

## **The Effect of Foreign Language Teaching on Mother Language in Amman - Jordan**

**Dr. KHALIL A. RAHMAN AL. FAYYOUMI**

Dept. Curricula & Teaching Methods

Faculty of Educational Science and Arts, University of Jordan

Email: fayyoumik@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

This study aims to identify the impact of learning foreign language on learning Arabic Language in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the Teachers' Perspective in the Marka Schools District in Amman, the Capital of Jordan. Data was collected via a structure questionnaire developed in English (a foreign language) which consisted of 58 items classified in four parts to measure the impact of English learning on Arabic learning in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage in the academic year 2016-2017. The study was conducted on a sample of 141 English teachers, representing 11.5% of the total study population. The sample was selected on the stratified random. The results show that there is a positive impact of English on learning Arabic. Teachers have positive attitudes towards teaching English in early ages: they enjoy learning it. The claim which indicates that L2 negatively impacts L1 from the perspective of students' development and cultural values are not valid according to the finding of the study.

**Keywords:** The 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage, teachers' perceptions, Marka Schools District, foreign language learning, teaching languages, achievement.

## INTRODUCTION

The unique case of the English language is often attributed to being the dominant language of international diplomacy, business, commerce, popular media, education, science, and technology in the twentieth and twenty-first century (Fishman, 1996; Master, 1998). Today, for transmission of information, English is mainly used, accelerating its spread and making it the international language of knowledge and information, which are recognized as the tools of political and economic power in our age (Mahmoud, 1992). This being the case, it is no wonder that English has become more and more integrated into the field of education all over the world. The overwhelming spread of English necessitates that countries review their language policies in connection with education. The two outstanding phenomena in this respect are English-medium instruction and the learning of English as a SL/FL (Evans & Iverson, 2002).

Several studies were conducted in the Arab World about the significant role of learning English as a second language (Zhou & Moody, 2017; Abdel-Galil, 2014; Abdou, 2014; Olaimat, 2012; Naqeeb & Awad, 2011; Ma'roof, 2010; Sadek, 2007; Daoud, 2001). These studies maintain that learning English at earlier stages broadens the students' horizons and positively affects the learners' awareness, intelligence, and achievement. They believe that English is an international language, the language of communication, business, science, and scientific research (Romanathan, 1999; Oskamp & Schultz, 2005).

On the other hand, some studies oppose this point of view. Their main arguments are based on the opinion that introducing English as a second language in the primary schools interferes and consequently hinders the teaching of their mother language (ML). Moreover, this confuses the students and has a negative effect on their culture, religion

and identity (Ventureyra, 2004). These studies argue that students' learning efforts should be concentrated on their ML (Schmid, 2016; Jiang, 2008a; Al-Mutawa', 2005; Kecskes & Papp, 2003; Morrow, 1975; Tickoo, 1996).

The linguistic development of a child can be balanced in his study of a language other than the mother tongue, if the follow-up element is available (Pavlenko & Jarvis, 2002), where Vygotsky (1962) sees that cognitive development depends on the area of growth, the level of linguistic development grows when children engage in social behavior. A full social interaction is needed, and an older person or more experienced peer collaboration needs to be pursued beyond what can be accomplished individually, and helps to refine thinking or performance to make it more effective. Awareness is not found in the brain but in everyday practice.

A major shift in the Jordanian curriculum is the decision made by Ministry of Education to teach English language as a foreign language starting from the 1<sup>st</sup> grade. This decision was based on the theories of many linguists that there must be bidirectional interdependence between the ML (L1) and the English Language (EL / L2) (Jiang, 2008b; Noor, 2007). As a matter of fact, only one side of this interaction has been emphasized in the relevant literature (Cummins & Swain, 1986; Cummins, 1979). Moreover, there are many efforts in the field of linguistic studies that discuss the impact of the ML on the EL. Few of them deal with teaching process itself. In fact they tend to the opposite direction – the effect that EL teaching has on the development of ML skills (Verhoeven, 1994; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991).

Research by Cummins (1979) predicts that transfer does not only occur from ML to EL, but also from EL to ML, unless the exposure and motivation conditions are negative. While in principle, transfer can occur both ways. Some researchers emphasize that we generally see only transfer from the ML to the other language. He attributes the lack of transfer in the opposite direction to the absence of motivation and exposure in a second or EL environment (Kecskes & Papp, 1995; Cummins & Swain, 1986)

This study argues that the interdependence hypothesis may work both ways in an EL environment, and Cummins is right when he considers motivation and exposure as criteria for positive transfer from L2 to L1 (Zhou & Moody, 2017; Cook, 1991). It is stressed that EL is learned through instruction in the classroom, and students do not have direct access to the target language culture. Krashen (1985) mentions the term "poor acquisition environment" to describe the condition where students learn English only in the classroom environment, without any exposure to the language in real life. This explains why students suffer from a general weakness in learning English, and sometimes form Arabic words in English letters to compensate for this weakness. In this context, this study is intended to measure the impact of second language learning on mother tongue on the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage students.

### **The Statues of the English language**

The spread of English can be viewed as three concentric circles, each representing types of spread, patterns of acquisition and the functional domains in which English is used: The inner circle, the outer circle, and expanding circle. The inner circle refers to the traditional basis of English, where English is the primary language as in UK, US, Ireland, Australia, Canada and New Zealand; the outer circle includes over (50) countries where English is institutionalized as in Singapore, India, Malawi, etc. because of colonization, and the expanding circle refers to countries that recognize the importance of English as an international language but have no colonial history, as in China, Japan, Jordan, Greece, etc. (Crystal, 2010).

In outer circle countries, English is learned and taught as a second language at schools (ESL), whereas in expanding circle countries, English is learned and taught as a foreign language (EFL), and studied as a regular subject at schools, in terms of language instruction. English medium instruction (EMI) is an issue often addressed in connection with the outer circle countries, which are ESL contexts, where the major language of education is not the native language of students. In these countries, most of which are multilingual and multicultural, EMI affects a majority of people, as it is a part of the national educational policy and is not solely a matter of concern for private schools. On the other

hand, EMI is not a major concern for expanding circle countries that have adopted an education in the mother tongue policy at national level, and EMI appears to be a rare educational practice rather than a common one in monolingual areas of the world (Crystal, 2010).

In his study, Al-Mutawa' (2005) identifies four main forms of English language teaching:

- Education bilingual programs: where students learn two languages at the same time, with a gradual increase of what he learns in English, more than his ML, which at the end take place of his ML.
- Immersion program student: where the child is taught in English language at his early life with neglect to his ML. E.g. Canada.
- English as a second language: where students learn their ML and take English courses. This helps in spreading the English language.
- Teaching English as a foreign language: This form is widespread in the Arab World and in Palestine.

### **Statement of the Problem**

In spite of many merits of teaching English in Jordan, introducing English in low grades is still a controversial issue. There are educationalists and teachers who support this trend, while others are against it, especially at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Noor, 2007).

The researcher felt the priority of conducting such a research in the field of English Language (EL) and Arabic Language (AL) relationship, because of its importance to both students and teachers in the field of education, in addition to the assumption that understanding the relationship between AL and EL is important in successful language teaching. The lack of studies conducted in the field of mother language and EL relationship in Jordan was another reason for conducting this study.

## **Purpose of the Study**

The present study aims at investigating the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, the Capital of Jordan.

