

Research Article

Mentoring ELT pre-service teachers: To use or not to use L1 in language classroom

Ümit Özkanal¹ and İlknur Yüksel²

¹Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Faculty of Education, Türkiye (ORCID: 0000-0003-2027-1337)

²Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Faculty of Education, Türkiye (ORCID: 0000-0003-1145-6495)

This study employed qualitative research methodology to investigate pre-service teachers' perceptions of L1 use in language classrooms and their reflections on mentor teachers' L1 use during practicum. In this way, the purpose of this study is to obtain a new perspective on the mentoring process of pre-service teachers during practicum, specifically in terms of L1 use as an important classroom dynamic in language teaching. 42 ELT pre-service teachers were selected and their teaching reflections and responses to open-ended questions were analyzed using a purposive sampling technique. Initially, some pre-service teachers expressed a preference for minimal or no use of L1 to promote immersive L2 learning. However, their observations of mentors' successful use of L1 for classroom administration caused them to change their minds. The results emphasize the significance of pre-service teachers' reflections on mentors' use of L1 and their willingness to modify their beliefs and instructional strategies in response to observed effectiveness.

Keywords: L1 use; Pre-service teachers; Mentoring; Mentor teachers

Article History: Submitted 29 May 2023; Revised 24 August 2023; Published online 9 September 2023

1. Introduction

Pre-service teachers can practice teaching in actual classrooms, observe experienced teachers, and receive guidance from them during the practicum, which is an essential component of teacher education. Significant stakeholders in the practicum process are mentor teachers in schools, as they guide pre-service teachers and influence their future practices. According to Lofthouse (2018), the practicum "helps new teachers acquire the skills they'll need to continue developing through continuing professional development" (p. 252).

During the practicum procedure, pre-service teachers have the opportunity to reinforce and apply the theories they have learned during territory education. They gain proficiency in a variety of skills, including teaching methods, techniques, classroom administration, etc. Language instruction must be dynamic and deliberate, taking classroom dynamics into account. Among these teaching-learning dynamics, L1 use is one of the most significant issues that pre-service teachers query, observe, and form their own opinions on during their practicum. In language classes, the use of the first language (L1) is an essential component. In addition, the topic of L1 use as a crucial classroom dynamic in language education has raised concerns in the context of pre-

Address of Corresponding Author

Ümit Özkanal, PhD, Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Faculty of Education, ELT Department, 26040 Odunpazarı, Eskişehir, Türkiye.

✉ ozkanal@gmail.com

How to cite: Özkanal, Ü. & Yüksel, İ. (2023). Mentoring ELT pre-service teachers: To use or not to use L1 in language classroom. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 7(4), 217-236. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202321853>

service teacher mentoring during practicum. However, a comprehensive understanding of how pre-service teachers perceive, observe, and evaluate their mentor teachers' use of L1 in language classes is lacking. This study aims to close this divide and shed light on both the opportunities and potential pitfalls of mentorship in language teaching by investigating pre-service teachers' perspectives and experiences regarding L1 use during practicum.

The implementations and attitudes of mentor teachers toward L1 use have an impact on the future practices of pre-service teachers. Even though pre-service teachers read and discuss numerous theories and studies on L1 use in their methodology courses, they witness the L1 use practices of their mentor teachers in actual classroom settings during practicum. Consequently, it is essential to investigate the practicum process and mentoring of pre-service teachers in terms of L1 use in order to investigate this contentious issue, L1 use, and obtain a fresh perspective on the practicum and mentoring process of pre-service teachers.

Although L1 use in language classrooms has been studied from various perspectives; as supporting (Çelik, 2008; de la Fuente, & Goldenberg, 2022; Jingxia, 2010) and objecting (Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002) and investigating the reasons (Sali, 2011; Zakaria, 2013), there are very few studies on pre-service teachers' opinions and practices about L1 in relation to mentor teachers and practicum. This study's primary objective is to investigate pre-service teachers' perspectives on L1 use in language classrooms and their reflections on mentor teachers' L1 use during practicum. In this way, the purpose of this study is to obtain a new perspective on the mentoring process of pre-service teachers during practicum, specifically in terms of L1 use as an important classroom dynamic in language teaching. The following research questions were posed of pre-service teachers regarding their L1 use perspectives:

RQ 1) How do future ELT instructors view the use of L1 in language classrooms?

RQ 2) How do they reflect on their mentor instructors' use of the L1 in language classes?

RQ 3) How do they evaluate the L1 proficiency of their language teachers' mentors?

It is believed that the results of this study could have significant implications for teacher training programs that question the theory and practice of L1 use, as well as contribute to the literature on codeswitching by providing actual observations, implementations, and reflections of pre-service teachers.

1.1. Literature Review

Just like Shakespeare's famous quote, there is another one in language teaching and learning: To use or not to use L1 when teaching L2. This has been and still is the main question whose answer has not been found yet. Despite having been studied, no one has found a sound answer as to use L1 while teaching L2. It seems that the debate on the use of L1 in L2 classes will be never over. While some support and insist the use of merely L2 in L2 classroom (Edstrom, 2009; Ellis, 1984), others support the use of L1 by stating it can lead a kind of association between learners and teachers, and the exclusion of L1 may not be appropriate in many situations (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Mirza et al., 2012). For the supporters, L1 use is seen as an essential tool having a facilitating role in foreign language teaching and learning process (Çelik, 2008; Jingxia, 2010). Similarly, Brown (2000) claims that L1 can be seen as a facilitator tool, not just an interfering factor, and Schweers (1999) suggests teachers to use L1 in their classes to influence the classroom dynamic expressing that using L1 may create a kind of secure atmosphere for students in class and allow them to express themselves. Tang (2002) adds two more reasons for using L1 in L2 classes by putting forward that L1 use brings effectiveness to the classroom and it saves time. Some are in favour of using L1 by stating that foreign language teachers should use moderate amount of L1 in order to maximize learning second language (Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Thongwicht, 2013). However, the term "moderate amount" is not so clear; what is moderate? Does it mean a tool towards reducing learners' anxiety (Meyer, 2008) or is it a technique to clarify some complex grammar points or vocabulary? To what extent should L1 be used in learning and teaching L2; or to check understanding, and to give instructions? (Afzal, 2013).

For some, L1 use is an impediment to an effective learning environment because it generates a learning atmosphere that is not sufficiently challenging and reduces concentration. Using L1 in the classroom may result in comfort, which can eventually lead to sloth (Edstrom, 2009). Atkinson (1987) warns of the peril of excessive L1 use in language classes, stating that it may result in the translation of the majority of language items into L1. Similarly, Nation (2003) argues that the use of L1 in the classroom reduces the quantity of L2 input and practice opportunities. These ideas are supported by Harmer's (2007) assertion that "English should predominate in an English lesson, particularly where the teacher is concerned, since, as we have seen, he or she is the best source of comprehensible input that the students have." In addition, English is the language they are learning and not their L1."

One of the proponents of L2 use in the classroom, Seligson (1997), believes that using L2 is the only way for learners to be exposed and adds that by using L2 most or all of the time in class, students are provided with listening practice and the opportunity to respond naturally to the spoken language, which is essential for exposure. The author also notes that using L2 alters the classroom atmosphere in a significant and positive way and allows the teacher to create a more positive and motivating environment by removing some learning barriers. He believes that the use of L1 by pupils should be minimized by rejecting the use of L1 when it can be expressed in L2. Burden (2001) asserts that the classroom is the only source of L2 exposure for instructors and that L2 use should be mandatory. In a similar vein, Ellis (2005) argues that the use of L2 should be maximized by considering it not only as the subject of instruction but also as the medium of instruction.

