

Citation: Ahsan, M., Younus, N., & Naeem, M. (2020). The Effect of Teachers' and Learners' Gender Variation on the Responses about L1 use in L2 Pedagogy. *Global Educational Studies Review*, V(III), 72-82.

[https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2020\(V-III\).o8](https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2020(V-III).o8)



The Effect of Teachers' and Learners' Gender Variation on the Responses about L1 use in L2 Pedagogy

Muhammad Ahsan*

Noshaba Younus[†]

Muhammad Naeem[‡]

Vol. V, No. III (Summer 2020)

Pages: 72 – 82

DOI: 10.31703/gesr.2020(V-III).o8

Abstract: *The focus of the present study was to find out the impact of teachers' and learners' gender variation on the responses about L1 use in L2 pedagogy at degree level. To explore a clear comprehension of the current topic, the study aimed at 577 learners and 156 teachers. The data collection was done through student-teacher questionnaires. The data were examined using SPSS (statistical package for social sciences) version 23. Data were analyzed with the help of descriptive analysis. The results of the present research show that L2 learners (male & female) and English teachers (male & female) exhibited an extremely positive tendency in regard to the use of L1 in the English classroom. Responses to the statements, overall, noted from the chosen senior to junior teachers show that letting mother tongue in foreign language classrooms is beneficial in Pakistani context as the ban of mother tongue from English class will cast a negative impact on their apprehension of EFL.*

Key Words: Gender, Pedagogy, EFL, Classroom, L1, L2

Introduction

The subject matter of the use of learners' native language (L1) in the foreign language (L2) classroom has been debated for many years. Steven Krashen, with his Natural Approach to Language Acquisition, proposed that students learn their L2 much in the similar way that they learn their L1, and that second language is best learnt by means of massive amounts of exposure to the language with limited time absorbed using first language (Tang, 2002). However, in current years, stress has been transferring toward L1 of an individual may feasibly be defined as the mother tongue or native language, and all these terms are used as an alteration. On the other hand, this does not mean that they are always employed to show a similar object in other conditions. Stern (1983) similarly, expands the circle of this term and discloses that these expressions may refer either to the language acquired first in premature life or to a language which was acquired later but has come to be the governing one. Kangas (1981) states L1 as the language one dreams in, the language one reflects in, and the language one computes in. She classifies characteristics of native language into four main categories. 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 the first language as the language which someone gets in initial years and which generally becomes his/her natural tool of thought and communication (UNESCO, 1953; cited in Hamers & Blanc, 2000). All the above-described terms, for the purpose of the current study, will be used to show the language acquired first at home or institution in youth and still influence and functioning as a national language. A large number of language teachers and researchers showed multiple areas and situations where the use of L1 may produce helpful outcomes in L2 teaching/learning. Auerbach (1993). In this line of action, recommends the below given possible occasions for using L1: record keeping; classroom management; language analysis; scene-setting; negotiation of the syllabus and the lesson; presentation of the rules governing grammar, morphology, phonology, and spelling, instructions,

*Lecturer, Department of English, Ghazi University Dera Ghazi Khan, KP, Pakistan. Email: mahsan@gudgk.edu.pk

[†]Department of English, Riphah International University Faisalabad Campus, Punjab, Pakistan.

[‡]Department of English, Ghazi University Dera Ghazi Khan, KP, Pakistan.

discussion of cross-cultural issues, assessment of comprehension and explanation of errors. Many teachers discover that the use of mother tongue gives more time to exercise the second language because comprehension is achieved much more speedily. The main point with teacher uses of L1 is that it can be utilized for clarification purposes after a try has been made to communicate ideas in a foreign language and students until now seem to be demented. The idea is that L1 assists a 'supportive and facilitating role in the EFL classroom' (Tang, 2002) and not that it is the main language of communication. The use of the first language also allows students to become more mindful of the differences and similarities between linguistic structures and cultures, and this may enlarge the exactness of translations. Finding resemblances between languages shapes 'interlinked L1 and L2 knowledge in the students' minds' (Cook, 2001).