## **Significance of the Study**

The analysis of the impact of EL on AL, perhaps could be significant in three domains: to the teacher, they show a student's progress; to the researcher, they show how a language is acquired (what strategies the learner uses); and to the learner, in that he can learn from these errors. The present study is significant as it:

- Provides insight for both teachers and learners on the relationship between EL and AL on students at an early age.
- Increases the teachers' awareness of the impact of L2 on L1 by training them on the use of language teaching in the light of EL and AL relationship.
- Provides explanation for the most common errors made by the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage students.
- Deals with a new topic, which has not been given due attention in EFL.

## **Questions and Hypotheses of the Study**

### **The main study Question**

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, the Capital of Jordan?

With the following questions:

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, on the teachers' experience?
- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in

Amman on student development, and Students` previous experience domain?

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, on the L1 use in L2 within the class domain?
- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage: from the Teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, on students' acquisition domain?
- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage: from the Teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, on the age of teacher's domain?

### **Study Hypothesis:**

The present study has the following null hypotheses:

- There are no statistically significant differences in means that at  $p$  value = 0.05 in impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the Teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, due to the teacher's gender.
- There are no statistically significant differences at  $\alpha = 0.05$  in the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage in the Marka Schools District in Amman, due to teacher's academic qualifications.

### **Limitations of the Study**

This study is limited to English language teachers for the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage in the Marka Schools District in Amman, the Capital of Jordan, 2016-2017.

### **Definition of Terms:**

- The 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage: The first level of primary education in Jordan, which includes students in: I, II, and III classes, for public and private schools in Jordan.
- Teachers' Perceptions: ideas, opinions and beliefs that were generated concepts by teachers' experiences or feedback, belief in their validity, and their ability to achieve goals.

- Marka Schools District: One of the educational districts in Amman, it includes (216) primary, and secondary schools.

### **Previous Studies:**

Maliborska & You (2016) conducted a study aimed at understanding the perceptions and expectations of students, and instructor expectations and perceptions of writing conferences for multilingual students in second language writing courses. The sample consists of (100) students, and (8) instructors who were teaching it – resulting in two writing conferences for each of five writing tasks. The authors collected data through extensive surveys that included Likert-type scales, item ranking, and open-ended questions. The results show that the students and their instructors regarded individual conferences of (10) minutes to be more effective than longer group conferences; however, participants voiced weaknesses of both types of conferences. The results and implications inform writing instructors and administrators about possible uses of such a course design and potential improvements for the use of writing conferences in second language writing courses.

Taha (2016) investigates English teachers' perceptions toward the effectiveness of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in teaching grammar at Al Ain public schools. This study was conducted using a questionnaire to collect the required data from the participants (n=180) regarding their perceptions toward the effectiveness of using CLT in teaching grammar. The results of this study revealed that English teachers at Al Ain public schools perceived CLT as an effective approach in teaching grammar (m=3.83). The results have also shown that the participants prefer using communicative activities in teaching grammar when using CLT (m=3.69). As for the challenges, the teachers indicated that student's low English proficiency, especially in grammar, large classes, and heavy teaching load are among the most common challenges that they face.

Abdel-Galil (2014) investigates the impact of implementing Smart Learning Program (SLP) on the English language performance of cycle2 students, in United Arab Emirates. That year (2013/2014) the program was implemented in 123 governmental schools and by 2017,

the Smart Learning Program will be installed in all K-12 school classes . The overall findings of the study and the examination of the data analysis indicate that the teachers and students' perception of the program and Smart Learning in general is encouraging. Moreover, students' and teachers' perception of the program applications, software and educational content increased their awareness of the Smart Learning Environments. A main significant finding is the strong and obvious communication between the learners and their teachers and the awareness of the structure of the Smart Learning environment.

Zohrabi, Torabi, and Baybourdiani (2012) reports on research findings on learner-centered approach compared to teacher-centered approach in teaching English grammar as a foreign language in Iranian high school context. To this end, a cohort of 60 male homogeneous students at a junior high school participated in this study. All participants were native speakers of Azerbaijani and Persian aged around 16. There were two classes, including 30 students in each group assigned to the control and experimental group. The results were compared. Control group or teacher-centered and the experimental group were given the opportunity to merge input in what they learn and how they learn. The results support the implementation of teacher-centered process for the purpose of developing grammar knowledge of Iranian EFL learners. English classes cannot fulfill the learners' needs on communication.

Jiang (2008a) conducted a study to reveal effect of L2 phonetic teaching on L1 vowel production. Mandarin-English bilinguals differing in the amount of L1 use produced Mandarin and English vowels. An acoustic analysis showed that both the Mandarin-English bilinguals of high L1 use and those of low L1 use deviated from the norm of Mandarin vowel /ii/. The Mandarin-English bilinguals of low L1 use who successfully acquired English vowel /ai/ deviated from the norm of Mandarin vowel /ai/, indicating a carry-over effect of L2 vowel on L1 vowel production. An analysis of inter speaker variability indicated that some individual Mandarin-English bilinguals, including both speakers of high L1 use and low L1 use, were accented in the production of /y/, /ai/ and /au/. This research suggests that the L1 phonetic system established in childhood does not remain static;

instead, it may undergo reorganization when the L1 and L2 phonetic systems juxtapose in a common phonological space interact.

Sadek (2007) examines the relationship between Arab students' motivation to learn English and attitudes towards the English language, speakers of English and Western culture. Through questionnaires and interviews, the results of this research show that there is a positive relation between attitude towards the target language, its culture, and its people and the motivation to learn the language. It also suggests that Arab students who participated in this study had mainly instrumental motivation, wished to learn English for economic and prestigious reasons, and felt un-easiness towards the dominance of English in the world. In addition, it supports the hypothesis that Arab students do not want to be fully assimilated into the target language culture and that over-acculturation de-motivates them to learn English.

Noor (2007) aimed to discuss the impact of L2 on the syntactic processing of L1 by Arab EFL learners. Approaching syntactic processing through the Competition Model Research Paradigm, this study examines how Arab university students assigned the subject to the sentence of their mother tongue (Arabic). The question of this study, therefore, was whether the advanced EFL learners' processing of L1 syntax differed from that of EFL beginners in some respect. The subjects of the study were 72 Saudi university students. They belonged to either a monolingual university group (36 students) or to a bilingual university group (36 students) majoring in English. The overall results indicated that the differences between the performance of both the monolingual and bilingual were mainly due to the overall changed state of the L2 users (i.e. their multi competence).

Benson (2005) conducted a study, proposing that mother tongue based education perpetuates equity in education, especially among girls who are often regarded as disadvantaged in access to education. The study showed that mother tongue-based bilingual education aims to develop the learner's knowledge through reading, writing and thinking skills in the mother tongue (L1) while teaching a second or foreign language (L2) as a separate subject. In addition, teachers in the mother tongue would gain the trust of girls and reduce the risk of abuse. The

study participants from the Philippines and Papua New Guinea confirmed the proposition that girls stay longer in formal schooling and get positive results from mother tongue bilingual education. Margit (2004) conducted a study to reveal changes in back channeling behavior, the impact from L2 to L1 on the use of backchannel cue. Backchannel cues seem to exist in all languages.

