

The Expression of 'Can' in Turkish Texts and Teachers' and Students' Views of Turkish-English

Ercan Tomakin

Ordu University, Department of Foreign Languages,
Faculty of Science and Letters, Ordu, Turkey
Telephone: + (90) (452) 233 91 49, Fax: + (90) (452) 234 44 00,
E-mail: etomakin@hotmail.com

KEYWORDS English. Modal (can). Teaching. Turkish Language. Foreign (English) Language

ABSTRACT As the literature review shows that there is a lack of studies stating the modal "can" in the Turkish text, this paper aims to show the possibility of expressing the modal "can" in the Turkish texts (sentences) and explore teachers' and students' views. In doing so, firstly an overview of the modals, modality and modal auxiliaries are briefly explained in the introduction section. It also reviews the teaching of modals in theory and literature. Secondly, the structure of the paper is explained which consists of approach, method, technique, participants, preparation and formation of the Turkish texts. To this end, the paper used the qualitative approach to explore the English language teachers', Turkish teachers' and interviewed students' views. Their views are transcribed and analyzed descriptively in the findings. As for the results, it was seen that covert teaching of the English modal "can" in Turkish texts could facilitate foreign (English) language teaching studies to some extent, not only for those who know the Turkish language in Turkey and in the world, but also for those who use code-learning.

INTRODUCTION

There are a few key terms to express the modals in English grammar. These are usually known as modals, modal verbs, or modal auxiliary. These terms refer to the modality, which means relating to manners, forms and limits. For example, Azar (1989) uses the term modal auxiliaries and states that they usually express a speaker's attitudes or moods. According to McArthur (1992: 664), in syntactic and semantic analysis, it is chiefly used to refer to the way in which the meaning of a sentence or clause may be modified through the use of a modal auxiliary, such as may, can, will, and must. In a wider sense, the term is used to cover linguistic expression of these concepts other than through the modal auxiliaries. In Swan's (1995: 345) view the meanings of the modal can be summed up in two groups. One is about degrees of "certainty", which means a situation is certain, probable, possible or impossible. The other is about "obligation" and there is freedom to act. It means someone is obliged to do something or it would be better if something happened.

The basic usage of the modals, to state briefly from the grammar books, is shown throughout the following. The modals *can* and *may* are used for ability, permission, request, possibility and certainty. The modals *must* and *have to* are used for obligations. In the former, the obliga-

tion comes from the speaker's opinion and in the latter, the obligation comes from outside the speaker. The modals *should* and *ought to* are used to say what is the best or right thing to do. The modal *had better* is used for what is the best thing to do in a situation. The modal *will* is used for prediction. The past forms of the modals are *could*, *would*, *might*, *should* and *had to*. The perfect form of them is constructed by the use of *have*, such as *could have* v3, and *would have* v3. In this context, Quirk and Greenbaum (1988: 37), after counting the modals, state the differences between British English (BrE) and American English (AmE). For example, *mayn't* is restricted to BrE, *shan't* is rare in AmE, *ought* has the to-infinitive, yet AmE uses bare infinitive in negative and question sentences.

Apart from the above stated definitions and meanings of the modals, the other important issue focuses on the question of semi-modals or marginal modals. For example, in McArthur's view (1992: 664) modals are in two groups, namely, central and marginal modals. The former are *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *must*, *shall*, *should*, *will*, and *would*. The latter are sometimes called semi-modals verbs and these are *dare*, *need*, *ought to* and *used to*. He (1992: 665) maintains that *shall* used in southern England was replaced by *will* and contracted as 'll. This modal is used to express future tense together with *be going to*. He (1992: 665) further states that there are a number

of semi-auxiliaries that express modal or aspectual meanings, such as *be able to*, *be about to*, *be bound to*, *be going to*, *have to*, *have got to*. Pyle and Munoz (1986: 91), after counting the modals in a table, state that *have to*, *had to*, *used to*, *ought to* and *had better* are semi-modals. *Has to* has not been mentioned in this table. Yet, the researchers can infer that it is a semi-modal because *has to* is used with third person singulars (he, she, it). Besides, Swan (1995: 344) states that *need*, *dare* and *had better* are also used like modal auxiliaries. In addition, Leech (1989: 261) states that *need* and *dare* sometimes are regarded as modals.

Another issue about the modals focuses on grouping them. For example, McArthur (1992) puts modals in three groups, namely, epistemic, deontic and dynamic modals. The first expresses the speaker's opinion about a statement. For example, it may be true. In the second the speaker affects a situation by giving permission. For example, you can go when you finish it, but the last neither expresses the speaker's opinion, nor the speaker affects the situation. It is like describing a factual situation about the subject of the sentence. For example, *He can speak perfect German*. Besides, Allsop (1987) groups the modals under five categories. These are the probability (*will*, *must/can't*, *could*), obligation (*must*, *have to*, *should*, *ought to*), necessity (*need*), ability/success (*can*, *could*, *able to*), permission (*may*, *might*, *can*, *could*) and condition sections (*if-sentences*). Summation, although the modals seemed to be classified into different groups such as semi-modals, marginal modals, epistemic, deontic and dynamic, they share the following common features:

They are auxiliary verbs.

They have no third person(s) form.

They have no non-finite forms (not infinitive, —ing participle, or —ed participle).

All, except *ought* and *used*, are followed by the bare infinitive without *to*.

They have idiosyncratic semantic and formal features, affecting particularly their use in the past tense and in negation (McArthur 1992).

As a result, the modal *can* means *ebilir* or *abilir* in Turkish. The modal *must* means *meli* or *mali* in Turkish. The question arises: Can one use the Turkish language and Turkish texts in teaching the modals in general and the modal *can* specifically? If so, how can one prepare and use the Turkish texts? In order to answer these

questions, this paper attempts to express and teach the modals in the Turkish texts.

Teaching Modals in Theory

It seems that there are some major grammar books published by the famous publishers such as Oxford, Cambridge, Longman and Collins that explain all of the grammatical rules for tenses, modal, conjunctions, active, and passive voices descriptively (Azar 1989; Swan 1995; Quirk and Greenbaum 1988; Allsop 1988). There are also some books on how to teach tenses in English (Akar 2005; Aitken 2002; Cross 1995; Harmer 1989). Yet it also seems that there are not many published resources about how to teach modals. At this point, there are some resources that can be accessed through the Internet. For example, one web-page¹ explains modal teaching under the title "How to teach modal verbs: four simple steps." In the first step the teacher demonstrates the pronunciation of the modal that will be taught. In the second step the teachers conduct exercises and so on. Another webpage² gives theoretical tips and clues. On the other hand, it is not generally known if these resources are written by academics or not. As a result, it seems the shortage of the resources on teaching the modal is obvious. Hence the suggestions of this paper explained in the findings sections can be one of the solutions faced in this area.