So, keeping in mind the above-mentioned view, the present study probed into the reactions of the direct practitioners, both providers (teachers) and receivers (students), of the L2 teaching activities concerning the degree of the use of L1 and the target language inside the EFL classroom. Language learning has its own ordeals, especially when it is the language that you were not born with; you need to struggle even more. New learners in an informal L2 learning situation are permitted to be silent till they are ready to speak, while mature teachers are often forced to speak (Lightbown & Spada, 1993). Develop what would happen if you study English in a controlled setting: nowhere in your country involves English communication eliminating your expensively artificial classroom. English in this environment, at best, is just the beautification of your wisdom. Resultantly, one of the encounters in this condition is the neighbouring context. Your cognitive process, in fact, belongs to one language while in class, you need to be wide-open to another world: an L2 world which is unusual to your habits and routines. What if in the limited situation, in class, you are excitedly motivated to use only English? As students, this might be a frightening job. Why? They simply, first, live their own life with their mother tongue: for studying other issues, talking with their friends and family, travelling, or even discussing with teachers at dinnertime. To make things more problematic, the students might have only two or four hours per week to exercise English in class. The input that learners are revealed to is important to make their language teaching happen (Ellis, 1997). The input is very limited here, yet. Second thing, language learning is like planting flowers. To develop at a suitable pace, it takes time. With utmost love and care, little young flowers will handsomely bloom. Language learners are like flowers: beautiful but different. They have countless hopes, beliefs, state of affairs and desired to learn ways. Whilst a language lesson conveys a constructive textbook, learners may not value this if they do not see any bridge between an examination they are working toward and the book (Richards, 2001). In the same way, what language a teacher uses (L1/L2) in an English classroom is as imperative as to how the students feel toward it. Whether or not to use Urdu in the language classroom: the students' opinions are noteworthy.

Why Employ L1 in L2 Classroom?

The current study, however, does not explore the cultural and political implications of L2 teaching in Pakistan thoroughly. Still, the truth that multilingual/bilingualism non-native English-speaking instructors in Pakistan present their students a totally different set of cultural understandings in the way that they interact, teach, and speak with learners and in their choice of languages and materials.

Motivational Reasons for L1 Use in L2 Classroom

Initially, when a learner gets into a language classroom, he/she carries excessive motivation, whether instrumental or integrative or both (Gardner and Lambert, 1972). Once the learning has initiated, things are not so uncomplicated to make a difference. His/her starting achievement may magnify higher motivation which, in turn, will urge the student to extend more effort, priority, and time to his/her learning and to name more laurel, thus making a remarkable circle. An untamed circle is also fairly possible. When students, especially adults, start to focus on a language class, they bring not only get-up-and-go but also a bit of anxiety. L2 is unknown to them, and they are not certain whether they will be victorious or fail in mastering it. For early learners, the first a smaller number of classes are important they should be a little challenging; however, encouragingly, not threatening. The feeling here is how to motivate and carry on the students' motivation. To make them learn, the teacher should offer what the

student is prepared to learn, i.e., what he is clever at learning, not necessarily what he wants to learn ([Claxton, 1984](#)). Thereafter the question is: are the adults good at learning L2 through L2 solitary? Perhaps some are. Many are not, however. In learning of English as L2/second language, for example, a Pakistani student in the United Kingdom, most of the students, whether they are proficient or not, will carry on learning since they have instant use of the second language, in this case, English in the U.K. In conditions where English is a second language or L2 such as in Pakistan, things are different to some extent. A number of L2 learners who are not competent enough may increasingly drop out or plainly let down because they can live in this world quite merrily without learning L2. Additionally, it is highly complicated to bridge the gulf between their restricted capability to talk in foreign language and the ideas they desire to share if the class is arranged completely in L2. In this sort of classroom, it is hoped that the teacher and the students have nothing to converse all the informal and in order to maintain the student's motivation in a perfect sphere, appropriate use of mother tongue in the classroom is helpful.