Al-Mutawa' (2005) aimed at identifying the effects of introducing L2 on L1 in curriculum at the primary school level. The researcher also wanted to identify teacher attitudes toward L2 effect on L1. A sample of 2407 was selected. The study result showed that there were no negative effects of L2 on L1, and it enhanced the acquisition of Arabic as (L1).

Nicoladis and Grabois (2002) was concerned the acquisition of English and the loss of Chinese by a child adopted from China into an English-speaking family in Canada, at the age of 17 months. As she was adopted after the age of one year, her switch to English might be expected to be slow and difficult. The child's production and comprehension of Chinese and English were observed from four weeks after her arrival. Her acquisition of English was remarkably fast, as was her loss of Chinese. These data suggest that the child's language acquisition was founded on already established social and communicative processes. Her previous exposure to Chinese may have allowed her to learn about language use in general, thus facilitating her rapid acquisition of English.

## **Discussion of Previous Studies**

An extensive survey on previous studies related to the field of the impact of EL on ML show that there are two main approaches: The first approach claims that there is a positive impact of EL on ML. Such studies are more accurate and new –the impact of EL on ML concerning students' skills, cognitive abilities, cultural and communication abilities.(E.g. Taha, 2016; Noor, 2007; Jarvis, 2003; Fenner, Trebbi & Aase, 1999; Flowerdew, Li & Miller, 1998; Girven & Trebbi, 1997; Houwer, 1990; Flege, 1987). The other approach warns against teaching EL because of its negative impact on mother tongue, especially with the beginning of the first basic stage. (E.g. Sadek, 2007; Benson, 2005;

Al-Mutawa', 2005; Nicoladis & Grabois, 2002; Taylor & Fiske, 1997; Rahman, 1997; Morrow, 1975).

This study is similar to previous studies in that it seeks to investigate the impact of EL on ML from the perception of teachers, while it is different in that it is conducted in the Jordanian environment, and it also includes the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage English teacher's perceptions of such impact. However, this study is the first to investigate the role of variables: The teachers' experience, student development, and students' previous experience, the L1 use in L2 within the class, students' acquisition, teacher's age, gender, and teacher's qualifications, L2 impact on L1 in Jordanian setting.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Study Design**

This study uses a cross-sectional design, based on questionnaires. The study design involves observation of a representative sample of the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage English language teachers in Marka schools District, from the 1<sup>st</sup> of September 2016 till the 30<sup>th</sup> of March 2017. It employs descriptive and inferential design. The primary goal is to try to provide as comprehensive description as possible, whereas the cross sectional is focused on individuals at a fixed event during life.

### **Population and Sample of the study**

This study was conducted in the Marka Schools District in Amman, Capital of Jordan. The study population included all the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage English language teachers in public schools. The study sampling frame was restricted to public the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage English teachers, taken from the Jordanian Ministry of Education database in (2016-2017). The number of schools and the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage English language teachers were selected in order to ensure a random sample. According to the Department of Planning and Statistics, the total number of public schools in Marka is 312, with a total of 1221 first Basic Stage teachers. The following table (1) shows the numbers and distribution of the study sample –a representative stratified sample of n=312, 25.5%. The study

sample consisted 141 (11.5%) teachers; 75 males (10%), 66 females (11%).

Table 1. The distribution of the study population

Basic Stage teachers	Male	Female
1 <sup>st</sup>	260	151
2 <sup>nd</sup>	251	142
3 <sup>rd</sup>	236	181
<b>Total</b>	<b>747</b>	<b>474</b>

## Instrumentation

After conducting an extensive literature review on the impact of EL teaching on ML, data was collected via a structured questionnaire developed in English language, which consisted of 58 items in three parts, organized to measure the impact of EL learning on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage English teachers' perceptions in Jordan:

- It informed the respondent of the objectives and importance of the study, and assured them that the data collected was for scientific purposes only.
- It collected demographic information about the teachers' experience, student development, and students' previous experience, L1 use in L2 within the class, students' acquisition, and teacher's age, through oral interviews.
- This was devised to collect information on the impact of EL teaching on ML in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from teachers' perception.

## Reliability of the Instrument

To determine the reliability of three sub-questionnaires, alpha formula was used (Table2). The results of Table 2 show that the ranges of reliability were between 0.61-0.84, and total score of 0.75; all of these values are suitable for conducting such a study.

Table 2. Alpha formula of instrument reliability

Domain	Reliability
Teachers` Experience	0.79
Students Development, and Students Previous Experience	0.81
MI Usage in EL within Class	0.61
Student Acquisition	0.71
Student Age	0.84
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>0.75</b>

## Validity of the Instrument

The questionnaire was reviewed by a group of nine educational experts in the field of English language teaching, and instructional curricula. They deleted and rephrased some items until the study instrument reached its final form, each expert agreed to delete four or more paragraphs, such as mixing the student in the language (between two languages), and preferred not to assume the impact of the mother tongue on the second language.

## Statistical Analysis

Various statistical tests and procedures were used including means, frequencies, standard deviation, cross-tabulation, percentage, t-test for independent samples, ANOVA, post hoc Scheffe's test. P-value,  $\alpha \leq 0.05$  was used to test the significance in testing the study hypothesis.

## Ethical Issues

This study is conducted on human subjects, and to assure that the ethical issues are taken into consideration, permission to conduct this study was obtained from the Jordanian Ministry of Education. In addition, teachers were informed about the purpose of the study before the interview and were told that their participation was voluntary, and any information obtained would be confidential and would be used for scientific research purposes only.

## Results

The Results are presented in two parts. The first part deals with the descriptive analysis of the impact of EL learning on ML in the 1<sup>st</sup>Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions. The second part is dedicated to test the validity of the study hypothesis, and discusses the role of the variables - gender and qualifications - in the perception of the 1<sup>st</sup>Basic Stage English language teachers in the study area.

### Results related to the first part

#### The main study questions

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup>Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, the Capital of Jordan?

To answer this question, mean, standard deviation, and percentages of each item, domain, and total score of the impact of EL teaching on AL in the Marka schools District in Amman from the teacher perceptions are computed. The study adopted a five-point scale in which the length of cells was determined through calculating the range of the scale 1–5 and divided on the highest value of the scale to determine the cell length (4.21–5), then added to the lowest value in the scale to determine the lowest value of scale (1.81-2.60). Table 3 illustrates this:

Table 3. The scale scoring of Likert Scale

Level	Appreciation
1-1.8	very low
1.81-2.60	Low
2.61-3.40	Moderate
3.41-4.20	High
4.21-5	very high

For data analysis, the researcher used the following percentages:

- 80% or more is very high degree of self-teaching effect.
- 70–79.9% is a high degree.

- 60–69.9% is a moderate degree.
- 50–59.9% is a low degree.
- Less than 50% is a very low degree.

### The following questions

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, on the teachers' experience?

Table 4 illustrates this.