Those who oppose the use of L1 in learning/teaching L2 believe that excessive use of L1 in L2 classes inhibits learners' exposure to the L2 and distorts the input, and that patterns transferred from the L1 are the primary causes of errors in L2 learning (Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002).

According to the dilemma, there are two primary approaches: the monolingual approach and the bilingual approach. As their names imply, the monolingual approach emphasizes the amount of exposure to the target language in classroom settings, whereas the bilingual approach suggests that native language aids in the acquisition of L2. Advocates of the monolingual approach assert that L1 and L2 learning share some characteristics and that it is crucial to prevent the negative transmission of L1 knowledge to L2 learning by exposing students to L2 as much as possible and L1 as little as possible (Krashen, 1981). Those in favor of a bilingual approach, on the other hand, are not in favor of the complete exclusion of L1 from L2 courses and advocate a moderate and appropriate use of L1 (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Thompson & Harrison, 2014; White & Storch, 2012).

With the emergence of the bilingual approach, there have been recent changes in the use of L1 versus L2 in foreign language classrooms, which can be termed "hybridity rather than monolingual exclusivity" (Canagarajah, 2007). Some view L1 as a constructive element that aids the L2 learning process or as a sort of foundation that learners can build upon if it is used sparingly and thoughtfully (Harbord, 1992). One of the proponents of L1, Macaro (2001), argues that L1 is an effective instrument for foreign language acquisition and that learners should not be prohibited from using it. Sali (2011), another proponent of L1, asserts that there are three primary functions of using L1 in L2 classes: academic, managerial, and social-cultural. By academic function, she means the communication of the lesson's content, by managerial function, the efficient regulation of classroom interactions and proceedings, and by social-cultural function, the effort to improve classroom relationships.

Similar to the "hybrid approach," Nation (2003) introduced the "balanced approach," which states that instructors should respect learners' L1 and avoid doing things that make L1 seem inferior to L2. According to him, it is the responsibility of the English teacher to assist students in developing their English proficiency, and this approach seeks a role for the L1 while recognizing the significance of L2 use in the classroom. Zakaria (2013) also lists comparable applications of L1

such as "assisting in establishing security, conveying the meaning of words, assessing comprehension, and explaining grammatical rules" (p. 373). To expand the detailed list of L1 applications, Schweers (1999) suggested the uses summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Suggested Uses for the L1 in the EFL Classroom (Schweers, 1999, p. 7)

1. Eliciting language	<i>"How do you say 'X' in English?"</i>
2. Checking comprehension	<i>"How do you say 'I've been waiting for ten minutes' in Spanish?" (Also used for comprehension of a reading or listening text.)</i>
3. Giving complex instructions to basic levels	
4. Co-operating in groups	<i>Learners compare and correct answers to exercises or tasks in the L1. Students at times can explain new points better than the teacher.</i>
5. Explaining classroom methodology at basic levels.	
6. Using translation to highlight a recently taught language item.	
7. Checking for sense	<i>If students write or say something in the L2 that does not make sense, have them try to translate it into the L1 to realize their error.</i>
8. Testing	<i>Translation items can be useful in testing mastery of forms and meanings.</i>
9. Developing circumlocution strategies	<i>When students do not know how to say something in L2, have them think of different ways to say the same thing in L1, which may be easier to translate.</i>

1.1.1. Teachers' opinion towards the use of L1

Some studies on the L1 use of teachers found that most teachers had positive thoughts towards the use of L1 in classrooms. Some teachers stated that the judicious amount of L1 use was appropriate. Appropriate use of L1 in an L2 classroom can be advantageous and does not hinder L2 acquisition. In fact, meticulous use of L1 can facilitate the acquisition of L2 due to its numerous advantages (Zulfikar, 2018).

The findings of different studies carried out at different school levels also showed that teachers had more positive thoughts on the use of L1 than L2 (Ahsan et al., 2016; Shabir, 2017). In a study by Lin (2005), it was found that the use of L1 by teachers was different; some used as single words and some as complete sentences and also the amount of use depended on the level of students. While L1 was used more frequently with elementary students, it was used less with advanced students.

Manara (2007) found that 57% of teachers agreed that L2 should be the sole medium of instruction and concluded that the majority of teachers support monolingual instruction, but that there is still room for L1 use in L2 classes in emergency situations. Macaro (2005) found that the majority of teachers viewed L1 use as immoral and regrettable, but necessary and unavoidable. Similarly, in a separate study, Edstrom (2006) observed that despite her efforts to maximize the use of L2 in her lectures, she was forced to use L1 at times. Based on these studies, it is possible to conclude that although some teachers did not wish to use L1 in their classrooms, they were compelled to do so for various reasons, and others found it beneficial as a tool for facilitating the acquisition of L2.

In a study conducted by Kim Anh (2010) with Vietnamese university teachers regarding the use of Vietnamese (L1) in teaching English, it was determined that the moderate use of L1 was required in certain situations when teaching English, and all participants advocated for the use of L1 in the classrooms, stating that L1 was a part of their teaching method and could play a positive role in their classroom. In a similar vein, Harun et al. (2014) reported that L1 use allowed learners

to discover and comprehend the L2 grammatical concept while investigating the role of L1 in enhancing Malaysian EFL learners' understanding of the English tense. According to the Vygotskian perspective, language serves not only as an instrument for communication but also as a psychological tool in the cognitive development of an individual.

The study of Aminifard and Mehrpour (2019) showed that more than half of the total number of teachers used L1 in the L2 classroom in the countries Iran and New Zealand. According to the study, 83 teachers out of 110 in Iran used L1 to interact with young learners in English classes. It is known that the numerous functions of L1 use in L2 classes are also related to the language teachers' total L1 usage. Although the primary objective in the classroom is to maximize the teaching of L2, there is no consensus regarding the proportion of L1 used in FL classes, as indicated by the issue's general trend. Therefore, previous research has shown that instructors use L1 for a variety of purposes and in varying amounts when teaching FL (Taşcı & Ataç, 2020). In the same vein, based on the results of the study with Indonesian teachers and students, Liando et al. (2023) listed the reasons why teachers tended to use L1 in language classrooms such as facilitating the connection between students' existing knowledge and new information, enhancing student motivation, and fostering an engaging and participatory learning environment. Nevertheless, over reliance on the first language (L1) was identified as a possible concern due to its potential to hinder the development of proficiency in the target language.

According to Wach and Monroy's (2019) study, Polish and Spanish EFL teacher-in-training beliefs about the utility of learners' L1 in teaching L2 English differ significantly. While both groups agreed that the L1 must be used in lower-level classrooms, the Spanish participants were more negative than positive on a number of crucial issues relating to the L1's usefulness, such as the justification of the translation technique in teaching vocabulary, of grammatical explanations being conveyed in the L1, of translating texts for comprehension, of coursebooks containing explanations in the L1, etc. For the vast majority of items, the Polish group's opinions exhibited the opposite pattern, with positive responses outnumbering negative ones. In general, the quantitative analyses revealed that Polish participants had a greater understanding of the function of the L1 in the EFL classroom than Spanish participants. This involved both the managerial and affective duties of the L1 as well as its role in teaching specific aspects of the L2.

A study conducted in Turkey by İnal and Turhanlı (2019) on the attitudes of teachers toward the use of L1 in L2 classrooms revealed that teachers had a slightly negative view of the practice. The qualitative data of the study, on the other hand, indicated that the teachers' general opinion regarding the use of L1 was positive. The results of this study were comparable to those of Kıcı and Mahmutoğlu's (2013) and Sarandi's (2013) studies in that a certain level of L1 usage was deemed acceptable. Taner and Balıkcı, (2022) explained the shift from negative to positive attitude towards the use of L1 in terms of experience and context. The results of their study indicated that both experience and the L2 teaching and learning context were influential on teachers' practices and beliefs while experienced teachers were more tolerant of the use of L1 in all of their practices than pre-service teachers, who tended to favour English only.