Psychological Reasons for Teachers Using L1 in L2 Classroom

There are some psychological benefits for proper use of L1, just as much as the student wants, for sufficient time, and for the precise levels for both the students and teachers:

- Teacher may hit upon it more accepted to propose psychotherapy in L1
- If teacher is not experienced to explain or illustrate something in English, he/she will feel better if he/she does accordingly in L1 rather than to pay no heed to the issue

Psychological Reasons for Learners Using L1 in L2 Classroom

- The use of L1 offers respite from using L2 all the time
- It replaces the anxiety at times of emotional disturbance such as the first encounter with the problems faced in the learning process specifically at graduation level, asking for counselling (even highly mature students if they desire to do so), inspection and as a superior substitute than remaining noiseless

Learners' Objectives for L1 Use in the Target Language Classroom

[Harmer \(1898\)](#) states out a huge number of reasons for the learners' tendency to use L1 in English lessons. Sometimes teacher offers students to do something (e.g., to speak about a difficult subject matter) which they are not proficient at managing with their reduced knowledge of L2. In this condition, the practice of the L1 is necessary. Teachers should think more attentively about the actions they choose in order to choose tasks corresponding with the learners' linguistic capability. In contrast, the countless exercises of the laborious tasks which learners cannot perform even with the huge struggle can bring about stress which can, again and again, cause detestation to the topic. Mother tongue is the most natural way of describing themselves for all. It is used in every school subject and in the English lesson as well. Learners use it frequently and without reflecting. That is why [Harmer, \(2004\)](#) puts it in simple words, 'we try to make sense of a new linguistic (and conceptual) world through the linguistic world we were previously familiar with'. In the same manner of thought, [Butzkamm \(2003\)](#) states that native language is the main key to foreign languages, the instrument which gives us the most precise, fastest and most complete medium of accessing L2. In general, and most often, learners use their mother tongue for elucidating activities and tasks to other learners. The students' use of their first language can be over and over again impacted by the teacher. If instructors use the native language themselves, it is quite possible that learners will carry it out as well. The very last ground which Harmer presents highlights the role of the individual learning abilities and ways as some students are able to learn L2 with no use of their first language, but for the others, the mother tongue is a requirement. Students mostly keep away from using the L2 for the reason that they do not desire to feel uneasy about the mistakes they make, says Nation (2003). It can be positive to reassure the students that mistakes are a crucial part of learning and that there is no need to feel pain. A number of motivating reasons are put by Harmer, but there is at least one more which he does not mention. Many learners move to their first language in no time because they are sluggish. It is much easier for them to communicate a bit in mother tongue and if there is not any punishment from the teacher, they will not see any solid cause why to distress themselves by finding

apt English correspondents and will carry on in using the L1 every time they find an opportunity. This condition should be a word of warning for all considerate instructors. Once instructors allow their students to do what they want, they will cause big trouble with removing their vices. In consequence, every teacher should make a list of the rules at the beginning and maintain time and again on its devotion during the whole course. [Moon \(2000\)](#) states that for students who are not stupendously encouraged, it may involve too much struggle to try to understand.

Teachers' Objectives of L1 Use in L2 Settings

If learners bend to the L1 instead of speaking L2, it is, to a certain extent, comprehensible. But the problem comes when the teacher is the one who uses the mother tongue more than it is needed. But even teachers have got a number of serious causes why they keep away from English. The first type belongs most likely to those instructors who advocate that they come again to the first language in the classroom interaction because learners do not understand them. This is real because students actually do not comprehend quickly. But every teacher should understand that this is not the matter of a moment, but it is a long-term exercise which has to be progressively developed. In this situation, a translation could be a helpful means, but it should be used only when it is essentially necessary, acknowledges [Atkinson \(1993\)](#). Instructors cannot surrender after a few unsuccessful lessons even if students look totally baffled. It is good to try some other techniques and methods at first, like L2 demonstrations or definitions, and only when nothing of that works, the teacher should use translation. One more usual reason refers to the truth that instructors are not sure about their linguistic capacities. They will use mother tongue rather than getting themselves into the shameful state by making errors while talking in the L2. Such a matter when teachers do not become proficient in the language which they have to teach can be very unpleasant. The certainty about the pathetic second language communicative abilities can result in the feelings of inferiority, states plainly by [Rahman \(2006\)](#). These teachers do not even take part in any further education in order to them keep away from the shameful state. But learners' knowledge of the L2 is much worse, specifically at the elementary school, so they are not able to become mindful of most of the mistakes. [Atkinson \(1993\)](#) states that it is further constructive for learner to hear faulty English rather than no English and he also gives advice to the teachers not to perform too much care of their accuracy because such an overstated care over and over again leads to more and more mistakes. In a similar way, a good strategy could be to make a list of most frequent phrases, sentences and commands because in this way the role of the first language in classroom management can be minimized and the role of the L2 increased ([Nation, 2003](#)). Several teachers minimize the use of the second language because it is very time-taking to clarify everything in the L2 (particularly when the learners' level of the native language is low) and the shortage of time in the lesson on the one hand and amount of syllabus they are supposed to teach on the other hand do not allow them such a kill of time. Long explanations in the foreign language could take too much time, and finally, students could lose concentration and interest, the same opinion given by [Moon \(2000\)](#). To conclude, it is important to say that there are some bearable reasons for using the first language in English language teaching, but some of them might look like excuses. Instructors should watchfully think over when the use of the mother tongue is legitimate, and when it is not. In short, whenever English is not being used, there should be a solid reason for this ([Gill, 2005](#)). Admitting the thought that L1 in English classroom context is not just a display of instructors' or learners' failure, instructors could use it as a helpful tool in the classroom conversation. It has, however, to be determined judiciously in which part of the teaching process participation of the learners' L1 could be truly helpful and in which it could work rather in an unruly way. A number of classroom tasks in which it can be constructive to take advantage of the mother L1, suggests [Atkinson \(1987\)](#). The present study attained the rationale of investigating the effect of teachers' gender variation on the responses about L1 use in L2 pedagogy and to explore the outcome of learners' gender variation on the responses about the use of Urdu language in EFL classroom.

