

## Perceptions of the students and the teachers towards the use of code switching in EFL classrooms

Merve Karakaya<sup>1</sup>

Kenan Dikilitaş<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Izmir Institute of Technology, Turkey / Contact: [mervekarakaya@iyte.edu.tr](mailto:mervekarakaya@iyte.edu.tr) 

<sup>2</sup> University of Stavanger, Norway / Contact: [kenan.dikilitas@uis.no](mailto:kenan.dikilitas@uis.no) 

### Abstract

The purpose of this study is to shed light on the perceptions of the teachers and the students towards the use of code switching in EFL classrooms where English was a medium of instruction. Besides, it mentioned the functions of code switching in the learning and teaching environment. The research was taken place at three state universities in the western part of Turkey and the participants of the students were volunteer university students (N=550) diversified according to their gender, English proficiency level, English learning year, and age. Moreover, English instructors (N=50) who volunteered to participate in the study and the participants varied depending on their gender, nationality, and teaching experience. Questionnaires were distributed to the students for the quantitative part of the research and analyzed by CHIAD analysis as well as descriptive analysis. Interview questions were asked to the teachers and the answers were investigated for the qualitative part of the research and teachers recorded semi-structured interview responses were processed deductively. The results are discussed, and some suggestions are given with respect to the present literature.

### Keywords

Code switching; attitudes toward code switching; perceptions and functions of code switching.

### Submission date

08.05.2020

### Acceptance date

08.06.2020

© 2020 The Literacy Trek & the Authors – Published by The Literacy Trek

### APA Citation

Karakaya, M., & Dikilitaş, K. (2020). Perceptions of the students and the teachers towards the use of code switching in EFL classrooms. *The Literacy Trek*, 6(1), 40-73.

### Introduction

Grosjean (2010) stated that the outstanding part of the world population was bilingual. Consequently, utilizing two languages in the same community achieved a norm in the world. The term bilingual indicated someone who owned two languages

(Mackey, 1962; Valdes & Figueroa, 1994; Wei, 2000). Asali (2011) pointed out that the presence of two languages in society was a mutual circumstance in several communities and speakers from such societies often utilized two languages when speaking or altering between the languages. This phenomenon was identified as code switching which was common in two languages spoken countries. It was widely accepted that the usage of two or more languages in the same speech took place in several bilingual or multilingual societies. The term 'code switching' is utilized to define such occurrences (Bentahila & Davies, 1992). Put forward by Wardhaugh (2010), code was a common umbrella term for languages, dialects, styles with reference to the extended body of studies on code switching and besides the term code stated some sort of system which two or more people utilized for communication. In the same vein, code switching was the variant usage of two or more languages by bilinguals within the same speech (Milroy & Muysken, 1995). There could be several reasons why people code-switched. For instance; particular concepts were solely comprehended better and stated in the other language; it could be necessary for speakers to fill a linguistic requirement for a word or a statement; speakers could utilize code switching as a communicative or social strategy to demonstrate their involvement; indicate group identity, omit someone, enhance the status of someone (Grosjean, 2010). Since the current research was investigating the perceptions and the reasons of code switching when the teachers and the students appealed to the use of it in EFL classes, it was approached from a sociolinguistic view.

The School of Foreign Languages at many universities in Turkey have institutionalized the target language only policy and despite not having it in their written policies, the three universities that the study was conducted at have been the supporters of this principle. Several people regarded code switching as a feature of the low proficiency level of language which made a number of teachers avoid code switching in the classroom (Palmer, 2009). Meanwhile, if the learners had difficulties with communication in L2, code switching could serve as useful tools of teaching and learning (Huerta-Macias & Quintero, 1992). Actually, depending on the researchers' observations about code switching, it was realized that both learners and educators sometimes used code switching between English and Turkish. The research aimed to specify why learners and educators code switched to Turkish in English preparatory

schools and if code switching contributed to the teaching settings and had pedagogical aims. Even though evidence proposed code switching was efficient as a teaching and learning procedure (Anton & DiCamilla, 2004; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Canagarajah, 1995; Cole, 1998; Ferguson, 2003), skepticism about this use was common.

Perceptions of code switching are various. Generally, there are two kinds of perceptions towards code switching which can be described as positive and negative. Skiba (1997) demonstrated that code switching was efficient in transmitting meaning. Congruently, Ahmad, and Jusoff (2009) stated the same opinion and claimed different positive perceptions of code switching like enriching grammar and vocabulary knowledge, relaxing students which enhanced their comprehension. In the review of Aurbach (1993) using the first language enables students to feel safe and allows them to explain themselves. Furthermore, students' code switching in the classroom aided their learning because they felt that their first language identities were precious (Gomez, 2014). On the other hand, there can be different reasons for the negative perceptions of code switching in a classroom setting. Cook (2002) indicated that one of the reasons was the use of L2 created a more reliable and real classroom environment. In the view of Sert (2005) when learners did not realize word in L2, they used the vocabulary of their native language, and this caused loss in the fluency of the students. Also, gender played a significant role in perceptions of the learners to use the first language so men and women generally utilized code switching for several various reasons.

### *Code Switching Researches around the World and in Turkish EFL Context*

Several studies have been carried out in universities worldwide. It is a topic that has commonly been the subject area in several Ph.D. and master thesis in ELT context (Amorim 2012; Auguste-Walter, 2011; Chan, 2007; Jakobsson, 2010; Jalal, 2010; Olmo-castillo, 2014; Sert 2005; Yletyinen, 2004). The major aim of these studies was clarification for comprehending and attitudes towards code switching in FL classes. Hussein (1999) investigated students' attitudes towards code switching and functions of code switching in Jordanian University to explore the reasons and the instances of code switching and mostly used expressions in English that students used in Arabic in dialogues. The findings revealed that the main reason for code switching was the lack

of equivalents for expressions in L2. Rahimi and Jafari (2011) conducted a qualitative research with EFL instructors and students in Iran and the findings revealed that code switching facilitated to check and clarify misunderstandings among instructors and students. On the contrary, in the study of Dweik (2000), students showed a negative perspective towards the instructors' use of code switching because they thought such instructors as inadequate in English.

Code switching has been thoroughly researched in the Turkish EFL context. Several studies, including a large variety of articles, action researches, theses, were dedicated to investigating the phenomenon. Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) examined Turkish students' code switching statements and found out that the language preference of the students was associated with the pedagogical degree of the teachers. Besides, another study was carried out to research the quantity of code switching, starting styles, and speech functions of code switching. Another recent study conducted by Bensen and Çavuşoğlu (2013) at a private university's English Preparatory School in North Cyprus exploring teachers' code switching, findings demonstrated that all of the instructors used code switching for various aims and they all supported code switching as being an efficient tool to increase learning achievement when used in a careful way.

## **Methodology**

This part outlines the methodology of the current study and provides detailed information about research design, setting, and participants, procedure of the study and data collection instruments, data analysis techniques in detail. In respect to the above-mentioned goals, this study aimed to address the following research questions:

1. What are the prep class students' general perceptions towards using code switching in Turkish EFL classes?
2. Do the students' attitudes and perceptions of teachers' code switching in Turkish EFL classes vary based on
  - a. their gender?
  - b. their age?
  - c. years of learning English?
  - d. their language levels.

