

Faculté de philosophie, arts et lettres

Exploring the Extent and Purposes of the Use of Code-Switching in EFL Classrooms: A Systematic Review

Auteur : Sherlyn DE TROEYE
Promoteur(s) : Ferran SUNER MUNOZ
Année académique 2022-2023 – Session de juin
Master [60] en Langues et Lettres Modernes, orientation générale

Table of contents

List of abbreviations	1
Introduction.....	3
Preliminary literature review	5
Research aim and research questions.....	15
Methodology	15
Search terms.....	16
Findings.....	16
Conclusion	49
Acknowledgments.....	51
References.....	52

List of abbreviations

TL: Target Language

L1: Native/First Language

L2: Second Language

CS: Code Switching

EFL: English as Foreign Language

FL: Foreign Language

Exploring the Extent and Purposes of the Use of Code-Switching in English as Foreign Language Classrooms: A Systematic Review

Abstract

Purpose: In recent years, code-switching has been widely observed in language classrooms on the part of both teachers and students, increasing the latter's exposure to their mother tongue in their learning process of an additional language. However, this phenomenon seems to divide opinions, both among academic and non-academic authorities, as well as among teachers and their students. This heated debate continues to rage on between the proponents of the monolingual principle and those of the L1/L2 mix. This paper consists of a systematic review of articles by thirteen different scientists about the use of code-switching in the classroom and more precisely its degree of use and its main pedagogical functions.

Method: Several research studies have been conducted on the use of code-switching in high school classrooms and its role in students' L2 acquisition. This research goes through the different opinions of scientists about this usage, its purpose, and to what extent it is used. This paper therefore systematically attempts to summarize the results, without particular attention to any specific skill. This systematic review, which follows the PRISMA guidelines (Page et al., 2021), includes thirteen articles mainly from Scopus, Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and Sage Journals that were collected and analyzed for the purpose of this research.

Conclusion: The study reveals that code-switching is a common practice in many classrooms across the world. Teachers use code-switching extensively, whether consciously or unconsciously and regardless of their teaching experience or general profile. This phenomenon is serving several functions such as, inter alia, enhancing comprehension, expressing identity, and building relationships with students. The findings also suggest that various factors including the linguistic backgrounds of both teachers and students, the school's language policies, and the content being taught during lessons, influence the use of code-switching in the classroom. This paper suggests that educators should adopt a balanced approach that considers the specific needs and backgrounds of each student to optimize language education.

Keywords

code-switching, L1, L2, classrooms, teaching, languages, foreign language, foreign language learning, second language acquisition, EFL, applied linguistics.

Introduction

In multilingual contexts, code-switching is a common linguistic phenomenon that can occur in any interaction between speakers who share knowledge of the same languages, as studies conducted by Lo (2015) and Raschka et al. (2009) have shown. This behavior consists in alternating between two languages in the same discourse associated with social groups they do not belong to (Hall & Nilep, 2015), which is a usual practice among people worldwide for various reasons, depending on certain factors. Linguists cannot agree on one definition of this phenomenon due to its complexity. However, it is generally considered “the result of material from two languages by a single speaker in the same conversation. ‘The same conversation’ means that all the other participants also speak, or at least understand, both (or all) the languages” (Thomason 2001, 132). Bilingualism can be understood in two ways: simply having two separate language skills or a more complex way of communicating where the two languages interact and combine. Some experts view bilingualism as an ongoing process where a person's first language can also help develop their bilingual abilities. Although some teachers are hesitant to switch between languages during their lessons, according to studies, code-switching can be a helpful method, especially for young learners who are still developing their language and cognitive abilities. The way people switch between languages, also called code-switch, can help bring to light complex strategies for learning and communicating (Moore 2002). Therefore, bilingualism is important for intercultural communication from a social and global perspective, which is why code-switching is a valuable tool used by bilingual speakers since their goal is to be understood by each other. It plays an important role in bilingualism and brings out various sociolinguistic and psychological aspects. Code-switching is one of the results of language contact widely observed in multilingual communities.

Even though this is a common phenomenon in everyday life, it also happens to appear in an academic context, that of foreign language classes, which will be referred to as EFL classrooms. This term known as "English-as-a-Foreign-Language" (EFL) should be understood as "English seen in the context of countries where it is not the mother tongue and has no special status". In the context of pedagogical practice, teachers also tend to code-switch in EFL classrooms. Its use has been the subject of controversy among scientists and those involved in

school life, such as policymakers and those in positions of institutional authority, known as head teachers, and teachers. In fact, the issue of whether the use of a student's L1 should be combined with his L2 or banned in their L2 learning process has been one of the most arguable ones in the field of foreign language teaching (for a review, see Turnbull and Arnett, 2002). L2 was mostly taught through L1 until the late nineteenth century, with a written-texts focused grammar-translation method and analysis focusing on grammar and linguistics (Ghobadi and Ghasemi, 2015). The spoken form of L2 has, nevertheless, been the focus of a few methods, including the direct method, audiolingual method, natural approach, communicative approach, and task-based approach. Such strategies promoted the use of L2 exclusively in the FL classroom. The use of L1 is implicitly discouraged in more recent approaches, such as the communicative approach, which also emphasizes the use of authentic language and a rich L2 environment to maximize exposure to L2 input and opportunities for L2 output. (Bruen and Kelly 2014; Ghobadi and Ghasemi 2015). Therefore, that could be the reason why L1 has lost its importance in the method of foreign language learning in the classroom and the use of L2 exclusively seems to be gaining ground. However, according to Hall and Cook (2012), a shift started to emerge in the 1990s to revalue the use of L1 in the FL education system in order to prove that L1 plays an important role in many pedagogical functions and is also a realistic choice in classroom settings.

Although this phenomenon was a major topic in scientific studies in the field of sociolinguistics in the past, code-switching as a strategy of foreign language teachers has received attention since the 1980s, and it has received more attention over the years through a series of investigations that have helped to understand the phenomenon and behavior of bilingual speech. It has gained interest as it is an interesting phenomenon to study since it is about the use of languages in society and is part of the developmental processes of a person and his use of multiple languages. However, there is a gap in the literature: researchers have been mainly focusing on the sociolinguistic variables of code-switching and the factors behind it. Studies in foreign language situations tend to be more linguistically focused and document the degree of L1 usage by FL teachers while also looking for variables that either limit or promote the use of TL (Kim and Elder, 2005). Furthermore, empirical studies on this topic have continued to investigate various aspects of L1 use in FL and have been more likely to oppose using L1, even though many FL classrooms still predominantly use L1 (Adinolfi and Astruc 2017; Cook 2010), and most studies were conducted in bilingual classrooms where L1 was English. Thus, there has been a call for more empirical studies to investigate a balanced

ratio of L1 and L2 use (e.g. Crawford, 2004; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002) and the reasons why and how the L1 should be used in pedagogical contexts (e.g. Hall & Cook, 2012; Macaro, 2009). The purpose of this thesis is to attempt to recognize and evaluate the pedagogical practices of teachers who code-switch in EFL classes to identify trends that may be important in order to give answers to the main issue of this work. To answer the research questions, this current paper will focus on the extent of use of both L1 and L2 and will weigh the pros and cons of the two equally valid teaching methods. It will also attempt to explain the multiple factors that lead teachers and students to use code-switching, and will also suggest a framework that will be able to potentially combine the two methods in a reasonable manner. It will set out as follows: firstly the paper will start with a literature review of previous studies on the same issue and then the main objectives of the paper and the research questions will be posed as well as the working method that will be used. The main part of this paper will consist of the findings of the different articles collected to answer the research questions and a summary will be established through the conclusion of this paper.

Preliminary literature review

In their studies, Moghadam et al. (2012, 2219) define switching from one language to another in a regular conversation held by two people who can speak both languages as code-switching. Bernstein first introduced the idea of *code* in 1971. It refers to any set of signs that have a clear, concrete meaning, such as words, numbers, or signals. The term *code* is a neutral term as opposed to phrases like *dialect*, *language*, *style*, *pidgin* and *creole* which are more likely to elicit strong feelings, according to Wardaugh: "Any mechanism that two or more individuals adopt for communication" is referred to as code (2000, 86). When a specific code is chosen, it is not necessary to abide by it constantly. People can and should switch from one code to another as necessary. The word *code-switching* has been defined in a variety of ways in code-switching studies. Gumperz (1982, 59) defined it as "the juxtaposition of speech passages from two separate grammatical systems or subsystems inside the same speech exchange." Cook (2000, 83) proposed that code-switching is the act of "changing from one language to another while both speakers are conversant in the same languages" It is "the systematic alternating employment of two languages or language varieties inside a single conversation or speech," according to Lightbown (2001, 598). Each definition of code-switching helps to understand the said phenomenon in different ways: the linguistic definition of code-switching focuses on the structural aspects of language and identifies code-switching

as a change in language within an interaction with other people. This definition clarifies how code-switching can happen at the level of syntax, phonology, and morphology, and how it reflects the speaker's linguistic competence in several languages (Auer, 1998). The sociolinguistic definition of code-switching focuses on the social and cultural factors that influence the use of language in different contexts. It highlights the role of language in identity formation, group membership, and power dynamics, and the communicative function of CS as a strategic tool that speakers use based on the situation they are in or the people they interact with (Li Wei, 1998). The psycholinguistic definition of code-switching focuses on the cognitive processes involved in the production and comprehension of CS. It explores how speakers activate and select words from different language systems, how they fix their speech errors, and how they negotiate meaning with their interlocutors (Green & Wei, 2014). Overall, each definition provides a different perspective on CS, each one helps to understand the complexity and diversity of this linguistic phenomenon. By considering the linguistic, sociolinguistic, and psycholinguistic factors that shape code-switching, scientists can gain a deeper insight into how language is used and processed in multilingual contexts. Each definition of CS covers aspects that are not covered by the other definitions, each one is important in its own way. For example, as said above, the linguistic definition of code-switching emphasizes the structural aspects of language and focuses on grammatical rules and patterns. It does not directly concern the social and cultural factors that influence language use, such as identity, power, and group membership (Auer, 1998; Myers-Scotton, 2002; Poplack, 1980). The sociolinguistic definition highlights the social and cultural aspects of language use and the communicative functions of CS in different contexts but it does not necessarily address the cognitive processes (Heller, 1988; Gumperz, 1982; Milroy et al., 1995). Finally, the psycholinguistic definition emphasizes the cognitive processes involved in the production and comprehension of code-switching but does not concern the social and cultural factors that influence language use, or the grammatical rules and patterns, etc (Green, 1998; Kroll et al., 2017; Grosjean, 1998). Additionally, it is important to note that these definitions are not mutually exclusive, and that they can overlap and interact with each other in complex ways (Auer, 1998; Gumperz, 1982; Heller, 1988). Macaro (2001) argues that understanding codeswitching requires an integration of both perspectives. In a nutshell, code-switching is the transition from one language to another during a statement or discussion. It describes the alternate use of the first language and the target language by language teachers, if necessary, as a form of communication in the setting of a foreign language classroom (Jingxia, 2010).

