second language is best learnt through immense amounts of exposure to the language with the limited time consumed using L1 (Tang, 2002). Though, in current years, emphasis has been switching toward the inclusion of L1 in the foreign language classroom. First language (L1), the national language of an individual, may possibly be defined as the native language or mother tongue, and all these terms are employed as changeover. On the other hand, this does not mean that they are always used to show the same object in other contexts. In the same way, the sphere of this term is expanded by Stern (1983) and reveals that these expressions may refer either to the language acquired first in early life or to a language that was acquired later but has come to be the dominant one. It is described by Kangas (1981) that L1 is the language one reflects in, the language one dreams in, and the language one computes in. She makes four categories of the features of L1. Firstly, the 'origin' (the language learnt first), secondly, the 'competence' (the language known best), thirdly, the 'function' (the language used most) and lastly, the 'attitude' (the language one identifies with and is identified by others as a native speaker of). The UNESCO reports national language as the language which someone attains in early years and which in general becomes his/her natural instrument of thought and communication (UNESCO, 1953; cited in Hamers & Blanc, 2000). For the purpose of this research, all the above-described terminologies will be used to show the language acquired first at home or institution in youth and

[*]Lecturer, Department of English, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: mahsan@gudgk.edu.pk
[†]Lecturer, Department of English, Emerson University, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.
[‡]Assistant Professor, Department of English, Riphah International University, Faisalabad Campus, Punjab, Pakistan.

Citation: Ahsan, M., Nasir, M. S., & Younus, N. (2021). Discovering the Impact of National Language use in L2 learning on the Proficiency of Learners. *Global Social Sciences Review*, *VI*(II), 17-29. https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2021(VI-II).03

still dominant and working as a national language.

Students use national language repeatedly when doing pair work to find out solutions to linguistic tasks and assess written language. The use of L1 gives permission to them to work within their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), as outlined by Vygotsky (Wells, 1999). By working in pairs and using L1 occasionally with L2, students may be cognitively processing at a higher level with regard to the linguistic tasks than if they were restricted only to converse in the language they are trying to learn. National language vocabulary allows students to use language which they may not up till now own in L2 in order to process ideas and reach higher levels of comprehension. This relates both to social talk between partners and private talk planned for the learner alone. Social talk, we mean, is a talk between peers for the purpose of conversing. Private talk, we assume, is when learners talk themselves through a learning process. In the private talk, for example, they might utter a non-standard target language phrase and then self-correct: "No, wait, (L2 phrase corrected)." Private talk can also be used to deconstruct grammar in real-time as the speaker is using it, such as: "I like the milk…the milk? No, I like milk." However, it is important to tell that L2 learners who use national language for communicative purposes in the classroom must also be expected to use a foreign language in the classroom to practice its use.

Students use L1 while speaking in order to:

- Enquire each other clarifying questions
- Display frustrations concerning their lack of understanding
- Simplify meaning of words in L2
- Discover new words in L2 which resemble already known words in L1
- Use language to process intricate concepts
- Build shared meaning while evaluating written tasks through shared discussion

Particularly, L1 use in written tasks is valued because it helps to build and clarify meaning. Learners are permitted by it to constantly clarify and evaluate communication with regard to choice of content and register suitable to the task (Wells, 1999). This re-evaluation is frequently done orally, in conversation with a fellow or teacher or in private talk. Cooperative dialogue permits learners to build linguistic comprehension regarding a number of language tasks. Resemblingly, it has been stated by Cook in her article "Using the First Language in the Classroom" (2001) that "L1 provides scaffolding for the students to help each other. So, keeping in mind the above-mentioned views, this study peeped into the reactions of the direct practitioners, both receivers (learners) and providers (instructors), of the EFL teaching activities regarding the extent of the use of L1 and the target language inside the EFL classroom.

Students' approach toward learning foreign language/L2 significantly impacts their learning experiences as well as the quantity and purpose of their national language/L1 use in the classroom. Learners who are compelled to learn a language they do not identify with or find to be related will be more likely to overuse L1 to stay within their area of ease. Tang (2002) states that many learners find the elimination of their mother tongue to be unbecoming to that tongue. Contrarily, if students sense that their mother tongue is a valued part of the language learning process, they are less likely to feel aggrieved about learning L2. The justification behind this study was to investigate the impact of National language/L1 use in L2 learning on the proficiency of the learners and to find out the influence of students' mother tongue on the use of National Language/L1 in L2 learning.