The studies on the teachers' opinions about L1 use in the literature agreed that teachers tend to use L1 as a beneficial tool and for specific aims to manage classrooms, maintain classroom and task dynamics, anxiety management, student rapport and interaction. The teachers' tendency differs in terms of experience, teaching context and skill to be taught.

1.1.2. Learners' attitude towards L1

Regarding the use of L1 and L2 in the classroom, it is essential to solicit the attitudes and viewpoints of students as the primary participants. Multiple studies conducted on the topic revealed that students favored L1 because they believed teachers who spoke their language would be more beneficial to them. In a study conducted by Satio and Ebsworth (2004), it was revealed that students desired explanations in L1 and that they found it startling that native English speakers did not permit them to use L1 in class.

To use L1 as a beneficial tool for communication, for establishing or maintaining control of the group, for reducing anxiety and for explicit focus on grammatical forms or vocabulary for comprehension and/or learning is accepted as the principled approach to L1 use (Levine, 2014). The teachers are to decide on L1 use observing their students, considering their needs and task dynamics (de la Fuente & Goldenberg, 2022). When compared L2-only approach and the principled approach of L1 in the second language teaching, specifically for writing and speaking skill development, de la Fuente and Goldenberg (2022) found out that the courses under both conditions promoted improvements in speaking and writing. However, students in the +L1 condition improved significantly more than those in the control -L1 group, both in speaking and writing. This finding suggests a potentially significant influence of the first language (L1) in the acquisition and development of a second language (L2). They emphasized that learners use their L1, and teachers have a difficult time 'managing' this. Once teachers have a trained awareness, they may formulate and apply their own informed, principled approach to L1. And, once they see their students as L2 users with two languages, they might become aware of the reason for their L1 usage and favour L1 use to improve their proficiency.

The findings of Huang's (2006) study of students' attitudes toward L1 use in a writing class at a Taiwanese university revealed that the students supported the use of L1 by instructors when explaining grammatical points, generating ideas, and explaining difficult concepts. On the other hand, although they wanted their instructors to use L1 in certain situations, they requested that the percentage not exceed 25 percent of class time, stating that frequent use of L1 by teachers would decrease their motivation and attention. In a similar vein, Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz's (2011) study of L1 use in EFL classes with low- and high-level English students revealed that all students, regardless of their levels, favored English over their native language in class.

1.1.3. Pre-service teachers' opinions

It is believed that pre-service teachers' opinions can be useful and provide insight into a variety of issues in the field of L2 education, and that their beliefs provide a solid foundation for empirical research. Studies on the beliefs of both pre-service and in-service teachers primarily focus on teaching experience and education (Borg, 2006; Peacock, 2001). The experience of pre-service teachers as language learners regarding the use of L1 appears to be significant, and it has been discovered that the pre-service teachers' prior experience influences their beliefs, philosophies, and practices. This factor is referred to by Lortie (1975) as "apprenticeship of observation," and he states that the experience acquired during their school years influences their behavior as teachers. In a similar vein, Borg (2004) asserts that when pre-service teachers are ready for training in schools, they already have some experience because they have observed and evaluated their instructors at their own schools; this contributes to their knowledge as future teachers. Borg (2006) adds that pre-service teachers' cognition is shaped by what they contribute to the teaching situation as well as what they encounter in practice.

The opinions of pre-service teachers regarding the use of L1 in teaching L2 may be deemed significant. A search of the relevant literature reveals that few studies have been conducted on the topic. In one of the scarce studies, Lee (2016) found that in-service teachers were more supportive of L1 in L2 instruction than pre-service teachers undergoing practicum training in schools. This finding is similar to the results of another study by Hall and Cook (2013), which found that teachers' attitudes toward L1 use become less dogmatic and more pragmatic with experience. According to the results of another study, there are variable levels of L1 use in teaching L2 depending on cultural, contextual, and individual factors. According to a study of the beliefs and practices of Mexican pre-service teachers in an EFL program (Higareda et al., 2009), pre-service teachers used L1 in their instruction, particularly for teaching grammar and vocabulary, but the majority denied its utility for giving instructions and classroom management. Othman and Kiely (2016) found in another study that Malay pre-service instructors held some peculiar beliefs regarding the use of L1 when teaching L2. Although they believed that the use of L1 should be

avoided when teaching L2, they admitted that they did so to help students comprehend explanations and instructions. Agudo (2017) found that Spanish ELT pre-service teachers supported the use of L2 in the classroom, stating that it facilitated the acquisition of L2 and adding that teachers should use L2 in the classroom. In addition, they indicated that L1 could be used to explain grammar, difficult vocabulary, and give complex instructions. Based on the depicted studies, it is possible to conclude that pre-service teachers have mixed sentiments regarding the use of L1 in teaching L2.

2. Method

The study employed a qualitative research design to investigate pre-service teachers' perspectives on L1 use in language classrooms and their reflections on mentor teachers' L1 use during practicum. (Noble & Smith, 2015) Qualitative research is a suitable method for investigating individuals' perspectives, experiences, and beliefs, which aligns with the study's objective of comprehending the perspectives of pre-service teachers. Through thematic analysis, qualitative research permits an in-depth examination of the opinions and experiences of the participants. This methodology permits the accumulation of rich and detailed data, allowing for a comprehensive understanding of the participants' perspectives and experiences. Additionally, qualitative research design permits flexibility and adaptability in data collection and analysis. The researchers can adjust their approach based on emerging themes and insights from the data (Branney et al., 2022). This approach enables the researchers to capture the complexity and nuances of the participants' opinions and reflections.

In addition, qualitative research design is well-suited for investigating subjective experiences and comprehending their social and cultural context (Hall & Cook, 2012). The researchers were able to obtain a deeper understanding of the participants' perspectives and the relationship between their views and experiences by employing a qualitative methodology. In this way, the phenomenon of L1 use in language classrooms was qualitatively investigated from the perspective of ELT pre-service teachers in relation to the mentoring they received at state schools in actual classrooms, focusing on a specific number of cases (samples) in a unique context.

2.1. Participants

Participants in this study included 42 pre-service ELT teachers and 11 mentor teachers who were selected using purposeful sampling, a technique widely used in qualitative research for the identification and selection of information-rich cases. (Campbell et al., 2020) Purposive sampling is the deliberate selection of participants or cases that can provide valuable insights and an in-depth comprehension of the research topic. The purpose of purposeful sampling is to ensure that the selected participants or cases can contribute abundant and meaningful data to the understanding of the research topic (Palinkas et al., 2015). By selecting information-dense cases on purpose, researchers can gain insights that may not be possible with a larger, more representative sample. (Campbell et al., 2020) Purposive sampling enables researchers to prioritize quality over quantity, emphasizing the profundity of understanding over the breadth of coverage.

Out of a total of 42 participants 10 male and 32 female pre-service teachers were enrolled in the fourth year of the BA English Language Teaching Department in Eskisehir, Turkey,. The participants ranged in age from 22 to 24 and came from various regions of Turkey. They had a C1 level of proficiency and were about to graduate from college. Eight participants (all female) attended primary school under the supervision of two mentor teachers, while twenty participants (7 males and 13 females) attended secondary school under the supervision of six mentors. 14 students (3 males and 11 females) attended the secondary school practicum under the supervision of three teachers.

Participants observed eleven mentor educators. During the course of the investigation, each mentor was employed at a public school. Five of them taught at the high school level, two at the

elementary level, and four at the secondary level. All of them had a minimum of five years of experience. They had mentored the pre-service teachers for at least three years.