There have been numerous attempts to provide a typological context for the code-switching phenomenon. The one made by Poplack (1980) is one of the most commonly discussed: tag switching, inter-sentential switching, and intrasentential switching are the three types of switching that Poplack identified in her data. She showed that “frequent intrasentential code-switching is associated with high bilingual ability, whereas use of intersentential switching is associated with nonfluency or dominance in one language over the other” and concluded that “the ability to code-switch intrasententially may be used as a measure of bilingual competence” (Poplack, 1980). Jingxia (2010) explains that the act of inserting a tag phrase from one language into an utterance from another is known as tag-switching. It appears that switches frequently involve the standard greeting or parting statements. Tags can readily be placed at several points in a monolingual speech without breaking syntactic constraints because they are subject to low syntactic restrictions. Inter-sentential switching takes place at a clause or sentence boundary, where each clause or phrase is in a different language (Jingxia, 2010). In the opinion of Romaine (1989), it may need more fluency in both languages than tag-switching because a larger section of the utterance must adhere to the rules of both languages. The author includes a last type of code-switching, which is known as intra-sentential switching, which is the most complex one and which occurs inside the phrase or sentence. Although it appears to be more common in utterances, the greatest syntactic risk exists because the language flipping takes place within phrase or sentence boundaries. By all but the most proficient bilinguals, intrasentential switching may be avoided due to social and linguistic factors, according to Poplack (1980). One reason for this is that code-switching can sometimes be stigmatized or viewed negatively by members of a community, and individuals may avoid it in order to conform to linguistic norms or avoid social consequences. In addition, individuals may avoid intrasentential code-switching if they perceive it as difficult or unnecessary because they may feel that using only one language is simpler, or that the situation they are in does not require the use of two languages or plus. Furthermore, some languages have stricter rules about when and how code-switching can happen, and learners may avoid intrasentential switching in order to adhere to these rules and avoid linguistic errors. Overall, the decision to avoid intrasentential CS is influenced by a complex mix of social, cultural, and linguistic factors, and can vary depending on the learner and the context in which they are speaking. Other types of code-switching coming from two categories of CS that reveal some of the most common reasons for language confusion in different contexts were first introduced by Gumperz in 1982: the situational and metaphorical switching. While metaphorical switching just changes the thematic emphasis and refers to using language from one domain to talk about something in

another domain, such as using sports metaphors in business or politics, situational switching incorporates changes to participants and/or methods, it refers to switching languages or dialects based on the situational factors, such as the topic of conversation, the interlocutor's language preference, or the formality of the setting (Romaine, 1995; Auer, 1998). Gumperz (1982) described this term as being the "language alternations that establish a regular relationship between language choice and social activities, such as when a community member speaks standard Norwegian in a school lecture but the local dialect to discuss personal concerns with a friend" (as cited in Hall & Nilep, 2015, 600). The social situation influences low and high varieties of the language, with low varieties used in informal settings and high varieties used in formal and official settings. Two different forms of code-switching were presented by Auer (1998), namely participant alternation and discourse-related alternation. Clause, not a sentence, is the primary unit of code-switching, according to Lin (1990), who distinguished himself from previous academics in this regard. As a result, he proposed two different methods of code switching: insertional switching and alternative switching. Insertional switching is interclausal whereas alternational switching is intraclausal.

Wei (2005) asserts that competence in all languages is required to practice this phenomenon, which is a regular language behavior that, moreover, as Zainil et al. (2021) argue, is increasingly occurring in today's bilingual classrooms. However, although little research has been done on the use of L1 versus L2 in the foreign language classroom, tensions and conflicts are clear in this area. The next sections will contextualize this paper by examining and investigating the theoretical and empirical research on the L1/L2 use by teachers in classrooms that have been conducted so far. That includes the monolingual principle, the purposes and the degree of use of codeswitching and the ongoing debate on the L1 vs L2 use.

The monolingual principle

The monolingual principle refers to the exclusive use of the L2 when learning the same language, i.e., using the latter's L1 is to be avoided by both learners and teachers. There are obviously many contexts, and this approach cannot be applied in all of them; for example, it would be impossible to adopt it if all learners in a class had a different native language. The acceptance and high reputation of this principle can be attributed to multiple factors. The first is the socio-political aspect, "it has been argued that this approach ensures that the world becomes dependent on 'native-speaker' language ways of teaching and language norms in a

one-size-fits-all approach that denies cultural and linguistic differences” (Phillipson 1997, 71). The exclusive use of L1 had become the norm because of the enormous influence of the Western textbook industry which dominated the market, so the pedagogical methods of non-native teachers were challenged.

For years in academic contexts, the prevailing principle in language teaching was the monolingual principle, which was simply to use only the target language when the teacher addressed the students, and thus to minimize or even banish the students' native language. In the research conducted, it is clear that this problem of teacher balance is a matter of debate. Policymakers and institutional representatives are in favor of maximizing the target language in lessons, an opinion supported by some scientists such as Hawkins (1987, 97–98) who compares teaching a foreign language to "gardening in the gale" - the teacher plants seeds but these are constantly blown away between lessons - and so it is essential to maximize the learners' exposure in the limited class time available". The monolingual principle is a practice that divides academics but also policymakers and teachers. Some like Levine (2003) (cited in Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2005, 234) advocate the need for some teachers to adhere to a single monolingual mode of language education, while researchers like Ellis (2005, 133) explain the importance for others to prefer "to use the pupils' L1 to explain and organize a task and to manage behavior in the belief that this will facilitate the medium-centered [language-related] goals of the lesson.” There are other disagreements about the use of code-switching in the foreign language classroom, including which approach to grammar learning is most effective, the effectiveness of teaching explicit knowledge, or the most practical way to provide corrective feedback (Ellis 2005: 9). In this regard, Macaro (2005, 63) declared that “this concept used during lectures does not reflect the positive image of being an asset and a valuable addition to their array of communicative strategies”. However, Ahmad and Jusoff (2009), as well as Ibrahim (2013), disagree on that, declaring that several positive functions of code-switching can be found, such as helping learners to improve their understanding skills of their L1 during their learning process. More studies on the perception or attitudes of teachers and students towards code-switching practices in classrooms have been conducted: Ibrahim et al. (2013) found that, according to teachers, this concept is seen as positive and used for educational purposes, while students either have a neutral perception of it (Rivera and Mazak, 2017), or find it important for reasons that will be explained later (Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009; Nordin, et al 2013).

The purposes of code-switching

In previous research, as explained previously, authors such as Poplack (1998), Macaro (1997) and Mitchell (1988) have distinguished between different types and functions of code-switching within the EFL classroom settings that could help both the instructors and their students in their learning or teaching methods: first, code-switching allows information given by the teachers to be more understandable for the learners. It also helps learners unwind in a learning environment that might become too intense for them. Skiba (1997) supports the arguments put forward by the previous authors by stating that code-switching enables the learners transmit the information to the receivers in a more effective way since it is given in the native language. Consequently, numerous research studies contend that the use of code-switching can be a valuable strategy in English language teaching and learning process that could be used by instructors to help learners in their learning process in general. Regarding the functions of code-switching in classrooms, as mentioned before, the main argument given by teachers as well as scientists in favor of this phenomenon is that it facilitates the students' understanding as well as the transmission of information.

According to Caukill (2015) and Wardaugh (2010), teachers use code-switching for both pedagogical and social purposes, mainly because it is a means of communication that can facilitate interactions between students and them. However, the question of to what extent and for what purposes this phenomenon is used in classrooms has not been satisfactorily answered since they are not numerous. Furthermore, as most studies were conducted in reading comprehension contexts, all contexts of teaching and learning could not be taken into account and could probably distort the overall result of the research question. Thus, the aim of this paper is to try to acknowledge the pedagogical practices of teachers who perform code-switching in EFL classrooms and analyze it in order to find trends that could become relevant to answering the main question of this work.

The amount of CS use in classrooms

In previous investigations on the use of L1 versus L2 in foreign language classrooms, researchers such as Krashen (1982), Ellis (1984) and Chaudron (1988) have insisted on the fact that the teachers must provide a high quantity and quality of foreign language input, adding that, in order to ensure this, the frequency of L2 use should be maximized in the classroom. However, as mentioned above, this issue divides opinions.