Background of the Study

In the 16th century, Latin was commonly used in Europe as the language of commerce, religion, trade and education. The purpose was mainly on teaching grammar rather than on communication; in consequence, translation was the main source of teaching. According to Byram (2000), for a thorough understanding of grammar, students were provided with lists of words to translate sentences. This teaching method was named the Grammar Translation Method (GTM).

Foreign language teaching, in the mid of the 19th century, got more consideration and developed a lot, particularly through some renowned persons such as Marcel (1793-1896), Prendergast (1806- 1886) and Gouin (1831-1896). Howatt (2004) says their period was known later as the Pre-Reform Movement. They considered this concept as the similarity between first language acquisition by children and second language

© 2021 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

learning by adults. Alternately, first language acquisition was the replica for learning a second language. Translation, for that reason, was thought of as the foundation of confusion and was substituted by pictures and gestures. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), the end of the 19th was characterized by the appearance of the Reform Movement, whose attempt was to develop some new language teaching principles. The use of national language in teaching L2 grew to be a controversial matter among reformers. Some of them seen that combining two languages would not help students to reach fluency; consequently, learners should use their mental capabilities to comprehend the meaning of the new language. In contrast to it, other reformers high lightened the importance of L1, especially when introducing unfamiliar items (Howatt, 2004). One of the pioneers who advocated the exclusion of L1 was J.S. Blackie. He took the side of his philosophy of learning words through the association of directly with objects, and thinking in L1 should be proscribed. This innovative method was identified as the Direct Method. The principle behind this method was that learners acquire their L2 directly in the same way as children acquire their L1 (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). The fact is that this method was an addition to Gouin and his contemporaries' Natural View towards Language Learning (Brown, 2001). Soon after it, another method named the Audio-lingual Method appeared, and this method also emphasized the proscription of the use of L1. This method viewed the target language and native language as two diverse systems that should not be connected, so merely L2 should be used (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). According to Brooks (1964), there is a range of characteristics of this method. For instance, Learners had to learn through repetition and memorizing; for this reason, listening and speaking were introduced prior to reading and writing. In addition, learning should take place without referring to L1. Cook (2001) suggested the idea that L2 should be expanded with no reference to L1 is known as language compartmentalization, and the interpretation behind this principle is to avoid L1 interference.

Numerous language researchers and theorists have put their attention on L2. For example, Krashen (1981) maintained that intelligible input provides opportunities for unintentional and implicit learning, which guides to attaining language competence. So, in the sight of Macaro (1997), the dominance of L2 may point out prohibiting L1 in the classroom. Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000), in response to this argument, broaden this concept to incorporate output as an issue leading to language competence. She spotlighted the significance of engaging learners in shared dialogues in which learners construct language. This production helps learners to assess and observe their progress. Although Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000) do not discuss the role of L1 in social communication, it seems that L2 output is the highest result of the concept of interaction. Cook (2001) states that classroom communication in L2 has been encouraged to offer learners a naturally communicative atmosphere. Keeping in view the preceding thoughts, it is asserted by Halliwell and Jones (1991) that using L2 as a practical and normal means of communication is promising. To achieve success in learning L2, learners should be optimistic about taking risks in practising equally speaking and understanding in L2. Halliwell and Jones (1991) describe that the reason is that learners can realize the message even when they do not know the accurate meaning of words or structures; this viewpoints to that learners do not require comprehending all the words they hear as long as they are able to understand the message. Macdonald (1993) thinks that the centre of attention on L2 can improve communication and stimulate both conscious and unconscious learning. It also generates confidence in learners and challenges them to communicate with others through their restricted language. A suggestion offered by Macdonald (1993) to teachers is that if you get stuck in the middle of a lesson, strive to communicate your message through other ways, such as mime or demonstration. This directs to the question: What if miming and demonstrations do not work for some reason? Methods and opinions which are discussed preceding call for avoiding L1 rely on two most important weak suppositions, as recognized by Cook (2001). The first proposition is the resemblance between L1 and L2 learning processes, and the second supposition is that learning L1 and L2 is a separate procedure. Both the assumptions are talked about methodically in the subsequent part.