Research Questions

The current study contained the following research questions:

- Is there any effect of teachers' gender variation on the responses about the use of Urdu language in EFL pedagogy?
- What is the influence of learners' gender variation on the responses about L1 use in L2 pedagogy?

Methods and Materials

Since the purpose of the current study was to explore the impact of teachers' and learners' gender variation on the responses about L1 use in the L2 classroom. To attain this objective, the main research tool was questionnaires. Research methodology should include target institutions, sampling plan, description of participants, data collection instruments and procedures (Beale, 2002). The researcher used a mixed-method type. A research design that uses both quantitative and qualitative data to answer a particular question or set of questions is called a mixed method. Therefore, the data collection procedure was of twofold: qualitative and quantitative. The qualitative tool investigated in more detail their beliefs and opinions as to why they agree or disagree with L1 use and the quantitative part explored college students' perceptions in general about L1 use in English classrooms. The qualitative approach appropriately dealt with the data that could not be simply obtained from the questionnaires while the quantitative measurement helped in collecting the massive data from a large group of participants. The selected approach presented the tools to get information from inside and to find out in more detail each issue from the participants. To answer all of the queries in this study, a mixed-method type was the best possible way. Government colleges/universities located in the home division of the researcher and two other divisions like Multan and Bahawalpur were the selected site of this study so it would be much easy to develop a healthy link with the respondents. English in daily communication is rarely found there. The learners' life outside the class is mainly based on their L2 only. Participants' number consisted of at least 577 college and university students: 301 were female, and 276 were male studying at their third- and fourth-year BA, BSc, B. Com and BS in the academic year 2015. Since to answer the queries of the present study, both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used, and they would have questionnaires. In order to determine the subjects' judgment of the use of the first language in their second language classes, the researcher designed teachers' and learners' questionnaires were the only data collection technique used in the present study. These two questionnaires were designed from the studies by Husna Suleiman Al-Jadidi (2009), Maniruzzaman (2003), Elmetwally (2012), and Rahman (2006) as models with a slight change on the basis of researcher's personal seven years of teaching experience and these few modifications and adaptations were also supported by Johnson (1992) who states 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 product, the ended form of the questionnaires, was of my own readings in the literature, joint with my own manifestations and comprehension of the topic. One of the most crucial purposes of these necessary adaptations and modifications was to appeal to the Pakistani context, similarly. The questionnaires consisted of two parts, i.e. 75 statements which were based on the format of a typical five-level Likert item and demographic information.

Demographic Data of Student Participants

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 shows data about the frequency and percentage of the age group of the participants (learners). 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)

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

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

Demographic Information of Teacher Participants

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage of Gender of the Participants (Teachers)

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	75	48.5
Female	81	51.5
Total	156	100

Table 3 indicates the variable selected for the present study, and this was the frequency and percentage of the gender of the participants (teachers). In this table, the collected data was divided into male and female categories, and in the male gender category, there were 75 respondents who were 48.5% of total 156 participants, and in the female gender category, 81 participants were included which were 51.5% of the total number of respondents.