Studies have quantified the frequency of use of the phenomenon in foreign language classes: Guthrie (1987) looked at teachers' speech in university French classes and Wing (1987) at secondary Spanish classes. Of the three studies mentioned above, only one in three teachers never used English in their classes. It should be noted, however, that the Guthrie (1987) and Wing (1987) studies have limitations. They were conducted in relatively homogeneous groups, where either English or Spanish was used consistently.

According to some studies of language choice used by foreign language teachers, the amount of target language use is a major determinant of the quality of the language environment in the classroom (Guthrie, 1987; Mitchell and Johnstone, 1986; Mitchell et al., 1981; Turnbull, 1999; Wing, 1987). Chaudron (1988) adds that "in the typical foreign language classroom, the common belief is that the fullest competence in the TL [target language] is achieved by means of the teacher providing a rich TL environment, in which not only instruction and drill are executed in the TL, but also disciplinary and management operations." (p.1) The main argument for proponents of the 'monolingual principle' turns out to be that, for the majority of learners, the classroom is the only place where they can be exposed to their target language. Indeed, Hawkins (1987: 97-98) compares language teaching to 'gardening in the gale' - the teacher plants seeds that get blown away between lessons. It is therefore essential to maximize exposure to the target language during lessons. Turnbull and Arnett (2002) evaluated several early studies that demonstrated an association between students' L2 learning results and the quantity of L2 utilized by teachers. Several academics have cited these findings as support for maximizing teachers' use of L2 in the classroom (Turnbull, 2001).

L1 vs L2

There is near unanimity that instructors should seek to make the most of the TL (Cook, 1991; Turnbull, 2001; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). Some studies also raise the possibility of some issue with overuse of the L1. Additionally, it has been claimed that instructors' use of the L1 might be a result of their limited L2 competence or a method to fix L2 communication failures, and that in these situations, some teachers may be less conscious of how, when, and how often they employed the L1 (e.g. Polio & Duff, 1994). In fact, it has been argued that in the lack of conclusive study findings, teachers may arbitrarily choose to utilize L1 (e.g., Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009). As a result, there has been a request for further empirical research to look for a proper L1/L2 use ratio and to look into how and why the L1 should be utilized in the

classroom (e.g., Hall & Cook, 2012; Macaro, 2009), but also to call for a balanced use of the L1 (Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). It has been argued that since the main learning objective for learners is to acquire communicative skills in the L2, it should thus be used as the language of real communication in the classroom (Richards & Rogers, 2001). Using learners' L1 for comprehension concerns or to communicate more easily with each other could prevent learners from engaging in authentic L2 communication if they were to face 'real' circumstances outside the classroom, for instance on holiday or while visiting another country. This would handicap them enormously. From this viewpoint, the use of L1 prevents the authenticity that learners could have by using their L2 alone, and so teachers who use L1 with their students contribute to this. In summary, the main argument of academics who oppose the use of L1 in the classroom is that it hinders the natural acquisition of L2 since it interferes with students' concentration on learning the language. They believe that learners do not need to understand every word that the teacher says, and that resorting to the first language can undermine the learning process. Advocates of this approach argue that teaching entirely in the target language provides a more genuine language experience, allows learners to face unexpected situations, and fosters the development of their innate language abilities. They say that although there may be some rules for the use of L1 in the classroom, using it unavoidably decreases exposure to the L2. Cook (1991) also supports this position. However, some scholars argue that, on the contrary, the use of L1 can be beneficial in learning a L2. To take up the concept of real communication and authenticity mentioned earlier, Butzkamm (2003) thinks otherwise; according to him, this authenticity and real communication clashes with the exclusion of L1. It is with the use of L1 in the classroom that communication can be built. If teachers abandon L1, this could jeopardise this communication, which would then be broken between teacher and student. Translation is one of the main reasons for using L1 in the classroom, indeed, although criticized, it is a valuable language learning strategy. Not only does it allow students to gain a better understanding but also to be able to compare aspects of the two languages. Cook (2010) calls for a reconsideration of this important teaching tool.

Since this paper refers to situations in which the teacher and students have their native language in common - it excludes situations in which the teachers are native speakers of a certain country who travel abroad to teach their first language, students' exposure to their L2 outside of the school context remains diminished, so the only opportunity to improve and learn a language properly is based on maximum use of the target language by teachers. Turnbull (2001, 532) supports this argument by stating that 'the teacher is most often the sole linguistic

model for the students and is, therefore, their main source of TL input'. Thus, teachers obviously play a very important role, -not only in the teaching of a language but also in the representation they may have in the learning of that TL. In this regard, Littlewood (1981, 45) states that "many learners are likely to remain unconvinced by our attempts to make them accept the foreign language as an effective means of satisfying their communicative needs, if we abandon it ourselves as soon as such needs arise in the immediate classroom situation". This argument further supports the fact that teachers should therefore maximize students' exposure to the target language and use their native language only as a last resort, for specific purposes that will be mentioned a little later. Students need to "think" in their target language and avoid interference with their first language, and this can only happen if the target language and L1 are kept as separate as possible. Most of the articles analyzed here support the idea that incorporating the use of the native language (L1) into the educational program in a thoughtful and purposeful manner is advisable. It is recommended to reconsider the way L1 is utilized and to promote effective use of L1 in order to optimize second language (L2) acquisition in the classroom.

Initially, research on bilingualism focused on how people spoke and behaved in bilingual communities (Milroy & Muysken, 1995; Romaine, 1989). Later, researchers began looking at how bilingual people interacted in classrooms (Martin-Jones, 1995). Milk (1990) and Merritt (1992) used a sociolinguistic approach to study how people choose what language to use and what language values they want to transmit. Researchers such as Roberts and Ellis (1987) also realized that the social context in which people learn a language influences their ability to acquire and use it. In a social interactionist perspective, language learning is closely tied to social interaction, this dimension is also shown in Vygotsky's "proximal zone of development" (1962), which refers to the gap between what a person can and cannot do with language, based on whether they have access to someone more fluent in that language.

Informal vs formal language learning

As this paper will only tackle studies carried out in the context of formal language learning, it is best to know the difference between formal and informal language learning. Formal and informal language learning are two different ways of language learning, each with its own characteristics and advantages. Formal language learning takes place in a structured setting, such as a classroom, with a teacher following a curriculum or syllabus. Informal language learning, on the other hand, can take place anywhere, such as in daily interactions

with people, through media, or in social contexts (Ellis, 2006). The focus in formal language learning is on explicit instruction, grammar rules, and academic language. In contrast, informal language learning emphasizes more on communication, real-life language use, and vocabulary acquisition (Nation, 2001; Schmitt, 2010). When it comes to the methodology, formal language learning usually involves a more systematic and structured approach, where students work through a set of prescribed materials, follow a sequence of lessons, and receive feedback from their teacher whereas informal language learning can be more flexible, spontaneous, and self-directed, with learners choosing the topics they want to focus on and learning through exposure to authentic language use (Nunan, 2003; Benson & Voller, 2014). Assessment usually focuses on testing students' knowledge of grammar and vocabulary in formal language learning but may be less formal and more focused on testing learners' communicative abilities in informal language learning (Fulcher, 2010; Bachman, 2010). Ultimately, the goal of formal language learning is often to achieve a certain level of proficiency, such as passing an exam while informal language learning is often led by the learner's personal goals, such as improving their ability to communicate with friends, family, or colleagues. Overall, formal language learning and informal language learning can both be effective ways to acquire a new language. Choosing one over the other may depend on the learner's goals, resources, and preferences (Dörnyei, 2009; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2013).

Tian and Macaro (2012, 367) state: “whether the lexical information provided to learners is more effective in L1 or L2 has been under-researched and, moreover, has only been investigated in a reading comprehension context”. Although little research has been done on the use of L1 and L2 in foreign language classrooms, it is necessary to mention that there is no consensus on the teacher's choice of language during lessons or on its teaching method. In most European countries, teachers are free to perform code-switching during their lectures.

Despite the dominance of the monolingual principle for a century, as reviewed above, there has been a growing interest in recent years in the pedagogical benefits of L2 on foreign language learning and teaching. Opinions have gradually shifted from a total exclusion of L1 to a recognition of the positive consequences that this approach could bring, including, as explained by Littlewood & Yu (2009), “direct influence (e.g. being used in a teaching method or facilitating students' L2 lexical acquisition), and implicit influence (e.g. creating enjoyable classroom environment or facilitating classroom management).” (Chen, 2019).

In short, what can be seen is that scientists and EFL classroom teachers are calling for further empirical studies that could address the lack of research on why and how teachers use code-switching in their classrooms, and that is what this paper will aim to address: the degree and functions of CS use in the EFL classroom.

Research aim and research questions

This section contains the details of this research project, including the collection of data and their analysis, and their relevance to the research questions posed down below. This research adopts a more descriptive and qualitative character, bringing together data from several studies tackling code-switching in classrooms conducted by different researchers such as Shin et al. (2009), Macaro (2001), Moore (2002), Hobbs et al. (2010), Raschka et al. (2009), Üstünel (2016), Littlewood & Yu (2011), Duff & Polio (1990), Kim et al. (2005), Jingxia (2010), Zainil et al. (2021), Morata (2012) and Fachriyah (2017). The descriptive qualitative approach is more often used in language learning studies. The aim of this approach is to describe and characterize a phenomenon, in this case the use of code-switching. Since the research done covers primarily reading comprehension contexts, a fist of honor is put on covering all learning or teaching contexts.

