ELT Prospective Teachers' Beliefs About Target Language Use in EFL Classrooms[1]

Şule ÇELİK KORKMAZ[2]

Abstract

This sequential explanatory mixed methods design study aimed to investigate the beliefs of English Language Teaching (ELT) prospective teachers about using the target language (L2) at macro and micro-levels in English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms in addition to some scaffolding strategies to minimize their native language (L1) use. Furthermore, whether being experienced in language teaching and being abroad made differences in the beliefs of prospective teachers (PTs) were examined. The study was conducted with 128 ELT PTs enrolled in a state university in Turkey by administering a questionnaire as a quantitative instrument and a semi-structured interview as a qualitative instrument. The results of the descriptive statistics revealed that the PTs were in favour of using students' native language whenever it is required rather than following English-only policy. Accordingly, they agreed on the use of L2 mostly to give feedback, information and instructions besides greeting students and later to encourage students, check their understanding, and to provide them supportive talk. They became hesitant to use L2 to manage classrooms, crack jokes, and to give instructions of new and complex types of activities. The dependent variables in the study indicated few differences in their beliefs as to using L2 in EFL classrooms. The results were discussed and some implications for ELT teacher education were suggested.

---

[1]Instructor Dr., Bursa Uludağ University, Faculty of Education, ELT Department, Bursa, Turkey, scelik@uludag.edu.tr, http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4354-844X
[2] For this study, Bursa Uludağ University Social Sciences and Humanities Research and Publication Ethics Committee approval dated 03.07.2020 and numbered 04 was obtained.

Introduction

Educating competent future teachers has been a hot topic in EFL teacher education field. Teachers, as the first string of an effective and meaningful education, should be examined from various aspects particularly in terms of their beliefs which might shape their future pedagogical orientation. If teachers are described as agents of change (Priestley et al., 2015), investigating the beliefs of not only practicing teachers but also prospective teachers (PTs) is undoubtedly urgent in the achievement of agency as beliefs are likely to shape teachers' future practices (Biesta et al., 2015).

Among several factors that affect students' foreign language development, teacher talk, as the main input in EFL settings, can be accepted as one of the most prominent factors that contribute students' progress in the target language (L2). Believing the provoking aspects of teacher talk to create interactions in the classroom, Yanfen and Yuqin (2010) suggested teachers to identify the correct language type to create an efficient language environment in which students feel relaxed and ready to be involved in interactive activities. Similarly,Setiawati (2012) recommended EFL teachers to become more cognizant of their talk to be able to use the most appropriate features consciously to remove students' boredom. As underlined by Crawford (2004), if students are really expected to use L2 in EFL classrooms, teachers themselves should become language users and create opportunities for students to use L2 in EFL classrooms where students are exposed to live and scaffolded L2 input for different features of teacher talk. Thus, the teacher talk should be taken into account by teachers, researchers, and PTs to increase their awareness and to provide more effective foreign language learning environments. For this purpose, this study focused on the means of teacher talk, namely L1 and/or L2, to figure out and offer attainable means of teacher talk for different linguistic and pedagogical situations that might occur in Turkish EFL teaching contexts via investigating PTs' beliefs about the issue.

Target Language Use versus Native Language Use in EFL Classrooms

In pursuit of creating the most conducive EFL environment, there appears support for English-only policy by Harmer (2001), Krashen (1985), Voicu (2012), Wong (2010) who signified the importance of providing exposure in L2 to be able to create situations similar to first language acquisition. However, later studies suggested the judicious use of L1 (Enama, 2016; Korkut & Şener, 2018; Pan & Pan, 2010; Shabir, 2017). Policy that specifies goals and processes might have an impact on framing teachers' future actions (Priestley et al., 2015). Accordingly, the policy of Turkish Ministry of Education with regard to L2 use in EFL classroom provides avenue to EFL teachers to decide the extent to which they should use L2. To clarify, although L2 use is encouraged to communicate mostly in the target language, the use of L1 is permitted if need be (Mone, 2018). In a sense, this is the teachers' responsibility to decide when to use L1. Accordingly, the following studies might clarify the situations in which teachers and PTs resort to L1 use both in local and universal contexts.

For instance, in the Turkey context, Yıldız and Yeşilyurt (2017) investigated the perspectives of PTs from four different state universities regarding L1 use in L2 teaching and indicated some contraversial views. To clarify, some of the PTs reported the benefits of using L1 as explaining a new word, giving instructions, explaining grammatical structures, checking understanding, providing feedback, joking and discussing classroom activities with students, and testing whereas some of them suggested that L1 should be avoided due to the limited

chances for practicing L2 in EFL settings. In the same vein, the study by Şener and Korkut (2017) revealed that the PTs were in favour of mostly target language use in EFL classrooms as they believe that overusing L1 limits the opportunities of students for practicing oral skills and improving their communicative competence. However, in the further study of Korkut and Şener (2018), PTs who displayed incongruence between their espoused beliefs and classroom practices stated the reasons for their use of L1 as the influence of examination regime, clarifying the meaning to students who do not understand, and practical purposes such as saving time. More recently, Karakaya and Dikilitaş (2020) found out that EFL instructors in three state universities' School of Foreign Languages in Turkey considered code switching as a useful strategy in L2 learning and teaching and reported that they utilized code switching for both curriculum access to explain words, structures and grammar and for interpersonal relations so as to encourage students to participate in classroom practices more, and to enhance the motivation and confidence in L2 learning.

When Turkish students' code switching was investigated by Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005), it was indicated that the students' language preference depends upon the pedagogical level of the teachers. Thus, developing strategies which promote more L2 use in EFL classrooms should be given priority by teachers and PTs who should also experience the target culture to improve L2 proficiency and boost more positive attitudes towards using L2 (Crawford, 2004). On the other hand, Jing and Jing (2018) emphasized that teacher talk is so nonstable and changeable that teachers sometimes resort to L1 use for clarifying the lesson to enable learners better understand the topic besides energizing the classroom atmosphere. Furthermore, Sa'd and Qadermazi (2015) indicated that although following only–English policy enables students to improve their listening and speaking skills and to become accustomed to English as students' exposure to English is maximized, a judicious use of the L1 is accepted as advantageous for clarification of instructions and explanations, efficiency and ease of learning English, and avoidance of ambiquity and misunderstanding.