Table 4. Mean Score Criteria

High		Medium		Low	
Strongly Agree	4.5 to 5.0	Sometime Used	2.5 to 3.4	Disagree	1.5 to 2.4
Agree	3.5 to 4.4			Strongly Disagree	1.0 to 1.4

Table 4 guides toward the mean score; a criterion adopted from Oxford (1990) having the object of enhanced comprehension of the overall scale use and use of all categories. Such 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 understanding of the finding current data analysis.

Students Responses Analysis

Table 5. 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 6. Showing Frequency of Students' Reported on Overall Scale of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy

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

In Table 6, descriptive statistics indicated that the participants responded a High degree of first language use in second language learning but overall, near to the medium having the value (M=3.47, SD=0.71).

Frequency of Learners Reported on Five Categories Scale L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy

Table 7. Showing Frequency of Students' Reported on Five Categories of Scale

Scale Categories	No. of students	Mean	S. D	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 7 indicating all five scale categories in the current study were employed 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).

Teachers Responses Analysis

Table 8. Reliability of the Scale = .935

Scale Category	Reliability
Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.821
Impact of L1 Use on L2 Pedagogy	0.806
The reasoning of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.743
Situation & Atmosphere of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.778
Contribution of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.807

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

	No. of teachers	Mean	SD
Overall scale L1 Use	156	3.30	0.53

In table 9, the descriptive statistics showed that the participants responded to a Medium degree of L1 use in L2 learning (M=3.30, SD=0.53).

Frequency of Teachers' Responses on Five Categories Scale L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy

Table 10. Showing Frequency of Teachers' Responses on Five Categories of Scale

Scale Categories	No. of teachers	Mean	SD	Frequency Category
Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.10	0.61	Medium
Impact of L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.32	0.45	Medium
The reasoning of L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.37	0.64	Medium
Situation and atmosphere of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.27	0.43	Medium
Contribution of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.44	0.51	Medium

Table 10 depicting all five scale categories in the current study were employed as medium-range the most preferred category reported was contribution of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.44, SD=0.51), the reasoning of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.37, SD=0.64), the impact of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.32, SD=0.45), situation and atmosphere of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.27, SD=0.43) and perception & belief of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.10, SD=0.61).

Gender T-test

Table 11. Showing relation of Teachers' Gender on five Scale Categories

	Gender	N	Mean	S. D	F	P
Perception	Male	75	52.67	10.68	.121	.728
	Female	81	46.85	11.07		
Impact	Male	75	68.07	10.63	.814	.368
	Female	81	65.22	12.35		
Reasoning	Male	75	42.77	7.01	.071	.790
	Female	81	38.92	7.01		
Situation & Atmosphere	Male	75	44.16	8.16	.056	.814
	Female	81	41.53	8.04		
Contribution	Male	75	32.26	6.03	3.758	.054
	Female	81	30.16	6.89		

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

Main Five Scale Categories

- Perception and belief of L1 use in L2
- Impact of L1 use in L2
- The reasoning of L1 use in L2
- Atmosphere and Situation of L1 use in L2
- Contribution of L1 use in L2

Table 11 shows results of the T-test with relation to male and female participants (teachers) of the study, the interaction of gender with the sub-categories of the main scale category reveals statistically non-significant correlation of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 with $F = .121$ and $P = .728$, the impact of L1 use in L2 with $F = .814$ and $P = .368$, reasoning of L1 use in L2 with $F = .071$ and $P = .790$, situation and atmosphere of L1 use in L2 with $F = .056$ and $P = .814$ and the contribution of L1 use in L2 with $F = 3.75$ and $P = .054$ which is near to significant.