During data collection, each participant was actively enrolled in their practicum course. In prior terms, they had completed successfully Methodology I and II, as well as Approaches to ELT and Teaching English to Young Learners I and II. For their practicum courses, they were assigned to state schools ranging from elementary to secondary, where they participated in six class hours per week of observations and macro teaching (40 minutes) under the supervision of an academician and one mentor teacher for four pre-service teachers. They were required to observe their mentor teachers for five class hours and to teach the mentor's language subject for one hour per week. As a requirement for this course, they were required to maintain teaching journals that included reflections on their mentors' lessons as well as their own practice instruction.

2.2. Data Collection

This study's data collection instruments consisted of open-ended questions about their perspectives of L1 use in language classrooms and their reflection journals about both their mentor teachers' and their own L1 use during their observations during practicum.

Three open-ended questions were posed: the first asked about the necessity of L1 use in language classrooms, the second about when L1 could be used, and the third prompted respondents to provide specific examples of when they used L1 and explain the rationale.

In the study, two separate reflection journals were analysed. The first was about their observations, reflections, and evaluations of their mentors' L1 use in language classrooms. The second consisted of 12 weeks' worth of teaching reflections maintained by practicum students during their teaching experience.

2.3. Data Analysis

For this qualitative study, qualitative data derived from open-ended queries and reflection journals were analyzed descriptively. Following the paradigm of Yıldırım and Şimşek (2011), four steps were taken. On the basis of the research questions and the conceptual framework of the study, which is L1 use in language classrooms and how mentors mentor pre-service teachers about this, a framework for descriptive analysis was developed, and themes were identified for the subsequent classification of the data. Second, the data organized in accordance with the thematic framework were read, combined in a meaningful and logical manner, and irrelevant data were eliminated. Thirdly, the previously organized data were defined and supported by direct participant quotations; and finally, the identified findings were explained, related, and interpreted in relation to each research question.

As a result, three major themes for the pre-service teachers' L1 use (positive, moderate and negative opinions to L1 use) and mentor teachers' L1 use were emerged. To increase the reliability, each participant was assigned a number and listed from 1 to 42. After that, the sentences that reflected the participants' opinions were pasted under the sub-themes. During this process, no corrections were made in the responses of the student teachers in order to keep the original language of the qualitative data intact. Lastly, to ensure validity, all parts of the data were analyzed and examined again and again, while iterative cases were actively eliminated in comprehensive data treatment (Creswell, 2014).

3. Findings

Pre-service teachers' reflections on their reported opinions, self-reflection of their own teaching practices in L1, observations and evaluations of mentors' practices of L1 use in language classrooms were analyzed qualitatively in order to investigate the pre-service teachers' attitudes toward L1 use in language classrooms and to reveal how their mentor teachers influence their attitudes and implementations regarding L1 use (see Table 2).

3.1. The Pre-service Teachers' Opinions on L1 Use: How do pre-service ELT teachers view the usage of L1 in language classrooms?

To demonstrate how practicum and mentoring influence pre-service teachers' opinions and practices in L1 use while teaching English, we analyzed the pre-service teachers' responses to open-ended questions about whether or not to use L1 and, if so, how and in what circumstances, so that their own opinions about L1 use were revealed. Positive, moderate, and negative themes about L1 usage emerged in the initial analysis.

According to Table 2, the majority of pre-service teachers in this study preferred L2 over L1 in language classrooms. While the majority of respondents emphasized the necessity and efficacy of L2 in language classrooms for language acquisition and methodology of language teaching principles, some acknowledged that they did not use L1 in the practicum (6 PTS). In addition, the analysis reveals that ten pre-service teachers did not embrace or reject L1 use categorically, but instead reported that L1 can be used when necessary. These pre-service instructors with moderate viewpoints tend to use L1 based on the level of the students, administrative concerns, and requirements. Seven pre-service teachers in the study supported using L1 in their teaching practices, highlighting the fact that young learners in particular do not understand English and the majority of students interact more effectively in L1.

To gain insight into these divergent viewpoints, each theme and subtheme was re-examined, and it was discovered that the majority of pre-service teachers preferred to avoid or minimize the use of L1 in the language classroom. As evidenced by the following quotations, they intended to rely on English, body language, and visual aids to promote learning.

PTS2: "As a trainee teacher who is against using L1 while learning another language, I have to say that I try to almost never use L1. Even where students do not understand, I try to express using other simple English words. If it fails again, I try to actively use my body language and facial expressions. I try to explain it by drawing on the smart board or on the white board. ..."

PTS12: "I don't prefer talking L1. What is the best way of learning English? It is by living, isn't it? I think we all agree with that. So, let's say that we live in USA and we do not know English at all, would the people in USA talk to us in our L1? Of course not! We would have to face with those challenges. Big win requires big sacrifice. We have to force ourselves as well as our students."

On the contrary to such pre-service teachers who were against the use of L1, some pre-service teachers with moderate opinions acknowledged the need to strike a balance between L1 and L2 use in language classrooms. They recognized specific situations where L1 could be beneficial, such as explaining abstract concepts, providing clear instructions, or clarifying challenging vocabulary. These students highlighted the advantages of using both languages for comparative learning and motivation. It indicates a flexible approach to L1 use, where it is selectively employed to enhance comprehension and facilitate instruction.

PTS17: "I could use L1 in some cases like explaining an abstract word, difficult grammar point and responding to personal needs of the students. I would say that I could use L1 in the classroom mostly because of the limited time we have at our schools. By this way we can gain so much time and invest it into something else..."

PTS31: "...if I say the instructions of an activity two or three times in L2, but I realize that the majority of the students do not understand, then I will briefly explain in L1..."

Some students clearly explained the necessity of balanced approach to L1 and L2 use rather than strict L2-only approach. The following quotations clarified their opinions:

PTS14: "...I think we can use both L1 and L2 in the lessons because there are benefits of hearing and speaking in both of the languages to learn English for the students. If the teacher does this in the right way the students can make a comparison between the structures of both of the languages and understand how each language work."

Some pre-service teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the limited opportunity to use L1 in the language classroom. They believed that allowing L1 use could facilitate student expression,

Table 2
The Pre-service teachers' Opinions about L1 use in Language Classrooms

Themes	f	Notes
Positive to use L1	7	The pre-service teachers under this theme support the idea of using L1 in language classrooms PTS29: "We all know Turkish so why don't we use it?" PTS15: "Every teacher speaks L1 so I do and will." PTS33: "No matter how simple I speak, children don't understand me."
Moderate to use L1	10	The pre-service teachers under this theme are not clear about their opinions but tend to perform depending on the conditions. PTS21: "Although my request is to never use L1, I can use L1 when I feel like I have no other choice." PTS13: "In my opinion, we cannot say that we should never use L1 in our classrooms. We can use it time to time"
Negative to use L1	25	The pre-service teachers under this theme either refuse the idea of L1 use or they cannot use due to the prohibition of L1 use in the lessons during practicum PTS3: "But I can't imagine an English class where I speak completely Turkish." PTS5: "I haven't used L1 so far at all and I will not." PTS19: "L2 cannot be taught with L1" PTS6: "Unfortunately, we have no chance to use L1 in any way during the lesson"

problem-solving, and motivation. For instance, PTS6 asserted that "Unfortunately, we have no chance to use L1 in any way during the lesson. I think that students should be able to use L1 while voicing their problems." In another response, PTS19 stated that "Sometimes students need interaction, when they hear Turkish they are motivated to talk..."