Table 4. Mean, standard deviation, and percentages of each item, and total score of the influence of EL teaching on AL, on the teachers' experience

No	Items	M	SD	%	% level
1	Feel responsible for taking the class on time.	4.00	.628	80.0	very high
2	I'd try to do my best to accomplish the job with enthusiasm.	3.89	.772	77.6	high
3	They feel responsible for getting information about the student's social life.	3.30	.637	65.7	moderate
4	I try to do my best to help poor students.	3.95	.494	79.2	high
5	I enjoy teaching of English as L2 in particular.	4.25	.762	85.1	very high
6	I Spend time with the students on lesson-related subjects.	4.00	.628	80.3	very high
7	I have the ability to look for supplementary material to support L2 classes.	3.57	.879	71.4	high
<b>Total score of teacher's experience</b>		<b>3.85</b>	<b>.686</b>	<b>77.0</b>	<b>high</b>

- maximum point for response = 5 points

Teachers' experience domain results indicate a high degree (M=3.85, SD=.686 percent =77.0%). It is worth mentioning that items (1, 5, 6) received the highest score, item 5 (M=4.25, SD=.762, percent=85.1%) received the very highest score, which indicates that

respondents perception of teaching English as EL is an enjoyable task. This may be interpreted as evidence that teaching English can enhance teacher-student communication and cooperation.

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman on student development, and students` previous experience domain? Table 5 illustrates this.

Table 5. Mean, standard deviation, and percentages of each item, and total score

No	Items	M*	SD	%	% level
8	L1 errors are frequent among students exposed to L2.	3.80	.674	78.4	High
9	Orthographical errors are more frequent among students who use L2 in their life.	3.25	.824	69.9	moderate
10	Pronunciation errors in L1 are common among students exposed to L2 in their environment.	3.25	.882	69.9	moderate
11	Syntactic errors in L1 are common among students exposed to L2 in their environment.	3.11	.944	65.3	moderate
12	Achievement in L1 is negatively affected when students learn L2.	2.52	.117	58.5	low
13	My perception of the cultural values of L1 is impacted by L2.	2.80	.112	60.4	moderate
14	Teaching L2 at kindergarten affects students` teaching of L1 negatively.	3.36	.106	70.1	moderate
15	I feel that courses taught at an early age focus more on L1 than L2.	2.55	.904	59.5	low
16	Students acquire their L2 vocabulary from English textbooks.	3.66	.101	74.1	high
17	Students learn songs in L2 more quickly than teaching in L1 in the primary school classes.	3.75	.762	77.4	high
18	I encourage students to use L2 vocabulary in the class.	3.96	.869	80.1	high
<b>Total score of student development</b>		<b>3.42</b>	<b>.572</b>	<b>69.4</b>	<b>high</b>

- Maximum point of response = 5 points.

Student Development, and students' previous experience domain results indicates a moderate response degree ( $M=3.42$ ,  $SD=.572$ , 69.4%). This domain total score was lower than teacher's experience domain. It is worth mentioning that item 8, 16, 17, and 18 received the highest score, especially item 18 ( $M=3.96$ ,  $SD=.869$ , 80.1%) which indicates that teachers encourage students to use L2 vocabulary in the class. This interprets that these errors are not as a direct result of the exposure to L2 because almost all students are exposed to L2. Whereas, item 12 "achievement in L1 is impacted negatively for students who study L2" is low score ( $M=2.5$ ,  $SD=.117$ , 58.5%), this indicates that student's achievement in L1, and cultural values are not impacted by exposure to L2. This is very important because it agrees with other studies of the positive impact of L2 on L1 (E.g. Taha, 2016; Abdel-Galil, 2014; Kovacs and Racsmany, 2008; Noor, 2007; Al-Mutawa, 2005; Mackay and Flege, 2004; Jarvis, 2003; Kecskes and Papp, 2003; Au, Knightly, Jun, and Oh, 2002; Kecskes and Papp, 2000; Pavlenko, 2000; Fenner, Trebbi, & Aase, 1999; Kecskes and Papp, 1995; Romanathan, 1999); at the same time, it disagrees with many studies that indicates that L2 negatively impacts L1 from the perspective of students' development and cultural values (E.g. Sadek, 2007; Benson, 2005; Al-Mutawa', 2005; Nicoladis & Grabois, 2002; Taylor & Fiske, 1997; Hoffmann, 1991; Morrow, 1975). Students' previous experience domain results indicate a high response degree ( $M=3.42$ ,  $SD=.572$ , 69.4%). It is worth mentioning that item (18) received the highest score ( $M=4.2$ ,  $SD=0.94$ , 84.6%) which indicates that respondents believe that L2 impact is highest among Arab students who were born in an English speaking country, which is a natural outcome of the fact that there is a real exposure to L2.

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, on the L1 use in L2 within the class domain?

Table 6 in the next page illustrates this:

Table 6. Mean, standard deviation, and percentages of each item, and total score of the impact of EL learning on ML, on the L1 use in L2 class domain.

No	Items	M	SD	%	% level
19	I prefer to use L1 as a medium of instruction in L2 classroom.	2.71	.972	54.5	low
20	L2 could play a supplementary role in teaching L1 in the classroom.	3.15	.795	63.2	moderate
21	The use of L2 in teaching affects L1 teaching negatively.	2.76	1.24	48.4	Very low
22	L2 should be the only medium of instruction in L2 classes.	3.35	1.20	64.6	moderate
23	Conversing in the classroom should be in L1 only.	2.90	1.32	55.1	low
24	Utterances in the classroom are approximately an equal mixture of L1 and L2.	3.15	.775	62.4	moderate
25	Class instruction should be in L2.	3.79	.952	78.9	high
26	Utterances used in the class should be in L2 only	3.66	.748	70.2	moderate
27	Teacher's beliefs about L1 are consistent with their teaching practices in L2 classroom.	3.25	.485	63.3	moderate
28	Teachers of EMs differ from teachers of NEMs in terms of their attitudes towards L1 in the classroom	2.94	.672	56.8	low
29	L2 teachers can use L1 to convey meaning.	3.36	.350	64.2	moderate
30	Relationship between reading in L1 and reading in L2 is stronger in process than in product of reading.	3.45	.442	62.2	moderate
31	Transfer of L1 reading strategies negatively affects L2 proficiency.	2.92	.686	58.2	low
32	L1 strategies are not always helpful in constructing appropriate meaning.	3.42	.466	82.4	moderate
Total score of L1 use in L2 class		3.20	.793	63.2	moderate

L1 use in L2 within the class domain results indicates a moderate response degree (M=3.20, SD=0.793, 63.2%). It is worth mentioning that items 19 received the lowest score (M=2.71, SD=.972, 54.5%) which indicates that respondents use of L2 in teaching has a negative

effect on the teaching of L1. This is very important because it agrees with other studies of the positive impact of L2 on L1, and disagrees with many Middle Eastern studies that indicate that L2 negatively impacts L1 from the perspective of students' development and cultural values.

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage: from the Teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools in Amman, on students' acquisition domain?