About the use of L1 in L2 classrooms, a number of arguments have been given. Chavez (2003) says that many researchers and language

practitioners want L1 not to occur at all in foreign language classroom settings. Elridge (1996), in the same line of thought, asserts that the use of L1 in L2 classroom produces short-term benefits to the foreign language learner but with the jeopardy of hampering long-term acquisition. It is affirmed by Duff and Polio (1990) that maximizing the use of L2 and minimizing the use of L1 is necessary, and it provides necessary exposure for L2 acquisition. On the other hand, it is also asserted by Cook (2008) that L1 should be avoided in L2 classrooms because it doesn't happen in first language acquisition, and the two languages should be kept separate in mind. She gives an argument that when children acquire the first language, they do not have another language to rely on. So, L2 learners should learn the second language in the same way they acquired their first language; without referring to an extra language. Cook's second statement urges keeping the two languages divided. It means, to learn L2 proficiently, students should use it independently from the first language. However, it is thought by Spada and Ligh brown (1999) that L2 learning is not considered separate from L1, and it has interactions with it.

Mentors and learners are normally proscribed from using their L1 in L2 classroom tasks. According to Cook (2005), one reason presented for this is that teachers need to recognize that the second language (L2) user is a particular kind of person in their own right with their own knowledge of the first language (L1) and the L2, rather than a monolingual with an added L2. If language teachers take this as a starting point and foundation their teaching on it, then they had better realize the needs and minds and of L2 learners. But here, the question emerges that what about the use of L1 in L2 classroom. To clarify this situation, it is viewed by Qi (1998) that the use of L1 seems to be a natural and cognitive behaviour in a bilingual mind engaging in an L2 assignment. Moreover, it is also believed by Wells (1998) that L1 can play an important role in the shared performance of tasks in L2, and consequently, in the creation of opportunities for learning L2. If students, for instance, are working in groups, they do not have to persistently speak English; they can use their mother tongue/L1. With this activity, they can triumph over L2 difficulties and attain effective communication with each other. In this situation, the use of L1 appears not merely as a tool to generate content but, more prominently, as a means to construct a social and cognitive space in which learners are able to provide themselves with help throughout the assignment (Anton and DiCamilla, 1999). In favour of collaborative performance, Turnbull and Arnett (2002) maintain that in a study that focused on the use of L1 made by 22 pairs of grade 8 French immersion students completing either a dictogloss or a jigsaw, the use of L1 during collaborative tasks took place for three most important reasons-increasing efficiency, focusing attention, and facilitating interpersonal interactions. As a consequence of using L1, students were able to attain accomplishment in their tasks more easily and effectively. It was added by Turnbull and Arnett that teachers could facilitate students' learning process by having L1 as the main source in the classroom.

Research Questions

i. What is the impact of National language/L1 use in L2 learning on the proficiency of the students?
ii. What is the influence of students' mother tongue on the use of National Language/L1 in L2 learning?

Methods and Materials

Since the objective of the current study was to explore the impact of L1 use in L2 learning on the proficiency of the students in the English language classroom, for this purpose, a questionnaire was used as the major research tool by the researcher. It was stated by Beale (2002) that research methodology should have a description of participants, target institutions, sampling plan, data collection procedures and instruments.

The data collection procedure, therefore, was of quantitative type. The quantitative part found out college and university students' perceptions in general about L1 use in English classrooms. The quantitative measurement assisted in collecting a huge amount of data from a large group of participants simply from the questionnaire. The selected approach offered the tool to get information from inside and to explore in more detail each issue from the participants. The site selected for study was government colleges and universities located in the home division of the researcher and two other divisions like Multan and Bahawalpur, so it

would be considered easy to make a good connection with the respondents. There English in daily communication is rarely found. The student's life outside the class is mainly based on their mother tongue only. Participants' number consisted of at least 550 college and university students: 225 were male, and 225 were female studying at their third and fourth year B.Com, BA, BSc, and BS in the 2015 academic year.

