

Teachers' and Students' Attitude towards Code-Switching in Learning English in Iranian EFL Classes

Shahla Nazeri^{1,*} , Davoud Amini², and Farzad Salahshoor²

MA in TEFL, Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran

² Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran



10.22080/iselt.2021.21571.1012

Received

February 11, 2023

Accepted

July 19, 2023

Available online

August 19, 2023

Keywords

Code-switching,
Teacher attitude,
Student attitude, EFL
Proficiency level

Abstract

Attitudes toward L1 use in EFL classes have ranged from an absolute ban to an inherent aspect of effective teaching. Code-switching, which refers to particular instances of L1 use in relation to psychological and social demands of classroom communications, has been investigated in terms of its appropriateness with regard to various classroom conditions. The present study sought to explore the effectiveness of code-switching in EFL classes from both teachers' and learners' attitudes with a focus on the differential effects of a set of individual difference factors. The data were collected from 400 subjects, including 374 students and 26 teachers by means of questionnaires and an observation checklist. The results of the data analysis revealed that students had dominantly positive attitudes about different aspects of code-switching. Meanwhile, learners' age, gender, and social class were significant sources of differentiation in this regard. Apart from rather cynical attitudes of the teachers toward code-switching, more than half of them thought that students did not become fully dependent on code-switching for better understanding, and assumed that code-switching strengthened learners' English. The teachers' attitudes about code-switching did not differ due to the level of the class they were teaching. The findings provide further evidence for the effectiveness of code-switching in EFL classes.

1. INTRODUCTION

The development of English proficiency is an important goal for Iranian students. Besides studying English as a course at school, most of them decide to attend language institutes. This demand for learning English as a foreign language makes researchers think about different factors which can affect the process of teaching and learning. One of the controversial issues in this case is the use of first language in class. As stated in Bozorgian and Fallahpour (2020), "the issue of L1 use in L2/FL instruction has been permanently debated over the past decades." (p. 2). Although there have always been theories about minimizing L1 as much as possible (Turnbull, 2001),

* Corresponding Author: Shahla Nazeri, MA in TEFL, Department of English Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran. Email: nazeri.shahla74@gmail.com



nowadays researchers believe in L1 use as a facilitating tool in FL teaching and learning (Cook, 2001) which does not hinder the FL process (Miles, 2004).

The fundamental issue of code-switching draws investigators' attention since pure L1 use is not usually common in language classes. According to Lin (2013), the studies related to code-switching are usually conducted in two kinds of contexts: 1) L2 contexts like English as second language classes, 2) bilingual education classrooms. As a pedagogical instrument, code-switching is defined as the "alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent" (Poplack, 2000, p. 224). Although this alternation of languages in routine speech may disrupt and bewilder the interlocutors, it could be a constructive instrument (Ghafar Samar & Moradkhani, 2014) for both teachers and students to make most of the teaching-learning process. However, the use of code-switching is usually neglected in language classes regardless of positive impacts on students' learning. Thus, most of the time, the regulations held by institutes oblige the teachers to teach just in English and not to let the students talk in any other language. Accordingly, the teachers force their students to restrict themselves to English in talking and asking their questions during the class time. These methodological impositions on the teachers, and consequently on the learners, may have roots in the belief that learning a foreign language is best achieved when the L1 use is abstained in classes and teaching should be in TL exclusively (Bozorgian & Fallahpour, 2015).

Based on the previous research, the optimal amount of L1 use in the FL classes for the success of instruction process (Lin, 2013) is recommended. Consequently, code-switching is treated as a teaching strategy not a sign of the teachers' imperfection (Ahmad, 2009). Then, considering code-switching as a pedagogical instrument leads us to think about its trace in language classes more precisely. Apart from the benefits and defects of code-switching, which is going to be discussed in the next part, its impact on the acceleration of learning a foreign language (FL) relies, to a large extent, on the degree to which both teachers and learners are aware of the effectiveness of code-switching. Therefore, the researchers of the present study aim to investigate code-switching from EFL teachers' and learners' perspective. The following research questions were proposed:

1. What are Iranian EFL learners' attitudes about the effect of code-switching on their learning?
2. Do Iranian EFL learners with different age, gender and social class have different attitudes about the effect of code-switching on their learning?
3. What are Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes about the effect of code-switching on their students' learning?
4. Do Iranian EFL teachers teaching different levels of proficiency have different attitudes about the effect of code-switching on their students' learning?

More specifically, attempts were made to investigate EFL teachers and students' attitudes about this pedagogic element in language classes.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

As Beatty-Martínez and Dussi (2017) have asserted "a unique feature of bilingual communication is that many bilinguals sometimes alternate between languages when speaking to other bilinguals" (p. 173). This alternation, which is a controversial issue in language classes is code-switching (Grosjean, 1982). According to Mirhasani and Jafarpour (2009), during the 1970s and 1980s, code-switching was viewed as a deficiency in language teaching and it was tried to be prevented in order to optimize teaching and learning by maximally using target language. However, code-switching, perforce, was accepted as an inescapable part of language classes, and since then "codeswitching in general has been a subject of great scholarly attention in recent decades" (Mirhasani & Jafarpour, 2009, p. 23).

Based on theoretical literature in bilingualism research, code-switching is a central issue in this area (Milroy & Muysken, 1995) which has received a great attention from researchers since the 1950s (Ibrahim, et al., 2013). Code-switching has been widely examined in the contexts of ESL (English as second language) and EFL (English as foreign language) (Weng, 2012). The main reason for investigating code-switching in classroom discourse is the fact that language classrooms are one of the social situations where speakers “share knowledge of communicative constraints and options” and, therefore, can be “said to be members of the same speech community” (Gumperz & Hymes, 1986, p. 17) and there code-switching occurs both for communication and for teaching.

Ife (2007) notifies that the use of first language (L1) in the classroom should be considered as a resource in second language acquisition (SLA), which may eventuate in bilingual competence in learners (Arnfast & Jørgensen, 2003). Using first language differs from code-switching. L1 use refers to using the students' first language to teach the target language in the classroom which differs from code-switching, i.e., the alternation between languages within a single unit such as a phrase, constituent or utterance (e.g., Poplack, 1980). In this regard, Hall and Cook (2012) explain Monolingual Teaching as a notion that “a language is best taught without reference to another language” (p. 273) and Bilingual Teaching as a notion that “use should be made of a language the student already knows” (p. 274).