In the Isreal context, Orland-Barak and Yinon (2005) found out that EFL student teachers fostered positive attitudes towards L1 use for purposes such as for clarifying, enhancing pupil participation, managing aspects of the lesson, and building rapport with students. In Spanish context, Bateman (2008) examined student teachers' use of L2 and reported that the PTs used L2 when conducting daily routines and giving basic instructions; however, their reactions to some factors such as student confusion, discipline problems, lack of time, and the desire to build rapport with students were different in terms of using L1 and L2. Furthermore, the ELT PTs enrolled in Master of Applied Linguistics TESOL program in the study by Shabir (2017), despite their tendency to use more and more L2 in their future classes, did not totally disagree to the use of L1 and agreed to use L1 in certain situations such as reducing anxiety, building a student-centred classroom, translating some expressions such as complex grammar explanations, managing classrooms, and checking comprehension to assist some students who could sometimes be stuck.

The importance of training teachers can be justified in the study by Macaro (2001) who observed the PTs in the study to reveal their decision making processes about the use of L1 after they were involved in a 36-week training programme regarding L1 use in L2. The results revealed little and short burst of L1 use by the participants (4.8%) across the recorded lessons due to the hegemony of the belief that L1 must be excluded at all costs. They used L1 only for procedural instructions for activities, keeping control of the students, and reprimanding them.

More recently, in their longitudinal study, Tammenga-Helmantel et al. (2020) examined the factors that affected EFL student teachers' L2 use in their teaching practice during teacher education and one year after graduation. The study reported language policy in the school and among colleagues, the reaction of their learners, and the practice-related domain due to teaching in different contexts, and personal experiences of the participants as former learners of English as the most prominent factors during their teaching practice. Furthermore, the factors were adjusted during the realms of their teaching after graduation, that is, the institutional domain and the teacher education emerged as the most dominant factors during their teaching after graduation. The study suggested that teacher educators should prepare PTs to be able to use L2 in linguistically and pedagogically difficult situations.

The Aim and Importance of the Research

All of the aforementioned studies addressed the importance of teacher education as a significant avenue for having qualified teachers who have the power of creating an EFL environment that is conducive to students' L2 development. PTs are in the process of forming their cognition as future EFL teachers; thus, teacher trainers should invite PTs on all occasions to check their beliefs about different aspects of teaching. In line with this purpose, the researcher, as an EFL teacher trainer, aimed to investigate Turkish ELT PTs' beliefs about L2 use in EFL classrooms to increase their awareness on this topic to enable them to enact their professional agency.

In the study by Külekçi (2018), the variable "teaching experience" did not affect the perspectives of the prospective teachers on teachers' behaviours and attitudes related to foreign language teaching including also teacher talk. Furthermore, one of the novice primary EFL teachers in the study by Çelik Korkmaz (2019) attributed EFL teachers' low level of speaking and lack of fluency to follow the whole lesson in L2 to never being abroad. Therefore, the variables "being abroad" and "having teaching experience" were involved in this study to reveal whether they would indicate significant differences on the beliefs of the PTs about L2 use in EFL classrooms. Taking into account the scarcity of studies conducted with PTs, this study is believed to contribute to the literature regarding L2 use in EFL classrooms as it might enable researchers to compare the effects of different teacher training programs on the beliefs of PTS besides the effects of being abroad and having teaching experience on their beliefs. Accordingly, the following research questions were formed to scrutinize the aforementioned issues.

1. What are the beliefs of Turkish ELT prospective teachers about L2 use in EFL classrooms?
2. What are the effects of being experienced in classroom teaching on Turkish ELT prospective teachers' beliefs about L2 use in EFL classrooms?
3. What are the effects of being abroad on Turkish ELT prospective teachers' beliefs about L2 use in EFL classrooms?

Method

Research Design

Sequential explanatory mixed methods design was utilized in this study by firstly collecting quantitative data and followed by qualitative data (Creswell & Clark, 2008) to investigate Turkish ELT prospective teachers' beliefs about L2 use in EFL classrooms.

Participants

128 ELT prospective teachers in Bursa Uludağ University Faculty of Education ELT department participated in the study. All of the participants were given a one-week theoretical lesson regarding teacher talk as a part of the "Teaching English to Young Learners (TEYLs) I and II" courses which are placed in the sixth and seventh terms of their teacher education programme. Furthermore, they were expected to evaluate their teacher talks during several microteaching sessions (totally 20) in which they planned and performed a variety of TEYLs tasks throughout these two terms. In addition, The junior PTs with real classroom teaching experiences had their experiences via teaching in several state and private primary and secondary schools during their school experience for four hours per week during 12 weeks in the fall term and in many state secondary and high schools during their practicum for six hours per week during 12 weeks as a part of their teacher education programme. In addition, the participants being abroad were either foreign national students and Erasmus students or those who have visited different countries for a very short time. Table 1 presents the demographic features of the participants.

Table 1

Demographic Information About the Participants

Gender		Year		Being Abroad		Classroom Teaching Experience	
Female (*n*)	Male (*n*)	Seniors (*n*)	Juniors (*n*)	Yes (*n*)	No (*n*)	Yes (*n*)	No (*n*)
88	39	55	73	54	72	73	53

Moreover, all of the participants were sent a message via the WhatsApp groups of senior and junior PTs to find out the volunteer interviewees. The first 15 volunteer PTs who made contact with the researcher were chosen to conduct semi-structured interviews to elucidate the findings obtained from the questionnaire. Nine of the interviewees had real classroom teaching experiences while six of them did not have experiences in teaching except for teaching to their peers in the micro-teaching sessions of some of the teacher education courses. In addition, 10 of them had never been abroad whereas five of them had.

Data Collection Tools

As a quantitative research instrument, the 15 item instrument with five-point Likert-type questions ranging from one (strongly agree) to five (strongly disagree) was conducted by the researcher to investigate the PTs' beliefs on L2 use in EFL classrooms.

Furthermore, as a qualitative instrument, a semi-structured interview with five questions which are in line with the questionnaire items was used to delve into the results obtained from the quantitative instrument. The interview questions were as follows:

1. What are your views about using L2 in EFL classrooms?
1.1. What are some situations in which you think that you should use L2 and/or L1?
2. What are some factors that affect your decisions on the use of L1 or L2?
3. How can an EFL teacher minimize L1 use?
4. Have you experienced teaching English in real EFL classrooms? If yes, do you think that being experienced in teaching makes a difference in teachers' choosing L1 and/or L2?
5. Have you ever been abroad? If yes, do you think that being abroad makes a difference in teachers' choosing L1 and/or L2?