Since to respond to the questions of the current study quantitative research method was employed, and for this purpose, a questionnaire was devised. With a view to determining the subjects' judgment of the use of L1 in their L2 classes, the researcher constructed a Students' questionnaire as a data collection technique used in this study. The questionnaire was developed from the studies by Elmetwally (2012), Al-jadidi, Husna Suleiman S. (2009), Maniruzzaman (2003) and Rahman (2006) as models with slight modification on the grounds of the researcher's personal seven years of teaching experience and these few adaptations and modifications were also supported by Johnson (1992) who noted that "what makes a high-quality questionnaire is building on theory and earlier research; building on preceding work not only assists in improving the quality of tools but allows researchers to share the findings of similar studies to one another". The ended form of the questionnaire was the product of my own readings in the literature, joint with my own manifestations and understanding of the subject.

Similarly, one of the most important purposes of these necessary modifications and adaptations was to appeal to the Pakistani context. The questionnaires had two parts, i.e. demographic information and 75 statements which were based on the format of a typical five-level Likert item.

Description of the Proposed Questionnaire

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage of Age Group of the Participants (N=577)

Age Groups	Frequency	Percentage
17-19 (years)	445	77
20-22 (years)	132	23
Total	577	100.0

Table 1. indicates data about the frequency and percentage of the age group of the participants (students). The data of 577 respondents (male and female) was divided into two categories of age groups. In the first category of age group (17-19 years), there were 445 participants who were 77% of the total number. In the second category of age group (20-22 years), there were 132 respondents who were 23% of 577 respondents.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage of Gender of the Participants (Students N=577)

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Female	276	48
Male	301	52
Total	577	100.0

Table 2. shows data about the frequency and percentage of the gender of the participants. In this table, the received data was divided into male and female categories, and in the female gender category, there were 276 respondents who were 48% of the total of 577 participants, and in the male gender category, 301 participants were included who were 52% of the total number of respondents.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage of the Participants year of Education (Students N=577)

Year of study	Frequency	Percentage
3rd	434	75
4th	143	25
Total	577	100.0

Table 3. shows the next variable selected for the current study, and this was the frequency and percentage of the participants' year of education. In this variable, 3rd and 4th year students were selected and were put into two different categories. In the first category, 434 participants were included that indicated 75% of 577. In the second category, 143 students participated, and this was 25% of the total population.

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage of the Participants Institution Wise (Students N=577)

Institution	Frequency	Percentage
Public	465	80.6
Private	112	19.4
Total	577	100.0

Table 4. presents data about the frequency and percentage of the participants' institution wise. In this table, the received data was divided into public and private institutions, and it was reported that 465 respondents got most of their education from the public sector institutions, which was 80.6% of the total 577. In the second category, 112 participants were reported who received a large part of their education from the private institutions, and it was 19.4 per cent of the sample.

Table 5. Frequency and Percentage of the Participants English Learning Start Wise (Students N=577)

Year of learning L2	Frequency	Percentage
1-above	319	55
6-above	258	45
Total	577	100.0

Table 5. shows the next variable selected for the present study, and this was the frequency and percentage of the participants' year of learning a foreign language. In this variable, the whole population was divided into two different categories, i.e. from 1 to above and 6 to above. In the first category, 319 participants were included that indicated 55% of 577. In the second category, 258 students participated, and this was 45% of the total population.

Table 6. Frequency and Percentage of the Participants Self-rated Proficiency Wise (N=577)

Self- rated proficiency	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	137	23.7
Satisfactory	240	41.6
Good	149	25.8
Excellent	50	8.7
Total	577	100.0

Table 6. shows the data gathered from the participants through frequency and percentage of the participants' self-rated proficiency. In this table, the received data was divided into four self-rated proficiency levels, i.e. poor, satisfactory, good and excellent. In the first self-rated proficiency level, it was reported that 137 students responded to their self-rated proficiency as poor, and it was 23.7% of the total number. Two hundred forty participants reported their L2 proficiency level satisfactory, and this showed 41.6% of the whole sample. In the third level of foreign language proficiency, 149 students participated, and this was 25.8 of the population. Fifty respondents replied their level of L2 proficiency was excellent, and it was only 8.7 of the entire population.