3. Do the students' attitudes and perceptions of their use of code switching in Turkish EFL classes vary in relation to
  - a. their gender?
  - b. their age?
  - c. years of learning English?
  - d. their language levels.
4. What are the perceptions of the teachers towards the use of code switching in EFL classrooms?
5. What are the teachers' purposes of using of code switching in Turkish EFL classrooms?

### ***Research Design***

In most recent studies, code switching has been measured in different ways. Robert (2011) holds the view that the mixed methodology aims to gather data through both quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a more spry and credible set of data without limitations. Besides, Brown (1995) points out that implementing both methods are required, as both types of data can supply the researcher with precious knowledge. Given the knowledge addressed above, it was decided the best method to adopt for the present research is both quantitative and qualitative methods which aim to show the receptions of EFL learners and language instructors' attitudes about the practice of Code switching in EFL classrooms at higher education institutions in the western part of Turkey so this is a descriptive study which embraces mixed data collection procedures. To elaborate, after seeking permission from the institutions to provide the researcher with at least 2 classes from each level, a total of 550 university students from different English levels were asked to fill in a survey with standardized Likert type scale to obtain the quantitative data and later 50 volunteer teachers were interviewed to gather qualitative data. Questionnaires and interviews were administered at three state universities.

### ***Setting and Participants***

This study took place at three state universities' School of Foreign Languages in the spring semester of 2018-2019 academic years in Izmir and Manisa, Turkey. The sample includes 550 students and 50 English instructors who voluntarily participated

in the study. 550 students took part in the study and the participants diversified according to their gender, English proficiency level, English learning year, and age which they were responsible for when the research was carried out. Moreover, 50 English instructors who participated in the study and the participants varied on the bases of their gender, nationality, teaching experience, and teaching education background.

From a total of 550 students, it is identified that 116 (21,1%) of them studying at University 1, 168 (%30,5) of them studying at University 2, and 266 (48,4%) of them studying at University 3. The majority (62,5%) of the students are male and 37,5% of them are female. The students' average English learning year is stated as 7,39 ±3,67 and their mode year is identified as 10. The mode age of the students is 19 which consists of 34,9% of the community. 26,2% of the students are 20 years old, whereas 24% of them are 18 years old. English level of the students is identified as 5,7% of them being in C level while 17,3% of them being at A1 level. Meantime, 34,5% of them are figured out at B1 level. Table 1 demonstrates the acquired demographic information about the students.

**Table 1:** The Demographic Information about the Students

	Characteristics	N	%		Characteristics	N	%
Gender	Female	206	37,5	University	(University 1)	116	21,1
	Male	344	62,5		(University 2)	168	30,5
English level	A1	95	17,3		(University 3)	266	48,4
	A2	138	25,1	18	132	24,0	
	B1	190	34,5	19	192	34,9	
	B2	96	17,5	20	144	26,2	
	C1	29	5,3	21	41	7,5	
	C2	2	,4	22+	41	7,7	

50 English instructors who have at least 15 hours of lessons a week and work in the preparatory school at the School of Foreign Languages participated in the study voluntarily. When selecting the participants for the study, random sampling strategy was utilized to gather the most sufficient data from the educators. Besides, apart from the lessons, teachers also attend meetings to provide coordination and consistency. The participants were native and non-native English instructors working at the universities

in the western part of Turkey and some of them were hired as part-time instructors. From the 50 participants, 40 (80, 0%) of them were female and 10 (20, 0%) of them were male. Their educational background was divided as ELT or Non-ELT so 23 of them graduated from ELT and 27 (54, 0%) of them were from non-ELT departments. Their teaching experience differed from 1 to +11 years which gave the researcher a detailed demographic background. Their nationality varied as Turkish, American, British, and Russian. The demographic information about the teacher participants of the present study is illustrated in the following Table 2.

**Table 2:** The Demographic Information about the English Instructors

Characteristics	Categories	N	%
Gender	Female	40	80,0
	Male	10	20,0
Education Background	ELT	23	46,0
	Non-ELT	27	54,0
Teaching Experience	1-3 years	10	20,0
	4-6 years	15	30,0
	7-10 years	20	40,0
	11 years +	5	10,0
Age	25 to 35	15	30,0
	35 to 45	27	54,0
	45 to 54	5	10,0
	Above 55	3	6,0
Nationality	Turkish	40	80,0
	American	5	10,0
	Russian	2	4,0
	British	3	6,0

### **Data Collection Tool**

Both qualitative and quantitative methods were implemented during the data gathering process to obtain the necessary data to achieve the findings of the study. The data for this study was obtained through the questionnaire and interviews. The quantitative data collection instrument of this study is code switching questionnaire (*see Appendix A*). On the other hand, the qualitative data collection instrument of this study is interview (*see Appendix B*). Data collection and data analysis took ten weeks in total.

The items in the survey, especially the functions of code switching statements were adopted from studies by Ahmad and Jusoff (1999), Canagarajah (1995), Ferguson (2009), and Greggio and Gil (2007) and whilst the statements related views and attitudes of code switching rely on the latest opinions of code switching in EFL classrooms pointed out in the literature. The questionnaire comprises general statements that were ingenerated to obtain students' perceptions and attitudes toward the role and functions of code switching. The questionnaire was organized in two languages; Turkish and English, and the opportunity was given to the students to reply to the questionnaires in the language that they preferred. The questionnaire (*see Appendix A*) consisted of 16 items that are categorized into three major parts. Students' scores for items were based on a Likert-Scale, with 5 prompts. The prompts were as the following: *Strongly Agree, Agree, Not sure, Disagree, Strongly Disagree*.

To respond the research questions, this study used face to face semi-structured interviews to gain information about teachers' attitudes towards the use of code switching in EFL classrooms. 50 teachers were interviewed in this study and all of them work at the state universities in the western part of Turkey. All the interviews were performed individually, and the researcher took notes and used audio recorder to save. The researcher gave short brief information about the definition of code switching and she mentioned about the study's purpose. This research conducted semi-structured interviews in which common questions were asked to all the participants. Semi-structured interviews were selected for this study since they focalize to gather answers from main topics and questions and supply flexible forms of questions (Kvale, 2008). The interview questions involve 8 items and especially the functions of code switching statements were adopted from study by Bilgin and Rahimi (2013). The interview questions (*see Appendix B*) were selected depending on the research questions and they are focused on the teachers' perceptions and attitudes for the practice of code switching, their views about the functions of both teacher and students code switching depending on their demographic personal background data, which include gender, nationality, experience in teaching, age, teaching education background.