Moreover, some students drew attention that L1 use might be necessary especially with young learners whose language proficiency is not so well and cannot understand. They reported that no matter how simple they speak in English, children do not understand and they get frustrated and demotivated. Thus, they thought that L1 use is necessary with young learners. Nevertheless, there are some pre-service teachers who insisted to use L1 in spite of students' frustration and L1 questions and declared that they managed to use L2 eventually.

PTS12: "My students tried to avoid L2 by asking me almost everything in L1, I replied, "English?". They asked me many questions in L1, I answered in L2. They came to me with various translations of unrelated things and wanted me to evaluate their translation, firstly, I said "Is this the right time to come ask me?" or "We are in the middle of the lesson right now." And then I continued my lesson. If they didn't understand an instruction, I simplified it. If they were noisy, I did the good old "plain staring" at them and they became silent. If they started to entertain themselves with other stuff, I gently told them to listen to me or asked a random question about the lesson to them."

Overall, the findings suggest a range of perspectives among pre-service teachers regarding the use of L1 in language classrooms. While some prioritize immersive L2 learning and advocate for minimal or no use of L1, others recognize the potential benefits of selective L1 use in specific situations. These findings reveal varying perspectives on L1 use, with some students who value its potential benefits for student engagement and others embracing a strict L2-only approach. Additionally, these findings indicated that the pre-service teachers are mostly aware of the factors such as student preferences, instructional objectives, and the promotion of L2 immersion when making decisions about L1 use in the language classroom.

3.2. The Reflections on the Mentor Teachers' L1 Use: How do they reflect on the L1 usage of their mentor teachers in language classes?

The analysis of the provided data on pre-service teachers' reflection on mentors' use of L1 reveals several themes regarding the effectiveness of L1 use in the classroom. These themes include the contextual use of L1, minimal L1 use for language immersion, L1 use for clarification and individualization, and L1 use in specific lesson phases. The themes capture both positive and negative perspectives on mentors' L1 use, highlighting the need for a balanced approach that considers the specific learning goals and individual student needs (see Table 3).

Table 3

Theme and Subthemes Emerged for Mentors' L1 Use

<i>Themes/Sub-themes</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>Descriptions</i>
Contextual Use of L1	45	The mentors were observed to use L1 in certain contexts
-Grammar Teaching		
-Vocabulary Teaching		
-Giving Instructions		
-Testing		
-Classroom management		
L1 for Clarification and Comprehension	35	The mentors were observed to use L1 for clarification and comprehension
-Comprehension Check		
-Eliciting		
-Preventing Confusion		
-Error correction		
L1 for Interaction	40	The mentors were observed to use L1 for interaction with students
-Building rapport		
-Social-chat		
No L1 Use	3	The mentors were reported not to use L1 at all

As Table 3 indicates, the pre-service teachers reported that their mentor teachers mostly used L1 for contextual purposes at the different stages of lessons. They observed that mentor teachers mostly favored L1 use when explaining complex or abstract concepts in grammar and vocabulary, providing instructions, or discussing important information such as exam-related topics. One of the pre-service teachers exemplified such an instance about complex grammar topic as:

PTS25: "...In one of our lessons, some students couldn't understand parts of speech such as adjectives and verbs, and even though the teacher tried to explain it in L2, students still couldn't understand it. Eventually, the teacher switched to L1 and gave the explanation. Same thing happened with to get used to and past continuous tense."

The second emerged theme for the mentor teachers' L1 use is L1 for *Clarification and Comprehension*. Students acknowledge that mentors sometimes use L1 to clarify complex tasks, explanations. L1 is also used during error correction or vocabulary explanations to ensure students' understanding before transitioning back to L2. In these cases, L1 is seen as a tool to ensure comprehension and prevent confusion among students.

PTS6: "...the lessons that I have observed, the last part where my mentor uses L1 is the part where she uses comprehension checking questions. She asks the questions with L1 to check whether the students understand the given instructions."

PTS9: "...The mentor teacher asked an abstract word in L2 and the students tried to say its meaning in L1, but they could not guess the meaning correctly. In this case, the mentor teacher told the abstract word momentarily in L1 and continued to explain it in L2."

PTS21: "...My mentor uses L1 a lot during the lessons. Her warm-up is mostly L1, during lessons she talks to the students with L1 a lot, and around half of the time she does error correction with L1."

Thirdly, the pre-service teachers' reflections about their mentors' L1 use were categorized under the theme of *L1 for Interaction*. They acknowledge that the mentors' use of L1 is more prevalent during specific phases of the lesson, such as the warm-up or wrap-up discussions. During these informal conversations, the mentors may use L1 to build rapport with students and establish a comfortable learning environment. Additionally, it was observed that the mentors used L1 in personal situations, such as providing comfort or addressing emotional needs. Students believe that the use of L1 in these cases creates a warm environment where students feel understood and supported. This finding suggests that mentors strategically use L1 during specific lesson phases to facilitate communication and create a supportive classroom atmosphere.

PTS13: "...after finishing some activities our mentor just starts to speak in Turkish. She talks about general topics about the class, students, their quizzes, their homeworks, their plans or their problems. She makes her lesson like it is a Turkish guidance lesson".

One of the pre-service teachers gave a striking example of how the mentor teacher used L1 to satisfy a student's emotional need and manage the classroom.

PTS5: "...L1 is often used by the teacher to show her anger towards an unwanted behavior in the classroom. She warns in L2 at first, but if the unwanted behavior still continues, she switches to L1 to show seriousness. I would say that our teacher switches to L1 whenever there's a personal issue with the students. This could also be responding to a student's emotional need. There was a case that the student was upset because she did her presentation poorly and some students laughed at her. The teacher immediately switched to L1 and comforted her. I think speaking L1 in those personal situations is effective because it makes the moment more intimate."

Lastly, five of the pre-service teachers reported that their mentors did not use L1 in the lessons they observed at all. They appreciated their mentors' stance against L1 use and they reported that they had a chance to observe L2-only approach for all classroom dynamics.

Overall, the data reveals varying perspectives on the effectiveness of mentors' L1 use. While some students appreciate L1 use in certain contexts to enhance understanding and support emotional needs, others emphasize the importance of minimizing L1 use to foster language immersion and target language proficiency. They argue that excessive L1 use can hinder language

immersion and discourage students from actively using the target language. These students believe that minimizing L1 use, even during grammar lessons, can encourage students to engage more with the target language and improve their language skills. These findings highlight the need for a balanced approach that takes into account the specific learning goals, individual student needs, and the overall language immersion environment.

3.3. The Pre-service Teachers' Evaluation on Mentors' L1 Use: How do they evaluate the L1 proficiency of their mentors in language instruction?

When the pre-service teachers' reflections on the effectiveness of mentors' L1 use were examined, it was seen that most of the pre-service teachers ($f = 28$) appreciated the mentors when L1 was used for contextual purposes and for clarification and comprehension. They realized that many mentor teachers used L1 as the last resort. Particularly, for complex grammar topics and abstract vocabulary, L1 explanation was the best solution for the pre-service teachers as well. For instance:

PTS29: "I believe my mentor's use of L1 is always on point. She always uses as a last resort and the students are get used to her using the target language first when there is an unknown word that has to be guessed. They try to guess its meaning first with using the words meaning. If they can't understand, they the teacher uses L1. I think this way of using L1 is effective. The definitions are not served on a silver plate for students. Instead, they are trying hard to get the meaning from their teacher."

Additionally, for clarification and comprehension purposes, not intensive but limited L1 use was appreciated by the pre-service teachers. One of the pre-service teachers exemplified the case in detail:

PTS 33: "For example; Our mentor teacher was giving instructions about writing a dialogue. (Expressing Likes/Dislikes - Making Suggestions) The mentor teacher explained the instruction on how to write the dialogue, but realized that the students did not understand. This time she explained the same instruction using simpler and with hand gestures. But when she realized that some students still did not understand what to do, she spoke L1 for a moment and continued to explain the rest of the instruction in L2 again."