For this purpose, data from research on the use of code-switching was collected through scientific sources such as Research Gate and Google Scholar for instance. Each source deals with the phenomenon in student-teacher interaction that occurs during the learning and teaching phase of the course, first describing the occurrence of code-switching in classrooms and then analyzing it with data, statistics and numbers from studies tackling code-switching that were conducted by researchers such as the ones mentioned before. Statistics all come from essays relevant to the purpose of this research.

Based on the problem mentioned above, the two main research questions are raised as follows:

1. To what extent is code-switching used in classrooms?
2. For what purposes do teachers and students resort to code-switching?

Methodology

A thorough literature review was conducted to identify relevant articles on the topic of code-switching, L1 and L2 learning, and classroom teaching. The search terms used were “code-switching” AND “L1” AND “L2” AND “classrooms” OR “teaching” AND “languages”

OR “foreign language” OR “foreign language learning” OR “second language acquisition” OR “EFL” OR “applied linguistics” and articles were searched on Google Scholar, Crossref, and Scopus. Articles (*cf. Table 2*) were first identified from the literature search. Thirty articles were then screened based on their availability as open-access publications and duplicate articles were removed. After this, articles were screened based on their relevance to the research question and meeting the inclusion criteria. Articles that focused on code-switching in non-classroom settings, articles that did not report empirical data, or articles written in languages other than English were removed. Additionally, articles that reported on code-switching in the wrong settings or patient population were also removed. This resulted in 22 articles that were included in the review. Data was extracted from the selected articles using a data extraction form. The form included the following fields: author, year of publication, study design, sample size, language(s) used for code-switching, age range of participants, and key findings related to the effects of code-switching on L1 and L2 learning in classrooms. In the end, 13 studies were kept as part of this paper.

Search terms

TITLE-ABS-KEY (“code-switching” AND “L1” AND “L2” AND “classrooms” OR “teaching” AND “languages” OR “foreign language” OR “foreign language learning” OR “second language acquisition” OR “EFL” OR “applied linguistics”).

Findings

In order to answer the questions posed above, the results of thirteen articles were collected and explained in this section. The first four subheadings of this section will tackle the first research question entitled: "What is the extent of code-switching use in the classroom? The next three subheadings will address the second research question called "What are the functions of code-switching in the classroom?".

Research Question 1: What is the extent of code-switching use in classrooms? *The extent of the L1 use in classrooms*

According to Littlewood & Yu (2011), Turnbull (2002), among others, analyzed the proportion of target language and L1 use in four foreign language classrooms in Canada and found that the use of L1, which is English, ranged from 28 to 76%. Studies carried out by Duff and Polio (1990), Levine (2003), Macaro (2001), Morata and Coyle (2012) showed results according to which teachers’ use of the foreign language in their classes is not linear. For

instance, for the purpose of their study, Duff and Polio (1990) analyzed the language behaviors of thirteen native-speaker teachers of foreign languages at the University of California. It turned out that their use of the foreign language ranged from ten to 100 percent, although six of them tended to use it ninety percent of the time during the lesson. However, the amount of code-switching use varied widely, with Duff & Polio (1990) showing two extremes in their study: teachers' use of the TL was as low as ten percent and as high as one hundred percent. Kim and Elder (2005) conducted the same study but in schools in New Zealand; the seven teachers surveyed were either native speakers of Japanese, German, French or Korean, they found that the teachers varied in the amount of the target language and first language they used. Some teachers used the TL between 23% and 88% of the time, while others used it less frequently. Similarly, according to Morata et al. (2012), some teachers used the L1 between 10% and 66% of the time, depending on the teacher. However, the study found that the teachers did not use the TL to its full potential in terms of both quantity and quality. This limited the potential for student learning and meaningful communication. However, Liu et al (2004) reversed the two languages and found that in lessons with thirteen English teachers whose L1 was Korean, the use of the L1 ranged from 10 to 90%. With Duff and Polio's found (1990) of the same percentage of L2 use, going even further to 100%, the variability made it difficult to draw any general conclusions about the use of FL in FL classrooms in this particular context. Despite some classes having very low L2 use, it was encouraging to see that six out of thirteen teachers used L2 90% or more of the time. The mean and median use of L2 by teachers was 67.9% and 79%, respectively. However, the study identified the wide variability in L2 use among teachers as the most surprising finding. In contrast to the findings of Duff and Polio's (1990) study, which found similar levels of L1 use in only two out of thirteen teachers' speeches, the percentages of L1 use reported in Morata (2012) are notably high. The two teachers identified by Duff and Polio (1990) used L1 in class for 69% and 90% of the time, which are comparable to the figures found in this study. Kim and Elder's (2005) study showed that the greatest levels of L1 use were observed in two Korean L1 teachers, who used their L1 63% and 66% of the time, respectively. However, even these percentages are lower than those reported in Morata's study (2012). In general, the average percentage of L1 use is 40% but given the nature of the data collected which was usually audio recordings, an average of 68% would be more appropriate given their day-to-day practice. These results are in line with the conclusion made by Macaro (1997) in his study on the same subject found in Littlewood & Yu's article (2011): "exclusive or near-exclusive use of the TL 'is rarely encountered in any learning context apart from [classrooms with mixed L1 learners].'" Teachers are thus the

primary instigators of the almost exclusive use of the target language, but some, as shown above, allow themselves to use L1 often.

Duff and Polio (1990), Morata (2012) and Macaro (2001) found that some teachers were not very conscious of how much and when they used English in the classroom, which caused inconsistencies in the use of the target language and L1. This finding is consistent with that of Jingxia (2010). Some teachers, who thought they only used the TL and encouraged students to speak it, would sometimes switch to the L1 for assistance. This lack of awareness among teachers further contributed to the variations in TL/L1 use in the classroom. A teacher in Morata's article (2012) who used lots of translations technique in her classroom and who lacked awareness regarding this matter explains that the teacher's reasons for using translations were linked to her concern that new vocabulary or language structures introduced without an L1 translation could make students feel insecure and unable to keep up with the class (Morata, 2012). Zainil et al. (2021) join Morata in this regard: teachers seemed to get conscious of their use of CS only when they switched to L1 in order to clarify some points of grammar or new difficult words. However, the analysis of the lesson transcripts revealed that even simple sentences were constantly translated into the L1, and no new structures or vocabulary were introduced in the observed lessons, which mainly focused on revision for an upcoming test. This topic will be discussed in the next few sections.

In regards of teacher's proficiency though, Fachriyah (2007) states that in order to ensure effective learning, it is important for English teachers to be fluent in English when teaching students. However, consistent with Duff and Polio's (1990) and Macaro's (2001) study, Hobbs et al. (2010) did not find a link between the teacher's proficiency and the amount of CS in the classroom when comparing less and more experienced teachers. Both teachers and students often switch or mix languages during the teaching and learning process, even at advanced levels, for various purposes and goals. Speaking of fluency, Hobbs et al. (2010) found that both native and non-native speaker teachers use code-switching in their teaching practice, but they do so in different ways. Native-speaker teachers tend to use code-switching more frequently than non-native-speaker teachers, and they are more likely to use it for communicative purposes, such as checking understanding or clarifying meaning. Non-native speaker teachers, on the other hand, tend to use code-switching less frequently, and when they do use it, it is often for pedagogical purposes, such as introducing new vocabulary or grammar structures. This finding is consistent with that of Zainil et al. (2021). When it comes to teachers' proficiency and native and non-native teachers, however, Duff and Polio (1990) ruled out the

role of teachers' English proficiency in influencing the amount of L2 used in their classes. They provided evidence that proficiency in English did not necessarily lead to more or less use of the L2. For instance, the Language-C teacher, who was bilingual in English and the L2, used the L2 96% of the time, while the Language-A teacher, who was enrolled in an ESL course during the quarter he was observed, used the L2 a lot. On the other hand, the Language-M teacher, who was a fluent speaker of English, used the L2 less because he was worried about his non-American accent being understood by students. Therefore, the authors concluded that perceived or real proficiency in English did not significantly influence teachers' use of the L2 in their classes. However, the teachers in Zainil et al. (2021) beg to differ: according to their study, the lack of English proficiency of the teachers is one of the main reasons of the CS use. Morata (2012) argues that code-switching, despite being familiar among bilinguals, does not appear to serve a clear pedagogical aim in the classroom. Given that students are aware that most target language input will be immediately translated into the first language, they may quickly realize that there is little need to exert effort to comprehend the teacher's TL discourse. This could potentially explain their difficulties in understanding when directly addressed in the TL and create a reliance on the teacher's code-switching to confirm comprehension.

When it comes to students' proficiency level, Macaro (2001), Duff and Polio (1990) and Üstünel (2016) argue that it can influence teachers' decision to codeswitch. This finding is consistent with that of Jingxia (2010). For example, if students are struggling to understand a particular concept or language structure in the target language, teachers may codeswitch to the students' native language to clarify meaning and facilitate comprehension. Similarly, if students are more proficient in their native language than in the target language, teachers may codeswitch to help them better understand the content being taught (Macaro, 2001, Üstünel, 2016). In this regard, Morata (2012) explains that after analyzing the most common pedagogical functions used by the teacher and the language she used for each function, his study concludes that the teacher mainly relies on the students' native language as the main language of communication in her English as a EFL classroom. However, Macaro's study (2001) demonstrated that there was no particular link found between the use of code-switching by teachers and the amount of L1 or L2 use by the students, even though little code switching was observed in classrooms analyzed in this said study, but it has also shown that after a certain amount of L1 use by the teachers, students started to use it too, which could have an effect on the language learning ultimately. Hobbs et al. (2010) agree with that idea, adding that this creates what is called a "reciprocal reinforcing effect." Their findings suggest that this effect

may occur within the teacher, as their own use of the TL can prompt them to continue using it. Macaro (2001) also found that there was no link between the language proficiency of the students and the amount use of L1 by the teachers, which shows that many factors play a role in the teachers' decision of using codeswitching in classrooms.