### ***Data collection procedures***

The quantitative data collection through the questionnaires lasted for three weeks. The researcher made a visit to the three state universities' School of Foreign



Languages which located in Izmir and Manisa about the scope of the study and asked two classes from each proficiency levels to distribute the questionnaire and the school management supplied and offered two classes from each level to the researcher. Then, the questionnaires were handed out to the students. Filling in the questionnaire was carried out under the control of the teachers after a brief explanation of how to complete the process to the students. The management of the questionnaires took approximately 15 minutes which included the following process; detailed explanation of the code switching meaning and how to fill in the questionnaire, learners answering the statement in the questionnaire.

The qualitative data collection through the interviews with the English instructors also took place for one month. The interviews were carried out by the researcher herself and the teachers through inquiring of them several questions (*see Appendix B*) based on the use of code switching in a face to face conversation. The researcher interviewed 50 teachers for this study and all of them work at the state universities in the western part of Turkey. The researcher supplied the interview questions at least 5 days before the interview took place. The interviews proceeded between 15 and 25 minutes. The interviews employed the strategies proposed by Kvale (2008). The management of the questionnaires took approximately 20 minutes which involved the following process; a short briefing explanation of the code switching meaning and explanation of the purpose of the study. During the interviews, the researcher asked for further clarification and detailed information if they were relevant to the major topic.

### *Data analysis*

In respect of the study's qualitative part, teachers' audio taped, face to face, semi-structured interview responses were processed through a deductive approach to content analysis. Content analysis was identified as being the process of notifying and summing up written, visual and vocal data and intended to analyze and validate written data (Cohen & Morrison, 2007). As it was pointed out by Elo and Kyngas (2007), in terms of the aim of the study, content analysis could be utilized through deductive approach or inductive approach. Thereby, the data were analyzed deductively depending on Apple and Muysken's (2006) framework. There were pre-specified

categories based on responses of the instructors about the functions, attitudes, reasons for using code switching, and they were categorized to reveal their perceptions about the stated aspect of code switching. The analysis would reveal the perceptions of the instructors towards using code switching in their EFL classrooms and if there were any functions of code switching which were related to their attitudes. On account of finding out and interpreting items with respect to the questions of the research, data were analyzed utilizing "segmentation, categorization and relinking of data" (Grbich, 2007, p.16). The instructors' names were numbered like Instructor 1, Instructor 2, Instructor 3, etc to conceal the identity of the instructors. Researcher categorized the responses succeeding the model of Apple and Muysken (2006) for code switching functions and reasons. The semi-structured interviews were transcribed completely and structured around the attitudes, functions, and reasons of code switching that enabled the researcher to find out teachers' perceptions towards using code switching.

The responses of the students to the questionnaire were the quantitative data and were processed through SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 24 to accumulate percentages and frequencies, and to calculate the mean for each item. First of all, the Cronbach's Alpha statistics was used for each of the items as being the measurement of reliability. It was decided upon the necessity of each item in the scale through looking at all items correlation and corroborative factor analysis. The necessity of the items was investigated through Hotelling T<sub>2</sub> test. Some of the cohesion measures which are obtained from the confirmatory factor analysis carried out in software IBM AMOS 22. CHIAD (Chi-square Automatic Interaction) analysis was used to gain the relation among variables as it constructs a predictive coding to enable optimum merge to describe the result in the specific dependent variable. While performing the CHAID analysis, students' attitudes of teachers' use of code switching considering the students' English learning year were named as dependent variables. The variable of the attitudes of students' code switching and variables that categorize students were named as independent variable. As a result of the CHIAD analysis, it was obtained 3 branching and 12 nodes. The necessity of the items was investigated through Hotelling T<sub>2</sub> test. The reliability of the scale was analyzed in order to see whether formed the latent variables or not. Some of the cohesion measures which are obtained from the

confirmatory factor analysis carried out in software IBM AMOS 22, are given in the Table 3.

**Table 3:** Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Code switching

Confirmatory measures	Positive confirmatory	Acceptable confirmatory	Measurement model
$\chi^2/sd.$	$0 \leq \chi^2/sd. \leq 2$	$2 < \chi^2/sd. \leq 3$	2,627
RMR	$0 \leq RMR \leq 0,05$	$0,05 < RMR \leq 0,1$	0,042
GFI	$0,95 \leq GFI \leq 1$	$0,90 \leq GFI < 0,95$	0,955
NFI	$0,95 \leq NFI \leq 1$	$0,90 \leq NFI < 0,95$	0,962
CFI	$0,97 \leq CFI \leq 1$	$0,95 \leq CFI < 0,97$	0,976
RMSEA	$0 \leq RMSEA \leq 0,05$	$0,05 < RMSEA \leq 0,08$	0,054
IFI	$0,97 \leq IFI \leq 1$	$0,90 \leq IFI < 0,97$	0,976

According to these statistics, the scale is considered highly reliable. In the analysis, the observed variables of Q11 and Q12 were excluded from the scale as they are not coherent with the model. The scale average was estimated as 3.923. No negative correlation was found in the scale's corrected item-total correlations.

In the study, it was tested whether the students' responses to the statements were different from the level of instability. If the students' tendency to the statements included in the scale is different than the value of 3, they will have a positive or negative attitude towards the situation in the statements. It was tested whether the scores given to the items in the scales show normal distribution. According to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality test results, all the variables included in the scales did not show normal distribution. Due to the lack of normal distribution of variables, the One-Sample Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test was preferred. It was tested whether the median value is 3 or not, and it was determined that the median value of the responses given only to Q15 was not different from 3 (Standardized test statistic= 1,026 P=0,305). The results obtained are given in the Table 4.

**Table 4:** One-Sample Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test

Item	N	Median	Standardized test statistic	P
------	---	--------	-----------------------------	---

Q1	550	4	14,128	,000
Q2	550	4	15,825	,000
Q3	550	4	13,152	,000
Q4	550	4	12,985	,000
Q5	550	4	15,572	,000
Q6	550	4	13,981	,000
Q7	550	2	-9,610	,000
Q8	550	2	-3,916	,000
Q9	550	4	11,611	,000
Q10	550	2	-12,126	,000
Q13	550	4	11,521	,000
Q14	550	4	10,226	,000
Q15	550	3	1,026	,305
Q16	550	4	12,004	,000

Before conducting the study, the points given to the statements were considered as scores one by one and then collected. The total score values were divided by the number of items in the scale, and the average values were estimated. It was tested whether the average score values and the responses to all the questions in the scale show normal distribution. It was seen that the teacher negative variable shows negatively skewed distribution while the teacher positive variable and student variables show positively skewed distribution that are given in the Table 5.

**Table 5:** Descriptive Statistics and Tests of Normality

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis		Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
				Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	df	Sig.
TeacherP	550	3,9234	,99205	-1,110	,104	,759	,208	,155	550	,000
TeacherN	550	2,4248	1,05290	,649	,104	-,135	,208	,129	550	,000
Student	550	3,5259	,89684	-,363	,104	-,179	,208	,094	550	,000

## Findings

### *Findings of the First Research Question*

The analysis of the results of the students' questionnaire shows that the majority of the students' perceptions are positive. The percentages demonstrated in Table 6 depict that majority of the students find that the teachers' use of CS makes the EFL lessons more enjoyable. A number of students believe that CS use by teachers enhances their confidence in learning English. Many students find that CS use by teachers raises their motivation in learning the target language. Students believe that CS use by the teacher helps them to focus on the lesson even the moment they faced with unknown target language items. A number of students found that the use of CS by the teacher encouraged them to actively participate in classroom activities. Based on the percentages showed in Table 7, it is apparent that majority of the students stated that they did not want the teacher not to use CS during English lessons. The data revealed that students utilized positive perceptions towards the use of code switching in EFL classrooms. The results are shown with the percentages in Table 6 (See appendix C).