Table 7 illustrates this:

Table 7. Mean, standard deviation, and percentages of each item, and total score of the impact of EL learning on AL, on students' acquisition domain

No	Items	M	SD	%	% level
33	Teaching L2 is the best way to develop student's comprehension.	3.27	.533	64.6	moderate
34	Teaching L2 is the best way to develop the student s cognition.	3.21	.554	65.2	moderate
35	Teaching L2 is the best way to develop the student s language experience.	3.40	.618	66.3	moderate
36	Teaching L2 affects the student's culture negatively.	3.24	.562	62.5	moderate
37	Teaching L2 threatens student s identity.	2.74	.615	57.2	moderate
38	L2 decreases student s loyalty to L1.	2.59	.676	56.2	low
39	Teaching L2 increases student s mental growth.	2.56	.582	60.4	low
40	Adults can learn L2 more effectively than children	2.72	.612	29.4	moderate
41	Teaching L2 burdens children and their families.	2.88	.540	61.2	moderate
42	Teaching L2 burdens teachers	2.70	.564	57.6	moderate
43	Teaching L2 is a big load on school timetable.	2.79	.730	58.2	moderate
44	L2 is considered the 3rd language after the colloquial and standard Arabic	2.84	.742	60.3	moderate
Total score of students' acquisition		2.86	.610	58.3	moderate

Student acquisition domain results indicate a moderate response degree (M=2.86, SD=.610, 58.3%). It is worth mentioning that item 38 & 39 received the lowest score, which indicates that respondents believe that L2 decreases student's loyalty to L1, and learning L2 does not impact L1 in terms of student's mental growth, identity, affection, or represent a load on school and family. This may be interrupted as meaning that teaching L2 has low to no impact on L1 concerning the development of students. This is very important because it agrees with other studies of the positive impact of L2 on L1, and disagrees with many Middle Eastern studies that indicate that L2 negatively impacts L1 from the perspective of student's development and cultural values.

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage: from the Teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools in Amman, on age of teacher's domain?

Table 8 illustrates this:

Table 8. Mean, standard deviation, percentages of each item, and total score of the impact.

No	Items	M	SD	%	% level
45	Teachers have positive attitudes towards teaching English in first grade.	2.98	.415	58.4	Moderate
46	Students in this primary stage can acquire both L1 and L2 effectively.	2.27	.716	58.6	low
47	Teaching L2 has a positive effect on the student s psychomotor skills.	3.32	.495	62.4	Moderate
48	Students in the primary stage need to acquire their native language.	3.25	.660	64.2	Moderate
49	Teaching L2 can increase the acquisition of L2 culture.	3.10	.475	60.1	Moderate
50	Teaching L2 is necessary because of its use in business and trade.	3.12	.682	59.6	Moderate
51	Teaching L2 increases colonial culture the acquisition of L1.	3.10	.504	61.6	Moderate

52	L2 teaching affects student s L1 pronunciation.	2.35	.642	59.3	Low
53	L2 teaching has a positive effect on the lexicon of L1.	2.97	.594	59.8	Moderate
54	Teachers see that the best time for teaching L2 is in the 5th grade	3.21	.551	62.4	Moderate
55	L2 in the Arab world is against the Arab philosophy toward Arabizing education.	2.85	.699	58.7	Moderate
56	L2 teaching affects the grammar of LI positively.	2.88	.489	60.2	Moderate
57	Teaching L2 has a positive effect on student s writing skills of L1.	3.20	.432	60.8	Moderate
58	L2 decreases social interaction among students.	2.58	.548	58.6	Low
<b>Total score of students' age</b>		<b>2.92</b>	<b>.564</b>	<b>60.1</b>	<b>Moderate</b>

Student age domain results indicate a moderate response degree (M=2.93, SD=.564, 60.1%). This is very important because it agrees with other studies of the positive impact of L2 on L1. Conversely, it disagrees with many Middle Eastern studies that indicate that L2 negatively impacts L1 from the perspective of students` development and cultural values.

### Testing the Study Hypothesis

The second part tests the validity of the study hypothesis, and discusses the role of the variables (gender and qualification) in the perception of the 1<sup>st</sup>Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman.

## Results of the first hypothesis

- There are no statistically significant differences in means that at  $p$  value = 0.05) in impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the Teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, due to the teacher's gender.

An independent sample (t-test) was computed to compare the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teacher's perceptions in females and male. There was no significant difference in the scores for males and females on teacher's experience, student development, student previous experience domains. Whereas there were significant differences in the scores of males and females on L1 use in L2 within class in male ( $M=2.95$ ,  $SD=0.269$ ) and female ( $M=3.05$ ,  $SD=0.247$ ) conditions;  $t(303) = -3.85$ -,  $p = 0.00$ . These results suggest that female teachers really do see an impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage on L1 use in L2 within the class more than male teachers.

Moreover, there were significant differences in the scores of males and females on student acquisition; for male ( $M=2.89$ ,  $SD=.231$ ) and female ( $M=2.98$ ,  $SD=.164$ ) conditions;  $t(303) = -2.42$ -,  $p = 0.01$  (Table 9). These results suggest that female teachers really do experience an impact of EL learning on AL on student's acquisition in the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage on L1 use in L2 class.

Also, there are significant differences in the scores of males and females on student age; in male  $M=3.10$ ,  $SD=.126$  and female  $M=3.31$ ,  $SD=0.161$  conditions;  $t(303) = -2.021$ -,  $p = 0.04$ . These results suggest that female teachers really do see an impact of EL learning on ML on student's age in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage on L1 use in L2 class. Consequently, there were significant differences in the scores of males and females on total score; in male ( $M=3.21$ ,  $SD=0.199$ ) and female ( $M=3.26$ ,  $SD=0.231$ ) conditions;  $t(303) = -2.13$ -,  $p = 0.03$ . These results suggest that female teachers really do see an impact of EL teaching on ML on total score in the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage on L1 use in L2 class. Table 9 illustrates this.

Table 9. An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare impact of EL learning on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage from the teacher's perceptions in Marka in female and male teachers.

domains	Gender	N	M	SD	t	DF	Sig. (2 tailed)
L1 Use in L2 Class	Male	75	2.95	.269	3.85	303.0	0.00*
	Female	66	3.05	.247		302.8	
Students' Acquisition	Male	75	2.89	.231	2.42	303.0	0.01*
	Female	66	2.98	.164		284.5	
Students' Age	Male	75	3.10	.126	2.02	303	0.04*
	Female	66	3.31	.161		293.2	
Total Score	Male	75	3.21	.199	2.13	303	0.03*
	Female	66	3.26	.231		278.6	
Student Previous Experience	Male	75	3.59	.398	1.64	303.0	0.101
	female	66	3.67	.449		287.1	
Student Development	male	75	3.13	.427	.280	303.0	0.779
	female	66	3.11	.526		277.9	
Teacher's Experience	male	75	3.84	.409	.299	303	0.765
	female	66	3.85	.377		302.9	

## Results of the Second Hypothesis

- There are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) in the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage in the Marka Schools District in Amman, due to teacher's academic qualifications.

A one-way between subjects was conducted to compare the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers'

perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman due to qualifications in Bachelors and Masters conditions on domains of teachers experience student development student previous experience, L1 use in L2 within class students' acquisition students' age total score. It is obvious from Table 10 that there are differences in means between bachelors, and master degree holders.

Table 10.M and SD between bachelor, and master degree holders.

		N	M	SD	Std. Error
Teacher's Experience	Bachelor	128	3.75	.399	.025
	Master	13	4.12	.184	.048
	Total	141	3.94	.292	.037
Student Development	Bachelor	128	3.10	.472	.029
	Master	13	3.19	.421	.096
	Total	141	3.15	.474	.063
Student Previous Experience	Bachelor	128	3.42	.411	.026
	Master	13	3.95	.443	.111
	Total	141	3.69	.425	.069
L1 Use In L2 Class	Bachelor	128	2.76	.266	.016
	Master	13	3.16	.229	.060
	Total	141	2.96	.248	.038
Students' Acquisition	Bachelor	128	2.97	.206	.013
	Master	13	3.22	.068	.017
	Total	141	3.09	.137	.015
Students' Age	Bachelor	128	3.05	.145	.009
	Master	13	3.39	.299	.025
	Total	141	3.22	.222	.017
Total Score	Bachelor	128	3.04	.227	.013
	Master	13	3.51	.218	.053
	Total	141	3.28	.223	.033

There were no significant differences of means of responses on impact of EL learning on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools in Amman due to qualifications on the domains of teachers experience, L1 use in L2 class, students' acquisition students' age, since  $p > .05$  level for the three conditions, and there were no significant differences of means of responses on impact,

due to qualifications on student previous experience, and total score. Table 11 illustrates this.