L1 vs L2 use

Despite the debate that is still going on and the emergence of studies targeting the issue of efficacy versus language exposure, Shin et al's article (2009) demonstrated that some scientists defend the use of the L1, such as Butzkamm. He has been a strong advocate for the value of L1 for years, but as Turnbull and Cook (2001), still in the article mentioned above, point out, "messages which support using the L1 are often accompanied by a warning that if we 'license' the use of the L1 in the foreign language classroom by taking away positive pressures to use the TL, this might 'lead to an overuse of the L1 by many teachers'", Butzkamm (2003) points out that the purpose of using L1 is more to help establish it as a means of communication in the classroom, not to 'take away time from the TL'. In this regard, Jingxia (2010) argue that the overuse of L1 might lead to the non-optimization of the learning time and affect the students' learning. For example, they might see their mistakes as standard forms of the language they learn. Macaro (2001) precises that Harbord (1992), in the middle of the debate, is the one who stands for the importance of a humanistic approach, meaning that while L1 use can be beneficial, overuse could slow down the development of learning, as agree Zainil et al. (2021). On this topic, Littlewood and Yu (2011) state that code-switching disadvantages and displaces the target language, which leads to a more unfavorable learning process. In this regard, as Macaro (2001) points out, most of them, except for a small group of girls, admitted that the use of L1 by the teachers made it easier to understand and that they could not learn properly if they did not understand their teachers. Scientists such as Macaro (2001) and Littlewood & Yu (2009) advocate for the need of a monolingual principle. As Macaro (2001: 537) declared: "after a certain threshold of teacher L1 use, there is a rise in learners' L1 use with possible effects on learning". In fact, he (2001) categorizes the different scholars' view into three principles:

1. exclusive TL use
2. opposition towards an exclusive TL use
3. somewhere in-between

The first principle for foreign language classrooms, based on Krashen's (1981) proposal, involves using comprehensive input and the natural order of acquisition. Researchers in group (1) support using only the target language (TL) to provide input to students, while those in group (2) suggest using some of the students' native language to avoid cognitive and processing difficulties and to develop code-switching skills. Finally, group (3) argues that a balanced use of L1 is important, as long as it doesn't hinder the students' exposure to TL input.

In Duff and Polio's study (1990), two main approaches to using the L2 in the classroom were identified: either it is introduced and used from the first day of class, or both the L1 and L2 are used at the beginning and English is phased out over time. The study found that teachers whose department preferred the first approach tended to use more of the L2, and it was harder for teachers to eliminate English use once it had become established in the classroom. They also explain that teachers do know that they should use the L1 but they also gave several reasons as to why they do not use the L1: "First, the FL classroom is different from the second language classroom in that the students in the former are "linguistically and culturally deprived" (Duff and Polio, 1990, 161). Second, they state that L2 is so different from English that the students would be confused if he spoke only the TL. In French class, he said, it would be much easier to conduct the entire class in the target language. And third, the teacher said that the students want to learn the material for the exams. Because the teaching assistants are given considerable material to cover for the exams, he would not be able to get through it all if he spoke only the TL."

Out of the research analyzed between 2011 and 2018 by Shin et al. (2019), 53% investigated the scope and influence of the native language (L1), and all of them validated the existence of L1 usage, supporting the finding of Hall and Cook (2012). Littlewood & Yu (2011) explain that in a study conducted by Mitchell (1988, 28), it seems that "it appears that this is an issue about which methodologists have succeeded in inducing a sense of guilt in teachers, if nothing else; almost a third of this sample seemed almost to feel they were making an admission of unprofessional conduct, in "confessing" to low levels of FL use." They all explain, as do Kim (2002, 2008), Jeon (2008) and Kang (2008) in Littlewood & Yu's article (2011), that the constraints that lead teachers to use L1 despite this feeling of guilt include the pressure of exams, the size of the class but also the level of language proficiency of their students, which also results in a lack of confidence in their own proficiency of their target language. These factors are what Meiring and Norman (2022, 32) call "the comforting effect"

and "psychological reassurance" that "learners receive from being able to relate learning to the familiar mother tongue" (Littlewood & Yu, 2011). Therefore, this institutional policy of 'L2-only' discussed in the last section could be a constraint to the teacher's both personal and professional behavior (Skinner, cited in Arthur 1996; Cook 2001; Macaro 2001), that is why exclusive use of L2 is unreachable and impossible because the maximal position could lead to teachers' inadequacy and guilt (Macaro, 2001).

When it comes to learning a foreign language, if there are few chances outside the classroom to hear and use the language being learned, then it's believed that the amount and quality of exposure to the language that learners get is essential, even though it may not be enough on its own for them to learn the language. Therefore, because the students do not have enough exposure to the L2, they will not understand him if he speaks only the L2 (Duff and Polio, 1990; Zainil et al., 2021). They assert that teachers should maximize the amount of L1 input because the L2 classroom is frequently seen as the primary resource for L2 input for students, and also limit their use of L1 and CS between languages, particularly in the foreign language context where students have few opportunities to be exposed to the L2 outside of the classroom.

Several studies also indicate that a teacher's exclusive use of the second language in the classroom may have the unintended consequence of reducing students' cognitive and verbal engagement (Shin et al., 2009). This could occur due to the teacher's inability to explain concepts effectively in L2, given students' varying levels of L2 proficiency. Macaro (2001) supports this idea. The findings of Macaro and Lee's (2013) study suggest that students with limited language knowledge may experience cognitive overload when teachers use L2 exclusively without pausing or providing explanations. Consequently, such students may struggle to comprehend the teacher's speech, leading to disengagement, misunderstanding, etc. Üstünel (2016) agrees with that finding. These studies show that too much L2 input is the most critical factor in improving L2 learning, highlighting the need for a more nuanced approach (Shin et al., 2009). Moore (2002) argues that when people interact with each other in a language that is not their first language, they may need to repeat or clarify their understanding of each other's meanings. In educational settings, teachers and students may simplify or adapt their language and conversation style to ensure that everyone can participate and communicate effectively. Teachers play a crucial role in supporting students to develop their language skills and understand how to use language appropriately in various situations. This can be

challenging for students, but teachers are dedicated to helping them and making the learning process more manageable.

The effectiveness of L1 on L2 and the techniques

Shin et al. (2009) explain that, concerning the efficacy, according to several studies, including Giannikas (2011), Hlas (2016), Lin (2012), and Liu and Zeng (2015), some teachers and students expressed favorable views about the use of L1 as an effective means of learning L2, particularly within the constraints of limited lesson time. However, three studies, including Giannikas (2011), Izquierdo et al. (2016), and Thompson and Harrison (2014), also appearing in Shin et al.'s study (2009), warn that using L1 extensively may prevent students from being exposed to the L2 and restrict their ability to use it, especially when referring to texts in a textbook, which may result in limited and inauthentic L2 development. Üstünel (2016) agrees with that. Speaking of authenticity, Jingxia (2010) argues that exclusively teaching in the L2 makes it more authentic and gives learners the chance to encounter unpredictability, and enhances their innate language system. In this regard, Macaro (2001) also found that this L2-exclusivity debate has produced varied viewpoints: for example, he explains that Guthrie (1984) expressed doubts about whether teaching in L2 only would lead to more effective learning and that Skinner (1985) supported that in some way, saying learners could struggle connecting with concepts already established in the first language. However, some others experts, as he said in his article (2009), including himself (e.g., Atkinson, 1993; G. Chambers, 1992; Coste, 1998; Macaro, 1995, 1996, 1997; Simon, 1998) have argued that excluding L1 in classrooms is detrimental to learning and would deprive students of an important language learning tool. According to them, especially Macaro (2001), teaching exclusively in L2 may become the dominant approach and overshadow other pedagogical techniques. Jingxia (2010) also cites a scientist, Cook, who thinks that allowing students to use their native language is a humanistic approach because it enables them to express themselves more freely and accurately.

However, even though scientists argue about which language to use in classrooms (Macaro, 2001), one important thing is that experts in the field have emphasized the importance of using both languages in the classroom to improve language awareness and help students learn better (Coste, 1994a; Coste, 2000; Coste & Pasquier, 1992; Gajo & Serra, 1999). This switching between languages can help students develop their metalinguistic awareness and how it works but also increases their ability to separate words from concepts. That is exactly what

Moore (2002) explains: the foundation of the teaching and learning experience is rooted in the practice of language alternation, which involves using two languages in a back-and-forth manner. The fundamental idea is that alternating between the two languages helps to reinforce the awareness that words do not have a fixed relationship with objects and concepts, and it is necessary to be able to separate words from their meanings. By using both languages for communication, language alternation can enhance metalinguistic awareness, which refers to one's understanding of how language works. Research, as stated by Macaro (2001), has shown that using both languages during the language learning process can be beneficial for learners, especially in the early stages of language development. This is because it helps learners develop metalinguistic awareness, as said previously, and increases their ability to separate words from concepts. Using only one language consistently could potentially lead to the same level of precision and accuracy. Code-switching can reorganize conceptual development to integrate new data and combine semantic features that are not available in one language or the other. Therefore, code-switching can directly impact the development of concepts, particularly when there are no semantically congruent equivalents available. Each code-switch highlights a different stage in the construction of meaning, and each stage represents a qualitatively different and superior form of knowledge construction. Code-switching also includes a feedback mechanism that sheds light on the functioning of both the first language (L1) and second language (L2), indicating the potential for learning, integration, differentiation, and growth in complexity and flexibility. Consequently, code-switching can be considered a part of an adaptation process. Nonetheless, Shin et al. (2009) insist that, when it comes to exposure, many informal online learning methods, including social media and language apps, have challenged the notion that the classroom is the sole source of L2 learning. They say that, according to Sawin (2018), these methods allow students to access a broad range of content, which meets their diverse needs and increases their motivation for L2 learning, leading to the development of more authentic L2 competence.