### *Findings of the Second Research Question*

This second research question of the current study aimed to respond the question "Do the students' perceptions of teachers' code switching in Turkish EFL classes vary based on their gender?". In order to respond this question, Mann-Whitney U test was utilized to find out if there were any statistically important differences among the attitudes of the students towards teachers' use of code switching according to their gender and no statistically meaningful differences were identified ( $z=-,396$   $p=,692$ ). The findings of the Mann-Whitney U test are shown in Table 7.

**Table 7:** Students' Attitudes towards teacher' code-switching according to gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	z	p
TeacherP	Female	206	3,9674	,90902	-,396	,692
	Male	344	3,8970	1,03899		
TeacherN	Female	206	2,3576	,97278	-,885	,376
	Male	344	2,4651	1,09749		

This research question of the present study tried to find an answer to the question "Do the students' perceptions of teachers' code switching in Turkish EFL

classes vary based on their age?'. In order to find whether there was any statistically meaningful difference between the positive attitudes of the students towards teachers' use of code switching according to their age, Kruskal-Wallis test was executed and statistically significant difference was identified (Test statistic=10,055 P=0,040). A multiple comparison test Bonferroni test was preferred so as to determine which groups have these differences. According to the Bonferroni multiple comparison tests; it was determined that there is a significant difference between the 20-years-old students' positive attitudes towards teachers' use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of the students 22-years-old or above. Accordingly, it was identified that students 22-year-old or above showed higher tendency to participate (Test statistic= -2.306 P=0.021). It was specified that there is a significant difference between the 20-years-old students' positive attitudes towards teachers' use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of 21-years-old students. Accordingly, it was identified that 21-year-old students showed higher tendency to participate (Test statistic= -2.402 P=0.016). It was determined that there is a significant difference between the 18-years-old students' positive attitudes towards teachers' use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of 21-years-old students. Accordingly, it was identified that 21-year-old students showed higher tendency to participate (Test statistic= -2.111 P=0.035). With the purpose of finding whether there was any statistically meaningful difference between the negative attitudes of the students towards teachers' use of code switching according to their age, Kruskal-Wallis test was executed, and statistically significant difference was identified. (Test statistic=11.819 P=0.019). A multiple comparison test Bonferroni test was preferred so as to determine which groups have these differences. According to the Bonferroni multiple comparison tests; it was specified that there is a significant difference between the 20-years-old students' negative attitudes towards teachers' use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of 21-years-old students. Accordingly, it was identified that 20-year-old students show higher tendency to participate such switches in negative conditions (Test statistic= 3.062 P=0.022). The findings are shown in Table 8.

**Table 8:** Students' Attitudes towards Teacher' Code switching According to Age

Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Test statistic	p
-----	---	------	----------------	----------------	---

TeacherP	18	132	3,8387	1,05221	10,055	,040
	19	192	3,9516	,89609		
	20	144	3,8274	1,02598		
	21	41	4,1882	1,00124		
	22+	41	4,1359	1,05024		
	Total	550	3,9234	,99205		
TeacherN	18	132	2,4545	1,04624	11,819	,019
	19	192	2,3333	1,03178		
	20	144	2,6181	1,11008		
	21	41	2,0976	1,01446		
	22+	41	2,4065	,90833		
	Total	550	2,4248	1,05290		

This research question of the current study aimed to respond to the question ‘‘Do the students’ perceptions of teachers’ code switching in Turkish EFL classes vary based on their years of learning English?’’. In order to respond to this question if there was any statistically meaningful difference between the positive attitudes of the students towards teachers’ use of code switching according to English learning year, Kruskal-Wallis test was executed, and statistically significant differences were not identified (Test statistic=2.378 P=0.498). With the purpose of finding whether there was any statistically meaningful difference between the negative attitudes of the students towards teachers’ use of code switching according to their English learning year, Kruskal-Wallis test was executed, and statistically significant difference was not identified (Test statistic=1.710 P=0.635). The results obtained are given in the Table 9.

**Table 9:** Students’ Attitudes towards Teacher’ Code switching According to English Learning Year

	English Learning Years	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Test statistic	p
TeacherP	1-2	117	3,9243	1,08628	2,378	,498
	3-5	35	4,0204	1,08196		
	6-9	198	3,8918	,91888		
	10 +	200	3,9371	,99425		
	Total	550	3,9234	,99205		
TeacherN	1-2	117	2,4815	1,06264	1,710	,635
	3-5	35	2,3905	1,24849		
	6-9	198	2,3704	1,01860		

---

10 +	200	2,4517	1,04926
Total	550	2,4248	1,05290

---

The research question of the present study tried to answer the question “Do the students’ perceptions of teachers’ code switching in Turkish EFL classes vary based on their proficiency levels?”. In order to respond to this question, Kruskal-Wallis test was executed, and statistically significant differences were identified (Test statistic=30,936 P=0,0001). In order to specify which category these differences belong; Bonferroni multiple comparison test was utilized. According to the Bonferroni multiple comparison test findings; it was determined that there is a significant difference between the C1-level students' positive attitudes towards teachers' use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of the A2-level students (Test statistic=4.38 P=.0001). Accordingly, it was identified that A2-level students showed higher tendency to participate. It was specified that there is a significant difference between the C1-level students' positive attitudes towards teachers' use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of the B2-level students (Test statistic=4.415 P=.0001). Hence, it was identified that B2-level students showed higher tendency to participate. It was determined that there is a significant difference between the C1-level students' positive attitudes towards teachers' use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of the A1-level students (Test statistic=-4.937 P=.0001). Thereby, it was identified that A1-level students showed higher tendency to participate. It was stated that there is a significant difference between the C1-level students' positive attitudes towards teachers' use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of the B1-level students (Test statistic=-5.308 P=.0001). Consequently, it was identified that A1-level students showed higher tendency to participate. The findings are demonstrated in Table 10. It was specified that there is a significant difference between the A1-level students' negative attitudes towards teachers' use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of the C1-level students (Test statistic=-4.822 P=.0001). Accordingly, it was identified that C1-level students showed higher tendency to participate. It was determined that there is a significant difference between the B1-level students' negative attitudes towards teachers' use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of the C1-level students (Test statistic=-4.281 P=.0001). Thereby, it was identified that C1-level students showed higher tendency to participate. It was stated that there is a significant difference between the C1-level students' negative attitudes towards



teachers' use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of the A2-level students (Test statistic=-3.682 P=.002). Therefore, it was identified that C1-level students showed higher tendency to participate. It was determined that there is a significant difference between the C1-level students' negative attitudes towards teachers' use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of the B2-level students (Test statistic=-3.282 P=.010). Consequently, it was identified that C1-level students showed higher tendency to participate. The average of students' positive attitude towards code switching was estimated as  $3.923 \pm 0.992$ . The findings are demonstrated in Table 10.