Use of Mother Tongue in Language Classes

Sarandi (2013) reviews theoretical arguments made for and against the use of L1 in the classroom and then offers survey results to show the use of the mother tongue in language classes across the world. Although some of these theoretical views can be regarded as useful, this section aims to offer the results of some experimental studies, which can be regarded usually, as more convincing. For example, Schweers (1999) found that all Spanish language instructors at the university in Puerto Rico believed that L1 should be used in their classes to teach English. Besides, Burden (2001) observed that of 73 instructors teaching English at different universities in Japan 63 (86%) mentioned that L1 should sometimes be used in the language classroom. Similarly, Tang (2002) reported that seventy-two percent of instructors in a university in China supported the incorporation of L1 in their English language classes. Another study with forty instructors in China showed that they all fa-

vored the use of the L1 in their classes (van der Meij and Zhao 2010). Crawford's (2004) study indicated that the mother tongue support depended on the proficiency level of the students (cited in Sarandi 2013: 326).

Sarandi also provides a rich literature showing the purposes of L1 use by instructors around the world and the outcome of recent studies. For example, Cook (2001) argues that L1 is used for certain management issues and language-based activities such as teaching grammar, organizing language tasks, handling disciplinary issues and conducting language tests. For Auerbach (1993), L1 is used for language analysis, comprehension checks, explaining errors, discussing cross-cultural issues and negotiation of syllabus and lessons. In Weschler's (1997) study, L1 can be used in conducting brainstorming during warm-up stages. In Polio and Duff's study (1994), L1 is mainly used for teaching grammar, managing classrooms, establishing relationships with students, teaching abstract vocabulary and assisting learners with their comprehension. Franklin (1990) found that French instructors used L1 for dealing with the students' low proficiency levels, handling disciplinary matters, and compensating for the instructors' lack of confidence and their physical tiredness (cited in Sarandi 2013: 326). In brief, there are both theoretical views and empirical studies that support the use of the mother tongue in foreign language classrooms.

Literature Review of Modal Studies

The postgraduate theses at the Thesis Centre of the Higher Education Council (HEC) in Turkey were reviewed to find out if there has been any study on the topic of modals. According to current records, only one study at the MA level was carried out by Oncu (1998) who made a comparison of grammar consciousness-raising tasks and traditional teacher-fronted grammar instruction on teaching modals (can, may, must, have to and their negative forms) in English.

In Oncu's (1998) study, the experimental group learners were instructed through grammar consciousness-raising tasks, which provided learners with grammatical problems they must solve interactively which would/might enable learners to increase their knowledge of a difficult grammar rule. The control group learners were instructed through traditional teacher-fronted grammar lessons, which provided learners with practice and production based activities so that

the students would be able to practice and produce grammatically correct sentences of the target structure. The results of the paper indicated that both groups naturally improved their proficiency gains significantly. However, there was a significant difference between the proficiency gains of both groups. The experimental group subjects performed better than the control group subjects. Thus, it can be said that grammar consciousness-raising tasks are more effective than traditional teacher-fronted grammar instruction in teaching modals such as can, may, must, have to and their negative forms.

As seen, few of the postgraduate studies have made an attempt to teach English modal. It was also seen that the mother tongue is still used in teaching a foreign language across the world. As to the use of Turkish as a means of teaching a foreigner, various people used the mother tongue by writing the verse dictionaries (manzum) that became the main source of teaching a foreign language in different times of the history. According to Kirbiyik (2007: 11), the first verse dictionary was written by the Arab linguists to teach Arabic in the 11th century. In this way, the first Arabic-Turkish dictionary is *Lügât-i Feris-teođlu* written by Abdullatîf İbn Melek in 1392 (Okumus 2007: 148-149). Besides this, there are many types of verse dictionaries such as Turkish-Arabic, Arabic-Persian, Turkish-Persian, Turkish-Arabic-Persian and Persian-Turkish that were written to teach a foreign language.

Yusuf Halis adapted the tradition of the Persian-Arabic verse dictionaries and wrote a French-Turkish dictionary called *Miftah-i Lisan* in 1849-1850 (Kirbiyik 2007: 27). It consists of 2,500 words and has 521 couplets on various topics. One can find overall information on the verse dictionaries in the literature, for example (Kirbiyik 2007). Only the following extract was provided to save space and to show the use of mother tongue in teaching a foreign (French) language.

Neje kar yağması nej kar nü bulut dahi nüaj.
(neiger, neige, nue, nuage).

Glass âyîne vü buz dolu grel kiya rivaj.
(glace, grêle, rivage).

Gemiye koymadır *anbarke debarke* çıkmak.
(embarquer, debarquer).

Batiman yapı gemi hem de navir nevl nolaj.
(bâtiment, navire, nolage) (Kirbiyik 2007: 103).

In general, the verse dictionaries generally aimed to teach the vocabulary of that foreign

language. Only few of them aimed to teach the grammar rules of that language. Similar to Kirbiyik's study, it was seen that English subject pronouns (I, you, he), to be verbs (am, is, was, etc.), simple present tense, and all the modals (may, must, might, has to) could be expressed in the Turkish texts (Tomakin 2014a, b, c).

The Objectives of this Study

As stated above, the English subject pronouns (I, You), to be verbs (am, is, was) simple present tense, and the modals (could, may might) are stated in the Turkish texts so far. Apart from these, the aim of this paper is two-fold: first, it aimed to show the use of English vocabularies (**do** = yapmak; **dolma** yapmak) and grammar (**Isil cansiz dolap yapabilir** = I can do) in the Turkish sentences. Secondly it aimed to explore the following objectives.

To place the modal "can" into the Turkish texts by using English verbs and nouns.

To explore the English language teachers' views of English-based Turkish texts.

To explore the Turkish language teachers' views of English-based Turkish texts.

To explore the students' views of these Turkish texts having English rules in them.

METHODOLOGY

Approach

This study used the qualitative approach to find answers to the research questions and included the volunteer teachers and students because of the purposive sampling (Robson 1995). The study used mainly twelve research questions in semi-structured form. Yet further questions such as why, when, how and explain this point, were asked when needed to have in-depth information about the issues. The questions had the following aims mainly:

The first question asks about the general problem of teaching English modals.