Table 11. A one-way between subjects ANOVA of the impact of EL teaching on AL, due to qualifications on the domains of teachers' experience

		Sum of Squares	DF	MS	F	Sig.
Teachers` Experience	Between Groups	00.67	2	.336	2.23	0.110
	Within Groups	46.54	302	.151		
	Total	46.21	304			
Students` Development	Between Groups	01.28	2	.639	2.88	0.058
	Within Groups	67.03	302	.222		
	Total	68.31	304			
Students` Previous Experience	Between Groups	01.47	2	.735	4.22	0.016*
	Within Groups	52.56	302	.174		
	Total	54.03	304			
L1 Use In L2 Class	Between Groups	00.64	2	.320	4.75	0.009*
	Within Groups	19.35	302	.067		
	Total	20.99	304			
Students' Acquisition	Between Groups	0.047	2	.024	.572	.565
	Within Groups	12.50	302	.041		
	Total	12.56	304			
Students' Age	Between Groups	0.031	2	.016	.737	.479
	Within Groups	06.42	302	.021		
	Total	06.45	304			
Total Score	Between Groups	01.06	2	.512	11.78	0.00*
	Within Groups	13.13	302	.043		
	Total	14.16	304			

Post hoc comparisons using the Scheffe test were computed to indicate that, the mean score for the qualification condition was significantly different between the B.A holders and M.A holders to M.A holders, taken together, these results suggest that qualifications really do have an impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage. Specifically, results suggest that when teachers have high levels of education, they tend to be more critical of the impact of L2 on L1, as indicated in Table 12.

Table 12. Post hoc comparisons using the Scheffe test

Academic Level	Bachelor	Master
Bachelor	0.750*	0.952*
Master		-0.202

Post hoc comparisons using the Scheffe test is computed to indicate that the mean score for the qualification condition was significantly different between the B.A to M.A holders.

Taken together, these results suggest that qualifications really do have an impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman on the L1 use in L2 within class. Specifically, results suggest that when teachers have high levels of education, they tend to be more critical of the impact of L2 on L1, as indicated in Table 13.

Table 13. Post hoc comparisons using the Scheffe test

Academic Level	Bachelor	Master
Bachelor	*.224*	0.111
Master		-0.113

There were no significant differences of means of responses on the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman due to qualifications on the study domains, since  $p > .05$  level for the three conditions. There were no significant differences of means of responses on impact of EL teaching on AL in Marka Schools due to qualifications on the student previous experience, and total score, as indicated in Table 14.

There were no significant differences of means of responses on impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage from the Teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman due to qualifications on the study domains, since  $p > .05$  level. There were no significant differences of means of responses on impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage from the Teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools due to qualifications on the student previous experience, and total score.

Table 14. A one-way between subjects ANOVA of the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> basic stage from the Teachers' perceptions in Marka Schools District in Amman due to qualifications

		Sum of Squares	DF	MS	F	Sig
Teacher's Experience	Between Groups	1.486	3	0.495	3.334	0.02
	Within Groups	44.72	301	0.149		
	Total	46.21	304			
Student Development	Between Groups	3.601	3	1.200	5.582	9.71
	Within Groups	64.70	301	0.215		
	Total	68.32	304			
Student Previous Experience	Between Groups	0.397	3	0.132	0.742	0.53
	Within Groups	53.63	301	0.178		
	Total	54.03	304			
L1 Use In L2 Class	Between Groups	1.567	3	0.522	8.088	3.38
	Within Groups	19.42	301	0.064		
	Total	20.99	304			
Students' Acquisition	Between Groups	0.728	3	0.243	6.173	4.39
	Within Groups	11.83	301	0.040		
	Total	12.56	304			
Students' Age	Between Groups	0.264	3	0.088	4.281	0.01
	Within Groups	6.187	301	0.021		
	Total	6.452	304			
Total Score	Between Groups	0.247	3	0.082	1.784	0.15
	Within Groups	13.91	301	0.046		
	Total	14.16	304			

## Discussion and Findings

Discussion of results is presented as follows. The first part talks about results related to the study question. The second part discusses the results of the study hypothesis and the role of the variables of experiences, gender, and qualification in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the English language teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District.

## Results related to the first part

### *Teacher's experience domain*

- What is the impact of EL learning on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the Teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools in Amman, on the teacher's experience?

Teachers' experience domain results indicate a high degree (M=3.85, SD=.686, percent=77.0%). It is worth mentioning that teachers in the study expressed that they particularly enjoyed teaching English as L2 which indicates that respondent's perception of teaching and learning English as EL is an enjoyable task. Also, it indicates that they have specialized in English because they love it, which encourages them to do their best to improve their students' skills. This may be interpreted to mean that teaching English enhances teacher-student communication and cooperation. This is very important because it agrees with other studies of the positive impact of L2 on L1 (E.g. Taha, 2016; Noor, 2007; Scherag et al., 2004; Jarvis, 2003; Fenner, Trebbi & Aase, 1999; Flowerdew, Li & Miller, 1998; Girven & Trebbi, 1997).

### *Student development domain and student previous experience domain*

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, on the teachers' experience?

Students' development domain and Students' previous experience domain results indicate a moderate response degree (M=3.42, SD=.572, 69.4%). This domain total score is lower than **teacher's experience domain**; it is worth mentioning that item 8, 16, 17, and 18 received the highest score, especially item 18 (M=3.96, SD=.869, 79.3%). These results indicate that respondents believe L2 errors are frequent among students who have been exposed to L2 which can be interpreted as meaning that these errors are not a direct result of the exposure to L2 because almost all students are exposed to L2. While item 19's achievement in L1 is impacted negatively for students who study L2, achievement in L1 is impacted negatively for students who study L2 and has a low score (M=2.5, SD=1.1, 50.5%). This indicates that

students' achievement in L1 and cultural values are not impacted by exposure to L2. This is very important because it agrees with other studies of such a positive impact of L2 on L1. This is very important because it agrees with other studies of the positive impact of L2 on L1 (E.g. Taha, 2016; Noor, 2007; Fenner, Trebbi & Aase, 1999; Flowerdew, Li, & Miller, 1998; Girven & Trebbi, 1997), and disagree with other studies that indicates that L2 negatively impacts L1 from the perspective of students' development and cultural values (E.g. Sadek, 2007; Benson, 2005; Al-Mutawa', 2005; Oskamp & Schultz, 2005; Nicoladis & Grabois, 2002).