**Table 10:** Students' attitudes towards teacher' code switching acc. to proficiency level

	Proficiency Level	N	Mean	SD	Test statistics	p
TeacherP	A1	95	3,9564	1,09752	30,936	,000
	A2	138	3,9410	,86212		
	B1	190	4,0654	,90585		
	B2	96	3,9792	,86338		
	C1	31	2,7005	1,27421		
	Total	550	3,9234	,99205		
TeacherN	A1	95	2,2035	1,05890	24,924	,000
	A2	138	2,4372	1,06390		
	B1	190	2,3404	,97346		
	B2	96	2,4688	,89779		
	C1	31	3,4301	1,35317		
	Total	550	2,4248	1,05290		

### **Findings of the Third Research Question**

This research question of the present study intended to look for a response to the question ‘‘Do the students' attitudes and perceptions of their own use of code switching in Turkish EFL classes vary in relation to their gender?’’. In order to answer this question, whether there were any statistically meaningful differences between the attitudes of the students towards teachers' use of code switching according to their gender or not was investigated by Mann-Whitney U test. According to the Mann-Whitney U Test, student's positive attitudes about students' code switching and no

statistically meaningful differences were detected ( $Z=-,885$   $P=,376$ ). The findings are presented in Table 11.

**Table 11:** Students' Attitudes Towards Students' Code switching According to Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	z	p
Student	Female	206	3,6226	,86134	-1,768	,202
	Male	344	3,4680	,91377		

This research question of the present study intended to answer the question “Do the students' attitudes and perceptions of their own use of code switching in Turkish EFL classes vary in relation to their age?”. With this purpose, Kruskal-Wallis test was executed, and statistically significant difference was not identified (Test statistic=6,891  $P=0,142$ ). The findings are shown in Table 12.

**Table 12:** Students' Attitudes Towards Students' Code switching According to Age

	Age	N	Mean	SD	Test statistics	P
Student	18	132	3,4981	,91296	6,891	,142
	19	192	3,4844	,90433		
	20	144	3,6458	,81587		
	21	41	3,6890	,95161		
	22+	41	3,2256	,96793		
	Total	550	3,5259	,89684		

The purpose of this research question of the current study was to elicit a response to the question “Do the students' attitudes and perceptions of their own use of code switching in Turkish EFL classes vary in relation to their years of learning English?”. Kruskal-Wallis test was executed, and statistically significant differences were identified (Test statistic=7.881.  $P=0.49$ ). A multiple comparison test Bonferroni test was preferred so as to determine which groups have these differences. According to the Bonferroni multiple comparison tests; it was identified that the attitudes of the students with 10+ learning years towards their own use of code switching according to their English learning year, showed higher tendency to participate than the attitudes of the students with 1-2 learning years. The findings are shown in Table 13.

**Table 13:** Students' Attitudes Towards Students' Code switching According to English Learning Year

	English Learning Years	N	Mean	SD	Test statistics	P
Student	1-2	117	3,3697	,93978	7,881	,049
	3-5	35	3,7214	1,04630		
	6-9	198	3,5316	,83731		
	10 +	200	3,5775	,89400		
	Total	550	3,5259	,89684		

The research question of the present study tried to find a response to the question ‘‘Do the students’ attitudes and perceptions of their own use of code switching in Turkish EFL classes vary in relation to their proficiency levels?’’. Kruskal-Wallis test was executed, and statistically significant difference was identified (Test statistic=10.695. P=0.030). A multiple comparison test Bonferroni test was preferred so as to determine which groups have these differences. According to the Bonferroni multiple comparison tests; it was determined that there is a significant difference between the C1-level students' negative attitudes towards their own use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of the A1-level students (Test statistic=2.869 P=.041). Accordingly, it was identified that A1-level students showed higher tendency to participate. It was stated that there is a significant difference between the C1-level students' negative attitudes towards their own use of code switching in English class and the attitudes of the A2-level students (Test statistic=3.182 P=.015). Hence, it was identified that A2-level students showed higher tendency to participate. With the purpose of finding whether there was any statistically meaningful difference between the negative attitudes of the students towards students’ use of code switching according to proficiency level, Kruskal-Wallis test was executed, and statistically significant difference was identified (Test statistic=24. P=0.0001). A multiple comparison test Bonferroni test was preferred so as to determine which groups have these differences.

#### *Findings of the Fourth Research Question*

The purpose of this research question of the study was to achieve a response to the question, ‘‘What are the perceptions of the teachers towards the use of code switching in EFL classrooms?’’. Based on the responses of the interviews, several instructors answered differently as they all had different perceptions of code switching

use in EFL classrooms. They have both positive and negative perceptions of using code switching in EFL classrooms. Instructors stated that utilizing code switching can vary depending on the classroom setting and students' levels.

*Instructors' positive perceptions about classroom CS.* The majority of the instructors stated that the reason for utilizing code switching was a strategic practice to facilitate the learning process and to obtain the expected outcomes of learning. They also added that it made students feel relief and assisted them to concentrate on the lesson more. A great number of instructors mentioned that it enhanced motivation of the students and even reduced anxiety or increased confidence of the students.

*Instructors use CS to save time.* A common positive view of the instructors (n=14) was identified utilizing codeswitching as a time saving method which assisted instructors to deliver the topics easily without consuming more time. On the other hand, some of the instructors (N=20) also stated that code switching should not be utilized fully in every process of the lesson as it could arouse an expectation to the students that the instructor would always clarify the subjects in L1.

*Instructors use CS to facilitate the learning process.* Some instructors also pointed out some other advantages of CS in the EFL classrooms such as facilitating the learning process. The common point of view was that CS was an effective tool to help students' acquisition of the language during an English lesson. Many instructors mentioned that teachers' CS could be the best way to overcome the language learning difficulties that learners encounter in the classroom. Besides, some other instructors claimed that code switching made their students understand the instructions or classroom tasks more effectively. The various teaching methods by the instructors affect how CS is utilized in EFL classrooms.

*Instructors use CS to explain the new vocabulary.* I 15: "mmmm on the other hand in teaching process CS is really the best strategy to explain the meaning of unfamiliar words, and I think it is the only strategy that I use in my class (laughing)..."

I 33: "CS is necessary when teaching different level of students, it helps teachers to provide explanations of the new vocabulary and concepts... yeah it really plays a crucial role in both learning and teaching process"

*Instructors use CS to provide the learning needs of the learners.* Many instructors (n=20) implied that they used code switching a lot as a classroom strategy that it was really required in teaching to various kind of students from different levels. A common belief between the instructors (n=22) was that utilizing code switching could assist to increase comprehension and enhance vocabulary knowledge of the students. Some of the instructors (n=15) stated that utilizing code switching could overcome student's problems for L2 learning. Some instructors highlighted that code switching could be applicable to only beginner proficiency level students and for the rest it was not necessary whereas some other believed that English level and ability of the students to comprehend L2 are generally the effects of deciding to utilize code switching or not. Besides, the common belief was that code switching could be beneficial when instructing learners who were in lower proficiency level classes, so they were all in agreement that social environment was an inevitable situation to utilize code switching in low proficiency level classes.