In contrast to positive evaluations of mentors' L1 use, there were some pre-service teachers ($f = 14$) who criticized their mentors' L1 use, especially overuse of L1 in the language classrooms. They named such L1 use as waste of time and a kind of short-cuts.

PTS3: "She mostly use L1 while explaining the rules, tenses, forms and the examples to the students. She thinks that it is more relatable and clearer for students to use L1 while teaching grammar. In the first weeks, she always explained herself to us like "Now, I need to use L1 for my students to make it clearer."

PTS17: "...my mentor directly uses L1 for a long time (as long as the chat goes) to catch up with the students. Half of the times she does error correction, she uses L1. Sometimes she describes meanings of the words in L1 too. Use of L1 during chatting in the lesson is just a wasted time for me. Because that time can be used to reinforce their receptive and productive skills by exposing them to L2."

The findings showed that the pre-service teachers evaluated their mentors' L1 use in terms of students' needs, classroom dynamics and teaching learning process.

The reflections indicated that the pre-service teachers evaluated the effectiveness of L1 use in terms of gain and loss dynamics. For instance, some pre-service teachers ($f = 3$) reported that their mentors used L1 mostly in social chat. Although they accepted that such interaction in L1 is important to build a rapport with students, extending and overusing such L1 chatting were evaluated as a missed opportunity. Some pre-service teachers suggested more fun or ice-breaking activities in L2 would work better and contribute more students' language acquisition. Thus, mentors' overuse of L1 use in social chats and interactions was evaluated as a kind of loss. On the contrary, many pre-service teachers ($f = 15$) appreciated their mentors' L1 use while giving instructions. They emphasized that rather than giving instructions in L1, the use of L1 to a limited extent, few words or phrases, is essential especially when the students are confused and they considered that their mentors managed such limited but effective L1 use in instructions. For the

pre-service teachers, it is crucial to apply the tasks effectively and make them work smoothly, for this, the students should understand what to do for the tasks. Giving instructions in L2 is mostly challenging for many pre-service teachers and they reported their difficulty in this issue. When they observed L1 use could solve this problem and more and even all students participated when they got L1 instruction, they appreciated the effectiveness of L1 use.

The teaching reflections also showed how many pre-service teachers put this observed point in practice. Many pre-service teachers ($f = 17$) admitted that they started to use L1 in giving instruction towards the end of practicum in spite of no-L1 policy but for the sake of effective tasks and teaching-learning process. Thus, it could be stated that many pre-service teachers had mentoring of L1 use in giving instructions during practicum observing their mentors. As they observed and realized how L1 could settle task confusions, they used it.

Another notable finding is that the pre-service teachers tended to use L1 for classroom management more throughout the practicum. While at the beginning of practicum, they were idealistic to use L2 all the time, as a result of mentor observations and their own experience, they realized that students reacted more and faster when they had L1 warnings. One of the pre-service teachers, PTS23, explained this as "I did my best but they did not listen to me at all. Whenever I warned them in L1 they kept silent and studied....In fact, my mentor did so. The silence is important, you know..."

In the same way, another pre-service teacher explained how their observations of mentor could change their beliefs in L1 use especially for classroom management.

S5: "At first, I was so against L1 use. They are high school students and their English levels are good. I tried to manage the class all the time in English. I thought I was good. Yet, my classes are all the time in chaos and noisy. My mentor could make them silent when she warned them in Turkish but they don't listen to my English warns. So I tried Turkish and it worked. I taught in English but I warned in Turkish."

PTS14: "I would use the L1 just as in the situations my mentor chooses to use. When coming across abstract words, or words that don't have an equivalent in our language, then I would use L1. In addition, I believe sometimes the students can't understand grammar points when speaking English, and they don't ask questions because they fear we as teachers will answer their questions again in English."

As these quotations reveal the pre-service teachers have opinions and beliefs scaffolded with their theoretical backgrounds, yet the mentoring process, observation of mentors are very important to put all these in practice. That is, they do what they see as effective and useful. In addition, they mentors are seen as authorities and they tend to follow the footsteps of the authority. One of the pre-service teachers, PTS7, clearly explained this as "If I were allowed to use L1 in class, I think I would use it when the mentor teacher had to use L1."

The findings showed that the pre-service teachers were critical in their evaluations and they considered many factors while deciding on the effectiveness of L1 use. For mentoring process, not only mentors' feedback but also their practices in actual classrooms are very important to reshape the pre-service teachers' beliefs and implementations, considering L1 use as in the scope of this study.

4. Discussion

The provided findings explore pre-service teachers' opinions about the use of the first language (L1) in language classrooms and how their mentor teachers influence these opinions and practices. The study utilized qualitative analysis, including pre-service teachers' reflections, observations of mentor teachers' practices, and evaluations of L1 use.

The findings indicated a range of perspectives on L1 use among pre-service teachers. Most of them prioritized immersive L2 learning and advocate for minimal or no use of L1, relying on English, body language, and visual aids. Others recognized the potential benefits of selective L1 use, particularly for comparative learning, motivation, and clarifying instructions. Some pre-

service teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the limited opportunity to use L1 and believed that its use could facilitate student expression, problem-solving, and motivation.

The qualitative analysis revealed three major themes regarding pre-service teachers' opinions of L1 use: positive, moderate, and negative. Under the positive theme, some pre-service teachers support the idea of using L1 in language classrooms, emphasizing that students understand better and interact more in their native language. As Huang (2006) and Sharma (2006) emphasized students started and insisted on L1 use in language classroom. Students' such tendency might cause the pre-service teachers to use L1 in order to build rapport and manage teaching and learning processes. To reach students is mostly more important for the pre-service teachers than any pedagogical principles. They want to be accepted and obeyed and L1 is sometimes the best and most effective tool for some pre-service teachers.

On the contrary, most of the pre-service teachers favored L2 only approach to provide effective input exposure and trigger language acquisition (Krashen, 1981). They believed in the effectiveness of L2 for language acquisition and teaching principles. As Lee (2016) explained the pre-service teachers tend to use L1 less than in-service teachers. The reasons underlying such attitude might be their fresh theoretical knowledge of teacher education, methodology and the requirements of the practicum. As some pre-service teachers mentioned that they did not use L1 due to practicum restrictions. In the practicum course, strict L2 only policy is applied thus the pre-service teacher cannot use L1 in their teaching practice. Some pre-service teachers admitted that they would use L1 if it was allowed.

In spite of any restrictions on L1 use, there are some pre-service teachers who were moderate to use L1 in some cases. They acknowledged the benefits of using both languages in certain situations, such as explaining abstract concepts or clarifying challenging vocabulary and grammar, giving instructions. Thus, they reported that they used L1 if necessary. Hall and Cook (2013) explained such attitude as pragmatic. The pre-service teachers tend to evaluate the situations and choose the best option considering profit and loss. Such an approach was also observed in the pre-service teachers' mentor evaluations. They evaluated the effectiveness of mentors' L1 use whether it a missed opportunity, waste or time or facilitating and time saving strategy or not.

Regarding mentor teachers' L1 use, it was seen that most of the mentor teachers used L1 in language classrooms. As the pre-service teachers mentioned that they did not have a strict L2 approach. Similar findings in different contexts also showed that language teachers tend to have a kind of positive attitude to use L1 in times of need (Kıcır & Mahmutoğlu, 2013; Sarandi, 2013). The main concern of the teachers is to ensure comprehension and facilitate learning (İnal & Turhanlı, 2019). The findings of this study indicated the cases when the mentor teachers find L1 use necessary. Mentor teachers were observed using L1 in contextual situations such as grammar and vocabulary explanations, providing instructions, testing, and classroom management. They also used L1 for clarification and comprehension purposes, error correction, and eliciting responses. Thus, the mentor teachers were observed that they used L1 in case of confusion or urgent clarification as Manara (2007) stated L1 was seen as a kind of emergency tool. Moreover, mentor teachers used L1 for interaction with students, building rapport, and social-chat during specific lesson phases.