Students' previous experience domain results indicate a high response degree ( $M=3.42$ ,  $SD=.572$ , 69.4%). It is worth mentioning that item 15 (I feel the courses presented at early ages focus on L2 more than L1) received the lowest score ( $M=2.55$ ,  $SD=.904$ , 59.5%), It is worth mentioning that item 18 (I encourage students to use L2 vocabulary in the class) received the highest score ( $M=3.96$ ,  $SD=.869$ , 80.1%), which indicates that respondents believe that L2 impact is clear among Arab students who were born in an English speaking country. This is a natural outcome of the fact that there is a real exposure to L2. This agrees what was found in other studies such as Benson (2005).

### ***L1 use in L2 within class domain***

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, on the L1 use in L2 within the class domain?

L1 use in L2 class domain results indicate a moderate response degree ( $M=3.20$ ,  $SD=.793$ , 63.2%). It is worth mentioning that item 39 "teaching L2 increases student's mental growth" received the lowest score, ( $M=2.56$ ,  $SD=.676$ , 56.2%); the use of L2 in learning has a negative effect on the teaching of L1; utterances in the classroom are only in L1 while specific words in L2 are used; transferring of L1 reading strategies has a negative effect on L2 proficiency which indicates that respondents believe that the use of L2 in teaching doesn't have a negative effect on the teaching of L1. This is very important because it is in line with other studies of the positive impact of L2 on

L1 (Benson, 2005; Al-Mutawa', 2005; Nicoladis & Grabois, 2002; Pevlenko & Jarvis, 2002).

### ***Students' acquisition domain***

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, on students' acquisition domain?

Results indicate a low response degree (M=2.86, SD=0.610, 58.3%). “Learning L2 has a big load on teachers” received the lowest score; item (45-52) indicates that respondents believe that teaching L2 does not impact L1 in terms of student's mental growth, identity, affection, or represent a load on school and family. This may be interpreted as meaning that teaching L2 has little to no impact on L1 concerning development of student. This result agrees with Kecskes (2001), and Kecskes & Papp (2000).

### ***Students' Age Domain***

- What is the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage: from the Teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, on age of teacher's domain?

Student age domain results indicate a moderate response degree (M=2.92, SD=0.564, 60.1%). Students in this stage can learn both L1 and L2 effectively; L2 has an effect on student L1 pronunciation; teachers have positive attitudes for teaching English in the first grades; L2 has a positive effect on the grammar of L1 and L2 decreases social interaction among students. L2 can help in the brain drain of the Arab children. This is very important because it agrees with other studies of the positive impact of L2 on L1 and disagrees with many Middle Eastern studies that indicate that L2 negatively impact L1 from the perspective of student's development and cultural values.

### **Results related to the second part**

- There are no statistically significant differences in means at I value = 0.05 in impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic

## Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman, due to the teacher's gender.

There were no significant differences in the scores for males and females on teacher's experience, student development, and student previous, experience domains.

However, there were significant differences in the scores of males and females on L1 use in L2 classes. These results suggest that female teachers really do see an impact of EL teaching and learning on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> grades on L1 use in L2 class more than male teachers. Moreover, there were significant differences in the scores of male and female teachers on student acquisition, in males and females conditions. These results suggest that female teachers really do see an impact of EL teaching on AL on student's acquisition in 1st grades on L1 use in L2 class more than male teachers. Also, there were significant differences in the scores of male and female teachers on student age, in males and females conditions. These results suggest that female teachers really do see an impact of EL teaching on AL on student's age in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage on L1 use in L2 class more than male teachers. Also, there were significant difference in the scores of males and females on total score; in male and female conditions. These results suggest that female teachers really do see an impact of EL teaching and learning on AL on total score in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage grades on L1 use in L2 class more than male teachers.

- There are no statistically significant differences at  $\alpha = 0.05$  in the impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage in the Marka Schools District in Amman, due to teacher's academic qualifications.

There were no significant differences of means of responses on impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers perceptions in the Marka schools District in Amman, due to qualifications on the domains of teacher's experience, L1 use in L2 within class, students' acquisition students' age, since  $p > .05$  level for the three conditions.

There were no significant differences of means of responses on the impact of EL learning on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools in Amman, due to qualifications on the student previous experience, and total score. Specifically, results suggest that when teacher have high levels of education, they tend to be more critical of the impact of L2 on L1. Post hoc comparisons using the *Scheffe* test were computed to indicate that the mean score for the qualification condition was significantly different for B.A and M.S degree; the differences were for B.A holders, and between MA holders to M.A holders.

There were no significant differences of means of responses on the impact of EL learning on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools in Amman due to qualifications on the study domains, since  $p>.05$  level. There were no significant differences of means of responses on impact of EL teaching on AL in the 1<sup>st</sup> Basic Stage from the teachers' perceptions in the Marka Schools District in Amman due to qualifications on the student previous experience and total score.

## **Recommendations**

Based on the results, one can recommend the following:

- To conduct future studies addressing the impact of English language not covered here.
- To conduct future studies that research could be replicated in other Districts of Jordan, not only in Marka Schools, but it could also involve other cities.
- To conduct educational studies showing the impact of the study of science topics and mathematics in EL on the level of achievement of students in the basic stage.
- To conduct the same study in other districts in Jordan and Arab Countries.

## References:

- Abdel-Galil, T. E. (2014). The Mohammed bin Rashid's Smart Learning Program (SLP) Initiative in the Ministry of Education and its impact on English language performance in Cycle2 Classes, in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). *Unpublished master dissertation, in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL)*, The British University in Dubai, Faculty of Education.
- Abdou, A. (2014). *Teaching English Language Vocabulary to ESL Learners via mobile phone applications short message service (SMS): An Investigation Based on Arabic-speaking Learners*. Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment Of MA for Teaching English Language. The British University in Dubai, Faculty of Education. <https://bspace.buid.ac.ae/handle/1234/665>.
- Al-Mutawa', N. (2005). The Effect of Foreign Languages on MotherLanguage. Arab Organization for Education, Culture and Science. Arab Center for Arabization, Translation, Composition and Publishing. *Journal of Arabization, 10*, 233-270.
- Au, T. K., Knightly, L. M., Jun, S.-A., & Oh, J. S. (2002). Overhearing a language during childhood. *Psychological Science, 13*(3), 238-243.
- Benson, C. (2005). *The importance of mother tongue-based schooling for educational quality*. Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report, 2005. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001466/146632e.pdf>
- Cook, V. (1991). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching, Psychology and Language*. London, New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in Education*. London: Longman.

- Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive, Academic Language Proficiency Linguistic Interdependence, The Optimum Age Question and Some Other Matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 19, 121-129.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?q=Cognitive%2fAcademic+Language+Proficiency%2c+Linguistic+Interdependence%2c+the+Optimum+Age+Question+and+Some+Other+Matters.+Working+Papers+on+Bilingualism%2c+No.+19.&id=ED184334>.
- Daoud, M. (2001). Language Policy and Planning in Tunisia: Accommodating Language Rivalry. In Steven J. Baker (ed.) *Language Policy: Lessons from Global Models*. Proceedings from Language Policy Conference held at the Monterey Institute.
- Evans, B. G., & Iverson, P. (2002). *Vowel normalization for dialect*. In S. Hawkins and N. Nguyen (Eds). *Temporal Integration in the Perception of Speech*. Cambridge, UK: Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities.
- Fenner, A., Trebbi, T., & Aase, L. (1999). Mother tongue and foreign language teaching and learning - A joint project. *Barcelona English language and literature studies*, 10, 133-143. Barcelona: Barcelona University.
- Fishman, J. A. (1996). Summary and Interpretation: Post-Imperial English: "1940-1990". In *Status Change in Former British and American colonies: 1940- 1990*(pp. 623-643). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Flege, J. E. (1987). The Production of New and Similar Phones in an El: Evidence from the Effect of Equivalence Classification. *Journal of Phonetics*, 15(1), 47-65.
- Flowerdew, J., Li, D., & Miller, L. (1998). Attitudes toward English and Cantonese among Hong Kong Chinese university lecturers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), 201-231.