The second question is about the easily learnt modals.

The third question is about the knowledge or awareness of the Turkish method in advance.

The fourth question is about the teachers' views of the Turkish method in general.

The fifth question is about the possibility of using the new method.

The sixth question asks about the effectiveness or usefulness of the new method.

The seventh question asks about the possible level at which the new method can be used.

The eighth question asks about the possible ways of using it.

The ninth question asks about the comprehensibility of the Turkish text in terms of teachers.

The tenth question asks about the difficulty of the Turkish text in terms of students.

The eleventh question asks about the possible delay of the national curriculum in the use of the new method.

The twelfth question explores the teachers' suggestions to use the new method effectively.

In addition, the questions answered by the Turkish teachers were about their general opinion about the method, their awareness of the method and richness of Turkish. In addition, the questions answered by the pupils were about recognition of the English grammar in the Turkish text, and difficulty and comprehensibility of the Turkish texts.

Method

The paper used the case study method. According to Adelman et al. (1984), researchers either take a bounded system (the case) to explore issues within that pre-selected case, or they start with an issue or problem and bound the case during the research process. It seems that this paper did both of these in defining the case of the study. The study took a pre-selected case and tried to explore the problems, views, and suggestions about the case. This is because the paper already identified the title of the study as teaching the English modal (can) in the Turkish texts. The study also started with an issue (can) in Turkish, collecting data from English and Turkish teachers, and pupils. At the end, the study bounded (identified) the case of the study in-line with the findings.

Technique

The paper used transcription coding techniques to analyze the collected data. Hence all data was transcribed and translated into English first. Then the answers to each research question were coded and collected to write a general finding about each question.

Participants

Schools were visited several times by the researcher to explain the topic (can) of the paper

and to persuade the participant teachers. These visits also had the aim of getting permission from the school management orally and showing that the English grammar can be taught by the Turkish text. As stated by Robson (1995), only the volunteer teachers and students were involved in the study because of the purposive sampling in qualitative research. The participant teachers were coded with their initials such as (AK, HY) to hide their identity and to protect them. Lastly, the schools were coded taking initials as school Karsiyaka Ilkogretim Okulu (KIO), Vakif Ilkogretim Okulu (VIO).

Preparation of the Turkish Texts

The language teachers write the English word on the board, put an equal mark and then write its Turkish meaning as shown: do = yapmak, make= yapmak, say= söylemek, in the classical teaching method. Or they use colored board markers to teach a new vocabulary. For example, they write the English words in red and their Turkish meaning in black. In this paper the researcher made a little change to teach the modal “can” and spent some time in innovating. The production of subjects, can and verbs are:

Subjects: Turkish proper names, which represent English subject pronouns either scripturally or phonetically, were identified like this. For example, Isil is a female Turkish proper name. The first letter of the word Isil represents the first person singular subject pronoun “I” of English. Similarly, other Turkish proper names were found, like Isilay and Isik. If there was no scriptural similarity, a phonetic similarity was found as in Ayla, Aydan, and Aylin. The first two letters of these names (Ay) represent the pronunciation of the first person singular subject pronoun “I” (ay). In brief, all subject pronouns were represented as follows.

Isil, Isik... Ayla represent	I
Yunus, Yusuf represent	You
Hekim, Herif represent	He
Sirin represents	She
It (dog) represent	It
Veysel, Vildan represent	We
Deylem represent	They

(Tomakin 2014b: 212).

Can: To teach the modal “can”, a Turkish dictionary was used to find the words starting

with “can”. Some of these words are “canli, cansiz, and candan.” Then the Turkish meaning of the “can” was added to the word “canli” and it became like “canlanabilir”. Finally, the meaning of the verb was highlighted by writing it in bold, italic or in color as seen *canlanabilir, canlanabilir* and *canlanabilir*.

Verbs: The same procedure was used in producing the Turkish words from the English verbs. For example, the word “make” means “yapmak” in Turkish. Then the Turkish words starting with “make” were reviewed and the word “maket” was found. Then the Turkish meaning of make was added after this word and it became maket yapmak. Finally, its English Turkish parts were highlighted as *maket yapmak*. Likewise, the verb “say” was converted into “sayi söylemek” and this was highlighted as *sayi söylemek*.

Formation of Turkish Texts

After producing the possible subject pronouns, the words having “can” in them and possible verbs, it was time to put the produced words in an order in-line with Subject + Verb + Object, to produce a Turkish-English sentence. **Isil canli dolap yapabilir = I can do.** In this way, a Turkish text was produced having all subject pronouns in affirmative form.

Then, to represent the question form of simple the modal “can” words that starting with “can...” like canli, candan, and cansiz, were brought to the beginning of the sentence. Then the sentence became **Canan, Isil’ a dolap yapabilir mi? Can I do?**

Finally, to represent the negative form of the modal “can”, the necessary words starting with “not” were found such as “nota, noter, and noterlik”. For example, **Isil, canli noterin maketini iter gibi yapamaz = I can not make it.** As a result, a Turkish text was produced and showed to the English and Turkish teachers including students.

FINDINGS

Findings for the First Objective

It was seen that all of the English subject pronouns could be expressed in Turkish scripturally or phonetically as explained in the methods. For example, Isik = I, Isilay = I, Ayla= ay (I), Yunus = Yu (you), Hekim = he. Besides, the modal “can” is expressed in the Turkish words as

seen, Canan, canlı, Cansu, cansız, canlanmak, and canavar. In addition, about 40 to 50 English verbs (present form) are expressed in the Turkish words. For example, do = yapmak; dolap yapmak; dolma yapmak, doktora yapmak, curetle tedavi etmek, diet yapmak, handana vermek, likeni sevmek. Moreover, some of the English nouns are expressed in Turkish, for example, boyacı erkek çocuk, Boyabatlı erkek çocuk, boylu erkek çocuk, arma kolu, armada kolu, and armalı kol. As a result, affirmative, negative and question forms the modal “can” come in the Turkish text as follows.