Pre-service teachers generally appreciated their mentors' use of L1 when it was contextually appropriate or used for clarification and comprehension purposes. They valued mentors' ability to switch to L1 as a last resort when students struggled to understand complex concepts. Some pre-service teachers also acknowledged the benefits of limited L1 use for interaction and addressing students' emotional needs. However, there were pre-service teachers who observed mentors who did not use L1 at all, appreciating their commitment to an L2-only approach.

Overall, the findings highlight the need for a kind of hybrid approach to L1 use in language classrooms. While some pre-service teachers prioritize immersive L2 learning, others recognize the potential benefits of selective L1 use in specific situations. Similar to Canagarajah (2007) and

Nation (2003), the pre-service teachers in the study used and appreciated the balanced use of L1 and L2 in language teaching. Their opinions and practices were found to be influenced by their mentors' practices. They reported to practice L1 use as their mentors did in the lessons, particularly for contextual purposes and clarification/comprehension. However, the importance of considering specific learning goals, individual student needs, and the overall language immersion environment is emphasized.

In line with overall results of the study, Hassane (2023) summarized that the question of whether L1 usage should be prohibited or allowed in L2 courses is an ongoing controversy. The points made by both sides are reasonable and relevant. However, there will always be common ground upon which the parties may agree. Proponents of L1 usage in L2 courses will keep arguing for it and defining the parameters under which it can be used. They advocate for just the most efficient usage of the first language. the use of L1 cannot be avoided whether by teachers or learner.

5. Implications

Within the framework of these conclusions, some in-class and research implementations could be suggested. Firstly, to encourage pre-service teachers to engage in regular reflective teaching practice they could be asked reflect on their instructional decisions, the use of L1 and L2, and the impact on student learning after each language lesson. Discussion sessions could be implemented on the scenarios that illustrate various situations where mentors effectively used L1 for classroom management. Moreover, role-playing tasks simulating the different classroom management scenarios could be used and pre-service teachers can take turns being the teacher and practice using L1 for effective classroom management while maintaining a supportive language learning environment.

As the findings of the study highlighted, the mentors' practices and decisions are valuable to shape pre-service teachers' practices, Furthermore, pre-service teachers could observe experienced language teachers who effectively use L1. After the observations, group discussions where pre-service teachers can share their observations and reflections on the use of L1 in different instructional contexts could be organized. The peer feedback can be integrated into the process of L1 use, during practicum, peers could give feedback about their L1 use and develop the implementations.

The advantages of specific L1 use in the language classroom should be incorporated into teacher development programs. This integration aims to dispel misconceptions surrounding the negative impact of L1 use and facilitate teachers' comprehension of the L1's role as a pedagogical tool. Simultaneously, it seeks to foster the provision of high-quality exposure to and utilization of the target language (L2) within the classroom setting.

This study was limited on the pre-service teachers' observation reports, to involve the pre-service teachers within the process more action research designs can be designed by the pre-service teachers on the impact of L1 use in language classrooms. This could involve gathering data from their own teaching experiences or conducting interviews and surveys with other language teachers and students. In addition to such micro projects, the pre-service teachers and mentors' views about L1 use could be searched from a broader scale considering different variables such as student profiles, school missions, purposes.

Furthermore, to investigate the long-term effects of pre-service teachers' L1 use mentoring, the longitudinal studies with the pre-service teachers during their professions could be conducted. So that the question whether mentoring L1 use has the effects on the pre-service teachers professional teaching practices or not could be answered.

In addition to the observation reports, the further studies could be carried out with focus-group interviews on the recorded classes for the ensure data triangulation. Different education levels, years of experience and different students' needs could be considered as variables for the further studies.

These implementations allow future teachers to further examine and develop their opinions regarding the usage of L1s in language instruction. They will be more capable of balancing L1 and L2 use, fostering a positive learning environment, and managing their future language classrooms and research successfully.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, the analysis of pre-service teachers' reflections on mentors' use of L1 in the language classroom revealed valuable insights into their opinions and beliefs about L1 use. While some pre-service teachers initially expressed a preference for minimal or no use of L1 to promote immersive L2 learning, their observations of mentors' successful L1 use for classroom management purposes led them to reconsider their beliefs.

The findings suggest that pre-service teachers recognized the effectiveness of using L1 for classroom management, particularly when students were more responsive and attentive to L1 warnings. This realization challenged their initial idealistic approach of using L2 exclusively and highlighted the importance of finding a balance between L1 and L2 use. By observing their mentors' successful L1 warnings, pre-service teachers acknowledged that L1 can be a valuable tool for establishing discipline, creating a silent learning environment, and managing student behavior.

These reflections demonstrate the significance of mentors' practices in shaping pre-service teachers' beliefs and influencing their instructional decisions. Pre-service teachers were open to adapting their approaches based on the observed effectiveness of L1 use in specific contexts, such as classroom management. This flexibility suggests that pre-service teachers are receptive to evidence-based practices and are willing to modify their beliefs to better meet the needs of their students.

However, it is important to note that pre-service teachers' reflections primarily focused on the use of L1 for classroom management purposes, and there may be additional factors and considerations regarding L1 use for instructional purposes. Further research and exploration of pre-service teachers' reflections on the instructional use of L1 would provide a more comprehensive understanding of their beliefs and practices.

Overall, the analysis highlights the importance of pre-service teachers' reflections on mentors' use of L1 and their willingness to adapt their beliefs and instructional approaches based on observed effectiveness. By striking a balance between L1 and L2 use and considering the specific needs and characteristics of their students, pre-service teachers can create a supportive and effective language learning environment that promotes both L2 acquisition and classroom management.

Author contributions: All authors have sufficiently contributed to the study and agreed with the results and conclusions.

Funding information: No funding source is reported for this study.

Declaration of interest: No conflict of interest is declared by authors.

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.
- Agudo, J. (2017). Non-native teachers' code-switching in L2 classroom discourse. In J. Agudo (Ed.), *Native and non-native teachers in English language classrooms*. Professional challenges and teacher education (pp. 75-97). Walter de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501504143-005>