As stated by Shin and Milroy (2000), “Codeswitching is used as an additional resource to achieve particular conversational goals in interactions with other bilingual speakers.” (p. 351). Thinking about the topic of code-switching evokes the ideas of transferring and compensating communicative needs that provide an opportunity for learners to develop their language when they cannot express themselves because of inability in target language (Mirhasani & Jafarpour, 2009).

As attested by Merritt et al. (1992), linguistic insecurity, that is, the difficulty in relating new concepts, and socializing, i.e., indicating solidarity and intimacy, are the reasons for conducting code-switching in L2 classes. Also Flyman-Mattsson (1997), Flyman-Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson (1999), comment on topic switching and affective functions as intentions of using code-switching in educational context. Depending on what is reported in Nazeri et al. (2020), “helping listener with better understanding, clarification, and checking comprehension are the most important motivational determinants for code-switching” (p. 151).

In a study conducted by Mirhasani and Jafarpour (2009) on 60 low-intermediate students assigned to the control and experimental groups, using a teacher-made achievement test, it was concluded that code-switching can be used as a technique to enhance students' speaking ability. Martinez (2010) investigated the significance of code-switching between Spanish and English and stated that code-switching enhanced educational literacy and helped the students manage their conversations. Later, Mokgwathi and Webb (2013) did a research in Botswana, a country in the center of Southern Africa, and declared that code-switching increases the students' participation and comprehension. In their study with two pre-intermediate classes of an English language institute, Bozorgian and Fallahpour (2020) found out that “teachers and students resorted to the first language as an important cognitive and pedagogical tool”; moreover, “teachers maintained that using the students' first language supports second/foreign language learning and teaching processes in the pre-intermediate levels” (p. 2).

What is noteworthy to this extent is the differences between teachers' and students' code-switching in TEFL. As claimed by Nazeri (2020), students code-switch in pair or group work and in daily conversations to clarify the meaning and structure of language for themselves; moreover, to compensate their lacks and inability in target language. However, teachers mostly try to avoid code-switching since they aim to make students competent both linguistically and communicatively. As a result, the use of code-switching in student-student and student-teacher

interactions is more than teacher-student interactions (Nazeri, et al., 2020). Also Bozorgian and Fallahpour (2015) investigated the amount and purposes of L1 use in EFL classrooms and concluded that EFL teachers used a limited amount of L1 in the EFL classrooms with the purpose of improving their teaching and the students' learning. In addition, they found out that using L1 should be included in the classroom syllabi because it facilitates students' learning in EFL classrooms.

After all, the definite presence and impact of code-switching in the process of language teaching is undeniable and "the use of native language is so compelling that it emerges even when policies and assumptions mitigate against it" (Lucas & Katz, 1994, p. 558). What is important then is the kind of impact it leaves in this process. Connecting the teaching and learning processes could be regarded as the foremost impact of code-switching (Üstunel, 2016).

Nevertheless, there are two oppositions about code-switching with one side believing in its positive effects like feeling safe and expressing oneself properly (Auerbach, 1993), facilitating the process of learning, harmonizing different capacities of language competency (Brown, 2006), enriching vocabulary and grammar, relaxing learners (Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009), verifying comprehension (Moghadam, et al., 2012), making the feeling of confidence, security, motivation, friendship (Peregoy & Boyle, 2013), maintaining fluency and overcoming difficulties in lexical access (Raichlin, et al., 2018). The opposite side is concerned with classroom code-switching as a counterproductive phenomenon which plays the role of inhibition of TL learning (Eldridge, 1996); likewise, Sert (2005) asserted that code-switching causes the loss of fluency. This side regards code-switching as the sign of incorrectness (Willis, 1981) whose use could not always be effective so it is better to decrease its use as the reason (Cook, 2001) and consequently expose the students to target language in the class as much as possible (Krashen & Terrell, 1983).

It seems that the recent research tries to recognize code-switching as a helpful instrument for EFL classes. For example, Osborne (2020) mentioned the discursive and structural effects of code-switching in classrooms and Gallagher (2020) referred to the "flexible fluid and mixed views of EFL teachers in relation to the use of the L1 in the classroom" and emphasized "the need for a more explicit focus on this area in teacher development and training" (p. 1). In Johns and Steuck (2021), code-switching was identified as a unique discourse mode that is used for facilitating production and may be costly at one level but beneficial at another. After all, factors accelerating code-switching were concerned in most of the studies but whether code-switching accelerates learning has not mostly been investigated so far.

Bearing in mind the positive effects of code-switching, the EFL teachers' attitudes about this issue is worthy of attention. In his research process, Macaro (2009) explored three inter-related issues about L1 use in language classes, that is, "whether exclusive use of the target language was the best teaching approach, how this approach might affect collaborative learning, and whether exclusive use by the teacher promoted or hampered independent learning" (p. 35). In his findings, he recognized three distinct positions for teachers' theories about L1, including: 1) *Virtual Position* considering the use of second language exclusively since L2 could only be learnt through L2; 2) *Maximal Position* referring to the idea that L2 was only really learnt through the second language (L2), but it is unattainable because there exist no perfect learning conditions in language classes; 3) *Optimal Position* believing in L1 value and the role it has in learning enhancement.

By and large, based on the previous research, this study examined the use of code-switching in EFL classes from teachers' and learners' attitudes to find out what the EFL teachers' and students' attitudes are about code-switching in language classes, and whether these attitudes vary with some individual difference factors such as age, gender, social class and level of proficiency in detail.

3. METHODOLOGY

Design

According to the methodology of the previous investigations, mixed methods were mostly used in code-switching studies. Thus, the present study decided to employ triangulation mixed method design which combines both quantitative and qualitative tools in collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and reporting the data with the purpose of achieving a fuller understanding of code-switching and verifying findings.

Context of the Study

Regarding the essence of the topic of code-switching, one of the multilingual cities of East Azerbaijan Province of Iran, that is, Tabriz was selected as the context of the study where people are equipped with Turkish and Persian as their mother tongue and second language, respectively. Furthermore, English is one of the courses at high schools, and besides that, most of the students study English as a foreign language at language teaching institutes, too.