*Instructors' negative perceptions about classroom CS* Some instructors had negative perceptions about code switching and expressed that utilizing CS could only be necessary when teaching students who were not very proficient in English. Even though answers varied but they even supported only L2 usage in some contexts, they even pointed out other issues to take into account if it was necessary to implement code switching like classroom setting, the motivation of the learners and even they stated that it was important to consider their proficiency levels. Besides, they pointed out that CS could create a negative effect on learning process because it could decrease the attention of the students to engage in classroom practices and also could decline the standards of English.

*The use of CS in EFL classrooms increases the dependency on the teacher.* Some instructors also stated that the use of CS could result in overdependence on the native language so the students' reliance on Turkish could increase. Many instructors expressed as a disadvantage of using excessive code switching could be the student's dependency on the instructor. According to the interview question about what the advantages and disadvantages of code switching in their classrooms, the majority of the instructors (n=31) claimed that when students were aware that teacher utilized code

switching, their inclination to speak in L1 was more than speaking L2. Whereas, some instructors (n=8) claimed that it was a method of interference from the learners' L1.

*English should be taught in English-only classroom setting.* Conversely, a number of instructors were in total disagreement with code switching use and expressed that only English should be used in the class and this would help students to acquire L2 in a natural way and further this way could motivate students for showing the necessity of learning L2. They even highlighted the importance of only L2 speaking classroom environment.

**Table 14:** English Instructors' Perceptions towards Code Switching

	<i>Instructors use CS;</i>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	
Positive Perceptions	<i>- to increase students' confidence.</i>	37	74,0	
	<i>- to save time.</i>	34	68,0	
Negative Perceptions	<i>- to facilitate the learning process.</i>	38	76,0	
	<i>- to explain the new vocabulary.</i>	26	52,0	
	<i>- to provide the learning needs of the learners.</i>	37	74,0	
	<i>- when they do not feel confident about their ability to explain the new vocabulary only in English.</i>	13	26,0	
	<i>The use of CS:</i>			
	<i>-decreases the standards of English.</i>	23	46,0	
<i>-increases the dependency on the teacher.</i>	31	62,0		
	<i>- English should be taught in English-only classroom setting</i>	17	34,0	

### ***Findings of the Fifth Research Question***

The aim of this research question of the study was to achieve a response to the question, "What are the teachers' purposes on using of code switching in Turkish EFL classrooms?". Depending on the answers of the interviews, many instructors responded differently as they all had various reasons that made them use code switching. Instructors used code switching for directive, expressive, phatic, poetic, metalinguistic and referential functions. Most of the instructors indicated that the reasons for using code switching were for 'directive functions' such as trying to catch the students' attention, to arouse interest to the topic and to discuss individual topics. Besides, according to the answers of the interview question on if they used code switching and

why they utilized it in their classes, some instructors accepted that they performed code switching for ‘expressive functions’ especially for emotional reasons to show cooperation to the students. When asked the major reasons for using code switching, a number of instructors claimed sociolinguistic purposes that they utilized code switching to express cooperation with the students. Totally 30% of the instructors reported that they used code switching for phatic functions such as giving formula of grammar explanations, practicing the grammar questions and they insisted on the benefits of this. On the other hand, many instructors reported that they used code switching for poetic functions which includes entertaining purposes in order to create a more enjoyable atmosphere with jokes and sustain the students’ attention to the lesson. Some instructors acknowledged that they utilized code switching for sociolinguistic purposes which can be identified as metalinguistic functions. Furthermore, most of the instructors expressed why they utilized code switching for referential functions. Besides, they stated that they used code switching when making explanation of difficult concepts, translating new vocabulary, giving the equivalent meanings. The following are the instructors’ responses to why they used code switching during EFL lessons.

**Table 15:** English Instructors’ Code switching Reasons

Functions	Reasons	N	%
Directive Functions	Personal reasons	28	56,0
	Drawing attention	20	40,0
Expressive Functions	Showing intimacy	23	46,0
	Emotional reasons	35	70,0
Phatic Functions	Grammar explanations	15	30,0
Poetic Functions	Amusement Purposes	30	60,0
	Quoting	3	6,0
Meta linguistic Functions	Sociolinguistic purposes	18	36,0
Referential Functions	Explaining difficult concepts	35	70,0
	Better comprehending	31	62,0
	Some particular reasons	12	24,0

## Discussion and Conclusion

The primary purpose of this study was to find out perceptions of the teachers and the students towards the use of code switching. In the current study, it can be concluded that students and teachers have positive attitudes about the use of code switching in Turkish EFL classrooms. Code switching was perceived by teachers as a useful strategy to facilitate both teaching and learning process and teachers employed it for affective purposes. Teachers were aware of code switching practices and how to balance the amount of code switching based on students' proficiency level and comprehension of the students. Even though teachers acknowledged the advantages and disadvantages of code switching in EFL classrooms, they had conflicting views about the negative aspects of code switching and its effect on the L2 learning process. Teachers' code switching verified as a necessary strategy in order to deal with the challenges in EFL classrooms. In this present study, all the functions are identified in a detailed way. Teachers mainly utilized functions as a useful strategy for curriculum access in order to explain words, structures and grammar. Teachers also utilized code switching for interpersonal relations in order to encourage the participation of the students to classroom practices, to enhance the motivation and confidence in L2 learning.

Students' perceptions towards teachers' code switching were positive and they found it useful as they perceived several advantages like enhancing students' understanding during lessons and providing affective support such as encouraging participation and improving students' motivation to learn L2. Nevertheless, some inconsistencies existed in the students' views of code switching in the classroom. Students preferred to minimize the use of code switching in the EFL classroom. There can be various factors which could express the discrepancies in the students' perceptions about utilizing code switching in the class. Students' perceptions towards students' code switching varied but it could be a useful strategy for students who had limited proficiency level in order to overcome communication barriers when they had challenges to explain themselves in L2. Students utilized code switching when they were interacting with their peers, especially during collaborative group discussions. Code switching in this context was utilized by the students to supply common guidance and assistance for task completion. Students also utilized it as a self-revision strategy to monitor their own learning.



The results regarding the first research question pointed out that the students had generally positive attitudes for the teacher's use of code switching and perceived it as a useful technique to help them to enjoy, understand the lesson, make them feel more confident and motivated in learning. Moreover, CS enabled them to focus on lesson, and encouraged them to actively participate in classroom activities. In the same vein, Schweers (1999) showed that the majority of the student code switching made them feel more comfortable and confident and aided to learn L2. Findings showed that students utilized code switching as a communicative resource in order to deal with the communicative obstacles which could occur because of restricted proficiency in L2.