- Girven, R., & Trebbi, T. (1997). Apprendredapprendreune langue en context institutional: deuxexemplesnorvégiens. In *L'autonomie de l'apprenanten langues vivantes/ Learner autonomy in modern languages* (pp, 191-207). Strasbourg: Education Council of Europe.
- Hoffmann, C. (1991). An Introduction to Bilingualism. *ELT Journal*, 37(3), 256- 261.
- Houwer, A. (1990). *The Acquisition of Two Languages from Birth: A Case Study*.Cambridge Studies in Linguistics.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jarvis, S. (2003). Probing the Effects of the L2 on the L1: A Case Study.In V. Cook, (Ed), *Effects of the Second Language on the First* (pp, 81-102). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Jiang, H. (2008a). *Effect of L2 phonetic learning on L1 vowels* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Simon Fraser University, Canada.
- Jiang, H. (2008b). Effect of L2 phonetic learning on L1 vowels. Competency in first language: Does it affect the quality of second language writing? *Dirasat International Journal of Scientific Studies and Humanities*, 34(2), 412-424.
- Kecskes, I., & Papp, T. (2003). How to Demonstrate the Conceptual Effect of L2 on L1? Methods and Techniques .In V. Cook, (Ed). *Effects of the Second Language on the First* (pp, 247-265). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kecskes, I., & Papp, T. (2000). Foreign Language Learning, affecting Mother Tongue. *Actas do Isimposio Internacional Sobre O Bilinguismo*, 5(1), 380-391.
- Kecskes, I., & Papp, T. (1995). The Linguistic Effect of FL Learning on the Development of ML Skills. In M. Haggstrom, L. Morgan, & L.Wieczorek (Eds.), *The FL Classroom: Bridging Theory and Practice* (pp, 81-163). New York: Garland.

- Kovacs, G., & Racsmany, M. (2008). Handling L2 Input in Phonological STM: The Effect of Non-L1 Phonetic Segments and Non-L1 Phonotactics on Nonword Repetition. *A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 58(3), 597-624.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis, Issues and Implications*. London: Longman.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M, H. (1991). *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research* (General Edition). Candlin, NY. Longman.
- Mackay, R. A., & Flege .J. E. (2004). Effects of the Age of Second Language Learning on the Duration of First and Second Language Sentences: The Role of Suppression. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(3), 373-396.
- Mahmoud, A. (1992). *Error-based Interlingua Comparisons as a learner-centered technique of teaching grammar to Arab students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Salford, UK.
- Maliborska, V., & You, Y. (2016). Writing Conferences in a Second Language, Writing Classroom: Instructor and Student Perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly Journal*, 7(4), 874-897 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com>.
- Margit, K. (2004). Title of the study Change in Backchanneling Behaviour the Influence from L2 to L1 on the Use of Backchannel Cue. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 36(1), 15-23.
- Ma'roof, S. (2010). Students' Attitudes toward English Language and its Relationship to Achievement in Gender in the Light of the Classroom Patterns (A Field Study on a Sample of First Year Students in Secondary Schools in Damascus). *University of Damascus Journal* (Arabic Ed.), 26(1, 2), 739-771.

- Master, A. P. (1998). Positive and negative aspects of the dominance of English. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. *TESOL Journal*, 32(4), 716–727.
- Morrow, L, M. (1975). *An Analysis of Syntax in the Language of Elementary School Children*.  
<http://fordham.bepress.com/dissertations/AAI7518919/>
- Naqeeb, H., & Awad, A. (2011). Learning Styles as Perceived by Learners of English as a Foreign Language in the English Language Center of The Arab American University - Jenin, Palestine. *An - Najah Univ. J. Res. (Humanities)*, 25(8), 2233-2256
- Nicoladis, E., & Grabois, H. (2002). Learning English and losing Chinese: A case study of a child adopted from China. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 6, 441-454.
- Noor, H. (2007). Competency in first language: Does it affect the quality of second language writing? *Dirasat, International Journal of Scientific Studies and Humanities*, 34(2), 412-424
- Olaimat, M, A. (2012). *The Effectiveness of Task-Based Language Learning Approach in Teaching English as a Second Language to the Students at the Vocational Education Development Centre in Abu Dhabi, UAE*. Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages (TESOL). The British University in Dubai, Faculty of Education.  
<https://bspace.buid.ac.ae/handle/1234/200>.
- Oskamp, S., & Schultz, P. (2005). *Attitudes and Opinions* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed). Lawrence Erlbaum. New Jersey, London: Associate Publishers.
- Pavlenko, A., & Jarvis, S. (2002). Bidirectional Transfer. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 190-214.
- Pavlenko, A. (2000). L2 impact on L1 in Late Bilingualism. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 175-205.

- Rahman, T. (1997). The medium of instruction controversy in Pakistan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 18(2), 145-154.
- Ramanathan, V. (1999). English is here to stay: A critical Look at Institutional and Educational Practices in India. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 211-231.
- Sadek, G.I. (2007). *Arab Student' Attitudes Toward Western Culture and Motivation to Learn English.A thesis in Teaching English to speakers of Other Languages*. Unpublished master dissertation, American University of Sharjah, College of Arts and Sciences.
- Scherag, A., Demuth, L., Rosler, F., Neville, H. J., & Roder, B. (2004). The Effects of Late Acquisition of L2 and the Consequences of Immigration on L1 for Semantic and Morpho syntactic Language Aspects. *Cognition*, 93(3), 97-108.
- Schmid, M. (2016). *At what age is it easiest to learn a second language?* The Conversation, Academic rigour, journalistic flair. <https://theconversation.com/at-what-age-is-it-easiest-to-learn-a-second-language-53840>.
- Taha, A.S.I.B. (2016). *English Teachers' Perceptions toward the Effectiveness of Using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Teaching Grammar at Al Ain Public Schools*. Unpublished Thesis, United Arab Emirates University (UAEU).
- Taylor, G., & Fiske, I. (1997). Errors and Explanations, *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 144-166.
- Tickoo, A. (1996). Learner hypothesis and past tense marking in Vietnamese English. *World Englishes (WE)*, 15, 183-192.
- Ventureyra, V., Pallier, C., & Yoo, H-Y. (2004). The Loss of M1 Phonetic Perception in Adopted Koreans. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 17, 79-84.

- Verhoeven, L.T. (1994). Transfer in Bilingual Development: The Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis Revisited. *Language Learning*, 44(3), 381-415.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and Language*. Boston: MIT Press.
- Zhou, S., & Moody, A. (2017). English in the Voice of China. *World Englishes (WE)*. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com>.
- Zohrabi, M., Torabi, M, A., & Baybourdiani, P. (2012). Teacher-centered and/or Student-centered learning: English Language in Iran. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 2(3), 18-30.