Participants

374 students and 26 teachers with Turkish as their mother tongue at English language institutes in Tabriz served as the subjects of this study. In a convenience sampling procedure, the participants were selected from five language institutes located in different regional areas of the city in terms of the social classes, that is, lower, middle, and upper-middle social class. The students, including 189 females and 185 males, from different ages including Children (5-10), Teenagers (11-20), Young Adults (21-30), Adults (31 and more), and different proficiency levels, that is, Basic, Elementary, Intermediate, High-intermediate, and Advanced, participated in this research. Also, the teachers, including 21 females and 5 males, teaching students with various levels of proficiency, participated.

Instruments and Data Collection

In the current study, the following instruments were employed for collecting data:

Questionnaire: Two separate sets of questionnaires were designed for students (Appendix A and B) and teachers (Appendix C). Both sets were based on Hymes' (1962) framework and Poplack's (1980) and Myers-Scotton's (1989) categorizations.

Observation Checklist: In order to observe the classes, an observation checklist was designed based on Motivational Orientation of Language Teaching (MOLT) observation scheme which was first used by Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008), including parts based on Blom and Gumperz's (1972), Gumperz's (1982), Poplack's (1980), and Myers-Scotton's (1989) models.

For testing the feasibility, validity, and reliability of the instruments, a pilot study was conducted with 30 students and 15 teachers before starting the main phase of the research. Both students' and teachers' questionnaires were analyzed and results revealed the reliability of 0.812 and 0.629, respectively. The data related to the research questions of the present research were inferred from the related questions in the questionnaires that is, questions 20-26 in students' and questions 21-29 in teachers' questionnaires.

Data Analysis

Research Questions 1 and 3 were answered descriptively based on frequencies of replies. For analyzing the collected data to answer the Research Questions 2 and 4, the SPSS software (Version 20) was used with the purpose of applying Chi-square Test.

4. RESULTS

The main focus of the current paper was to investigate teachers' and students' attitudes regarding code-switching in Iranian EFL classes. The results of analysis related to each research question are reported below:

Research Question 1: Learners' Attitudes about Code-switching

Students' Answers

The data related to learners' attitudes about code-switching can be discussed once in general and then based on students' age, gender, and social class. The students' answers in general are provided in Table 1. The questions applying to the research reported here in students' questionnaires are 20-26, which were answered on a Likert scale of 5 components (SA= strongly agree, A= agree, SD= strongly disagree, D= disagree, and N= Neutral). Due to space limits, the frequencies and percentages for neutral responses have not been included here.

According to the Table 1, 78.7% of the students strongly agreed with practicing English through using code-switching all the time. In other words, they assume that code-switching from their L1, i.e., Turkish, or L2, i.e., Persian to English, or vice versa, leave them in a better position to learn English. About 80.5% believed that they could understand better when the teacher code-switched to Turkish or Persian, and 84.2% reported that the teachers at school usually teach all lessons in Persian and sometimes in Turkish.

Almost 59% of the students (strongly) disagreed on losing confidence and being discouraged when talking and participating in class activities because of being ridiculed or not being allowed to use code-switching. Also almost half of them (strongly) disagreed on not being allowed to code-switch to Turkish or Persian in class.

Table 1: Students' Attitudes about Code-switching

	SA+A Frequency (N) Percentage (%)		SD+D Frequency (N) Percentage (%)	
I am ridiculed by classmates and lose confidence when I codeswitch.	94	25.1	222	59.3
Code-switching helps me practice English all the time.	294	78.7	36	9.6
The teacher usually codeswitches to Turkish or Persian during teaching.	189	50.5	126	33.7
I can understand better when the teacher codeswitches to Turkish or Persian during teaching.	301	80.5	38	10.2
We are not allowed to codeswitch to Turkish or Persian in class.	119	31.8	169	45.2
The teachers at school usually teach all lessons in Persian and sometimes in Turkish.	315	84.2	30	8.0
Since we are not allowed to codeswitch to Turkish or Persian I am not confident to talk and stay silent.	95	25.4	224	59.9

Table 2: Chi Square Test for the Effect of Students' Gender, Age, and Social Class

Characteristics	Gender	Age					Social Class			
		Girls	Boys	Children.	Teenagers	Youths	Adults	Upper-middle	Middle	Lower
20 I am ridiculed by classmates and lose confidence when I codeswitch.	Sig.	.028		.043				.001		
	SA+A%	27.5	22.7	25	26.3	13.4	26.6	26	27.6	19.3
	SD+D%	56.6	62.2	57.5	58.8	66.7	60	63.8	50.3	69.3
21 Code-switching helps me practice English all the time.	Sig.	.001		.000				.004		
	SA+A%	83.6	73.5	70	81.7	56.7	86.6	82.7	81.7	67.1
	SD+D%	3.7	15.6	27.5	7.3	10	6.7	11.8	6.9	11.3
22 The teacher usually codeswitches to Turkish or Persian during teaching.	Sig.	.437		.014				.007		
	SA+A%	48.6	52.4	75	48.1	46.7	40	59.1	42.8	52.3
	SD+D%	32.8	34.6	22.5	34.6	33.3	46.7	29.1	38.3	31.8
23 I can understand better when the teacher codeswitches to Turkish or Persian during teaching.	Sig.	.133		.000				.052		
	SA+A%	78.3	82.7	80	81	66.7	100	82.7	83.6	71.6
	SD+D%	13.2	7	20	20	7.9	23.4	11	6.3	16
24 We are not allowed to codeswitch to Turkish or Persian in class.	Sig.	.027		.000				.001		
	SA+A%	36	27.6	50	30.8	20	26.7	40.9	30.2	21.6
	SD+D%	38.1	52.4	42.5	44.3	63.4	33.4	40.2	43.4	55.6
25 The teachers at school usually teach all lessons in Persian and sometimes in Turkish.	Sig.	.160		.007				.010		
	SA+A%	88.3	80	87.5	85.1	80	44.7	87.4	81.1	85.6
	SD+D%	4.7	11.3	7.5	6.9	16.7	13.3	5.5	10.7	6.8
26 Since we are not allowed to codeswitch to Turkish or Persian, I am not confident to talk and stay silent.	Sig.	.515		.282				.024		
	SA+A%	25.9	24.9	37.5	25.2	6.6	33.3	28.3	25.8	20.5
	SD+D%	57.7	62.2	50	60.4	73.3	46.7	58.2	55.4	70.5

Research Question 2: Learners' Gender, Age and Social Class

The results related to possible differences in learners' attitudes about code-switching in their EFL classes which can be attributed to learners' age, gender, and social class are presented in Table 2.