Table 7. Mean Score criteria

High	Strongly Agree
	4.5 to 5.0

	Agree 3.5 to 4.4
Medium	Sometime used 2.5 to 3.4
Low	Disagree 1.5 to 2.4
	Strongly Disagree 1.0 to 1.4

Table 7. Leads toward the mean score, criteria adopted from Oxford (1990) having the object of enhanced comprehension of the overall scale use and use of all categories. Such a type of taxonomy has been a well-liked statistical analysis of the scale with all its categories. Hence the same criterion is adopted to enhance comprehension of the results of the current data analysis.

Table 8. Reliability of the Scale = .939

Scale Category	Reliability
Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.805
Impact of L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy	0..742
The reasoning of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.764
Situation & Atmosphere of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.825
Contribution of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.869

Table 9. Showing Frequency of Students' reported on the overall scale of L1 use in L2 pedagogy

	No. of students	Mean	SD
Overall scale L1 Use	577	3.47	0.71

In Table 9 descriptive statistics indicated that the participants responded to a High degree of L1 use in L2 learning but overall near to the medium having the value (M=3.47, SD=0.71).

Table 10. Showing Frequency of Students' Reported on Five Categories of Scale

Scale Categories	No. of students	Mean	SD	Frequency of Category
Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2	577	3.44	0.51	Medium
Impact of L1 use in L2	577	3.41	0.55	High
The reasoning of L1 use in L2	577	3.39	0.54	Medium
Situation & Atmosphere of L1 use in L2	577	3.53	0.53	High
Contribution of L1 use in L2	577	3.57	0.61	High

Table 10 showing all five scale categories in the present study were used as High to medium range. The most preferred category reported was Contribution of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy (M=3.57, SD=0.61), Situations of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy (M=3.53, SD=0.53), Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy (M=3.44, SD=0.51), Impact of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy(M=3.41 SD=0.55) and the medium Reasoning of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy (M=3.39, SD=0.54).

Table 11. Showing analysis of variance ANOVA students' Proficiency with five Categories

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Perception	Between Groups	1573.122	4	393.280	2.819	.025
	Within Groups	79809.593	572	139.527		
	Total	81382.715	576			
Impact	Between Groups	912.863	4	228.216	3.871	.004
	Within Groups	33718.744	572	58.949		

	Total	34631.607	576			
	Between Groups	513.992	4	128.498	2.293	.058
Reasoning	Within Groups	32053.384	572	56.037		
	Total	32567.375	576			
	Between Groups	605.369	4	151.342	2.196	.068
Situation & Atmosphere	Within Groups	39419.961	572	68.916		
	Total	40025.330	576			
	Between Groups	1033.212	4	258.303	2.836	.024
Contribution	Within Groups	52096.767	572	91.078		
	Total	53129.978	576			

**. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.*

Table 11 indicates the analysis of variance (ANOVA) of student's language proficiency with respect to the five scale categories. It reveals results and findings of ANOVA with relation to respondents (students) of this study. The interaction of students' language proficiency with the first sub-category reveals the statistically most significant correlation of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 with F= 2.819 and P=.025, the second sub-category also reveals the most significant correlation of the Impact of L1 use in L2 with F= 3.871 statistically and P=.004, but Reasoning of L1 use in L2 with F=2.293 and P=.058 showed statistically near to significant. On the other hand, the fourth sub-category, Situation and Atmosphere of L1 use in L2 with F=2.191 and P=.068, showed a statistically non-significant correlation. But the fifth and the last sub-category, which is the Contribution of L1 use in L2 with F= 2.836 and P=.024, showed the most significant correlation statistically.

Table 12. Showing mean Comparison of Students Self-Rated Language Proficiency with five Categories

Proficiency		Perception	Impact	Reasoning	Situation	Contribution
	Mean	73.7512	45.2951	38.5347	43.2965	46.6199
Poor	N	137	137	137	137	137
	Std. Deviation	10.09376	7.51632	8.12718	8.64651	9.73583
	Mean	71.6508	44.5405	37.9806	42.5022	46.8932
Satisfactory	N	240	240	240	240	240
	Std. Deviation	11.97819	7.04802	6.78680	8.13064	8.96369
	Mean	70.8743	43.2210	36.9111	42.2261	46.3965
Good	N	149	149	149	149	149
	Std. Deviation	13.25512	8.53383	8.07368	8.83460	10.65736
	Mean	74.3436	44.6929	37.9100	43.0215	46.0971
Excellent	N	50	50	50	50	50
	Std. Deviation	10.74662	8.31140	7.01985	6.22904	8.07236