The results of the second RQ of the study are intended to discover the students' attitudes and perceptions about teachers' code switching in Turkish EFL classes based on their gender, age, years of learning and proficiency levels. According to findings, age, English learning year and gender of the students do not create differences in the attitudes of the students towards teachers' use of code switching. The findings of this research are in line with Rahimi and Jafari (2011), they conducted a study in order to explore code switching and gender preferences. However, the analysis of genders' role in students' attitudes was inadequate. Moreover, the findings showed that there is a direct connection between the negative and positive attitudes because the students' negative attitudes towards code switching increase while their positive attitudes towards code switching decrease. On the other hand, the proficiency level of the students creates major differences in the students' attitudes towards teachers' use of code switching. When the English level of students decreased their participation in the positive attitudes towards teacher's code switching increased. Thus, lower proficiency level students' tendency to positive attitudes was more than higher proficiency levels. The findings of this current study further support the idea of Sert (2005) because as a consequence of the learners' and the educators' linguistic backgrounds contended with teaching and learning process, changed among the languages in the shape of code switching is a widely observed fact in EFL classrooms.

The results regarding the third RQ of the study, age and gender do not affect their attitudes towards their own code switching. On the other hand, their English learning years and proficiency levels showed statistical differences between their attitudes towards their own code switching. The students who learn English for more

than 10 years showed higher tendency than the students learning English for 1 or 2 year. Moreover, lower proficiency level students' tendency to positive attitudes was more than higher proficiency levels. The results are in line with Ahmad (2009) who found that low proficiency level students supported code switching and they had a positive attitude towards utilizing native language in the class and they perceived code switching as part of the learning achievement in Malaysian EFL classrooms. Moreover, the results resonate with Asghar and Jafarian (2016) who performed a study at a university in Iran in order to analyze gender differences on students' attitudes towards code switching and results revealed that students had positive attitudes towards code switching although there were some cases in which they were not associated with it but gender did not affect any crucial differences in the attitudes of the students towards the use of code switching.

The findings of the fourth RQ indicate that there are both positive and negative attitudes towards using code switching in EFL classrooms and it is perceived as a significant teaching and learning resource by the instructors. The responses changed depending on their students' proficiency levels and classroom settings. The common opinion of the instructors was that they perceived code switching as a facilitating tool for both learning and teaching process which made students feel relief and concentrate more on the lesson. Moreover, it, enhanced students' motivation, reduced students' anxiety and increased confidence and comprehension of the students. Greggio and Gil (2007) reported similar findings on code switching which bridged a linguistic gap, made students feel more concentrated, supplied equivalent meanings, and clarified comprehension. These finding are in line with Sert (2005) who indicated that many educators utilized code switching to convey the necessary knowledge to the learners in order to clarify meaning and made sure of the efficient comprehension. The results showed that instructors had positive points of view in terms of using code switching in a necessary way in EFL classrooms. However, some of the instructors have negative attitudes of using code switching because they supported the idea that only English should be used in the class. Code switching is the intentional choice of language which facilitates the classroom atmosphere on many sides and conveys the message better than one could do in another language. In the same vein, Ahmad and Jusoff (2009) expressed that teachers' code switching was an effective teaching strategy. Although

some instructors believed that only English should be utilized in EFL classroom, their attitudes towards code switching were not negative.

The findings of this fifth RQ signified that the purposes of using code switching were varied depending on different functions. Many instructors used directive functions such as trying to catch the students' attention, to arouse interest to the topic and to discuss individual topics, to build confidence with their students, in order to increase the student's motivation and willingness to participate in the lesson, creating a relaxing atmosphere. Wardhaugh (2006) confirmed the findings as they stated teachers' directive functions of code switching were discussing individual topics and drawing the students' attention. Some performed code switching for expressive functions especially for emotional reasons so as to show cooperation and intimacy to the students. Instructors stated the reason of using code switching could be psychological because when they wanted to minimize the gap between the students and the teachers, they might use it and they pointed out some examples like joking with the students. The results are resonated with the previous studies done in this field and conducted by Shamash and Collins (2001) who acknowledged that code switching uplifted the affective environment as it contributes to build a good relationship with the students and decrease anxiety while using L2. Instructors used code switching for phatic functions such as giving formula of grammar explanations, practicing the grammar questions. The findings in the current study resonated with Ruan (2003) who reported that teachers could use code switching to Chinese for meta-linguistic functions. It was even good to save more time for the lesson. Some instructors acknowledged that they utilized code switching for mainly sociolinguistic purposes which can be identified as meta-linguistic functions. Since they used code switching in order to translate or clarify difficult vocabulary and terminology. This function is used mostly by instructors. Instructors can find it difficult to instruct exclusively in the English (Duff & Polio, 1990). Besides, many instructors used code switching for poetic functions which included entertaining purposes in order to create more enjoyable atmosphere with jokes and sustain the students' attention to the lesson. Zentella (1987) reported that bilingual speakers were more likely to utilizing code switching while they were telling jokes. A similar finding was revealed in a study which was carried out in Taiwan and Tien and Liu (2006) found that there were socializing effects of code switching between students

and instructors. They expressed why they utilized code switching for referential functions they used code switching when making explanation of difficult concepts and words, translating new vocabulary, giving the equivalent meanings and clarifying what is being discussed. These findings resonate with previous studies' findings in the same field (Chowdury, 2012; Jingxia, 2010).

To conclude, this research put forward some implications for principals of the schools, instructors and researchers. The result showed that using code switching in the class and the perceptions of teachers' and students were satisfied enough to take into consideration about CS when writing their policies. The common view of both teachers and students were to minimize the use of CS in EFL classrooms and utilized it in necessary moments to facilitate the learning process. Thereby, in relation to the literature, code switching demonstrated a variety of positive attitudes in the classroom context.

### Notes on the contributors

**Merve Karakaya** is an English Language Instructor in the School of Foreign Languages at Izmir Institute of Technology (IZTECH), Izmir, Turkey. She is currently the member of PDU (Professional Development Unit) at IZTECH. Merve received her MA from the English Language Education Program at Bahçeşehir University, Turkey. She is a CELTA qualified English Instructor. Her research interests include professional development and reflective teaching.

**Kenan Dikilitas** is a Professor of University Pedagogy at the department of higher education pedagogy at University of Stavanger, Norway. His recent areas of research includes digital pedagogy in higher education and teacher education as well as teacher development through action research.

### References

Ahmad, B. H. (2009). Teachers' code switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 49-55.