<i>Affirmative Form</i>	
Isil canlı dolap yapabilir.	I can do
Yunus canavar sayısını söyleyebilir.	Yu (you) can say.
Hekim canıyla reportaj yapabilir.	He can report.
Sirin Can'la ahit yapabilir.	She can hit.
It, Canan'ı sekillere sokabilir.	It can kill.
Vildan cankurtarını parkedebilir.	Vi (we) can park.
Deylem canavarı eldivenle yakalayabilir.	Dey (they) can dive.
<i>Question Form</i>	
Can, Isil'a dolap yapabilir mi?	Can I do?
Cansız Yunus sayı söyleyebilir mi?	Can you (you) say?
Caniler hekimle reportaj yapabilir mi?	Can he report?
Can, Sirin'in payesini ödeyebilir mi?	Can si (she) pay?
Cansız it onu minderde rahatsız edebilir mi?	Can it mind?
Canan Vildan'ı begenebilir mi?	Can vi (we) beg?
Canavar Deylem robotu soyabilir mi?	Can dey (they) rob?
<i>Negative Form</i>	
Isil canlı not dolabı yapamaz.	I can not do.
Yunus canlı noter sayısını söyleyemez	You can not say.
Hekim canıyla noterde reportaj yapamaz.	He can not report.
Sirin Can'ın notsuz ahitini yapamaz.	She can not hit.
It Canan'ı monoton sekillerde öldüremez.	It can not kill.

Vildan cansız astronotu parketmeyebilir.
We can not park.
 Deylem, Can'ın notunu söyleyebilir.
Dey (they) can not say.

Findings for the Second Objective

General Problem of Teaching Modals

The English teachers' responses were positive and negative as follows. One teacher (NP) says, “*She does not have any view.*” Four of the teachers (EX, YI, SI, MY) state that *there is no problem in general*. Two of the teachers (HNU, SI) say that *the students do not know how to use the word order of the English sentences*. In their view the students do not know *if a sentence is positive or negative*. Sometimes they *forget to use the verb after the modals*. In CK's view, *the students do not exercise much and they forget the meaning of modals in one or two months, post class*. For SK, “*had better and ought to*” are among the problematic topics. In EY, AY and E2's view, *the students are forgetful*. That is, they either *forget what they learn or they forget to use the modal while they are writing or speaking*. In two teachers' view (GGK, YK), *the students confuse the modals that have similar meanings such as must, have to, has to, and should*. In ED's view, *the modals perfect are a problem in general*. For OC, “*have to and do not have to*” are *problematic topics*. According to AH and HA, *any modal, for example can, has more than one meaning and this is a problem for the students*. Finally, YG makes a general statement by saying *there are some problems*.

Those who have a negative view about the study state the following modal problems. For SU, *the student makes mistakes about the word order of an English sentence*. In TA's view, as stated above, *the modals that have similar meaning such as must and have to, are problems*. The teacher (MS) has negative views for the study, yet he says that *the modals are one of the easily learnt topics*. In sum, it is seen that while few teachers see the teaching of the modals as problematic, most of them see it as non-problematic. Hence, the English-based Turkish texts can possibly be a solution to these problems in the future.

Easily Learnt English Modals

The views about the easily learnt topics seem diverse. For example, sixteen of the teachers (EY,

NP, HNU, HA, to name a few) state that 'can' is one of the easily learnt topics. They also state that it is one of the first learnt topics. Besides, four of the teachers (EY, ED, OC, SI) say that 'should' is among the easy topics. In addition, seven of the teachers (HA, YK, ED, to name a few) express that 'must' is another easily learnt topic. In one teacher's (CK) view, the students learn 'have got' and 'has got' easily. In MY's view, the modals in general are learnt easily.

Two teachers (SU, MS) out of three who have negative views against the study did not regard any topic as easy. The other teacher who also has negative view says, the modal 'can' is learnt easily. In conclusion, it seems that most of the teachers include the present forms of the modals in the easily learnt topics and the language teachers can consider this point.

Awareness of English-based Turkish Texts

Some teachers briefly and some others in a long answer, state that they are unaware of these texts. For example, fourteen of the teachers (EY, NP, AH, HA, to name a few) briefly say no about the awareness. Other five of the teachers (including HNU, OC) state that they have not seen these sorts of texts anywhere before. Three of the teachers (SU, TA, MS) who have got negative views about the study also state that they have not seen or heard the English-based Turkish texts so far. In conclusion, it seems that all the teachers do not know these sorts of texts. These can be used as a new method in English teaching—English as a foreign language.

Teachers' Views about the English-based Turkish Method

Most of the teachers' positive views appear as follows. In EY's view, the modals can be taught like this in the Turkish text. In HNU's view, it can be useful. In AH's view, since the method is based on teaching from known to unknown principle it is useful. For HA, it can be an amusing activity in teaching the grammar. YK regards it as interesting. In ED's view, the English in the Turkish texts is not much favored. In four teachers' views (OC, YG, GGK, E1) it is a different study. In AY's view it is an original and different study. In two teachers' opinion (MY and YI) these texts can be used in teaching the modals. According to SI, some of the Turkish sentences can be used

in teaching the modal. Finally, SI says that learning by coding is more effective as occurred in this text.

Those who have negative views about the study state the following reasons. For NP these sorts of texts can confuse some students' mind. E2 asks the question by saying will we find coded sentences in the text forever? In CK's view it is a confusing method for secondary school students. Of the three teachers, one teacher (MS) did not declare any view. One teacher (SU) says that it is confusing, and the other teacher (TA) says that it is causing pronunciation problems. In conclusion, although the suggested Turkish method was not used or tried by the teachers in the classrooms, most of them stated that the study was, different, new, original, usable and interesting.

Teachers' Perception of English-based Turkish Texts

Most of the teachers regard the study as different and give further explanations as seen below. In EY's view it is a different method. Three of the teachers (NP, GGK, YI) briefly say that it is different. For HNU's view it is interesting and remains in the students' mind. In AH's opinion it is useful. According to HA, it is different and interesting. In ED's view it is a comparative method, which is based on similarity. In six teachers' view (including YG, AY, MY) it is interesting. According to CK, the study is different, but a bit confusing for the secondary schools. In E1's view the study is different and extraordinary. Finally, SI says that it is an amusing study.

Those who have negative views about the English-based Turkish texts have the following views. For example, in OC's view it is different, but confusing. One teacher (TA) did not reveal any view. Another teacher (SU) says that it is confusing. Although MS is against the study, he sees it differently. As a conclusion, most of the teachers' perceptions about these texts are positive and diverse (p=16, n=3, undecided 1).