Gender

The amount of Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) is less than .05 just in two cases. Although less than half of the participants, both boys and girls, agreed or strongly agreed on being ridiculed by classmates and losing confidence when they code-switched, the number of girls agreeing on this case is a bit more than boys. Also, girls (strongly) agreed about not being allowed to code-switch to Turkish or Persian in class.

Age

No differences were observed between age groups in terms of Question 26 that concerned not being allowed to code-switch in Turkish or Persian and not being confident to talk and stay silent. However, in all other cases significant differences were observed between age groups. Less than half of the students-- almost 26% of the adults and teenagers and 25% of the children (strongly)

agreed that they were ridiculed by classmates and lost their confidence when they codeswitched. In this case, the least percentage is related to the young adults. 86.6% of the adults, 81.7% of the teenagers, 70% of the children, and 56.7% of the young adults reported that code-switching helps them practice English all the time. 75% of the children and less than half of the other age groups, i.e., 48.1% of the teenagers, 46.7% of the youths, and 40% of the adults, agreed or strongly agreed that the teachers usually codeswitch to Turkish or Persian during teaching. All of the adults -- 81% of the teenagers, 80% of the children, and 66.7% of the youths stated that they can understand better when the teacher codeswitches to Turkish or Persian during teaching. Half of the children, 30.8% of the teenagers, 26.7% of the adults, and 20% of the youths reported they are not allowed to codeswitch in Turkish or Persian in class. More than 80% of the children, the teenagers, and the youths reported that the teachers at school or university usually teach all lessons in Persian and sometimes in Turkish.

Social Class

According to the amount of Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) which should be less than .05, there are significant differences between three groups of social class with regard to all questions except Question 23. Less than half of the participants in all social classes agreed or strongly agreed on being ridiculed by classmates and lose confidence when they code-switched; however, among them the lower class has reported the least and the upper-middle and the middle class are almost identical. Nearly 82% of the upper-middle and the middle class and 67.1% of the lower class believed that code-switching helped them practice English all the time. 59.1% of the upper-middle class and more than half of the lower class reported that the teachers usually codeswitched to Turkish or Persian during teaching but this frequency is 42.8% in the middle class. The frequency of not being allowed to codeswitch to Turkish or Persian in class is from more to less in the upper-middle, middle, and lower classes, respectively. The lower class has the lowest frequency in being allowed to codeswitch to L1 or L2. In all social classes with order of the upper-middle, lower, and middle class, the teachers at schools usually teach all lessons in Persian and sometimes in Turkish. About not being allowed to codeswitch to Turkish or Persian and not being confident to talk and staying silent, less than half and almost 20% to 28% agreed or strongly agreed. The highest frequency in this case is related to upper-middle and the lowest belongs to the lower class.

Research Question 3: Teachers' Attitudes about Code-switching

Teachers' Answers

The teachers' answers regarding their attitudes about code-switching in their classes in general are provided in Table 3. Furthermore, teachers' answers classified based on the level they teach are provided in Table 4. The questions applying to the research reported here in teachers' questionnaires are 21-29, which were answered on a Likert scale of 5 components (SA= strongly agree, A= agree, SD= strongly disagree, D= disagree, and N= Neutral). Due to space limits, the frequencies and percentages for neutral responses have not been included here.

Table 3: Teachers' Attitudes about the Effect of Code-switching⁴

		SA+A		SD+D	
		Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
21	Code-switching eases up teaching method.	11	42.3	15	57.7
22	Code-switching wastes time in the classroom.	13	50	9	34.6
23	The students give positive feedback (participation, results, etc.) when I codeswitch.	9	34.6	13	50.0
24	The students still get confused when I codeswitch.	16	61.5	4	15.3
25	Code-switching does not promote English speaking environment.	10	38.4	10	38.5
26	I'm being asked to codeswitch by my students.	10	38.4	14	53.9
27	The students become fully dependent on code-switching for better understanding.	8	30.8	15	57.7
28	Using code-switching leads to the weakness of the students' English.	8	30.7	18	69.3
29	Using code-switching strengthens the students' English learning.	14	53.9	8	30.8

According to the Table 3, 42.3% of the teachers (strongly) agreed that code-switching eases up teaching method but 57.7% of them (strongly) disagreed about it. Almost half of the teachers stated that code-switching wastes time of the classroom. Also 50% reported they do not get positive feedback (participation, results, etc.) from the students when they codeswitch. In other words, they declared that when they codeswitch, the students' participation in activities, and consequently, their grades decrease. 61.5% of teachers (strongly) agreed that the students still get confused when they codeswitch. 53.9% of them declared they are not being asked to codeswitch by the students. About 57.7% of the subjects stated that the students do not become fully dependent on code-switching for better understanding, and almost 70% believed that using code-switching does not lead to the weakness of the students' English. Moreover, 53.9% strongly agreed or agreed that using code-switching strengthens the students' English.

Research Question 4: The Effect of Students' Level of Proficiency on Teachers' Attitudes

Among all teacher-related variables potentially moderating teachers' attitudes about code-switching, the Level of the Class they were teaching was hypothetically predicted to be relevant. The results of the analysis regarding the differences between teachers teaching at each of the 5 levels of language classes in terms of their attitudes about code-switching have been presented in Table 4.

The results of Chi Square test provided in Table 4 indicated no differences between the attitudes of teachers resulting from the level at which they were teaching since the amounts of Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) was above .05 in all cases.