Validity and Reliability

The study is a part of a larger scale study. As one of the parts of a three-stage research (first part investigated the qualitative inquiry of EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of L1 use in primary education and second part focused on the quantitative investigation of 308 practicing EFL teachers' beliefs and practices regarding their use of L2 in their classrooms), this current study aimed to investigate the PTs' beliefs about L2 use to teach L2 in EFL classrooms. In order to obtain a more valid and reliable instrument, the questionnaire was firstly given to 308 practicing teachers to be able to run factor analysis due to the limited number of the PTs (N=128).

With regard to the quantitative instrument used in the aforementioned parts of the study, the researcher firstly prepared 21 items by taking the related literature into account (For instance Bateman 2008; Macaro, 2001; Orland-Barak & Yinon, 2005; Salı, 2014). The questionnaire with 21 items was given to five experts who were asked to rate each item by taking three-level ratings (3-essential, 2-useful but not essential and 1-not necessary) to validate the instrument in terms of its content (Lawshe, 1975). six items which failed to meet the rated "essential" not more than by half of the experts were removed from the instrument as content validity index (CVI) of 21 items in the questionnaire was found to be 0.52. CVI for the remaining 15 item questionnaire was found to be 0.89, which is considered the evidence of good content validity (Davis, 1992). Furthermore, the reliability of the questionnaire given to the PTs revealed a Cronbach's alpha score of a=.70, which indicated an acceptable reliability for the questionnaire to be utilized in the study (Can, 2013).

As for the factor analysis obtained from the questionnaire of EFL teachers, Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) values were calculated to be .83. Based on the factor analysis of the belief questionnaire, it was found that eigenvalue was 2.1, variance rate was 14.02%, and cumulative variance rate was 50.62% for the first component 5.49, 36.60, and 36.60 for the second component; 1.4, 9.9, and 60.60 for the third component. The reliability is high in terms of internal consistency based on the alpha coefficient for each component respectively: .76; .86; and .85. The results of the factor analysis via principal component analysis and rotation method via varimax with Kaiser Normalization revealed three factors for the 15 item questionnaire as seen in Table 2.

Tablo 2

Results of the Factor Analysis

	Components		
Macro-level Teacher Talk (Maximum L2 Use)	**Factor 1**	**Factor 2**	**Factor 3**
5. An EFL teacher should give instructions in L2 at students' level.	.578		
8. EFL teachers should use L2 to provide functional language such as greetings.	.709		
9. Giving information to clarify the target subject should be given in L2.	.672		
11. Feedback to students' answers or activity outcomes should be given in L2.	.576		
12. Supportive talks such as "well-done, super" should be in L2.	.781		
Micro-level Teacher Talk (Minimum L2 Use)	**Factor 1**	**Factor 2**	**Factor 3**
1. EFL teachers should use only L2 (English) throughout the lesson.		.684	
6. Classroom management and discipline should be handled in L2.		.659	
7. Whether students understand what they are going to do should be checked in L2.		.667	
10. Jokes that might change classroom atmosphere positive should be cracked in L2.		.680	
13. EFL teachers should use L2 to encourage their students to increase their involvement to the lesson.		.593	
14. Instructions of the new type of activities or exercises should be given in L2.		.843	
15. EFL teachers should use no matter how complex the instructions of an activity are.		.824	
Non-Verbal Scaffolding Techniques To Minimize L1 Use			
2. EFL teachers should use L2 at students' level to minimize L1 use.			.742
3. EFL teachers should use their body language, gestures, and mimicries effectively to reduce L1 use.			.907
4. EFL teachers should support their L2 use with visual materials to reduce L1 use			.919
The Percentage of Explained Variance	26.147	18.380	16.076
The Total Percentage of Explained Variance		60.603	

As for the semi-structured interview, five open-ended questions created by the researcher were given to three experts in ELT teacher education to ensure the content validity of the questions. As a result of the expert opinions, two questions were revised and one sub question was included to obtain a more valid data collection instrument.

Data Collection Process

The questionnaire was conductyed online via Google Docs by posting it in the Uludağ ELT Facebook groups immediately after the Spring term of 2019-2020 Academic year. The data collection was completed in a month. The participation in the study was voluntary.

After collecting the quantitative data, semi-structured interviews were administered through sitting in a classroom with windows open and keeping a distance from the interviewees due to the Coronavirus crisis. To provide security, both the researcher and the interviewees

were wearing masks during the interviews. In this situation, face-to-face interviews were conducted with only nine interviewees who accepted to come to the campus. They were mostly fourth graders who were about to graduate. On the other hand, the researcher used Zoom platform for interviewing six more PTs. The interviews were in the participants' native language. Face-to-face interview processes were voice-recorded while online processes were video-recorded to be transcribed later. Each interview lasted approximately 12-18 minutes. The recorded interviews were translated by the researcher into English and transcribed, which took approximately a week to be completed.

Data Analysis

The quantitative data through the questionnaire were analyzed via the SPSS program 23 by utilizing descriptive statistics to answer the first research question regarding the beliefs of the participants about using L2 in EFL classrooms. Moreover, the Mann-Whitney U statistical test was used due to the lack of conditions of normality (Nachar, 2008) to reveal whether there were statistically significant differences between the participants concerning their beliefs in terms of being experienced in teaching and being abroad.

Content analysis using a directed approach was followed to interpret the interview extracts as coding depended on the research questions (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Accordingly, the predetermined codes such as the reasons for maximum L2 use and minimum L2 use and non-verbal scaffolding techniques to minimize L1 use which are in line with the questionnaire components were used to report the expressions of the interviewees which might clarify the quantitative results.

Ethical Issues

Pertaining to ethical consideration, the study was conducted after receiving the approval from the Bursa Uludağ University Social Sciences and Humanities Research and Publication Ethics Committee dated 03.07.2020 and numbered 04. This study had no funding and there is no conflict of interests.

Findings

This section presents the findings that emerged from the study by taking the research questions into account. The first question was "What are the beliefs of Turkish ELT prospective teachers about L2 use in EFL classrooms?" Considering that the least point that could be obtained from the questionnaire is 15 and the maximum one is 75, the PTs' overall point regarding their beliefs about L2 use in EFL classrooms is found to be 59.04, which is closer to "I agree" ($\bar{X}$=60). To reiterate, the PTs agreed on the use of L2 in EFL classrooms for several reasons such as giving feedback,information, and instruction but not all the reasons given in the questionnaire. The detailed findings were presented under three factors emerged from the factor analysis such as macro-level talk, micro-level talk, and scaffolding techniques to minimize L1 use. Accordingly, the participants' beliefs regarding macro-level teacher talk were displayed in Table 3.