- Ahsan, M., Ghani, M., & Khaliq, A. (2016). Teachers' perceptions toward the use of Urdu language in teaching/learning English as a foreign language. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 7(8), 61-72.
- Al-Nofaie, H. (2010). The attitudes of teachers and students towards using Arabic in EFL classrooms in Saudi public schools - A case study. *Novitas-Royal*, 4(1), 64-95.
- Aminifard, Y., & Mehrpour, S. (2019). Mother tongue use in young Iranian EFL learners' classroom: Helpful scaffold or debilitating crutch? *The Reading Matrix: An International Journal*, 19(2), 77-85.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241-47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/41.4.241>
- Borg, M. (2004). The apprenticeship of observation. *ELT Journal*, 58, 274-276.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. Continuum.
- Branney, P., Brooks, J., Kilby, L., Newman, K. L., Norris, E., Pownall, M., & Whitaker, C. (2022). Three steps to open science for qualitative research in psychology. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 17(4), 1 - 16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12728>
- Brooks-Lewis, K. A. (2009). Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning. *Applied linguistics*, 30(2), 216-235. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm051>
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Pearson Education.
- Burden, P. (2001). When do native English speakers and Japanese college students disagree about the use of Japanese in the English conversation classroom? *The Language Teacher*, 25(4), 5-9.
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker K. (2020). Purposive sampling: complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research Nursing*. 25(8), 652-661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/174498712092720>
- Canagarajah, S. (2007). The ecology of global English. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1(2), 89-100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15257770701495299>
- Celik, S. (2008). Opening the door: An examination of mother tongue use in foreign language classrooms. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 34, 75-85.
- Creswell J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Sage.
- de la Fuente, M. J., & Goldenberg, C. (2022). Understanding the role of the first language (L1) in instructed second language acquisition (ISLA): Effects of using a principled approach to L1 in the beginner foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 26, 943 - 962. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820921882>
- Edstrom, A. (2009). Teacher reflection as a strategy for evaluating L1/L2 use in the classroom. *Babylonia*, 1(9), 12-15.
- Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom Second Language Development: A Study of Classroom Interaction and Language Acquisition*. Pergamon.
- Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of Instructed Language Learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(3), 9-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.12.006>
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 45, 271 - 308.
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2013). *Own-language use in ELT: Exploring global practices and attitudes*. British Council.
- Harbord, J. (1992). The use of mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 350-355. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.4.350>
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach english*. Longman. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn029>
- Harun, H., Massari, N., & Behak, F. P. (2014). Use of L1 as a mediational tool for understanding tense/aspect marking in English: An application of concept-based instruction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 134, 134-139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.231>
- Hassane, E. (2023). Issues in English Language Teaching: The use of L1 in teaching and learning. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 10(1), 42-53
- Higareda, S., López, G., & Mugford, G. (2009). Duermes mucho Tony? Interpersonal and transactional uses of L1 in the foreign-language classroom. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 11, 43-54.
- Huang, H. Y. (2016). *CYUT Students' attitudes and motivation toward native language and foreign language as a medium of instruction in English Writing Classes*. [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Chaoyang University of Technology, Taichung.
- Inal S., & Turanlı, I. (2019). Teachers' opinions on the use of L1 in EFL classes. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(3), 861-875. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.631526>

- Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' code-switching to the L1 in EFL classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 3(10), 10-23. <https://doi.org/10.2174/1874913501003010010>
- Kıcı, Z., & Mahmutoglu, H. (2013). The use of mother tongue in EFL classrooms. *EUL Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(1), 49-72.
- Kim Anh, K. H. (2010). Use of Vietnamese in English language teaching in Vietnam: Attitudes of Vietnamese university teachers. *ELT Journal*, 3(2), 119-128. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n2p119>
- Krashen, S. D. (1981) *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Pergamon Press.
- Lee, J. (2016). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' beliefs about the monolingual approach: differences between pre-service and in-service Korean teachers of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 37, 759-773. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1133629>
- Levine, G.S. (2014). Principles for code choice in the foreign language classroom: A focus on grammaring. *Language Teaching*, 47, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498>
- Liando, N. V. F., Tatipang, D. P., & Wuntu, C. N. (2023). First language interfere in EFL Classes: Revealing students' perspectives and teachers' reasons in ELL. *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, 5(1), 77-88. <https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v5i1.13183>
- Lin, H. Y. (2005). *Teacher talk on native and non-native English teachers in EFL classrooms*. [Unpublished Master Thesis]. Ming-Chuan University, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Lofthouse, R. M. (2018). Re-imagining mentoring as a dynamic hub in the transformation of initial teacher education: The role of mentors and teacher educators. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 7(3), 248-260. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-04-2017-0033>
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. University of Chicago Press.
- Macaro, E. (2005) Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: a communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 63-84). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-24565-0_5
- Macaro, E. (2011). Analyzing student teachers' code switching in foreign language classrooms. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 531-548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00124>
- Mahmoudi, L., & Amirkhiz, S. (2011). The use of Persian in the EFL classroom the case of English teaching and learning at pre-university level in Iran. *English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 135-140. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n1p135>
- Manara, C. (2007). The use of L1 support: Teachers' and students' opinions and practices in an Indonesian context. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 4(1), 145-178.
- Meyer, H. (2008). The pedagogical implications of L1 use in the L2 classroom. *Maebashi Kyodai Gakuen College Ronshu*, 8, 147-159.
- Mirza, M. G. H., Mahmud, K., & Jabbar, J. (2012). Use of other languages in English language teaching at Tertiary Level: A case study on Bangladesh. *English Language Teaching*, 5(9), 71-77. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n9p71>
- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 1-8.
- Noble, H., & Smith, J. (2015). Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Evidence-based Nursing*, 18(2), 34-35. <https://doi.org/10.1136/eb-2015-102054>
- Othman, J., & Kiely, R. (2016). Preservice teachers' beliefs and practices in teaching English to young learners. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6, 50-59. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v6i1.2661>
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Adm Policy Ment Health*, 42(5), 533-44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
- Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning: A longitudinal study. *System*, 29, 177-195. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(01\)00010-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00010-0)
- Saito, H., & Ebsworth, M. E. (2004). Seeing English language teaching and learning through the eyes of Japanese EFL and ESL students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(1), 111-124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2004.tb02178.x>
- Sali, P. (2011). An Analysis of the Teachers' Use of L1 in Turkish EFL Classroomss. *System*, 42, 308-318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.021>
- Sarandi, H. (2013). The use of L1 in English preparatory schools: where is the balance? *Anthropologist*, 16(1-2), 325-335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2013.11891360>
- Schweers, W. Jr. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 37(2), 6-9.
- Seligson, P. (1997). *Helping students to speak*. Richmond Publishing.

- Shabir, M. (2017). Student-teachers' beliefs on the use of L1 in EFL classroom: a global perspective. *English Language Teaching*, 10(4), 45-52. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n4p45>
- Sharma, K. (2006). Mother tongue use in English classroom. *Journal of NELTA*, 11(1-2), 80-87. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v11i1.3132>
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 760-769. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588224>
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (2000). Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: exploring task effects. In Bygate, M., Skehan, P. & Swain, M. (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: second language learning, teaching and testing*. (pp.99-118). Longman.
- Taner, G., & Balıkcı, G. (2022). EFL Teachers' opinions on the use of L1 in L2 classrooms: Role of experience and context. *Focus on ELT Journal*, 4(1), 74-90. <https://doi.org/10.14744/felt.2022.4.1.6>
- Tang, J. (2002). Using L1 in the English classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 40(1), 36-43.
- Taşcı, S. & Ataç, B. (2020). L1 use in l2 teaching: the amount, functions, and perception towards the use of l1 in Turkish primary school context. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 7(2). 655-667.
- Thompson, G. L., & Harrison, K. (2014). Language use in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(2), 321-337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12079>
- Thongwichit, N. (2013). L1 use with university students in Thailand: A facilitating tool or a language barrier in learning English? *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts*, 13(2), 179-206.
- Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204-218. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190502000119>
- Wach, A & Monroy, F. (2019). Beliefs about l1 use in teaching English: a comparative study of Polish and Spanish teacher-trainees. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(6), 855-873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819830422>
- White, E., & Storch, N. (2012). En Français s'il vous plaît: A longitudinal study of the use of the first language (L1) in French foreign language (FL) classes. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35(2), 188-202. <https://doi.org/10.1075/arat.35.2.04whi>
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* [Qualitative research methods in the social sciences] (8th ed.). Seckin.
- Zakaria, F. (2013). The role of first language in EFL Classroom. *Jurnal Ilmiah Didaktika*, 13(2), 373-383. <https://doi.org/10.22373/jid.v13i2.484>
- Zulfikar, Z. (2018). Rethinking the use of L1 in L2 classroom. *Englisia Journal of Language, Education and Humanities*, 6(1). 43-51. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v6i1.2514>