Table 4: Chi Square Test for the Impact of Teachers' Teaching Level

Characteristics		Proficiency Level of Class				
		Basic	Elementary	Intermediate	High-Intermediate	Advanced
21 Code-switching eases up teaching method.	Sig.	.761				
	SA+A%	57.1	100	55.5	0	60
	SD+D%	28.6	0	22.2	50	20
22 Code-switching wastes time in the classroom.	Sig.	.650				
	SA+A%	42.9	0	44.4	50	20
	SD+D%	28.6	100	55.5	0	60
23 The students give positive feedback (participation, results, etc.) when I codeswitch.	Sig.	66.7				
	SA+A%	100	66.7	22.2	0	40
	SD+D%	0	0	66.7	50	40
24 The students still get confused when I codeswitch.	Sig.	.562				
	SA+A%	0	0	22.2	50	20
	SD+D%	71.5	100	55.5	0	60
25 Code-switching does not promote English speaking environment.	Sig.	.419				
	SA+A%	28.6	33.3	44.4	100	20
	SD+D%	28.6	66.7	33.3	0	60
26 I'm being asked to codeswitch by my students.	Sig.	.077				
	SA+A%	42.9	100	77.8	50	0
	SD+D%	57.2	0	22.2	50	60
27 The students become fully dependent on code-switching for better understanding.	Sig.	.631				
	SA+A%	57.2	100	55.6	50	40
	SD+D%	28.6	0	22.2	50	60
28 Using code-switching leads to the weakness of the students' English.	Sig.	.296				
	SA+A%	57.2	33.3	100	100	40
	SD+D%	14.3	33.3	0	0	20
29 Using code-switching strengthens the students' English learning.	Sig.	.475				
	SA+A%	57.2	100	44.4	50	60
	SD+D%	14.3	0	33.3	0	20

5. RESULTS OF OBSERVATION

For analyzing the observation checklists, all parts were coded and imported to SPSS (Version 20). Distribution and frequency of data, along with correlational analysis were computed for checklists of 22 classes. We analyzed data through coding, identifying themes, interpreting, and providing meaning through inferential analysis. The results indicated that the teachers had two approaches about code-switching. Most of them tried to avoid code-switching which usually resulted in wasting class time for providing abstract and ambiguous explanations. However, the teachers who did not have prohibition for code-switching could accelerate their teaching and students' learning by saving time and directing students' attention to what was the main point. These classes were of two kinds: a) The teacher could manage the class after code-switching and

continued their teaching in English; b) classes where code-switching was not used in restricted way; hence, shifted into L1 or L2 use. This shift could create some hidden problems in students' learning in longtime.

6. DISCUSSION

The main concern in this research was to investigate how Iranian EFL teachers and learners perceived code-switching in FL learning, and whether these attitudes varied according to some individual difference and contextual factors. Clarifications on this can contribute to outlining a detailed 'effectiveness scheme' for code-switching in EFL classes. The findings attest to the relevance of affective, social and contextual variables to the way teachers and students encounter code-switching. Therefore, most of the students asserted that they could understand better when the teachers codeswitched to Turkish or Persian during teaching. This refers to the functions called *interjections* (Gumperz, 1982) and *reiteration* (Eldridge, 1996) both of which mean to use code-switching to clarify and conform the message for better understanding.

Students expressed that they could practice English when they used code-switching and half of them reported that the teachers codeswitched during teaching. The reasons for which the teachers codeswitched could be: 1) to provide L1 equivalents in target language (equivalence); 2) to fill the conversational gaps (floor-holding); and 3) to manage the clash use of language (conflict) (as in Eldridge, 1996); 4) to evaluate the comprehension; 5) to affirm and stimulate the participation; and 6) to manage the classroom (Myers-Scotton, 1993).

Mostly the students mentioned that using code-switching did not make them lose their confidence. This idea refers to what has been proposed by Peregoy and Boyle (2013) who declared that code-switching facilitates teaching and learning by making the feeling of confidence, security, motivation, and friendship. Also Gomez (2014) stated that using the students' native language makes them feel their L1 identities are valued and improves their learning.

In all social classes especially with the upper-middle social class with the highest frequency, a number of students, particularly girls declared that they were not allowed to codeswitch to Turkish or Persian in class. Also about preventing the use of code-switching, the results revealed that girls were prevented from code-switching more than boys. According to Üstunel (2016), sometimes the students tend to switch language because their language proficiency is not the same as their peers or is not equal to the teachers' mastery. Using code-switching prevents miscommunication and as Moore (2010) argued, the students may codeswitch to clarify what is being talked. Therefore, preventing students to use code-switching can affect their language learning negatively which may result in lower language proficiency.

In multilingual pedagogy, the individuals deal with different languages, i.e., their mother tongue, second language, and maybe other languages. In the context of Iran, Persian is the language of education. Meanwhile, in Tabriz, Northwest of Iran, students deal with Turkish as L1 and Persian as the official language, and the majority of them declared that all courses at schools were usually taught and learned in Persian as well. In addition to education, the language of media is Persian too. So the multilingual Turkish speakers are always dealing with Persian in reading books, writing letters, and watching TV. Beside Persian, individuals learn Arabic language at school, which is their religious language. They learn Arabic vocabulary and structures and unconsciously use some Arabic expressions in their daily conversations.

Subsequently, when these multilingual individuals, who already have Turkish, Persian, and Arabic structures in mind, attend English classes, and start to deal with a new language and culture, they try to put what they learn in the form of the languages they are already equipped with (Nazeri, 2020). Hymes (1962) has focused on communicative functions of code-switching and suggested that one of the functions of classroom code-switching is *poetic functions* which means to insert

some jokes, stories, and poetic quotations in order to add a sense of humor. Based on the results of the observation checklists used in this study, they mostly translate what they hear into Turkish or Persian, they use lots of Arabic expression like *Ya Allah, Masha Allah, Insha Allah*, etc. or Turkish expressions like *Vay Dada!* for joking and making fun or showing their wonder and surprise, in their conversations. Most of the students especially the adults, the teenagers, and the children in all social classes believe that code-switching helps them practice English all the time. Moreover, in all social classes especially the upper-middle and the lower social class, mostly children have reported that the teachers usually codeswitch to L1 or L2 during teaching.