The Use of English-based Turkish Texts

Those who have positive views state the following cases to use the English-based Turkish sentences. Four of the teachers (including HNU, AH) briefly say yes about the usage of the study. The teachers (EY, SI) state a possibility by say-

ing possible. In NP's view *it can be used with the appropriate students and levels*. For HA *it can be used in reinforcing the grammatical rules*. In YK's view *it saves time in teaching grammar*. In ED's view *it can be used when needed, but it must be used little*. In two teachers' view (OC, SI, SI2) *it can be used*. In AY's view *it must be used definitely, yet it must be used at intermediate or upper levels*. In GGK's view *coding is best recognized at an older age*. E2 answers the question by saying *why not* and further says that *this must be tried at classrooms*. In E1's view *it can be used, but it may take much time*. For YI *it can be used occasionally*.

Those who have negative views state the following views. CK says that *the text is confusing for the secondary school students*. SY states briefly *no*. In TA's view it is not functional and finally, MS says that there is no need to use this method. In conclusion, most of the teachers state briefly positive views by saying yes. It is seen that the majority is taking the positive side although one-third of them have negative views.

Effectiveness of the English-based Turkish Texts

The teachers state different areas of effectiveness for the English-based Turkish sentences. For example, SI2 says that *such a method makes learning amusing instead of memorizing the rules*. YI says that *it is effective, but it may take much time*. SI says *the texts that affect the mind will be effective*. SK, MY and ED explain the topic in terms of children. The former reveals that *it can be effective, for example, as some children learn visually*. For the middle, *it can catch the children's attention*. For the latter, *some children learn in this way (by coding)*. In CK's opinion *it can be useful for high school students*. Two of the teachers (YG, AY) briefly state a possibility by saying *it can be effective*. Another teacher (OC) very briefly confirms the possibility by saying yes. In YK's view *the English-based Turkish texts save learners' time to learn English*. For AH *the English grammar in the Turkish texts can become permanent*. In HNU's view *since the students see both the English word and its meaning in one word, it remains in the mind much better*. According to NP, *it can be useful for some students*. Finally, EY says that *since the modal topics are learnt easily compared to tenses, the Turkish texts can be useful*.

The teachers who have got negative views about the study put forward the following reasons for not using these texts. In EI's personnel view *the Turkish-texts do not become very effective*. HA says that *it is difficult for her to use these texts*. GGK says that *it can be confusing for the beginner level language learners*. SU's personal view is that *it is confusing because the Turkish text has both English and Turkish meanings*. In TA's view *it is not useful*. Finally, MS tells that *there is no need such a study*. In conclusion, six of the teachers have negative views and thirteen of them have positive views about the effectiveness of the Turkish texts.

Levels to Use the English-based Turkish Texts

In EY, MY, and ED's view *the texts can be used at all English levels*. According to GGK and NP's views *these sorts of texts can be used at advanced levels*. GGK further says that *the texts are for an older age (secondary or high school students)*. In AY's opinion, *the texts can be used at the intermediate level*. According to AH, *the texts can be used at year six, seven and eight of the primary schools*. Four of the teachers (HA, YK, OC, SI) state that *these texts can be used at the beginner and elementary levels*. One teacher (CK) states that *they can be used at the high school level*. Another teacher (YG) briefly says yes, but he does not reveal any idea about the level. The teachers (SK, SI, YI) say that *the texts can be used at elementary level*. Other three teachers (HNU, X1, EX) seem to be *undecided*. As a result, most of the teachers say that there are some places or levels to use the Turkish texts having English in them. A final note about this subtitle is that those teachers who have a negative view against the study do not reveal any view about English levels, at which the study can be used.

The Ways of Using the English-based Turkish Texts

Thirteen of the teachers (including EY, NP, HNU, AH) *did not explain any view* about how to use the Turkish texts. Apart from this, other teachers state the following views. For EY *more Turkish texts can be produced and they can be used in this way*. In OC's view *it can be used with translation and grammar exercises*. According to AY, *the text can be used with symbols*

and coding. For one teacher (CK) *the Turkish texts can be used in reinforcing the rules*. For YI *the texts can be produced in the form of short sentences*. In SI2's view *various kinds of games and activities can be used in the text*. As a result, although most of the teachers do not have any idea about how to use the Turkish texts, this does not mean that these teachers are against the method. This is because they came across the study for the first time and they may not have any initial idea about the ways of using the study.

Teachers' Negative Views about the English-based Turkish Texts

Since eight out of twenty-two teachers answered the questions negatively, only negative views are included in this part and the reasons behind their views come as follows. For YG *the method is different*. In GGK's view *the method is difficult*. In E2's view *producing these sorts of texts can be difficult and may take much time*. This person also says that *the method can be difficult for the students rather than the teachers*. According to EB, *the method is quite different and difficult*. For YI *the Turkish texts are difficult*. In SU's opinion *the texts are difficult and confusing*. In TA's idea *the method is a little confusing and causing the comprehension problem*. Finally, one teacher (MS) does not reveal any positive or negative view. In conclusion, nearly one-third of the teachers have negative views about the study, this does not necessarily mean that none of the students like this method.

Clarity of the English Modal (Grammar) in the Turkish Texts

Five of the teachers stated short and positive views. They (EY, YG, GGK, etc.) state that *yes, the Turkish sentences reflect the modal (can) rules in them*. Four of the teachers (AH, HA, YK, ED) state that *the grammar rules are clear in the Turkish texts this is because they are bold, italic or colored*. For HNU *the text both gives the grammatical rules and its meaning in one word. Hence, it remains in the mind*. In OC's view *the rules are clearly understandable in the text*. In AY's opinion *the analogy in teaching "can" is very good*. The teachers YI and E2 say that *it can be for "can"*, and asks further ques-

tions. The former says *what about the other modals?* The latter says that *the modal in the middle of a Turkish word, for example fincanci, can't be recognized by everybody*. According to CK *the modal "can" may catch the attention of the students at the secondary schools, and the listening lessons can be effective with these examples*. SI2 says that *since we use "can" in expressing our abilities, we can use the English-based Turkish texts as well*.

On the other hand, five of the teachers state negative views for the following reasons: In NP's view *the students may see the rules in the Turkish texts as a bit confusing, especially the students whose English level is low*. For MY, *these texts do not reflect the rules of "can" completely*. EB briefly says *no*. Although SU has negative views about the study, this teacher says that *the texts exactly reflect the rule of "can" and there can be some difficulty as there is some comprehensibility*. Another teacher (TA) has negative views, but tells that *the texts partly reflect the rule (can), yet there are some negative views as he stated earlier*. Finally, one teacher (MS) remains undecided. In conclusion, most of the teachers have positive views about the clarity and recognition of "can" in the Turkish texts.