Table 3

Descriptive Results of the PT's Beliefs About L2 Use in EFL Classrooms at Macro-Level Teacher Talk

Items	N	Certainly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Certainly Agree (%)	X	SD
11. Giving feedback	128	0	.8	.8	10.9	87.5	4.85	.43634
8. Greeting students	128	0	.8	4.7	21.1	73.4	4.67	.60326
9. Giving information	128	0	.8	6.3	28.1	64.8	4.57	.64824
5. Giving instruction	128	0	3.1	9.4	21.9	65.6	4.50	.79368
12. Providing supportive talk	128	.8	13.3	23.4	31.3	32.3	3.78	1.0548

Concerning macro-level teacher talk, the highest frequency results presented in Table 1 were related to giving feedback and greetings. Majority of the PTs agreed that EFL teachers should use L2 for giving feedback to students' answers or activity outcomes (98.4%) and for providing functional language such as greetings (94.5%). In addition, they also agreed that L2 should be used to give information to clarify the target subject (92.9%),to give the instructions of the activities and exercises (87.5%), and to provide supportive talk such as "well-done, super" (62.6%). Some of the interviewees (six Interviewees) mentioned using L2 for the aforementioned macro-level talk as seen in the extracts below:

Interviewee one:" Greetings enable teachers to form an everyday chunk. Greetings in L2 also give this message to students that you are in English lesson now and please get ready for English course. We also need to use L2 to give instructions to make them chunks for students."

Interviewee eight: "I believe that if teachers are really decisive and motivated to teach in L2, they can use English not only to give information but also to give instructions, feedbacks, explanations etc. They should perceive language learning as communication rather than a school subject to be passed."

Interviewee 11:" All of my previous English teachers have used L2 to greet us before starting the lesson so far. This is an accepted routine both by students and teachers here in Turkey. Over time, this becomes automated routine to start an English lesson. I think greetings in L2 are very common but not meaningful, which can also be observed in our micro-teaching sessions. We reply like robots. We are killing our emotions and make students' involvement concrete. We do this automatically maybe due to out previous experiences."

Interviewee 15: "...If students are afraid of speaking English and foster negative attitudes towards hearing something in L2, speaking in English will not help them to change their negative attitudes into positive. Thus, teachers can use L1 to provide supportive talk to affect their feelings and to comfort them."

The findings showing the PT's beliefs as to using scaffolding techniques to minimize L1 use were indicated in Table 4.

Table 4

Descriptive Results of the PT's Beliefs About Using Scaffolding Techniques to Minimize L1 Use

The Items	N	Certainly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Certainly Agree (%)	X	SD
3. Use of body language, gestures, and mimics.	128	2.3	3.1	3.9	16.4	74.2	4.57	.89340
4. Use of visual materials	128	3.1	2.3	3.1	15.6	75.8	4.58	.90951
2. Using L2 at students' level	128	7.1	3.1	15	20.5	54.3	4.11	1.20590

With regard to non-verbal scaffolding techniques to reduce L1 use, most of the participants believed that EFL teachers should use their body language, gestures, and mimicries effectively (90.6%), support their L2 use with visual materials (91.4%), and use their L2 at students' level to reduce L1 use. Similarly, nearly all of the interviewees (14 Interviewee s) mentioned about some suggested strategies to minimize L1 use as seen in the extracts below:

Interviewee seven: "I do not have any teaching experience except for our micro-teaching sessions in some of our courses. Based on the feedback given by our teacher trainers, I can say that not only I but also some of my friends have problems about adjusting our talk at students' level. I know that we should support our talk through our body language and visual materials. However, if my students do not understand my speech, I may switch to L1 use. Of course, firstly, I will try my best to speak in L2."

Interviewee15: "I always try to use English to provide maximum exposure in my private course classes. I have been teaching to students whose age range from 20 to 60. You cannot believe that I use my body language, gesture and mimicry as if I were the monkey to be able to help them understand what I am trying to say in L2. I think it works."

The findings as for the beliefs of the PTs about L2 use in EFL classrooms at micro level were shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Descriptive Results of the PT's Beliefs About L2 Use in EFL Classrooms at Micro-level Teacher Talk

The Items	N	Certainly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Certainly Agree (%)	X	SD
12. Encouraging students	128	2.3	9.4	18.8	28.9	40.6	3.96	1.08970
7. Checking students' understanding.	128	1.6	7.1	18.9	43.3	29.1	3.91	.95139
13. Giving instructions for new types of activities/ exercises.	128	3.1	13.3	24.2	32.8	26.6	3.66	1.10316
6. Managing the class.	128	6.3	10.2	32.3	27.6	23.6	3.51	1.14677
10. Making jokes	128	14.1	17.2	27.3	21.9	19.5	3.15	1.31279
1. Using only L2	128	13.3	31.3	25.8	21.9	7.8	2.79	1.15941

Table 5

(Continued)

14.Giving instructions for complex types of activities/exercises.	128	31.3	28.9	20.3	13.3	6.3	2.34	1.22595

As for following only English policy, the frequency results were not so high that only some of them (29.7 %) agreed that they should use only English throughout the lesson. In addition, nearly almost every interviewee (12 Interviewees) stated that they tend to use L1 whenever it is required as indicated in the following extracts:

Interviewee one: "I am trying to follow some practicing teachers who have been posting their classroom videos on Instagram and Facebook. They could teach without using L1 with the help of demonstration techniques and their students understood as they absorbed L2. I believe that I will be able to talk in L2. However, I think I can use L1 whenever it is required".

Interviewee two: "When I gave my first lesson in teaching practice, I tried to use L2 throughout the lesson. However, the students were always complaining that they could not understand anything. They said their previous teachers were using L1 when they did not understand. When I realized that they really could not understand despite my use of some strategies such as demonstration, I understood the importance of their previous experiences. Thus, I used L1 in the following lessons whenever they could not understand to get rid of their resistance to the use of L2."

Interviewee two: "I believe that we should mostly use L2. On the other hand, teachers should prefer L1 use whenever teachers really want to take students' attention. I believe the positive effects of using L1 if a teacher can evaluate the right time such as dealing with classroom management issues".