Although the majority of the teachers believe that the students are still confused when they codeswitch, the teenagers, children, and young adults have mostly reported that they can understand better when the teacher codeswitches. The same finding was reported by Al-Qaysi (2016) that educators codeswitched in their lectures to help the students understand better. Besides, the teachers in the current study believed that code-switching strengthens the students' English learning. This is in line with Ahmad and Jusoff (2009), who found that teachers' code-switching was an effective teaching strategy when dealing with low English proficient learners. Therefore, using code-switching enhances effective learning foreign language (Akynova, et al., 2012).

Although some of the teachers argued that code-switching eases up teaching, as mentioned in Uys and Van Dulm, (2011), they asserted that it wastes time, does not promote English speaking environment, and when using code-switching they do not get positive feedback from the students, and thus their common belief is that *the best English teachers just teach in English*. However, the teachers say that they are being asked to codeswitch which they think may lead to the weaknesses of the students since they may become fully dependent on code-switching.

One important issue that should be considered all the time is the fact that the teachers should distinguish between code-switching and using first or second language. The students cannot avoid Turkish identity, Persian thinking, and Arabic expressions which have been mixed with their language in a way that they use them unconsciously. Thus, using pure L1 or L2 in teaching target language can be problematic and can impede learning (Nazeri, 2020). On the contrary, code-switching can accelerate learning. Students and teachers mostly reported favorable attitudes towards code-switching, and also the observation results indicated that code-switching can save much of class time. This is in accordance with the dominant literature on the effectiveness of code-switching. Üstünel (2016) believes code-switching connects the teaching and learning process. Furthermore, Enama (2016) states that the target language learning should take place together with first language. There should not be any burden of employing L1 because it serves the precise function to the students in the class (Enama, 2016).

7. CONCLUSION

Alongside providing a brief history about code-switching and its' motivational determinants and attitudes toward its use in language classrooms, the present study attempted to indicate the relative differences between teachers' and students' code-switching and its role in acceleration of learning a foreign language. In spite of the fact that the results disclosed almost the cynical perspectives of teachers about code-switching i.e., they think that code-switching may impede learning, both students' questionnaire and the observation reports demonstrated that code-switching accelerates not only learning but also teaching English.

Since the students reported that teachers at school usually teach all lessons in Persian and sometimes in Turkish, they deal with L1 and L2 most of the time so the role and impact of these languages in FL learning is incontestable. Likewise, students declare that they practice English through code-switching and can understand better when the teacher codeswitches.

Using code-switching saves the time of the class and prevents wasting the time for explaining the subject matters with abstract definitions which are completely incomprehensible to students. In other words, by introducing code-switching to our teaching methodology, we as the teachers provide ourselves with a teaching strategy which benefits our class as well as our students. It is irrefutable that everyone's identity and culture is attached to them and we, whether being averse or not, cannot abnegate this priority. Thus, instead of denying code-switching, rebuking ourselves for using it consciously or unconsciously during teaching, and reproaching our students for code-switching to their mother tongue, it is the time that we should recognize code-switching as an aid that assists on the teaching-learning process.

The current study attempted to investigate the role of code-switching in acceleration of foreign language learning in a multilingual context. It could be replicated in any context where any language is taught as second or foreign language and could look into more cases by increasing the number of participants, conducting individual interviews with the teachers and the students, increasing the number of classes to observe, doing an ethnographic research, doing the same research in schools where a foreign language is taught, and finally investigating the effect of code-switching in TEFL or English language proficiency of the students by conducting research with experimental designs.

Like most of the other studies based on self-reporting, the current study suffered from the data reliability limitation. Although we tried to minimize this deficiency by increasing the number of participants, it did not become possible in the case of teachers. A more realistic view of students and teachers' attitudes regarding instances of effective code-switching requires a more in-depth and closer probe into their inclinations during the teaching-learning process. Complimented with the more empirical research designed to compare the teaching schemes with and without integration of code-switching can pave the path for a better understanding of the effectiveness of code-switching in L2 classes.

References

- Ahmad, B., & Jusoff, K. (2009). The teachers' code-switching in the classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 49-55. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n2p49>
- Al-Qaysi, N. J. M. (2016). Examining the students' and educators' attitudes towards the use of code-switching within higher educational environments in Oman. (Unpublished master's thesis). The British University in Dubai, United Arab Emirates.
- Akynova, D., Zharkynbekova, S., & Aimoldina, A. (2012). Code-switching and second language acquisition in the educational space of Kazakhstan. *GSTF International Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 224-230. https://doi.org/10.5176/2251-2853_2.1.84
- Arnfast, J. S., & Jørgensen, J. N. (2003). Code-switching as a communication, learning, and social negotiation strategy in first-year learners of Danish. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 23-53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00036>
- Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586949>
- Beatty-Martínez, A. L., & Dussias, P. E. (2017). Bilingual experience shapes language processing: Evidence from codeswitching. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 95, 173-198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2017.04.002>
- Bozorgian, H., & Fallahpour, S. (2020). Exploring L1 use in English as foreign language classrooms through activity theory. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 39(3.1), 1-35. <https://doi.org/10.22099/jtls.2021.39025.2912>

- Bozorgian, H., & Fallahpour, S. (2015). Teachers' and students' amount and purpose of L1 use: English as foreign language (EFL) classrooms in Iran. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 3(2), 67-81. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2015.20390>
- Blom, J., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning and linguistic structures: Code-switching in Northern Norway. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 407-434). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Wilson.
- Brown, K. (2006). *Encyclopaedia of language & linguistics*. Elsevier.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-415. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>
- Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal*, 50(4), 303-311. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.4.303>.
- Enama, P. R. B. (2016). The impact of English-only and bilingual approaches to EFL instruction on low-achieving bilinguals in Cameroon: An empirical study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(1), 19-30. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0701.03>.
- Flyman-Mattsson, A. (1997). Communication strategies in French as a foreign language. *Working Papers*, 46, 57-75. Department of Linguistics, Lund.
- Flyman-Mattsson, A., & Burenhult-Mattsson, N. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of French. *Working Papers*, 47, 59-72. Department of Linguistics, Lund University.
- Gallagher, F. (2020). Considered in context: EFL teachers' views on the classroom as a bilingual space and codeswitching in shared-L1 and multilingual contexts. *System*, 91, Article 102262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102262>
- Gomez, A. (2014). How do native Spanish speakers engage with and respond to bilingual instructional strategies in the ESL classroom? Retrieved from <http://bilingualstrategiesinesl.weebly.com/>
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Harvard University Press.
- Guilloteaux, M. J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2008). Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(1), 55-77. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00207.x>
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. H. (1986). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. Basil Blackwell.
- Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin (Ed.).
- Kim, M. (2008). Are cases of unconventional code-switching useless? *The Panels*, 44(2), 139-149.
- Ibrahim, E., Shah, M., & Armia, N. (2013). Code-switching in English as a foreign language classroom: The teachers' attitudes. *English Language Teaching*, 6(7), 139-150. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n7p139>
- Ife, A. (2007). A role for English as lingua franca in the foreign language classroom. In A. Soler & S. Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 79-100). Springer.
- Johns, M. A., & Steuck, J. (2021). Is code-switching easy or difficult? Testing processing cost through the prosodic structure of bilingual speech. *System*, 211, Article 104634. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2021.104634>

- Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. The Alemany Press.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(1), 195-218. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0009>
- Lucas, T., & Katz, A. (1994). Reframing the debate: The roles of native language in English-only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(3), 537-561. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587307>
- Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 35-49). Multilingual Matters.
- Martinez, R. (2010). Spanglish as literacy tool: Toward an understanding of the potential role of Spanish-English code-switching in the development of academic literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 45(2), 124-149. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40997087>
- Merritt, M., Cleghorn, A., Abagi, J. O., & Bunyi, G. (1992). Socializing multilingualism: Determinants of code-switching in Kenyan primary classrooms. In C. M. Eastman (Ed.), *Code-switching* (pp. 103-121). Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Miles, R. (2004). Evaluating the use of L1 in the English language classroom. (Unpublished master's dissertation). University of Birmingham, UK.
- Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (1995). Introduction: Code-switching and bilingualism research. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 1-14). Cambridge University Press.
- Mirhasani, A., & Jafarpour Mamaghani, H. (2009). Code-switching and Iranian EFL learners' oral proficiency. *Journal of Teaching English as a Foreign Language and Literature*, 1(2), 21-31. Retrieved from <https://www.sid.ir/en/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id=201515>
- Moghadam, S., Samad, A., & Shahraki, E. (2012). Code-switching as a medium of instruction in an EFL classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(11), 2219-2225. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.11.2219>
- Mokgwathi, T., & Webb, V. (2013). The educational effects of code-switching in the classroom—Benefits and setbacks: A case of selected senior secondary schools in Botswana. *Language Matters: Studies in the Languages of Africa*, 44(3), 108-125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2013.839734>
- Moore, D. (2010). Code-switching and learning in the classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(5), 279-293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050208667762>
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1989). Codeswitching with English: Types of switching, types of communities. *World Englishes*, 8(3), 333-346. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971x.1989.tb00673.x>
- Nazeri, S., Amini, D., & Salahshoor, F. (2020). Motivational determinants of code-switching in Iranian EFL classrooms. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, 8(1), 151-173. <https://doi.org/10.22049/jalda.2020.26812.1171>.
- Nazeri, S. (2020). The sociolinguistic study of code-switching in TEFL in Iranian English language institutes. (Master's thesis). Azerbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran.

- Osborne, D. (2020). Codeswitching practices from “other tongues” to the “mother tongue” in the provincial Philippine classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 55, Article 100780. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2019.100780>
- Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F. (2013). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL: A resource book for teaching K-12 English learners* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581>.
- Poplack, S. (2000). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. In L. Wei (Ed.), *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 221-256). Routledge.
- Raichlin, R., Walters, J., & Altman, C. (2019). Some wheres and whys in bilingual codeswitching: Directionality, motivation, and locus of codeswitching in Russian-Hebrew bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 23(2), 629-650. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006918763135>
- Samar, R. G., & Moradkhani, S. (2014). Codeswitching in the language classroom: A study of four EFL teachers' cognition. *RELC Journal*, 45(2), 151-164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214534796>
- Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code-switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, XI(8). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html>
- Shin, S. J., & Milroy, L. (2000). Conversational code-switching among Korean-English bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4(3), 351-383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069000040030401>
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but... *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(4), 531-540. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.4.531>
- Üstunel, E. (2016). *EFL classroom code-switching*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Uys, D., & van Dulm, O. (2011). The functions of classroom code-switching in the Siyanda District of the Northern Cape. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 29(1), 67-76. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2011.583159>
- Wei, L. (2008). Research perspectives on bilingualism and multilingualism. In L. Wei & A. G. Moyer (Eds.), *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism* (pp. 3-17).
- Weng, P. (2012). Code-switching as a strategy in an EFL classroom in Taiwan. *US-China Foreign Language*, 10(10), 1669-1675. <https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8080/2012.10.007>
- Willis, J. (1981). *Teaching English through English*. Longman.

Appendix A: Students' Questionnaire

سلام

زبان آموزان عزیز، در ابتدا از اینکه وقت ارزشمندتان را برای پاسخ دادن به این پرسشنامه اختصاص داده اید سپاسگزاریم. موضوع تحقیق درباره تغییر زبان "Codeswitching" است. هدف دانستن نظرات شما نسبت به این موضوع، بررسی دلایل استفاده از codeswitching، پررنگ تر کردن مزایا و یافتن راه حل مناسب برای معایب و مشکلات احتمالی است. این پرسشنامه برای افرادی تنظیم شده که زبان مادری شان ترکی است. از اینکه صادقانه به سوالات پاسخ می دهید متشکریم.

*CS مخفف واژه code-switching است بمعنی تغییر بین دو یا چند زبان هنگام صحبت کردن (مثلا از انگلیسی به فارسی یا ترکی).