Students' Recognition of the Modal Rules in the Turkish Texts

Seventeen of the teachers stated positive views about the students' recognition of the English grammar rules in the Turkish texts. The diversity of their views appears as follows. For NP, HNU and SI *the students can recognize "can" if they are written in bold or colored letters in the sentences*. SI2' further states, *the selectivity in learning is more important and the bold, italic and color texts make it selective*. Two of the teachers (AH, ED) state that *careful students can recognize the rules in the texts*. Five of the teachers (including EY, YG, AY) say that *yes, the students can notice and understand the rules*. For HA, *the students can notice the rules, yet there must be a teacher for those who want to learn the English for the first time*. In OC's view *the students can clearly notice the rules and teachers can use these texts easily*. Two of the teachers (XI, CK) have both positive and negative views as follows. The former says that *the students can notice for a while, yet this won't become permanent*. The latter tells that

the texts can be understood by examples, yet the time does not become sufficient. In SI's view *the texts about the vocabulary teaching is much sticking in the mind.* In GGK's opinion *the students who can understand this must be at least in year six, seven and eight.* One teacher (MS) states negative views about the previous questions, yet he replies to this question by saying *yes the students can understand them.*

Those who have negative views about the study state these reasons. MY says *the students may face difficulty in understanding the texts.* In EB's view *the texts do not become useful.* SU states the following worry. *Since the students will understand the Turkish texts, the rules of the modal in them may not be noticed.* In TA's view *the students can understand them partly.* In conclusion, except one-fourth of the teachers, the rest are taking the positive side about the students' recognition of the rules (can) in the Turkish texts.

The Use of English-based Turkish Texts: A Barrier or Helper

Nineteen of the teachers state positive views in general and eleven of them (including EY, NP, AH) briefly state that *it is not a barrier to the use of the current curriculum.* In HNU's view *this method can be used with the curriculum.* In AH's view *it is not a barrier to the curriculum, many methods are always tried.* OC says *she does not think it as a problem.* AY tells that *these Turkish texts provide richness.* Two of the teachers have partial hesitation as appears. YG says that *the texts can be a barrier, possibly or a little.* SI2' says that *there might be a time limit in using the Turkish texts.*

Five of the teachers have negative views about the study for the following reasons. MY briefly says that *yes, it is a barrier.* For the teachers YG, SU, SI2 *the time to use these texts does not become sufficient during the lessons.* For TA *the curriculum at the primary schools is not grammar based, hence it does not overlap with the current system.* In short, as seen in the previous articles most of the teachers are pro-new to the method and the use of these texts can help with the teaching of English.

The Teachers' Views to Improve English-based Turkish Texts

This section offers teachers' diverse views about improving the Turkish texts as follow. Four

of the teachers (EY, ED, GGK, SU) say that *songs can be used in these texts.* SU further says that *the students like learning the use of songs.* For five of the teachers (including, EY, NP, HA) *tongue twisters can be used in the texts.* In four teachers' views (including NP, YG) *jokes can be used in these texts.* In HNU's view *interesting writings always catch the attention and they can be jokes or tongue twisters.* For AH's view *good examples must be chosen in producing the texts.* In SI2 and HA's views *poems can be easily used.* The latter gives the following example by saying "I wish I were a fish, in your dish". According to YK, *a story can be written by using "can" that has unexpected ends.* In ED's opinion *the verbs can be taught by doing exercises on the board.* For OC *the sentences must be remembered in the mind.* For AY's opinion *all (riddle, joke, tongue twister) must be simple.* E2's view is important because he says that *the activity that will be used changes from one topic to another.* The teachers (MY, TA, MS) seem undecided. SK tells that *she does not have difficulty in teaching the modals.* The negative views about the study are as follows. EB says that *this method does not become useful.* In conclusion, most of the teachers state a few possible views about producing and using the Turkish in the texts. Hence it seems that it is worth trying or using the suggested offers.

Turkish Language Teachers' Views

The teacher (NS), teaching at VIO School says that *it can be confusing at first, but if it was given a little importance, it can be a good step to learn English. For example, canlanabilir; it has "can" in it and its Turkish meaning as well, it came different and interesting to me, it can be used, in fact, it can be.* The Turkish teacher (AK), teaching at Ataturk Anadolu high school (AAHS), stresses the importance of knowing the mother tongue by saying that *to learn English it is necessary to know Turkish, the person whose Turkish is weak and doesn't know the elements of the sentence can't learn English. It can be used and it can shorten the time spent to teach the grammar.* The interview with a deputy head (MK) of ASM high school shows that *if a word has more than one meaning, for me, it is richness of that language. For example, the word rose has fifteen to twenty different meanings in literature and poetry. These texts can*

have an association effect. That is, association links the new information to the previous ones. The teacher (EO) says that *it is the richness of Turkish, yet doesn't it (Turkish-English sentence) cause confusion? It seems necessary to consider this point, as all in all, it is a nice view.* The office manager (NA) and French teacher of a private language center says that *it can be, in fact, yet pronunciation can cause a problem, the elementary level students can understand them, the older already know a little English, we used to use a little coding in France.* The teachers (GS, TY) interviewed at SDI school have positive and negative views. The former says that *Turkish is an agglutinating language, it is rich in terms of vocabulary and pronunciation, of course this can be useful in terms of grammar teaching.* Yet the latter tells that *the "can" in English and the "can" in the canli, and canavar are different.* One teacher (BK) teaching at Ataturk İlköğretim (AIO) School says that *I see at this point, a similarity between both languages, but not the richness of Turkish.* In conclusion, it is seen that the Turkish teachers say that learning a foreign language depends on knowing one's own language well. Besides, some of them see the similarity of the some Turkish words with the English ones as a hint to learn it easily.