- Ahmad, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' code switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2(2), P49.,
- Anton, M., & DiCamilla, F. J. (1999). The discourse of a learner-centered classroom: Sociocultural perspectives on teacher-Learner interaction in the second-language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(3), 303-318
- Asali, S. (2011). *Attitudes of Arab American speakers in the USA towards English-Arabic code switching* (Master thesis). Middle East University. Amman, Jordan.
- Bensen, H. & Çavuşoğlu, Ç. (2014). Reasons for the teachers' uses of code switching in adult EFL classrooms. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(20), 69-82.
- Bentahila, A., & Davies, E. E. (1992). Code switching and language dominance. *Advances in Psychology*, 83, 443-458.
- Brooks, F. B., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 77(2), 262-274.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1995). Functions of codeswitching in ESL classrooms: Socialising bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 16(3), 173-195.
- Cole, S. (1998). The use of L1 in communicative English classrooms. *Language Teacher-Kyoto-JALT*, 22, 11-14.
- Cook, V. (2002). *Portraits of the L2 User*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Duff, P. A. & Polio, C. G. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 74 (2), 154-166.
- Dweik, B. (2000). Linguistic and cultural maintenance among the Chechen of Jordan. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 13, 184-195.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62, 107–115.

- Ferguson, G. (2003). Classroom code switching in post-colonial contexts: Functions, attitudes and policies. *AILA review*, 16(1), 38-51.
- Gomez, A. (2014). How do native Spanish speakers engage with and respond to bilingual instructional strategies in the ESL classroom? Available at <http://bilingualstrategiesinesl.weebly.com/>
- Greggio, S. & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and learners' use of code switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: A qualitative study. *Linguagem & Ensino*, 10(2), 371-393.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: life and reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Huerta-Macias, A., & Quinterro, E. (1992). *Code Switching, bilingual and biliteracy: Case Study*. Duluth: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hussein, R. F. (1999). Code-alteration among Arab college students. *World Englishes*, 18(2), 281-289.
- Kvale, S. (2008). *Doing interviews*: Sage.
- Mackey, W. (1962). The description of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 7, 51-85.
- Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (1995). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code switching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, D. (2009). Code switching and symbolic power in a second-grade two-way classroom: A teacher's motivation system gone awry. *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association or Bilingual Education*, 32(1), 42-59.
- Robert, K. Y. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York: The Guilford Press
- Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11(8) /online/. Available at <http://www.iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html>.

- Skiba, R. (1997). Code switching as a countenance of language Interference. *The Internet TESL Journal*. 3(10) /online/. Available at <http://www.iteslj.org/Articles/Skiba-CodeSwitching.html>.
- Tien, C., & Liu, K. (2006). Code switching in two EFL classes in Taiwan. *English in Southeast Asia: Prospects, Perspectives, and Possibilities*, 215.
- Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? CS and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 302-325.
- Valdes, G., & Figueroa, R. (1994). *Bilingualism and testing: A special case of bias*. Norwood: NJ: Ablex.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wei, L. (Ed.) (2000). *The Bilingualism Reader*. New York: Rutledge.
- Zentella, A. C. (1987) Language and female identity in the Puerto Rican community. In P. Jocyte (Ed.), *Women and language in transition* (pp. 167-79). New York: NY Press.

## Appendices

### A. Code switching Questionnaire English Version

Dear Students,

This questionnaire is prepared to assess students' personal preference or beliefs in the practice of code switching during English lessons.

Gender: Male ( ), Female ( ) Age: Level: A1( ) A2( ) B1( ) B2( ) C1( ) C2( )

I have been learning English for .....years. /

5. Strongly Agree      4. Agree      3. Undecided      2. Disagree      1. Strongly Disagree

No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5
1	Teacher's use of code switching helps me to enjoy the lesson.					
2	Teacher's use of code switching helps me to understand the lesson better.					
3	Teacher's use of code switching makes me feel more confident in learning English					

4	Teacher's use of code switching makes me feel more motivated in learning English					
5	Teacher's use of code switching enables me to focus on the lesson without worrying about unfamiliar words and sentences.					
6	Teacher's use of code switching encourages me to actively participate in classroom activities					
7	I would prefer the teacher not to use code switching during lessons and not to use my first language.					
8	I would prefer the teacher to minimize the use of code switching during lessons.					
9	I would prefer the teacher to use code switching during lessons.					
10	I don't like when the teacher uses code switching during English lessons.					
11	I find it difficult to learn when the teacher does not explain new words/topics/concepts using code switching.					
12	I find it difficult to concentrate during English lessons when the teacher uses only English					
13	I use code switching when I am unable to express myself in English					
14	I use code switching to help me maintain the flow of conversation					
15	I use code switching when I communicate with my peers who share the same language					
16	I use code switching when explaining difficult words and sentences to my peers					

### ***B. Interview questions with the teachers***

1. Do you use code switching in your classrooms? Why and When?
2. In what specific moments do you use code switching while teaching?
3. How does CS affect teaching and learning process?
4. What are the factors which you consider when using CS during English lessons?
5. Do you consider relatedness between CS and your emotional state? Explain, please.
6. What are the advantages and disadvantages of utilizing CS in EFL classrooms?
7. Could you please explain in detail why your code switching contributes to or hinders learners' EFL learning?
8. According to your experience which code would you maintain your Ss' interest and keep the lesson more enjoyable, and why?



*C. Table 6: The Distribution of the Students' Responds about their Perceptions Towards Code switching*

		Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree	
		Fi	%	Fi	%	Fi	%	Fi	%	Fi	%
Q1	Teacher's use of code switching helps me to enjoy the lesson.	35	6,4	34	6,2	69	12,5	192	34,9	220	40,0
Q2	Teacher's use of code switching helps me to understand the lesson better.	26	4,7	35	6,4	39	7,1	213	38,7	237	43,1
Q3	Teacher's use of code switching makes me feel more confident in learning English	37	6,7	45	8,2	66	12,0	211	38,4	191	34,7
Q4	Teacher's use of code switching makes me feel more motivated in learning English	32	5,8	55	10,0	70	12,7	217	39,5	176	32,0
Q5	Teacher's use of code switching enables me to focus on the lesson without worrying about unfamiliar words and sentences.	27	4,9	34	6,2	44	8,0	217	39,5	228	41,5
Q8	I would prefer the teacher to minimise the use of code switching during lessons.	110	20,0	169	30,7	107	19,5	81	14,7	83	15,1
Q9	I would prefer the teacher to use code switching during lessons	44	8,0	53	9,6	80	14,5	191	34,7	182	33,1
Q10	I don't like when the teacher uses code	197	35,8	195	35,5	68	12,4	42	7,6	48	8,7

	switching during English lessons										
Q11	I find it difficult to learn when the teacher does not explain new words/topics/concepts using code switching	72	13,1	111	20,2	107	19,5	140	25,5	120	21,8
Q12	I find it difficult to concentrate during English lessons when the teacher uses only English	78	14,2	117	21,3	88	16,0	135	24,5	132	24,0
Q13	I use code switching when I am unable to express myself in English	36	6,5	63	11,5	87	15,8	205	37,3	158	28,9
Q14	I use code switching to help me maintain the flow of conversation	30	5,5	78	14,2	112	20,4	208	37,8	122	22,2
Q15	I use code switching when I communicate with my peers who share the same language	97	17,6	108	19,6	90	16,4	163	29,6	92	16,7
Q16	I use code switching when explaining difficult words and sentences to my peers	37	6,7	62	11,3	60	10,9	236	42,9	155	28,2