جنسیت: مونث مذکر سن: سطح Intermediate Elementary Basic (level):
High Advanced

سوالات	کاملا موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملا مخالفم
1 من در مکالماتم از CS استفاده می‌کنم.					
2 من معمولا از کلمات انگلیسی Yes, No, Thank you در مکالماتم استفاده می‌کنم.					
3 در کلاس زبان هنگام انجام کار گروهی با هم گروهی‌هایم از CS استفاده می‌کنم.					
4 من در کلاس زبان در آموزشگاه به زبان انگلیسی ولی خارج از کلاس به زبان ترکی یا فارسی با مدرس صحبت می‌کنم.					
5 CS مهارت‌های ارتباطی من را تقویت می‌کند.					
6 CS به رشد مهارت‌های زبانی من کمک می‌کند.					
7 استفاده از CS نشان می‌دهد که من فرد باسوادی هستم و دانش زیادی دارم.					
8 استفاده از CS نشان می‌دهد که من فرد با اعتباری هستم.					
9 CS مدرس و دانش آموزان بین زبان‌های ترکی و انگلیسی و فارسی تاثیر مثبتی در یادگیری زبان دارد.					
10 موقع صحبت کردن به زبان ترکی یا فارسی گاهی از بعضی کلمات انگلیسی استفاده می‌کنم چون آن کلمات معادل ترکی یا فارسی ندارند و یا من آن لحظه بخاطر نمی‌آورم.					
11 موقع صحبت کردن به زبان انگلیسی گاهی نمی‌توانم بعضی کلمات را بخاطر بیارم و یا بلد نیستم به همین خاطر از کلمات ترکی یا فارسی استفاده می‌کنم.					
12 CS از ترکی یا فارسی به انگلیسی یا برعکس به من کمک می‌کند تا کلمات جدید را راحت‌تر انتقال دهم.					
13 بخاطر پیچیدگی بعضی از لغات در زبان مادری‌ام (ترکی) یا زبان دومم (فارسی) از CS استفاده می‌کنم یعنی از ترکی یا فارسی مدام به انگلیسی CS می‌کنم.					
14 CS از فارسی و ترکی به انگلیسی و برعکس به من کمک می‌کند نظرات و احساساتم را راحت‌تر بیان کنم.					
15 CS به من کمک می‌کند تا بهتر متوجه شوم.					
16 من اغلب فقط یک کلمه در جمله انگلیسی را codeswitch می‌کنم.					
17 من اغلب یک جمله کامل را codeswitch می‌کنم.					
18 من اغلب یک عبارت را codeswitch می‌کنم.					
19 من اغلب در داخل کلمه codeswitch می‌کنم. (مثال: apple ها).					

					20	وقتی در کلاس زبان CS انجام می‌دهم مورد تمسخر همکلاسی‌هایم قرار می‌گیرم.
					21	استفاده از CS از ترکی یا فارسی به انگلیسی به من کمک می‌کند تا زبان انگلیسی را در طول روز تمرین کنم.
					22	مدرس در کلاس از CS از انگلیسی به فارسی یا ترکی استفاده می‌کند.
					23	وقتی مدرس از CS از انگلیسی به فارسی یا ترکی استفاده میکند من درس را بهتر متوجه می‌شوم.
					24	ما در کلاس زبان در آموزشگاه اجازه نداریم از CS از انگلیسی به فارسی یا ترکی استفاده کنیم.
					25	در مدرسه یا دانشگاه معلم‌ها یا اساتید درس را بیشتر به زبان فارسی و گاهی به ترکی توضیح می‌دهند.
					26	من بخاطر اینکه اجازه استفاده از CS در کلاس نداریم و باید انگلیسی صحبت کنیم اعتماد بنفس ندارم که صحبت کنم و معمولاً ساکت‌م.

Appendix B: Little Students' Questionnaire

به منظور تسهیل در امر پاسخگویی زبان آموزان کم سن و سال، محقق سوالات پرسشنامه را برای زبان آموزان می خواند و آنها شکلک مورد نظرشان را علامت می زنند.

جنسیت: مونث مذکر سن:

سطح Advanced High Intermediate Elementary Basic (level)

کاملاً موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملاً مخالفم	
					1
					2
					3
					4
					5
					6
					7
					8
					9
					10
					11
					12
					13
					14
					15
					16
					17
					18
					19
					20
					21
					22
					23
					24
					25
					26

Appendix C. Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear Lecturer/Instructor,

Thank you for participating in this questionnaire. You are going to deal with questions about Code-switching (refers to alternating between one or more languages). This questionnaire is designed to find out types of code-switching, motivational factors of code-switching and your opinion about code-switching. Please answer the questions honestly.

Gender: Female Male **Edu. Level:** MS BA MA PhD

Teaching experience:years

Level you teach: Basic Intermediate High Advanced

	Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	I use English for teaching.					
2	I use Persian for teaching.					
3	I use Turkish for teaching.					
4	I usually code switch from English to Turkish/Persian when I teach.					
5	I use code-switching to give tasks.					
6	I use code-switching to translate and clarify difficult vocabulary.					
7	I use code-switching to boost students to participate in class activities.					
8	I often codeswitch to English when I am talking in Turkish/ Persian.					
9	I only use English when I feel I'm being observed. Mostly, I teach in Persian or Turkish.					
10	I only codeswitch to Turkish or Persian when teaching new terms.					
11	I only codeswitch to Turkish or Persian when my students are confused.					
12	I teach better when I codeswitch.					
13	Code-switching saves time in teaching.					
14	Codeswitch simplifies teaching.					
15	Students understand better when I codeswitch.					
16	I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my students in language other than English.					
17	I often use code-switch one word within an English sentence.					
18	I often codeswitch the complete sentence to Turkish or Persian.					
19	I use code-switching for tag phrases.					
20	I often use code-switching within the word.					
21	Code-switching eases up teaching method.					
22	Code-switching wastes time in the classroom.					
23	Students give positive feedback when I codeswitch.					
24	Students still get confused when I codeswitch.					
25	Code-switching does not promote English speaking environment.					
26	I'm being asked to codeswitch by my students.					
27	Students become fully dependent on code-switching for better understanding.					
28	Using code-switching leads to the weakness of students' English.					
29	Using code-switching strengthens students' English.					
30	Code-switching is important in teaching any subject.					
31	Code-switching is necessary in Iranian context.					
32	Code-switching can be planned in teaching.					
33	Code switching should be avoided.					

34	I think teaching courses only in English language is beneficial for students.					
35	Teaching courses in English and a language other than English makes it easy for students to understand.					