Students' Views

The interviewed students' replies about the effectiveness of the suggested method came as follows. Two students (UK, AY) from the VIO school stated positive views about the study by saying that *it is better for one who understands the technique, I'm always confusing "am, is, are", I understand better in this way, I memorize the words before the exam, yet I forget them if they are taught in this way. This method also removes the use of dictionary partly.* Besides, the students from Ataturk Saglik Meslek high school (ASM) have positive views. For example, FSC says that he learns the formula of the topic pressure in chemistry by coding. He also gives the following example in learning the prepositions: *Inay atsa on gün tutar.* In Inay, "in" is English and "ay" is a Turkish code, which means "month". It implies that "in" is used before the months. Similarly, in "atsa", "at" is English and "sa" is a Turkish code that means o'clock. It implies that "at" is used before hours. Finally, "on gun" means "ten days" literally. "On" is English

and "gun" means day. It implies that "on" is used before days. From the same school FG tells that *in normal teaching it is necessary to memorize, yet there is a clue here, as seen in maket yapmak.* In addition, five students (two boys and three girls) were interviewed from Ataturk secondary school. The boys were neither positive nor negative. For example, AK tells that *the traditional ways of learning is easy because we got used to using it, yet the second way can be easy if we get used to using it.* Three of the girls state positive views and one view is sufficient to show general idea. For example, KD responded by saying, *in fact, the second text is more understandable, it is a good method, but we got used to using the traditional one as from primary school.* Moreover, four students from the MI school have positive views about the study. For example, the student (SC) says that *the second text is more useful this is because everybody knows Turkish, so everybody can learn English.* Furthermore, six students (two from language-based class and four from normal class) were interviewed of the Basogretmen Anadolu Lisesi (BAL) and all of them commonly say that *the second text is easier because it is similar to Turkish. Hence, it may remain in the students' mind a bit longer.*

DISCUSSION

The researcher coined and used the terms "Turkish-English grammar, English-based Turkish texts and English-based Turkish method" for the first time. These terms were produced on the basis of the writer's teaching experience and considering the linguistic terms in the literature. For example, the reason for using Turkish-English grammar is that some Turkish sentences included English sentences in them as seen in the findings section. Besides, it is quite easy to see many types of English in the literature. One can find them easily by surfing the Internet. The examples of these are BBC English, Black English, US English, Canadian English, Indian English, Irish (Hiberno)-English, Scottish English, and Carabian English. In addition, new discoveries and inventions make it necessary to give a new name to these. Some Turkish-English sentences exist in this study as seen. Hence, coining these sentences under a general term of Turkish-English grammar seems logical. In addition, there are

many terms using ‘-based’ such as, computer-based teaching, and internet-based teaching.

Another point that may be questioned by the language experts is the use of the mother tongue (L1) in teaching a foreign (English) language. This is because it is usually accepted that second language acquisition (SLA) is deeply affected by the language learners’ mother tongue. It is also widely believed that some of the grammatical and pronunciation mistakes of the learners derive from the L1 (Ellis 1994). On the contrary, it was stated that the degree of similarity between the L1 and SLA is an important determinant. This is because Ellis (1994: 34), in explaining the contrastive analysis theory, says, “The greater the difference, the greater the difficulty and the more numerous errors will be”. Similarly, Cook (2001: 41) tells, “When the languages are closely related, this may be effective”. The modal “can” and some others in English are expressed in Turkish as seen in this study, it has some similarity as seen in can = canli, canlanabilir, Canan olabilir, canavar olabilir, canavarlasabilir. Hence, the teaching of “can” would be easier with this new discovery. Teaching “from known to unknown topic principle” in education also supports this point.

It can be claimed that foreign language teaching is a problem in Turkey and not only the parents, but also teachers and students complain about it. The teachers interviewed revealed the problematic side of it. It is seen that the problematic side of the modals changes from one teacher to another. For example, while the teacher SK sees “*had better and ought to*” are among the problematic topics, in ED’s view *the modal perfect* is a problem in general as seen in the findings section of 2.1. Similarly, one topic that is regarded as problematic by a teacher is sometimes seen as unproblematic by another teacher as seen in section 2.2. As a solution, the general problems of the learners can be investigated by large-scale studies.

It was seen in this study that some of the modals are learnt easily while some others are not. Hence it seems that it is necessary to investigate elaborately to what extent the topics are learnt easily or not. This can be carried out by conducting several studies with the same subjects or by getting in-depth information through face-to-face interviews. Hence those who are involved in teaching a foreign language can use or exploit the easily learnt topics to be able to

teach the topics learnt hard. On the other hand, once the problematic topics are identified, then the possible solutions are entertained to teach the foreign language.

It is seen that the history of using the mother tongue in teaching a foreign language is very old and Arabic, Persian and Turkish are some of the mother tongues used so far for that purpose. It was also seen that the mother tongue was used until 1925 and no new work has been produced so far. The Turkish-English sentences explained in this study and some other sentences revealed in the future publications could become a starting point in teaching English. Besides, the teachers’ suggestions can be considered as well. Although these suggestions have not been put into practice in the classrooms, each of the interviewed teachers stated a way of using or improving the Turkish-English sentences. For example, one can insert the rules of modal into the Turkish riddles, songs and poems. In this way, one can learn the grammatical rules subconsciously and never forget as happened in “*portakali soydum, basucuma koydum, ...*”. More than this, the learners possibly get rid of looking up words in the dictionary as seen canlanabilir if they are written bold, italic or colorful.

Most of the teachers were eager to use the English-based Turkish texts during the English lessons. This should not be seen as the researcher’s prejudice to prove the study. This is because the suggested method by the researcher is based on Turkish. That is, the students and teachers in Turkey know very well how to read and write in Turkish. Even the pupils in year one learn how to read and write in Turkish at primary school. Hence, Turkish-based sentences can be easy for the language teachers, students and pupils. On the other hand, some teachers did not accept the method for their reasons. Yet their reasons are not because of the use of Turkish, but for the difficulty of the Turkish-texts. Hence, one can prepare Turkish texts that can be read easily. In brief, it is not impossible to overcome some of the teachers’ objections and difficulties. One can also overcome the difficulties by preparing the Turkish texts in the form of a poem, riddle, tongue twister or proverb.

These teachers also stated that this method could be effective while teaching. This point should not be a surprise. This is because the teachers (English, Turkish) know Turkish very well. They are the native speakers of Turkish.

The interviewed students are Turkish and they know Turkish as well. So, most teachers' positive views cannot be regarded as researcher bias. It is true that a few teachers have negative views for the method, saying that the method is based on memorization and Turkish-texts. As stated above, using the known subject in teaching an unknown subject is a universal principle in language teaching and education. So the method of this study, being Turkish can be an advantage for the language learners.

Overall, the study indicated that the method could be used at different levels ranging from elementary to advanced level. First of all, one should bear in mind that the teachers' observations are very important for the researchers who can research and test these teachers' observations. Besides, the students themselves can be consulted to learn about their views. Students' ways of learning may be different from one another. The important thing is that their views are consulted. The importance of exploring the students' views in the qualitative approach was stated by the researcher (Tomakin 2012: 245). In sum, the unnoticed feature and richness of Turkish must be supported and appreciated by those who like Turkish, language teachers and Turkish teachers. A final note is that the similarity between Turkish and English may arise and bring about new discussions and contribute to the classifications of the languages in the world.