The debate between effectiveness vs. exposure cannot be happening without mentioning translation, which is the main representative form of L1 use, as Shin et al. (2009) say. Although overreliance on translation is typically discouraged, they showed in their study (2009) that recent research (Khan 2016; Khresheh 2012; Sampson 2011; Tian and Macaro 2012) has highlighted its advantages such as assisting students in identifying the accurate meanings of L2 vocabulary, texts, and grammar while enhancing cultural awareness and comprehension. Shin et al. (2009) say that several studies support the intentional use of

translation techniques in L2 learning (Källkvist 2013; Kelly and Bruen 2015; Kim 2011; Scheffler 2013). For example, in a study carried out by Kelly and Bruen (2015), as explained thoroughly in Shin et al.'s study (2009), students worked on active translation activities, which enabled them to concentrate more on L2, allowing them to learn a more authentic form of L2. Instead of asking for translations, teachers asked questions such as “what would this book be called if he was published In English?” (Kelly and Bruen 2015, 13). Such questions encourage students to consider the cultural, pragmatic, and grammatical aspects of target sentences and expressions, rather than simply translating word-for-word (Shin et al., 2009). Moreover, the latter stated that Källkvist (2013) observed higher attention and participation when using written translation tasks with high- to advanced-level proficiency Swedish learners of English. These translation tasks increased student-initiated referential questions about prepositions and vocabulary, leading them to be more focused on vocabulary than the L2 grammar structures. The study suggests that translation exercises and other ones involving less difficult vocabulary and expressions can help learners concentrate on grammar and sentence structure. These findings coming from Källkvist's study (2013), which can be retrieved in Shin et al.'s article (2009), challenge the notion that translation is harmful to L2 learning, and instead, should be considered a beneficial tool. In the said article, several studies have investigated how vocabulary is learned incidentally through listening (Tian and Macaro, 2012) and reading (Dabaghi and Rafiee, 2012; Khan, 2016; Lee and Macaro, 2013; Samian, Foo, and Mohebbi, 2016; Zhao and Macaro, 2016). All of the studies, except for one by Ha (2017), compared L1 translation and L2-only explanation. Concluding, most all of the studies, except for Vosoughi (2012), found that L2 students benefit more from being provided with L1 translations than L2-only explanations, especially when it comes to learning concrete and abstract words (Zhao and Macaro, 2016), free active vocabulary (Asiyaban and Bagheri, 2012), productive vocabulary knowledge (Dabaghi and Rafiee, 2012), and lexical phrases (Ha, 2017). Vosoughi's study (2012), which is distinct from the other studies that were reviewed in Shin et al.'s article (2009), as it focused more on the extent to which learners participated in acquiring lexical knowledge, rather than just comparing the effectiveness of L1 and L2 explanations under similar conditions, highlights the importance of a more in-depth approach to word processing that emphasizes student-centered practice and increased exposure to L2 reading texts.

Nevertheless, despite this difference, most of the studies reviewed in the article (Shin et al., 2009) suggest that using L1 can have a positive impact on students' recall and retention of vocabulary. Also, according to Macaro's study (2001), Kobayashi and Rinnert (1992) and

Freidlander (1990) showed some benefits when it comes to thinking in the L1 as far as writing exercises are concerned, Anton and DiCamilla (1998) supported that saying that students used L1 during this type of exercises in order to externalize their inner thoughts, while Kern's (1994) study including reading ones showed that L1 use helped reduce memory constraints and think about familiar structures when learners come across unfamiliar ones so they do not lose the meaning of them. Macaro (2001, 532) adds: "Storage, processing, and retrieval of language is actually facilitated by (the teacher's) revealing to the students similarities between the L1 and the L2 as suggested by the findings of Campbell (1997) and those of Butzkamm (1998) retrieved in Macaro's article (2001), especially in near-cognate languages", even though some scientists such as Hermans, Bongaerts, de Bot, and Schreuder (1998) questioned whether the L1 activation should be suppressed when students are facing retrieval tasks.

In Shin et al.'s article (2009), two studies explored the link between the use of the first language (L1) in grammar instruction and its effect on second language (L2) learning outcomes. The first study, conducted by Viakinnou-Brinson et al. (2012), compared the effectiveness of an L2-only group to a combined L1-L2 group in improving grammar skills through multiple-choice grammar testing. The results showed that the L2-only group made more significant gains in grammar skills than the combined L1-L2 group. The authors suggest that the reliance on translation and less activation of L2 processing may be the cause of the combined group's low-level performance. In contrast, the other study by McManus and Marsden (2017) examined the impact of L1 instruction on L2 French grammar learning outcomes and the researchers observed that providing extra instruction in L1 resulted in an enhanced comprehension of L2 French grammar among the students. Therefore, the effectiveness of using L1 in grammar instruction was investigated in both studies with conflicting results. Still according to Shin et al. (2009), Viakinnou-Brinson et al. (2012) found that using only L2 in grammar instruction may be more effective, whereas McManus and Marsden (2017) suggest that combining L1 and L2 in instruction can be useful for enhancing L2 grammar understanding and processing. When it comes to writing proficiency, L1-L2 translation and L2 writing were compared by Lo (2006), students showed much better lexical and grammatical usage in the former. While lexical improvements were observed more frequently, improvements in grammar were also observed. Overall, the majority of studies reviewed in Shin et al.'s article (2009). showed positive results for L1 use in foreign language learning tasks, except for two studies (Viakinnou-Brinson et al. 2012; Vosoughi 2012) which had conflicting results Therefore, Shin et al. (2009) suggest that teachers can use translation as

a teaching tool for second language instruction. They can provide L2 input in various forms such as repetitions and paraphrasing, before offering L1 translations at the final stage of explanation. Zainil et al. (2021) state that this technique is productive and time-saving. This approach can help students enhance critical thinking skills and develop speaking skills. Additionally, they declare that results favor the use of translation from the beginning of a lesson when it comes to vocabulary explanations (Shin et al., 2009). For grammar instruction, teachers should give explanations exclusively in L2 with examples. They should also encourage peer work that allows the use of L1 (Viakinnou-Brinson et al., 2012; Thompson & Harrison, 2014). Concluding, translanguaging should be allowed in class, it increases students' understanding and helps them use their own repertoire in order to improve their L2 skills. Moore (2002) joins Shin et al. on this statement: having two words in their bilingual vocabulary enables learners to evoke two mental images that correspond to two types of knowledge. These images can either overlap or not. Each image brings a new perspective and highlights particular characteristics, which contributes to developing a more detailed and subtle understanding. Having a bilingual repertoire allows students to elaborate on knowledge from different levels of understanding and information. They can connect new linguistic and conceptual material with what they already know, and acknowledge its limitations when presented with additional or distinct meanings in a different language.

In Macaro's study (2001), scientists such as Gearon (1998), Cain, Briane, and Morgan (1998) expressed concerns about how to regulate the extent of L1 usage once it has been considered acceptable in the classroom. Littlewood and Yu (2009), aware of this importance of balance between L1 and TL use in classrooms, as Macaro (2001) is, then suggested a framework of principles to guide the integration of the L1 into the second language classroom without endangering the primary status of the TL. This framework is based on two distinctions previously made in the literature. They can overlap but can also serve as a base for teachers in developing a framework for balanced L1 and TL use. First: "Kim & Elder (2005) distinguish between 'core goals' (teaching the target language) and 'framework goals' (managing the classroom situation) as a basis for analyzing teachers' use of the L1 and TL. Then, Pennington (1995) distinguishes between teachers' 'compensatory use' of the L1 (responding to a perceived problem) and 'strategic use' (serving a pedagogical purpose)" (Littlewood and Yu, 2009, 186).

- When it comes to 'core goals', which focus on specific techniques to help learners internalize, comprehend, and produce the TL, there are a plethora of potentially beneficial teaching strategies that intentionally use the L1 as a technique for learning but that, particularly in light of the 'monolingual principle' and during the 'communicative revolution,' have been often overlooked. Some activities have been proposed by Littlewood and Yu (2009) in their article, which aim to integrate L1 into the classroom for certain purposes. For instance, the sandwich approach, introduced by Butzkamm (2003) and Dodson (1972) in the said article, which consists of the presentation of each new utterance in the sequence TL – L1 – TL, can be a really effective means of clarifying the meanings of words, structures, or utterances, and thus allowing pupils to move more swiftly to the more critical stages of active usage and internalization. By comparing the TL and the L1, learners can understand better by making links between new structures, utterances or words and familiar ones, while also increasing students' general language awareness, and see their confidence boosted. Jingxia (2010, 18) found in her study that students used code-switching “to make comparison between two languages and cultures” or “to translate difficult sentences.”
- When it comes to the practical stage, an important component of the 'bilingual technique' found by Dodson (1972) (and developed further in Butzkamm 2003; Butzkamm & Caldwell 2009) is the “drill-like use of L1 stimuli to elicit equivalent target structures, that equivalence lies at the levels of meanings instead of the word itself, meanings are implanted into the learner's cognitive system and re-expressed through TL” (Littlewood & Yu, 2009, 469). This principle also underpins the use of translation as a teaching method, which should be more widely used since, as Munro (1999, 7) explains in Littlewood & Yu's study (2009): "The L1 stimulus 'makes demands on the learner's meaning system and creates a need for this to be extended and enlarged.'" This translation technique can obviously not only benefit the learner's comprehension but also compensate for shortcomings that may exist in monolingual activities, during which some students avoid using complex communication strategies since they can replace them with easier and more familiar ones, as said Seedhouse (1999) in the same study. However, Jingxia (2010) explains that several teaching methods advocate for not using the first language in the classroom. For instance, the Direct Method, which has been in use since the 19th century, requires the exclusive use of the target language in the language classroom, including for exercises and teacher talk used for classroom management. This method has a fundamental rule: no translation is permitted. Polio and Duff (2010) also talk about this method in their study, which does not

allow the use of L1. Similarly, the Audio-Lingual Method is an oral-based approach that utilizes only the target language in the classroom and not the students' native language. This is because using the students' mother tongue may interfere with their ability to master the target language.