On the other hand, few of the interviewees (three Is) were in favour of English-only policy as shown in the following extracts:

Interviewee four: "I think I am in favour of Krashen's ideas. If we make the input meaningful for children and if we truly commit to providing input in L2, we can achieve this. I will try to use English to explain even very complex aspects of language".

Interviewee eight: "We will be English teachers so that we should be decisive. Of course, there will be some problems we might face with. However, we should give time to us, for instance a month, to be able to set up our system to teach English through English. At first, we should prepare our students for the lesson, motivate them to listen to in English, and to help them get rid of their prejudices, etc. If we believe in ourselves to communicate with our students by using only English, we can be successful."

Pertaining to some micro-level teacher talk, more than half of the participants agreed that L2 should be used to encourage students to increase their involvement into the lesson (69.5%) and check students' understanding about what to do in the lesson (65.2%). Some of the interviewees (six Interviewees) mentioned some affective reasons for using L1 whereas one of them (Interviewee three) supported the idea of using L2 for positive expressions as seen in the following extracts:

Interviewee 12:" I think I will use mostly L2 in my future classrooms. However, I can use L1 to revive my class, motivate my students, and encourage them to be involved in the

activities. I think hearing some good expressions from the teacher in L1 might be more effective to take students' attention".

Interviewee three:"I think positive expressions should be in L2. They tend to understand and use positive expressions more easily. For instance, they easily learn to say 'I love you' as they think that they are cool. Thus, we should use some positive expressions such as well-done, etc. in L2."

Furthermore, the agreement on the use of L2 for maintaining classroom management and discipline and for making jokes was lower. In relation to that, only 51.2 % of them agreed that classroom management and discipline should be handled in L2. Similarly, most of the interviewees (13 Interviewees) preferred L1 to L2 to deal with misbehaviours that occurred in classrooms as displayed in the following extracts:

Interviewee one:"I think we should use mostly L2. However, if a student is crying, I will not expect him/her to explain the matter in L2 as I know that s/he could not explain the situation in that manner. Besides, if they fight each other, I intervene in L1."

Interviewee two: "I think teachers should use L1 to manage the classroom. Based on my observation, I can say that if a teacher uses L2 to intervene misbehaviours occurred in the classroom, students might perceive this situation as the lesson. When L1 is used to manage students' behaviours, it becomes easier to take their attention to their misbehaviours."

Interviewee 10:" ...if there is a problem in the classroom due to students' misbehaviours, I prefer L1 to show my seriousness. I send the message that I am really serious."

However, two of the interviewees followed English-only policy even to manage their classrooms as seen in the following expressions:

Interviewee 15: "I always spoke English during my lessons in the private course I worked. When there were classroom management problems, I used not only non verbal messages but also some expressions in English. I only preferred saying in L1 'Heeey! Arkadaşlar' (Heey! Friends!) to take their attention. However, I immediately moved to use L2. I think I was able to manage my classes".

As for cracking jokes, 41.4% agreed that jokes that might change the classroom atmosphere positively should be made in L2. Believing that developing an effective and positive interaction between a teacher and students would be difficult via L2, some of the interviewees (six Interviewees) stated that they would use L1 to increase the effectiveness of their sarcastic use of language. As seen in the following extracts, the interviewees consider jokes something cultural:

Interviewee three: "I tried cracking jokes in L2 by translating Turkish jokes. However, it did not work. Nobody understood and laughed. I think jokes are mostly cultural and they are not so effective in real terms when they are made in L2".

Interviewee five: "I do not think that we are able crack jokes in L2. In addition, I believe that they do not make sense to students if they are not at advanced learners. I think that teachers tend to use sarcastic language in L2 rather than jokes".

Despite the high frequency results showing the agreements of the participants on giving instructions in L2 at students' level, they indicated lower level of agreement in their beliefs regarding giving instructions for the new types of activities and exercises in L2 (59.4%). The lowest-level of agreement of the participants was about giving complex types of instructions in

L2 and only 19.6% of them agreed that instructions of the activities/ exercises should be given in L2 no matter how complex they were. three of the interviewees stated that they should use L2 no matter whether it is complex or not as indicated in the expressions below:

Interviewee 15: "If we use L1, students are not exposed to enough English. In their daily lives, they are also exposed to some difficult expressions in their L1. They will learn how to deal with this situation naturally. Every teacher thinks differently. However, I believe that if students use the expressions in their daily lives, I will use them in L2. If they do not use in their daily lives, why should I teach?"

The second research question was "What are the effects of having experience in classroom teaching on Turkish ELT Prospective teachers' beliefs about L2 use in EFL classrooms?" The findings were displayed in table 6.

Table 6

Mann-Whitney U Test Results Regarding the Variable Having Experience

The Items	Teaching Experience	N	Mean Ranks	U	Z	p
12. Providing supportive talk in L2	Yes	73	67.14	1669.00	-2.223	.023
	No	53	58.49			

Based on the Mann-Whitney U test result there appeared no statistical differences between the PTs with classroom experiences and the PTs without classroom experiences with regard to 14 items except for one item (item 12) which is about providing supportive talk in L2. To clarify, the PTs with classroom experiences (MR= 67.14) believed more than the PTs without classroom experiences (MR= 58.49) that supportive words should be given in L2. The following expressions might make this result clear:

Interviewee seven: I think using L1 is a safe zone for teachers to send the correct message. I have not taught English in the real classrooms yet, but I believe that motivating students is really important. Teachers want students to believe in themselves to perform the activities so that they use some expressions. However, they might be afraid of being misunderstood by students who might be discouraged due to lack of understanding in L2. I think I can use L1 to increase their desire to be involved in the lesson."

Interviewee 15: "In my private course classes, I always try to use L2. When I feel that they their motivation decreases, I say: 'Come on, we can do this together. I can help you etc.' I think it is not so difficult to use these kinds of expressions in L2".

The last research question was "What are the effects of being abroad on Turkish ELT prospective teachers' beliefs about L1 use to teach L2?" The findings with regard to the aforementioned question were displayed in table 7.