Table 12 illustrates the results of the mean comparison of students' self-rated language proficiency with the five sub-categories. The perception and belief of L1 use L2 sub-category indicate that 'Excellent' category has maximum mean value (M=74.343) than Poor category (M=73.751), Satisfactory category (M=71.650) and 'Good' category (M=70.874). On the contrary, the impact of L1 use in the L2 sub-category shows that the 'Poor' category has a maximum mean value (M=45.295) than the 'Excellent' category (M=44.692), 'Satisfactory' category (M=44.540) and 'Good' category (M= 43.221). Similarly, the third sub-category, which is the reasoning of L1 use in L2, reveals that the 'Poor' category has a maximum value (M=38.534) than the 'Satisfactory' category (M=37.980), 'Excellent' category (M=37.910) and 'Good' category (M=36.911). The situation and atmosphere of L1 use in the L2 category, which is

the fourth sub-category, indicate that the 'Poor' category has the maximum value (M=43.296) than the 'Excellent' category (M=43.021), Satisfactory category (M=42.502) and 'Good' category (M=42.226). The fifth and last sub-category, which is the 'Contribution of L1 use in L2', showed that the Satisfactory category carries the maximum value (M=46.893) than 'Poor' category (M= 46.619), 'Good' category (M= 46.396) and 'Excellent' category (M=46.097).

Discussions on the Findings

The answers to the research questions and the discussions on those answers are as under:

Research Question # 01

What is the impact of National language/L1 use in L2 learning on the proficiency of the students?

Statistically, the most significant correlation of students' self-rated language proficiency was found in the first sub-category of the main scale, such as perception and belief of national language/L1 use in L2 and the same type of self-rated students' language proficiency was found in the sub-categories of impact and contribution of L1 use in L2.

Compare mean results of students' self-rated language proficiency showed that in the first sub-category, the category 'Excellent' showed the highest mean value and the 'Good' category showed the lowest mean value. In the impact sub-category, the highest mean value was found in the 'Poor' category, and the lowest correlation was found in the 'Good; category and the same correlation was found in the sub-category of reasoning of national language/L1 use in L2. In the atmosphere sub-category, the highest mean value was in the 'Excellent' category, and the lowest mean value was found in the 'Good' category. In the case of a contribution of Urdu/national language use in L2 pedagogy, all the mean values of self-rated language proficiency like 'Poor, Satisfactory, Good and excellent' showed nearly the same mean values.

The research findings indicated that the students' outlook toward the use of national language/L1 in English language classroom differs according to their self-rated English language proficiency level. As the study clearly shows that the students who reported their self-rated English language proficiency level as 'Poor' or 'Satisfactory' showed a highly positive attitude regarding the use of L1 in English classroom. The current study correlates with the results of Prodromou (2002) and Mouhanna (2009) as their findings also indicate that due to their low proficiency level in L2, they have a more positive attitude toward using Arabic.

Research Question# 02

What is the influence of students' mother tongue on the use of the National Language in L2 learning?

Correlation between students' variable (mother tongue) and National Language (Urdu) use in L2 learning statistically, the most significant correlation of students' mother tongue was found with perception and belief of national language use in the target language classroom and the same correlation was found with the impact of L1 use in L2. But 'reasoning' of L1 use in L2 showed a statistically non-significant correlation. Conversely, the fourth sub-category, situation and atmosphere of L1 use in L2, showed the most significant correlation statistically. On the other hand, the fifth and the last sub-category, which is the contribution of L1 use in L2, showed a statistically non-significant correlation.

Results of the sub-categories of 'perception/belief and impact' of L1 use in L2 revealed that students showed highly positive attitudes regarding L1 use in their EFL classrooms. The findings of the research indicated that the students revealed a highly positive attitude toward the use of L1 in L2 classroom with respect to 'perception/belief and impact' of L1 use in L2 sub-categories' and this correlation is the most significant as the students are prompted to use L1 to become more proficient in English language and literature. Similarly, they were highly motivated to use Urdu while comprehending summaries and short questions, letter writing and paraphrasing the text in BA/BSc and B.Com courses.