- Finally, during the production stage, teachers may plan activities in which students begin with scenarios of L1 use and these serve as input or stimuli for TL use, for example, brainstorming in L1 and then writing the ideas in the TL or interviewing classmates in L1 and then write portraits of them in TL, etc. L1 usage is envisaged as a basis for strategies that systematically use its potential as a learning aid in the activities outlined above. In other situations, the L1 may be utilized arbitrarily to cope with communication challenges, such as when the teacher tries to explain new structures or meanings as could be seen above in the presentation stage. Yet, there is no apparent distinction between planned strategic usage and ad hoc L1 use. The teacher will try to match the skills of his or her students and will adapt this to the needs of the students. This finding is consistent with that of Morata (2012) and Üstünel (2016). Duff and Polio (1990) go on by saying that, as teachers gain confidence and students gain experience in their TL, it is possible that the amount of L1 use will also decrease.
- As far as framework goals are concerned, meaning creating the affective and material conditions for learning, these serve to create meaningful communicative contexts. It has been shown in several studies that L1 has a comforting aspect for learners, they feel more confident, and it is the affective aspect that makes L1 score higher. As mentioned before, teachers not only model themselves on the needs and abilities of their students but also on which language they feel most comfortable using, and as these increase, teachers will use the TL as a natural means of communication, not forgetting the 'safety' and 'reassurance' of the L1 and its importance in learning a TL. In the case of compensatory use, the focus is more on the pragmatic aspects that help in the management of the classroom in general, be it the instructions given to students, the discipline or even the learning contexts (Littlewood & Yu, 2009; Jingxia, 2010). Again, even on these managerial aspects, teachers' views differ, as Mitchell reports in one of his studies (1988, 31): “A few had effectively dismissed the possibility of using the FL for managerial purposes as a time-wasting intrusion into the “real work”; a few were committed to making it the communicative norm and were confident that the pupils could cope and that they would benefit.” It is true that natural communicative instincts force humans to make things easier for themselves by preferring to avoid confusion or save time, so they tend to resort more easily to L1, and so do teachers,

especially if there is no cooperation between them and the students, there needs to be a mutual effort to understand each other. Macaro (2001) suggests that using L1 is quicker than exclusively using the TL, which aligns with the four teachers' view in his study that code-switching is necessary to save time due to limited EFL classroom time. The teachers argue that incorporating L1 in EFL classrooms is essential because it is more efficient and time-saving.

- Finally, communication strategies are important as they allow teachers to anticipate difficulties when planning a lesson. These strategies and the way teachers use them are crucial for good communication in the TL, but so is the nature of the task and the message conveyed. These strategies are numerous. Mitchell (1988, 148) found in classroom observations retrieved in Littlewood & Yu's study (2009) that some teachers sometimes used a wider repertoire of strategies to get a particular message across, for example, repetition, explaining a word in simpler terms or using synonyms.

Several learning techniques exist today, but a key strategy that is recommended by Littlewood and Yu (2009) would be in classroom contexts where L1 is heavily used and the teacher is trying to gradually introduce TL, to use L1 for tasks that are familiar to the students so that they understand what is expected of them, and even more so if they are already familiar with the content through a previous exposure as Lee said (2007), or to use TL only if the task requires a simple TL. Littlewood & Yu (2009) explain that Kim (2008, 68) supports this argument by recommending that teachers introduce the TETE policy "to explore 'which types of tasks call for easy English' in order to 'gradually introduce teachers to the use of English in their classes.'" In conclusion, establishing TL as the primary means of communication requires commitment and consistency on the part of the teacher. "The L1 can be 'the single biggest danger' in the foreign language classroom (Atkinson 1993, 13) if it threatens the primacy of the TL or 'the most important ally a foreign language can have' if it is used 'systematically, selectively and in judicious doses' (Butzkamm 2003, 30, 36)" (Littlewood & Yu 2009). Even Butzkamm, who is an ardent admirer and defender of the use of L1 and its role, as said by the latter two scientists, sees his proposals as a means to "temper 'the tough day-to-day battle that teachers have to endure in trying to establish an FL atmosphere among their pupils'" (Butzkamm 2003, 32).

According to Macaro (2001), sociocultural studies have demonstrated that translanguaging is a natural process based on the native speakers of L1's language repertoire

and the social interaction of two languages through which they use their L1 as a means to develop their L2 proficiency and confidence (García and Lin 2017; Otheguy, García, and Reid 2018; Wei 2018; Conteh, 2018). In Macaro's study (2001), DiCamilla and Antón (2012) showed that first-year students of Spanish used their L1, which was English, as a safety net in order to construct content, help with language difficulties, and create relationships with classmates, while fourth-year students used L2, which was Spanish, as a mediating tool for the same functions mentioned previously. The authors, he said, argue that beginners and students with a high level of proficiency often rely on their L1, but the latter use it in order to verbalize their thoughts when they are facing challenging issues. Translanguaging is also employed as a teaching technique that encourages bilingual individuals to make use of their complete language repertoire to facilitate the learning of a second language. The practice is based on the idea that allowing students to freely use their first language can enhance their proficiency in the second language (García and Kleyn, 2016; Wei, 2018). Lin (2012) conducted a study on the co-use of both L1 and L2 in teachers' guidance of game play, which showed that translanguaging can be an effective method. However, Adinolfi and Astruc (2017) highlight that the use of translanguaging in pedagogy is not yet fully developed or systematically established. They suggest that current discussions focus mostly on the languages used in instruction, rather than the specific learning goals of the lesson. Both studies appear in Macaro's article (2001). To conclude, the majority of recent research shows that using one's native language (L1) is a common tendency in foreign language (FL) classrooms at various levels. Moreover, there is growing proof that using L1 intentionally and wisely can aid in acquiring the second language (L2). To improve students' ability to communicate, it is necessary to have a better grasp of translanguaging, which involves using L1 to aid in L2 learning. Based on this comprehension, strategies for translanguaging should be promoted and cultivated (Macaro, 2001).

The attitudes of teachers and students towards CS

The article written by Shin et al. (2009) show that a significant proportion of research has focused on exploring the attitudes and opinions of both teachers and students, with more emphasis on learners' perspectives. In particular, they say that these studies, carried out by Liu and Zeng (2015), Tsagari and Diakou (2015) and Yao (2011), have revealed that a majority of teachers and students agree that the use of the first language can be beneficial in second language learning. Duff and Polio (2010) say that most students were satisfied with the amount

of CS in their class, while teachers had varied attitudes and opinions. The findings of several studies support this claim, including a study by Chiou (2014) which surveyed 966 Taiwanese college students across different proficiency levels. The results showed that all groups of students would rather use L1, and the group with the lowest L2 proficiency demonstrated the strongest preference for this approach. Similarly, Macaro and Lee (2013) found that both adults and children acknowledged the usefulness of L1 in foreign language (FL) classrooms, although the adults were more comfortable with L2-only instruction due to their greater experience and proficiency in language learning. In this regard, Hobbs et al. (2010) carried out a study about native speaker teachers and non-native speaker teachers and found out both native and non-native speaker teachers have positive attitudes towards CS, and they believe that it can be a useful tool for teaching and learning. However, there are some differences in the reasons for these positive attitudes. Native speaker teachers tend to view code-switching as a natural and authentic part of language use, and they believe that it can help students develop their listening and comprehension skills. Non-native speaker teachers, on the other hand, view code-switching as a strategic tool for managing the classroom and helping students understand new concepts. According to Jingxia (2010), most teachers (80%) and students (66%) have a cheerful outlook about teachers' CS. This finding is consistent with that of Macaro (1997). Üstünel (2016) states that teachers' attitudes towards CS can influence their use of it in the classrooms. Indeed, teachers who have positive attitudes towards it are more likely to use it in a positive and effective manner.

Shin et al. (2009) wrote a review which aims to provide specific guidelines and practices for the judicious use of L1 in support of L2 learning. It includes 55 studies, most of which support the use of L1 in teaching L2. However, there are six studies (Giannikas 2011; Hlas 2016; Izquierdo et al. 2016; Thompson and Harrison 2014; Viakinnou-Brinson et al. 2012; Vosoughi 2012) in the said article (Shin et al., 2009) that demonstrate explicitly negative attitudes towards the use of L1 or had negative outcomes. To be able to provide recommendations for the judicious use of L1 in L2 learning, it is necessary to have a comprehensive understanding of how L1 use affects learning, meaning that it is also necessary to consider the realistic, relational, and situational aspects of L1 use. It implies that realistic aspects acknowledge that L1 is naturally used in group discussions for example, and even if students follow a no-L1 policy, they may still utilize L1 as an invisible tool for language learning by activating their prior knowledge. Overall, these studies suggest that L1 can play a valuable role in L2 learning, and that both teachers and students recognize its importance.