Gender T-test

Table 12. Showing Relation of Student's Gender on five Categories

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P
Perception & Belief	Male	301	73.4998	11.24256	5.743	.017
	Female	275	70.7165	12.37922		
Impact	Male	301	45.4013	7.83999	.565	.452
	Female	275	43.2281	7.50894		
Reasoning	Male	301	38.2240	7.62427	.392	.531
	Female	275	37.3536	7.39620		
Situation & Atmosphere	Male	301	43.2305	8.35314	.001	.982
	Female	275	41.9648	8.29707		
Contribution	Male	301	47.1690	9.60098	.007	.935
	Female	275	45.9423	9.59806		

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

Table 12 indicates findings and results of the T-test with relation to male and female participants (students) of the study, the interaction of gender with the sub-categories of the main scale category reveals statistically most significant correlation of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 with $F =$

5.743 and $P=.017$. On the other hand, the second sub-category, which is 'Impact of L1 use in L2' with $F=.565$ and $P=.452$ showed statistically non-significant correlation. Similarly, the third category which is reasoning of L1 use in L2 with $F=.392$ and $P=.531$ also carried statistically non-significant correlation, situation and atmosphere of L1 use in L2 with $F=.001$ and $P=.982$ and the contribution of L1 use in L2 with $F=.007$ and $P=.935$ both likewise showed statistically non-significant correlation.

Teachers' Results

Gender T-test

Relation of Gender on Five Scale Categories

T-test with relation to male and female participants (teachers) of the present study, the interaction of gender with the sub-categories of the main scale category reveals statistically non-significant correlation of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 with $F=.121$ and $P=.728$, Impact of L1 use in L2 with $F=.814$ and $P=.368$, Reasoning of L1 use in L2 with $F=.071$ and $P=.790$, Atmosphere and Situation of L1 use in L2 with $F=.056$ and $P=.814$ and the contribution of L1 use in L2 with $F=3.75$ and $P=.054$ which is near to significant.

Students Results

Gender T-test

T-test with relation to male and female participants (students) of the current study, the interaction of gender with the sub-categories of the main scale category reveals statistically most significant correlation of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 with $F=5.743$ and $P=0.017$. On the other hand, the second sub-category, which is 'Impact of L1 use in L2' with $F=.565$ and $P=.452$ showed a statistically non-significant correlation. Similarly, the third category which is Reasoning of L1 use in L2 with $F=.392$ and $P=.531$ also carried statistically non-significant correlation, Situation and atmosphere of L1 use in L2 with $F=.001$ and $P=.982$ and the contribution of L1 use in L2 with $F=.007$ and $P=.935$ both likewise showed statistically non-significant correlation.

Discussions on the Research Findings

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

RQ 1: Is there any effect of teachers' gender variation on the responses about the use of Urdu language in EFL pedagogy

Teachers' Gender

Results concerning the impacts of gender variation on the responses about native language use in a foreign language, the teachers (female and male) in case of all the sub-categories such as perception and belief, impact, reasoning, situation and contribution of L1 use in L2 indicated statistically non-significant correlation. Results of this study showcased that the relation between teachers' gender with other sub-categories of the main scale such as perception and belief, impact, reasoning, situation and contribution of L1 use in L2 revealed statistically non-significant correlation which means teachers' gender has no variation effects as teachers seem mature in this respect.

RQ 2: What is the influence of students' gender variation on the responses about L1 use in L2 pedagogy? Learners' Gender?

Results concerning the effects of gender variation on the responses about L1 use in L2, the learners (female and male) in case of perception and belief disclosed most significant correlation statistically, and in case of rest of the four sub-categories such as impact, reasoning, situation and contribution of L1 use in L2 showed statistically non-significant correlation. As explained in the above-mentioned results that learners have a highly motivational attitude toward the sub-category of the main scale, i.e. the 'perception and belief' of L1 use in L2 from statement 01-22. In these statements, female and male learners showed their responses mostly as strongly agreed and agreed because they get motivated when their

mentor uses their L1 in the classroom. The intention behind this purpose could be to make learners restful in the classroom so that they can sit in the class with comfort and pay maximum heed toward learning the L2. In this sub-category, some of the learners also exhibited their negative attitude as they are of the view that L1 stops them from learning English as it should be. On the other side, in the rest of the four sub-categories such as impact, reasoning, situation and contribution of L1 use in L2 students indicated their negative attitude with respect to their gender.

Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

The findings of the present research offer two beneficial inferences. Firstly, it turns out that the female and male teachers who contributed in this research used too much and exhibited a highly positive attitude towards the use of Urdu (L1) in English (L2) classroom setting, which is useful for the female and male teachers and their teaching to some degree. Formerly, it was supposed that the use of L1 may or may not be a helping tool or a language obstacle. Responses, overall, to the statements described from the selected senior to junior teachers signify that letting mother tongue in L2 classrooms is productive in Pakistani context as excluding L1 from English class will cast a negative effect on their understanding of the second language. The maximum use, however, of the English language should remain the prime focus and teachers should, therefore, be aware of the immoderate use of Urdu only to aid their teaching and learning activities. In addition, it is also seen that it is so uncomplicated for teachers to use mother tongue not only as a useful teaching technique to solve uneasy situation or concept but as the major means of instruction. This type of activity in the foreign language classroom might be proved nonproductive both for students and teachers. So, it can be concluded from the above discussion that L2 should be the main language to be used in the L2 classroom anyhow, with the judicious and limited use of L1 in some situations. In the same way, a large number of students, whose means of instruction was Urdu and starting learning English from class 6th indicated highly positive attitude concerning the use of Urdu in English classroom along with those students whose means of instruction was English and started English language learning from the very first class irrespective of gender discrimination. The originality

lity of the Study

Since the present study tried to disclose the impact of instructors' and learners' gender variation on the responses about first language use in second language pedagogy at Degree level in the Southern Punjab (Multan, Bahawalpur and D G Khan), its contribution stemmed from the below-given considerations:

- Since it determines and indicates whether teachers and learners are ready to accept and use L1 (Urdu) in EFL classrooms that is why the present study is well contributory in the said field.
- Information from the present study regarding EFL learners' and teachers' attitudes toward using L1 encourages students and teachers to use their L1 just to that extent by which they can only cater their teaching/learning understanding in an L2 classroom.
- The available study would help curriculum designers in developing proper syllabi to make foreign language teaching and learning more fruitful in the Pakistani context.
- The use of L1 in L2 situation provides to learners' and teachers' potential development of meaning.

Limitations of the Study and Research Gaps

- The current study was restricted to explore the impact of instructors' and learners' gender variation on the responses about first language use in second language pedagogy at degree level. But in future research on this subject matter can be implemented on school going L2 learners and their instructors simultaneously for grand view point of the marked population.
- The study was limited to survey the government universities and colleges of the Southern Punjab i.e., Dera Ghazi Khan, Multan and Bahawalpur Divisions. Contrary to this in future studies sub-campuses of the government sector universities, private universities, their sub-campuses and colleges can also be merged for boosted understanding of the issue.

References

- Al-jadidi, H. S. (2009) Teaching English as a foreign language in Oman: an exploration of English Language teaching pedagogy in tertiary education. PhD thesis, Victoria University.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241-247.
- Atkinson, D. (1993). Teaching in the Target Language: A Problem in the Current Orthodoxy. *Language Learning Journal*, 8(93), 2-5.
- Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL*, 4, 50-70
- Beale, J. (2002). Is communicative language teaching a thing of the Past? *TESOL*, 37(1), 12-16. Retrieved on September, 06th, 2008 on the World Wide Web: http://www.jasonbeal.essaypages/ clt_essay.html
- 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.
- Claxton, G. (1984) Live and Learn, Buckingham: *Open University Press*.
- Cook, V. (2001). Second Language Learning and Language Teaching. London: *Oxford University Press*.
- Ellis, R. (1997). Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*.
- 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.
- Gardner, R., & Lambert, W. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House.
- Gill, S. (2005). The L1 in the L2 classroom. Humanizing Language Teaching Major Articles, 76(5). February 24, 2006, from <http://www.hltag.co.uk/ sepo5/marto3.htm>
- Harmer, J. (1998). How to Teach English. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Harmer, J. (2004). How to Teach Writing. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- 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.
- Lightbown, P.M. & Spada, N. (1993). How languages are learned. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*.
- Maniruzzaman, M. (2003). 'The use of mother tongue in the EFL classroom: learner's reaction.' Harvest: Jahangirnagar Studies in Literature, 18.
- Moon, J. (2000). Children Learning English. UK: *Macmillan Heinemann*.
- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), pp. 1-8.
- 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. (2001). Curriculum Development in Language Teaching. New York: *Cambridge University Press*.
- Stern, H. H. (1983). Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*.
- Tang, J. (2002). Using L1 in the English classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 40, 36-43.
- UNESCO (1953). The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education, Paris, *UNESCO*.