Compare Mean of Students' Mother Tongue

In the case of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) indicated the highest mean value, and the Punjabi mother tongue showed the lowest mean value. Similarly, the impact of L1 use in the L2 sub-category shows that other languages (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) category signified the highest

mean value, and the Urdu mother tongue indicated the lowest mean value. The third sub-category, the reasoning of L1 use in L2, reveals that other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) has the highest mean value and Punjabi mother tongue indicated the lowest mean value. The situation and atmosphere of L1 use in the L2 category indicate that other languages category (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) has the highest mean value and Punjabi mother tongue has the lowest mean value. The fifth and last sub-category, which is the 'Contribution of L1 use in L2, shows that other languages (Bloch, Pushto and Rangri) category carries the highest mean value and Punjabi mother tongue showed the lowest mean value.

Results about the use of students' mother tongue revealed that the native speakers of Balochi, Pushto and Rangri are highly motivated and desirous of using their mother tongues in their EFL classroom and the possible reason behind this intention was their poor schooling and low proficiency level in L2. Contrary to it, Urdu speakers are highly discouraged from using their mother tongue in L2 classroom as they want to attain high proficiency level in L2.

Similarly, findings of the study also indicated that the students who have Balochi, Pushto and Rangri languages as their mother tongue in the second sub-category are highly motivated and have a high tendency toward the use of their mother tongue in their L2 classroom setting due to the socio-cultural factors such as their limited access to the quality education, their restricted aptitude toward English language and their emotional attachment with their mother tongues. On the other hand, native speakers of the Punjabi language are highly dispirited to use their mother tongue in L2 classroom as they want to attain maximum exposure and high proficiency level in L2. The same results are repeated in the sub-category 'contribution' of L1 use in L2. Similarly, Macdonald (1993) believes that the focus on L2 can improve communication and set in motion both mindful and unconscious learning. Moreover, it creates confident learners and challenges them to communicate with others through their restricted language.

Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

The outcomes and results of the present research present and suggest two optimistic conclusions. Primarily, it gets clear from the findings that the teachers who engaged in this research used too much and showed highly positive perceptions toward the use of national language (Urdu) in the foreign language classroom, which is favorable for the students and their learning to some extent. Previously, it was assumed that the use of L1 may or may not be a facilitating tool or a language obstacle. The more and more use of the foreign language should remain the main objective, and therefore, teachers and learners should be aware of the superfluous use of L1 only to facilitate their teaching and learning activities. Secondly, it also comes into view that it is so easy for teachers to use L1 not only as a useful teaching technique to solve difficult concept or situation but as the main medium of instruction. This type of behavior in L2 classroom might be proved destructive both for teachers and students. So, it can be concluded from the above discussion that the target language should remain the main language to be used in the foreign language classroom however, with the limited and judicious use of L1 in some situations.

Contribution/Originality of the Study

Since this study attempted to reveal the impact of National language/L1 use in L2 learning on the proficiency of the students at Degree level in the Southern Punjab (Multan, Bahawalpur and DG Khan), its significance stemmed from the following considerations:

1. The current study is significant since it shows and determines whether learners are ready to accept and use L1 (Urdu) in EFL classrooms.
2. Information from the current study concerning EFL students' attitudes toward using L1 motivates students in an L2 classroom.
3. The current study would assist curriculum developers in designing appropriate syllabi to make EFL teaching and learning more beneficial in the Pakistani context.
4. The use of L1, L2 contributes to students' potential development of meaning.

Limitations of the Study and Research Gaps

In the course of executing this study, a number of restrictions were witnessed, and research breaches were generated as discovered below:

i. The sample of this work consists of male and female L2 learners, and they were undergraduate students. So, additional researches on this topic can be executed on school going students and Postgraduate level (MPhil & PhD) to view the all-inclusive perspective and opinion of the target population.
ii. These learners were only from public sector universities and colleges of South Punjab. Contrary to this, in future researches, sub-campuses of the public sector universities, private colleges and universities can also be included for a better understanding of the concern.
iii. This study was conducted at the Government colleges/universities of the Southern Punjab (Dera Ghazi Khan, Multan and Bahawalpur Divisions). But in future, this study can be expanded to the country level for the conclusive viewpoint of the notion.