Table 7

Mann-Whitney U Test Results Regarding the Variable Being Abroad

The Items	Being Abroad	N	Mean Ranks	U	Z	p
15. Giving instructions for complex types of activities/exercises.	Yes	54	71.21	1527.500	-2.126	.033
	No	72	57.72			

Based on the Mann-Whitney U test result, there appeared no statistical differences between the PTs with experience abroad and without experience abroad pertaining to14 items except for one item (item 15) which is about giving instructions of a complex type of activity. Accordingly, the PTs who had been abroad agreed more than (MR =71.21) the PTs who had never been abroad (MR= 57.72) that an EFL teacher should use L2 no matter how complex the instructions are. The following expressions might clarify this situation:

Interviewee one: "The country I visited was not a country in which people do not speak English. Similar to our students, their native language was not English. However, I needed to communicate with those people in English which was the only way to communicate. Somehow, I was able to communicate correctly due to my immediate need. I did not have second chance but only English so that I forced myself to communicate. I realized that I really used demonstration techniques and very simple expressions. It worked. I felt self-confident."

Interviewee eight:"I realized that the language we use in another country is not too complex. However, once I realized that I was able to use language fluently, I believe that I can explain everything, even complex language in L2."

Conclusion, Discussion and Implications

As commonly suggested by majority of researchers and teacher educators, providing exposure in the target language has a pivotal role in promoting language development of EFL students. Hence, teacher talk has been considered as the main input in EFL classrooms. However, following English-only policy was criticized by some researchers including Auerbach (1993) who inspired several further research including also this one. Accordingly, the study investigated the beliefs of ELT PTs with regard to L2 use in EFL classrooms. The overall results revealed that the PTs confirmed the use of L2 in EFL classrooms for some reasons to maximize L2 use. For instance, most of the participants preferred L2 to give instructions of the activities and exercises and to give information to clarify the subjects in addition to greetings, providing supportive talk and giving feedback to students' answers. These results are in opposition to Cook (2001) but in accordance with Şener and Korkut (2017).

In line with Auerbach (1993) and Korkut and Şener (2018), but contrary to the PTs in the study of Macaro (2001), the PTs in the study did not consider L1 use as the factor to be excluded at all costs. Instead, the participants of this study indicated that L1 can be used when it is required, which is in line with the findings of the studies by Afzal (2013) and Sa'd and Qadermazi (2015). On the other hand, there appeared some PTs who believed the importance of following English-only policy, which was also reported by Karakaya and Dikilitaş (2020) and Sert (2005).

Furthermore, confirming the results of the studies by Macaro (2001) and Shabir (2017), this study also signifies the importance of training teachers. To clarify, the PTs who had been consistently trained to use effective teacher talk during their teacher training program by

underlying the importance of providing L2 exposure confirmed the advantages of using lots of scaffolding techniques including adjusting their talk at students' level to minimize L1 use in EFL classrooms. In agreement with the PTs in the study by Gürsoy, Korkmaz and Damar (2017) and Jing and Jing (2018), the PTs believed that using non-verbal messages including body language, gesture, mimicry, and visuality to support their talk in L2 would help them to minimize their L1 use. In addition, as Crawford (2004) reported that teachers' choice of language is not affected by lack of supplementary materials given by the schools to support their L2 use. In line with this result, the TTs in the study were likely to be ready to prepare, adapt and use supplementary visual materials to support their L2 use.

As for some reasons such as encouraging students and providing them supportive talk, the participants could not reach consensus on whether to use L1 or L2. Agreeing with Yanfen and Yuqin (2010) and Spahiu (2013), some of the interviewees preferred L1 to encourage students and support their involvement to remove the silence that might occur as a result of their negative attitudes towards L2 use and to motivate them to be involved in activities more. Furthermore, some of the participants who agreed on the use of L1 to check students' understanding might consider L1 use as a facilitating factor for understanding or a way of restoring understanding of a word or sentence in L2, which is in line with the PTs in the study by Korkut and Çelik (2020).

The L1 preference of the PTs regarding cracking a joke might be attributed to the expressions of Gach (2020) who stressed that comprehending and cracking jokes depend on the linguistic and cultural competencies of teachers in L2. Thus, PTs who do not consider their linguistic and cultural competencies as at high level are likely to switch on L1 use for this function of teacher talk. In addition, as found by Jawhar (2018), teachers' use of L1 as a source of humor provides better EFL teaching and learning besides enabling the less-proficient learners to be involved in ongoing classroom interaction. Furthermore, in accordance with the previous studies (Orland-Barak & Yinon, 2005: Shabir, 2017; Timuçin & Baytar, 2015; Yao, 2011), some of the PTs favoured L1 use to discipline students as they believed that they could take their attention to their misbehaviours more effectively.

In line with the study by Külekçi (2018) in which the variable "teaching experience" did not affect the perspectives of the PTs on teachers' behaviors and attitudes related to foreign language teaching including also teacher talk, the variable"teaching experience" did not show significant differences except for one point in this study, namely, providing supportive words in L2. As reported by Tammenga-Helmantel et al.(2020), the beliefs of the PTs were shaped by different factors such as teacher education, different teaching contexts, institutions, colleagues, learners, and previous experiences. From this point of view, it is likely for the PTs in this study to have beliefs formed by either their personal experiences as former learners of English or by their teacher education rather than their teaching experiences in real classrooms.

Furthermore, the PTs who had been abroad believed more that they should use L2 no matter how complex the instructions are. Being abroad made a difference in their beliefs about L2 use in EFL classrooms presumably due to becoming more skilful in using L2 and having more self-confidence and low-anxiety level regarding their use of L2. This result is in agreement with Tammenga-Helmantel et al. (2020) who underlined that once teachers become more skilful in the target language, using L2 throughout the lesson becomes easier for them.

The findings of the study provide some implications for PTs, teacher trainers, and textbook publishers. To clarify, teacher trainers should help PTs to gain insights in teacher talk and help them to become aware of some strategies such as using non-verbal messages, creating visual materials, and adjusting their talk at students' levels to minimize their L1 use in EFL classrooms. However, they should avoid suggesting the rigid, artificial English-only policy by ignoring the realities of the EFL classrooms. There is a fine line regarding this issue that PTs as future practicing teachers should not take the easy way out and they should be compelled to think critically about their use of L1 to decide whether it is really judicious or excessive. In addition, they should be taught taken-for-granted practices in terms of effective EFL pedagogies related to teacher talk. Accordingly, they need to be given suggestions related to when and how much L1 can be used by not only reminding both advantages and disadvantages of L1 use in EFL classrooms but also underlying the pivotal role of L2 use to maximize exposure in EFL classrooms where students have limited time, input, and need. Although several studies including the current one have been conducted to investigate the use of target language in EFL classroom from different perspectives, whether to use L1 or L2 is still a non-conclusive issue to be investigated. However, the significant role of teacher training on shaping PTs' cognition is approved in almost every study. Frankly, if teachers are really dedicated, we should trust their intuitions as for their use of L1 as a strategy to communicate with their students.