CONCLUSION

This paper aimed to express the grammar rules of the English modals in the Turkish texts, especially the modal "can". It also aimed to explore the English language teachers, the Turkish language teachers and some students' views. It was seen that the modal "can" with its positive, negative and question forms were expressed in the Turkish texts. The expression of this modal is not limited to only a few examples.

The overall finding is that most of the interviewed teachers stated positive views about the study. For example, sixteen teachers out of 19 gave positive answers to the article 3.2.2. Besides, nineteen of the teachers were unaware of the English-based Turkish texts (3.2.3.), which is the originality of the paper. In addition, seventeen of the teachers stated positive views about the recognition of the modal rules in the Turkish texts (see 3.2.12). In brief, the teachers gave a

positive response to the twelve questions under the heading of 3.2.

Another crucial result is that although some of the teachers stated negative views about the topic called Turkish-English in general, (see 3.2.4. teacher, TA and see 3.2.5 teacher MS), these teachers regard the study as different, new, original and interesting. Like this, there are many articles in which the participants responded positively. Thus, originality and interesting points can be exploited in teaching English to those who know Turkish.

Last but not least, neither the literature review nor the interviewed teachers were aware of the possible similarities or associations between the Turkish and English languages, and the blending of Turkish and English as in *maket* yapmak like the blending word brunch (breakfast + lunch).

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was carried out in one province (Ordu) of Turkey in 2013, by using purposive sampling with the volunteer teachers and students. In this sense, the study seemed to be a slice from a mass. Yet it reflects some general views about the mass. It is true that it would be better if more teachers and students were involved in the study. It is also known that there is no point in involving those who are negative views about the study. It is also true that the study could be carried out in other provinces of Turkey to get more data. This depends on the time, expenditure, the availability and volunteers in the form of teachers and students. Finally, it is believed that the study reflects some gist and core information about the topic of the paper—Turkish-English. This is because the participants know and speak Turkish, and the method is based on Turkish whether the study is small-scale or large-scale. Hence the participants' positive views should not be taken as research or researcher's bias.

REFERENCES

- Adelman G, Jenkins D, Kemmis S 1984. Rethinking case study. In: J Bell et al. (Eds.): *Conducting Small-Scale Investigations in Educational Management*. London: P. C. P., pp. 93-102.
- Allsop J 1987. *Cassell's Students' English Grammar*. East Sussex: Cassell's Publishers Limited.
- Aitken R 2002. *Teaching Tenses*. London: Longman.

- Akar N 2005. *Teaching Grammar: Bridging the Gap between Theory and Practice*. Ankara: Gündüz Eğitim ve Yayıncılık.
- Auerbach ER 1993. Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27: 9-32.
- Azar BS 1989. *Understanding and Using English Grammar*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Burden P 2001. When do native English speaking teachers and Japanese college students disagree about the use of Japanese in the English conversation classroom? *The Language Teacher*, 25: 5-9.
- Busyteacher <<http://busyteacher.org/4126-h0w-to-teach-modal-verbs-4-steps.html>> (Retrieved 23 on October 2013, 14 June 2015).
- Cook V 2001. *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. Great Britain: Edward Arnold.
- Cook V 2001. Using the first language in the classroom. *UTP Journal*, 5: 1-14.
- Cross D 1995. *A Practical Handbook of Language Teaching*. Hertfordshire. Prentice Hall Europe.
- Ellis R 1994. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: OUP.
- Franklin CEM 1990a. Teaching in the target language: Problems and prospects. *Language Learning Journal*, 2: 20-24.
- Harmer J 1989. *Teaching and Learning Grammar*. London: Longman.
- Kirbiyik M 2007. *Yüsun Hâlis, Miftâhi Lisan Manzum Fransızca Türkçe Sözlük*. İstanbul: Besir Kitabevi.
- Leech G 1989. *An A-Z of English Grammar and Usage*. Surrey: Longman.
- McArthur T 1992. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. London: BCA.
- Okumus S 2007. *Anadolu Sahasında Manzum Sözlükler ve Hevâi'nin Makbûl-i Ârif'ine Dair*, Zbornik Radova. Tuzla Üniversitesi, Felsefe Fakültesi, Vol 32, br.9 (Borna-Hersek) Tuzla, pp. 309-324.
- One stop english <(http://www.onestopenglish.com/grammar/grammar-referene/verbs-and-tenses/modal-verbs-1-tips-and-activities/144872.article)> (Retrieved on 23 October 2013, 14 June 2015).
- Oncu H 1998. *A Study on Comparison of Grammar Consciousness-raising Tasks and Traditional Teacher-fronted Grammar Instruction on Teaching Models in English*. MA Study, Unpublished. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Quirk R , Greenbaum S 1988. *A University Grammar of English*. Essex: Longman.
- Polio CP, Duff PA 1994. Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *Modern Language Journal*, 78: 311-326.
- Pyle MA, Munoz M E 1986. *Test of English as a Foreign Language, Preparation Guide*. Lincoln: Cliffs Notes.
- Robson C 1995. *Real World Research*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sarandi H 2013. The use of Turkish in the English Preparatory Schools: Where is the balance? *Anthropologist*, 16(1-2): 325-335.
- Schweers CW 1999. Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 37: 6-13.
- Swan M 1995. *Practical English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tang J 2002. Using L1 in the English Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 40: 36-44.
- Tomakin E 2012. İlköğretim bölümü matematik, fen bilgisi, sosyal bilgiler ve sınıf öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin İngilizce öğrenme yöntemleri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16(3): 231-247.
- Tomakin E 2014a. Teaching English Tenses (grammar) in the Turkish texts: A case of Simple Present Tense: *Isil maketi iter*. Macrothink Institute. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 4(1): 115-131.
- Tomakin E 2014b. Teaching English *Subject Pronouns* and *To Be Verbs* in the Turkish texts: The Turkish Method, Atatürk Üniversitesi. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 18(1): 203-228.
- Tomakin E 2014c. İngilizce Kiplerin Türkçe Metin İçinde Örtük Öğretimi: Türkçe Yöntemi. *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 9/8: 823-839.
- van der Meij H, Zhao X 2010. Codeswitching in English courses in Chinese universities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94: 396-411.
- Weschler R 1997. Uses of Japanese (L1) in the English Classroom: Introducing the Functional- Translation Method. *The Internet TESL Journal*, III: 11.