References

Al-jadidi, Husna, S. S. (2009). Teaching English as a foreign language in Oman: an exploration of English Language teaching pedagogy in tertiary education. PhD thesis, *Victoria University*.

Anton, M., & DiCamilla, F. J. (1999). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 83*, 233-247.

Brooks, N. H. (1964). Language and language learning: theory and practice. New York: *Harcourt, Brace & World.*

Brown, J. D. (2001). Using surveys in language programs. New York: *Cambridge University Press*.

Byram, M. ed., (2000). The Routledge encyclopedia of language teaching and learning .London: *Routledge Publications*.

Chavez, M. (2003). The diglossic foreign-language classroom: Learner's views on L1 and L2 functions. In C. Blyth (Ed.) The sociolinguistics of foreign-language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native, and the non-native speaker. Issues in Language Program Direction, a Series of Annual Reports (pp. 163-208). *Boston, Thomson and Heinle*.

Cook, V. (2001). Second Language Learning and Language Teaching. London: Oxford University Press.

Cook, V. (2005). Basing teaching on the L2 user. In E. Llurda, (Ed.), Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession (pp. 47-61). New York: *Springer.*

Cook, V. (2008). Second language learning and language teaching (4th Ed.). London: *Hodder Education.*

Duff, P., & Polio C. (1990). How Much Foreign Language Is There in the Foreign Language Classroom? *The Modern Language Journal, 74*(2), 154- 166.

Elmetwally, E. E. (2012). Students' and teachers' attitudes toward the use of learners' mother tongue in English language classrooms in UAE public high schools. Unpublished Master's Thesis, The British University in Dubai, UAE.

Elridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *English Language Teaching Journal, 50*(4), 303-311.

Gouin, F. (1892). The art of teaching and studying languages. (H. Swan, & V. Betis, Trans.). New York: Longmans, Green & Co.; London: *George Phillip & Son*.

Halliwell, S., & Jones, B. (1991). On target teaching in the target language. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Howatt, A. P. R.(2004). A History of English Language Teaching. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*.

Johnson, K. E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Reading Behaviour, 24*(1).

Kangas, S (1981) Bilingualism or not, Bank House, 8a Hill Road, clevedon, Avon BS21 7HH, England.

Krashen, S., (1981). Second language acquisition and second language learning. Oxford: *Pergamon*.

Larsen-Freeman, D., (2000). Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. 2nd ed. Oxford: *Oxford University Press.*

Macaro, E. (1997). Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy. Clevedon, UK: *Multilingual Matters.*

Macdonald, C., (1993). Using the target language. Cheltenham: *Mary Glasgow*.

Maniruzzaman, M. (2003). 'The use of mother tongue in the EFL classroom: learner's reaction.' Harvest: *Jahangirnagar Studies in Literature, 18.*

Mouhanna, M. (2009). Re-examining the role of L1 in the EFL classroom. UGRU Journal, vol. 8 (spring), pp. 1-19.

Prodromou, L. (2002). From mother tongue to other tongue. *Teaching English [online*].

Qi, D. S. (1998). An inquiry into language-switching in second language composing processes. *The Canadian Modern Language, 54*(3), 413-435.

Rahman, S. (2006). Speech Repertoires in Bangladesh: Monolingual or Multilingual, in ELT in Bangladesh: a Socio-psychological Study of Public and Private Universities in Dhaka, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. *Jawaharlal Nehru University. India*.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). Approaches and methods in language teaching. New York: *Cambridge University Press*.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (1999). Instruction, first language influence, and developmental readiness in second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal, 83*(1), 1-22.

Stern, H. H. (1983). Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*.

Stern, H. H. (1992). Issues and Options in Language Teaching. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: the uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 251-274.

Tang, J. (2002) Using l1 in the English Classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 40*, 36-43. http://exchanges.state.gov.forum/vols/vol40/no1/p36.pdf

Turnbull, M. & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' use of the target language and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 204-218.

UNESCO (1953). The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education, *Paris, UNESCO*.

Wells, G. (1998). Using L1 to master L2: A response to Antón and DiCamilla's, socio- cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classrooms'. *The Canadian Modern Language, 54*(3), 343-353.

Wells, G. (1999). Dialogic inquiry: Towards a socio-cultural practice and theory of education. New York: *Cambridge University Press*.