Furthermore, PTs who have lack of confidence in using effective L2 should do self-assessment to become more aware of their weaknesses in delivering effective and comprehensible input in L2. For this purpose, they can record their talk during the micro-teaching sessions in some of their teacher education courses in addition to recording their teaching throughout their practicum to be watched and evaluated by them later by focusing particularly on their talks and by discussing the issue with their teacher trainers who can support them to increase the effectiveness of their talks.

Finally, as one of the most important factors in EFL learning and teaching, textbooks should be designed in a way that students are provided language at their level and supported via visual and contextual clues in order for them not to expect their teachers to explain various points in L1.

The generalization of the findings is limited to the PTs who have been receiving the same teacher education which might be considered as the factor that affects their beliefs about the means of language to be used in their future classes. Since the result of this study was based on a sampled population of PTs enrolled at Bursa Uludağ University in Turkey, further research should be conducted with PTs attending different universities to be able to compare the effects of different teacher education programs. The data is limited to the questionnaire and interviews in this study so that classroom observations of PTs during their practicum could also be included to compare and contrast their espoused beliefs and classroom practices.

References

Afzal, S. (2013). Using of the first language in English classroom as a way of scaffolding for both the students and teachers to learn and teach English. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, *4*(7), 1846-1854.

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32. Retrieved July 21, 2020 from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3586949

Bateman, B.E. (2008). Student teachers' attitudes and beliefs about using the target language in the classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41, 11–28. Retrieved April 19, 2020, from, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2008.tb03277.x

Biesta, G., Priestley, M. & Robinson, S. (2015). The role of beliefs in teacher agency*, Teachers and Teaching*, 21(6), 624-640. Retrieved July 19, 2020 from, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13540602.2015.1044325

Can, A. (2013). SPSS ile bilimsel arastirma surecinde nicel veri analizi. *Ankara: Pegem Akademi*.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423. Retrieved July 20, 2020 from, https://utpjournals.press/doi/abs/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402

Crawford, J. (2004). Language choices in the foreign language classroom: Target Language or the learners' first language?. *RELC Journal*, 35(1), 5-20. Retrieved July 20, 2020 from, https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/003368820403500103

Clark, V. L. P., & Creswell, J. W. (2008). *The mixed methods reader*. Sage.

Çelik Korkmaz, Ş. (2019). Turkish EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of L1 use in primary education. In V. Krystev, R. Efe, and E. Atasoy (Eds.). *Theory and Practice in Social Sciences*, (1st ed., pp. 32-143). St. Kliment Ohridski University Press, Sofia. Retrieved July 18, 2020 from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Hanife-Orhan-Karsak/publication/338236093_Internet_Learning/links/5e0a4298a6fdcc28374acdb3/Internet-Learning.pdf#page=141

Davis L.L. (1992). Instrument review: getting the most from a panel of experts. *Applied Nursing Research*, *5*(4), 194–197. Retrieved April 15, 2020 from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0897189705800084?via%3Dihub

Enama, P. R. B. (2016). The impact of English-only and bilingual approaches to EFL instruction on low-achieving bilinguals in Cameroon: An empirical study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *7*(1), 19-30. Retrieved July 21, 2021, from, https://search.proquest.com/docview/1763480658/fulltextPDF/D53BB3C1355C4DD8PQ/1?accountid=17219

Gach, N. (2020). From totalitarianism to democracy: Building learner autonomy in Ukrainian higher education. *Issues in Educational Research*, *30*(2), 532. Retrieved July 20, 2020, from, https://www.iier.org.au/iier30/gach.pdf

Gursoy, E., Korkmaz, S. C., & Damar, E. A. (2017). English language teaching within the new educational policy of Turkey: Views of stakeholders. *International Education Studies*, *10*(4), 18-30. Retrieved March 15, 2021, from, http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ies/article/view/63323

Harmer, J. (2001).The practice of English language learning (3rd ed.). China: Pearson Education Limited.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *15*(9), 1277-1288. Retrieved July 18, 2020, from, https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1049732305276687

Jawhar, S. S. (2018). The use of L1 as a source of humour to facilitate interaction in EFL classrooms. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume*, *9*. Retrieved July 20, 2020, from, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3258829

Jing, N., & Jing, J. (2018). Teacher talk in an EFL classroom: A pilot study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *8*(3), 320-324. Retrieved July 19, 2020, from, https://search.proquest.com/docview/2015723386/fulltextPDF/3EB3D5D639C1434DPQ/1?accountid=17219

Karakaya, M., & Dikilitaş, K. (2020). Perceptions of the students and the teachers towards the use of code switching in EFL classrooms. *The Literacy Trek, 6*(1), 40-73. Retrieved December 28, 2020, from, https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/literacytrek/issue/55072/734427

Korkut, P., & Şener, S. (2018). Teacher trainees' use of mother tongue in EFL classes: A case study. *Eğitim Kuram ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *4*(1), 118-127. Retrieved December 28, 2020, from, https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/453470

Korkut, P., & Çelik, M. (2020). Pre-service teachers' cognition on student understanding in the EFL language classroom. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, *10*(1), 57-72. RetrievedDecember 28, 2020 from http://www.jltl.com.tr/index.php/jltl/article/view/180

Krashen, S. (1985). The input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications. New York: Longman.

Külekçi, G. (2018). Identifying the perceptions of prospective English language teachers on characteristics of effective teachers: Who is the ideal teacher?. *Novitas-ROYAL (research on Youth and Language)*, *12*(1), 1-15. Retrieved March 3, 2021 from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1177690.pdf

Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28, 563–575. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x Retrieved May 12, 2020, from, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x

Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, *85*(4), 531-548. Retrieved April 19, 2020, from, https://www.jstor.org/stable/1193074?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

MoNE [Republic of Turkey, Ministry of National Education]. (2018). English language teaching program (Primary and secondary 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades). Ankara: T.C. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı. Retrieved July 18, 2020, from, https://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/Dosyalar/201812411191321-%C4%B0NG%C4%B0L%C4%B0ZCE%20%C3%96%C4%9ERET%C4%B0M%20PROGRAMI%20Klas%C3%B6r%C3%BC.pdf

Nachar, N. (2008). The Mann-Whitney U: A test for assessing whether two independent samples come from the same distribution. *Tutorials in quantitative Methods for Psychology*, *4*(1), 13-20. Retrieved July 21, 2020, from, https://tqmp.org/RegularArticles/vol04-1/p013/p013.pdf

Orland-Barak, L., & Yinon, H. (2005). Different but similar: Student teachers' perspectives on the use of L1 in Arab and Jewish EFL classroom settings. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 18, 91-113. Retrieved April 19, 2020, from, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07908310508668735

Pan, Y. C., & Pan, Y. C. (2010). The use of L1 in the foreign language classroom. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journa*l, 12(2), 87-96. Retrieved July 18, 2020, from, http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0123-46412010000200007

Priestley, M., Biesta, G.J.J. & Robinson, S. (2015). Teacher agency: what is it and why does it matter? In R. Kneyber & J. Evers (eds.), Flip the System: Changing Education from the Bottom Up. London: Routledge. Retrieved July 22, 2020, from, https://dspace.stir.ac.uk/bitstream/1893/21559/1/Teacher%20agency%20matters_Flip%20the%20system_final.pdf

Sa'd, S. H. T., & Qadermazi, Z. (2015). L1 use in EFL classes with English-only policy: Insights from triangulated data. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal, 5*(2), 159-175. Retrieved 19 July, 2020, from, https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1128961.pdf

Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System*, *42*, 308-318. Retrieved April 15, 2020, from, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0346251X14000037?via%3Dihub

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *11*(8) /online/. Retrieved July 18, 2020, from, http://www.iteslj.org/Articles/SertCodeSwitching.html.

Setiawati, L. (2012). A descriptive study on the teacher talk at EYL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(2), 33-48. Retrieved July 20, 2020, from, https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/IJAL/article/view/83

Shabir, M. (2017). Student-teachers' beliefs on the use of L1 in EFL classroom: A global perspective. *English Language Teaching*, *10*(4), 45-52. Retrieved July 19, 2020, from, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1133200

Spahiu, I. (2013).Using native language in ESL classroom. *IJ-ELTS: International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 1(2), 243-248. Retrieved July 18, 2020, from, https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1167274.pdf

Şener, S., Korkut, P. (2017).Teacher trainees' awareness regarding mother tongue use in English as a foreign language classes.*Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13*(1), 41-61. July 21, 2020, from, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1140646

Tammenga-Helmantel, M., Mossing Holsteijn, L., & Bloemert, J. (2020). Target language use of Dutch EFL student teachers: Three longitudinal case studies. *Language Teaching Research*, 362168820911195. Retrieved July 21, 2020, from, https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1362168820911195

Timuçin, M., & Baytar, İ. (2015). The functions of the use of L1: Insights from an EFL classroom. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, *23*(1), 241-252. Retrieved July 21, 2020, from, https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/209874

Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? CS and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(3), 302- 325. Retrieved July 19, 2020, from, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00093.x

Yanfen, L., & Yuqin, Z. (2010). A study of teacher talk in interactions in english classes. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics. 33(2)*, 76- 86.

Yao, M. (2011). On attitudes to teachers' code-switching in EFL classes. *World Journal of English Language*, *1*(1), 19-28. Retrieved July 21, 2020, from, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276226234_On_Attitudes_to_Teachers'_Code-switching_in_EFL_Classes

Yildiz, M., & Yesilyurt, S. (2017). Use or avoid? The perceptions of prospective English teachers in Turkey about L1 use in English classes. *English Language Teaching*, *10*(1), 84-96. Retrieved July 19, 2020, from, https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1124246.pdf

Voicu, C. G. (2012). Overusing mother tongue in English language teaching. *International Journal of Communication Research*, *2*(3), 212. Retrieved July 21, 2020, from, https://www.ijcr.eu/articole/84_30_IJCR%203-2012.pdf

Wong, R. M. (2010). The effectiveness of using English as the sole medium of instruction in English classes: Student responses and improved English proficiency. *Porta Linguarum*, 13: 119-130. Retrieved July 20, 2020, from, https://www.academia.edu/7663341/The_Effectiveness_of_Using_English_as_the_Sole_Medium_of_Instruction_in_English_Classes_Student_Responses_and_Improved_English_Proficiency

Appendix 1

	TARGET LANGUAGE USE IN EFL CLASSROOMS
	Dear ELT Prospective Teachers!
	This questionnaire aims to investigate your beliefs about L2 use in EFL classrooms. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. The researcher requests your consent for participation in this study. Please put "X" under the correct options for you. I would be very happy if you could share your demographic information in addition to your beliefs regarding L2 use in EFL classrooms. Thanks for your contribution!
	Dr Şule ÇELİK KORKMAZ
	Part 1: Consent Items
	Please tick the correct options for you! ❖ I agree to participate in this study. I am aware of the purpose of the study and I am participating voluntarily. Yes ( ) No ( ) ❖ I grant permission for the data generated from this questionnaire to be used in the researcher's publication. Yes ( ) No ( )
	Part 2: Demographic Information
	Please tick the correct options for you! ❖ **Gender:** Female ( ) Male ( ) ❖ **Class:** Seniors ( ) Juniors ( ) ❖ **Classroom Teaching Experience:** Yes ( ) No ( ) ❖ **Being Abroad Experience:** Yes ( ) No ( )
	Part 3: Beliefs of ELT Prospective Teachers about L2 use in EFL classrooms

	1) Certainly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Certainly Agree	1	2	3	4	5
1	EFL teachers should use only L2 (English) throughout the lesson.					
2	EFL teachers should use L2 at students' level to minimize L1 use.					
3	EFL teachers should use their body language, gestures, and mimicries effectively to reduce L1 use.					
4	EFL teachers should support their L2 use with visual materials to reduce L1 use.					
5	An EFL teacher should give instructions in L2 at students' level.					
6	Classroom management and discipline should be handled in L2.					
7	Whether students understand what they are going to do should be checked in L2.					
8	EFL teachers should use L2 to provide functional language such as greetings.					
9	Giving information to clarify the target subject should be given in L2.					
10	Jokes that might change classroom atmosphere positive should be cracked in L2.					
11	Feedback to students' answers or activity outcomes should be given in L2.					
12	Supportive talks such as "well-done, super" should be in L2.					
13	EFL teachers should use L2 to encourage their students to increase their involvement to the lesson.					
14	Instructions of the new type of activities or exercises should be given in L2.					
15	EFL teachers should use L2 no matter how complex the instructions of an activity are.					