However, scientists such as Macaro (2001) do not agree with that idea. Some have negative attitudes towards the expansion of codeswitching, particularly targeting teachers. Macaro (2001) even provides a detailed list of arguments and counterarguments for CS and describes a range of attitudes towards teacher CS.

Research Question 2: "What are the functions of code-switching in the classroom?"

The functions of the use of code switching

As seen previously and reinforced by Raschka (2009), the majority of CS used by teachers in classrooms has specific purposes and is used solely for instructional purposes, as Macaro (2001) strongly argue as well, and joined by Moore (2002) in her article adding that cognitive and linguistic processes, as well as classroom interactions are influenced by code-switching. She demonstrates that the use of the L1 plays an essential role in structuring classroom discourse and facilitating the learning process. In her article (Raschka, 2009), she reports the findings on the multiple roles of the native language (L1) in language education (Hall and Cook (2012): L1 can be utilized in teaching, such as providing translations, defining new vocabulary (which is the main feature according to Jingxia (2010)), clarifying grammatical structures, answering students' inquiries, and correcting errors made by students (e.g., Cheng 2013; Moghadam, Samad, and Shahraki 2012; Mohebbi and Alavi 2014; Mora Pablo et al. 2011; Nakatsukasa and Loewen 2015). Littlewood & Yu (2011) also show that, according to Mitchell (1988), like Macaro (1997), Jingxia (2010), Duff & Polio (1990) Liu et al (2004) Üstünel (2016), teachers use L1 to establish constructive social relationships, explain grammar and discipline, but also to maintain some control over the classroom environment and ensure their learners' understanding if they encounter difficulties with complex meanings. Determining whether to use the first language or the second language for grammar instruction is a pragmatic issue. According to Polio and Duff (1990) and Jingxia (2010), many teachers are reluctant to teach grammar using the target language due to factors such as time constraints, exams that emphasize grammar knowledge, and concerns about putting undue stress on students. Moreover, Raschka (2009) adds that L1 can be employed in classroom management and discipline, such as explaining tasks, homework assignments, giving directions for exams, and discussing procedures (Gauci and Camilleri Grima 2013; Izquierdo et al. 2016; Nukuto 2017). Duff and Polio (1990) also found out that teachers tended to use L1 for classroom management and grammar teaching. Indeed, these previous scientists mentioned in the article

used reasons for CS use previously identified by Flyman-Mattsson and Burenhult (1999, 61) and analyzed and adapted them in their study. Seven explanations could be cited:

1. linguistic insecurity, such as instructors' difficulties in linking new concepts (also mentioned by Merritt et al. 1992, 112-3);
2. topic switch, when the teacher changes the code based on the topic being discussed;
3. affective functions, such as spontaneous emotional expression and emotional comprehension in conversation with learners;
4. socializing functions, when instructors use their students' first language to show friendliness and solidarity (also briefly covered in Merritt et al. 1992, 108-9);
5. repetitive functions when teachers deliver the same material in both languages for clarity;
6. metalinguistic function, in which activities are completed in the target language but comments, assessment, and discussion of the task can occur in the first language; and
7. classroom management (and/or questions), in which teachers negotiate the evolution of classroom activities in the students' native language.

According to Fachriyah (2017), the functions cited above are similar than the one found by Reyes (2004, p. 84) but he added other ones. In total, these exclude: (1) speech representation, (2) imitate quotation, (3) turn accommodation, (4) topic shift, (5) situation switch, (6) insistence, (7) giving an emphasis, (8) clarification or persuasion, (9) persons specification, (10) question shift, and (11) as a discourse maker. Based on her study (2017), she found precise functions of code-switching in classrooms between the teacher and the students with some already cited above. Jingxia (2010) and Morata (2012) join her and cites the exact same functions in her study. These turned out to be:

1. clarification, the primary purpose of the first function is to ensure clarity in communication, and both the teacher and students participate in it. The objective is to avoid any misunderstandings that may happen when trying to understand the English language. This can be done through clarification or confirmation of explanations, information, questions, or statements. The teacher uses code switching to confirm or clarify her message, and the teacher in Fachriyah's study (2017) resorts to using Indonesian to clarify her previous English conversations as an example of this function.
2. reiteration or repetition, when using code switching for this purpose, the teacher repeats a sentence or phrase in Indonesian, in Fachriyah's case (2017) to align the meanings

of the two languages (Indonesian and English) and help the students understand the words or phrases better.

3. explanation, the third purpose of code switching is to explain or redirect. During interactions with students, the teacher may need to provide additional explanation for certain lessons, and to do so, the teacher may use code switching to explain the earlier information given in L2 by providing an explanation in L1 beforehand. This helps the students better understand the content and clarify any confusion.

4. asking, during interactions between the teacher and students, if a student asks a question in L1 instead of L2, the teacher may use code switching to respond to the question in Indonesian and ask another question back. This helps facilitate effective communication and ensures that both the teacher and student are on the same page.

5. translation, when speakers feel that a statement or question needs to be translated for better understanding, they may use code switching from L2 to L1. This is important to avoid misunderstandings and ensure effective communication.

6. checking for understanding, in Fachriyah's case (2017), the teacher may use code switching from English to Indonesian (or vice versa) to review previously taught material and check for the students' understanding. This helps the teacher gauge the level of comprehension among the students and determine whether additional instruction or clarification is needed.

7. emphasizing of a language element, the teacher may have needed to emphasize certain linguistic elements related to the L2 teaching materials and used code-switching to ensure that the students understood them clearly. This was done to prevent any misunderstandings and ensure that everyone had the same understanding of the material. It is possible that the linguistic elements were theoretical and complex, which is why the teacher felt the need to use code-switching to explain them in Indonesian, making it easier for the students to comprehend, in Fachriyah's study (2017).

8. making inferences, in Fachriyah's case (2017), the teacher used basic English codes to explain the materials. However, when concluding the lessons, she used code-switching into Indonesian to emphasize or make conclusions.

9. developing vocabulary, during discussions about vocabulary, the teacher and students may use code-switching to interpret or translate words into their first language, allowing for better comprehension and vocabulary development.

10. class discussions of student' tasks, the teacher may use code-switching into L1 to discuss assignments with her students and ensure that they fully understand the instructions. Similarly, students may use code-switching for clarification and to ensure that they have correctly grasped the instructions.

11. giving feedback, code-switching was important here to assess the students' understanding of the material and determine which parts needed improvement. This allowed the teacher and students to fully engage in feedback discussions and ensure that everyone had a clear understanding.

12. aiding memorization, the teacher frequently reminded students about materials, tasks, rules, or roles that they may have forgotten or overlooked, and often used code-switching in these conversations.

13. class management, as cited before by Raschka (2009), in the classroom in Fachriyah's study (2017), there were some activities that did not require knowledge transfer as their main objective, but rather aimed to support classroom management during learning. In such situations and interactions, the teacher and students often switched to L1 because they felt that the condition or situation was not related to the transfer of knowledge.

14. entertainment and general communications, In the study (2017), it was observed that the lecturer and students used code switching for purposes such as alleviating boredom, reducing tension, or simply getting to know each other better in the educational setting. On some occasions, they even made jokes with each other, and when doing so, they felt more comfortable using Indonesian. This suggests that code switching can serve a social function in the classroom, allowing for a more relaxed and enjoyable learning environment.

Hobbs et al. (2010) also investigated the functions of code-switching in classrooms, and they found that these were quite similar than all the others mentioned above. In fact, only a few of them were added by these scientists. In total, these include:

1. opening of the lesson
2. warm-up (i.e., formulaic questions and answers, generally in L2 and not particularly linked to the lesson itself)
3. instructions
- 4.. explanation
5. checking comprehension
6. translation

7. timekeeping (time managing for each activity)
8. praise (i.e., 'very good')
9. elicitation
10. answering students' questions
11. correction
12. giving objectives
13. closing of the lesson

Duff and Polio (1990) also identified these uses of L1, except that they added some other ones. In total, these include (1) classroom administrative vocabulary, (2) grammar instruction, (3) classroom management, (4) showing empathy/solidarity, (5) unknown vocabulary/translation, (6) practicing English (students helping teachers improve their non-native English), (7) lack of comprehension by the students, and (8) an interactive effect involving students' use of English. Zainil et al. (2021) argue that according to the teachers, CS serves two main purposes: pedagogical and affective. Pedagogical reasons include using it to teach grammar, explaining new vocabulary through translation, checking students' comprehension, emphasizing certain points in the lesson, and clarifying the lesson's objective. Affective reasons include accommodating students with limited English proficiency, saving time, reprimanding students, and maintaining the lesson's flow. Linguistically speaking, other pedagogical functions were identified by Morata (2012) and Kim and Elder (2005):

1. Model/Correct/Scaffold, the model/correct/scaffold function involves the teacher modeling or correcting the use of code-switching to guide students in its appropriate use.
2. Directive, directive function involves instructing students on when and how to use code-switching.
3. Accept, accept function involves the teacher accepting the use of code-switching when it is appropriately used.
4. Marker, marker function involves signaling a shift in language or code.
5. Meta statement, the Meta statement function involves discussing and reflecting on code-switching practices and its role in communication.

These functions can help in facilitating effective communication in multilingual settings where code-switching is common. They can also help language teachers in guiding their students in the appropriate use of code-switching in order to improve their language proficiency and

intercultural competence. Kim and Elder (2005) found in their study that among the seven teachers analyzed, the functions of Directives and Model/Correct/Scaffold were also consistently among the top functions, as in Morata's article (2012). The functions of Accept and Markers also appeared frequently in the analyzed sessions.

Duff and Polio (1990) and Jingxia (2010), as well as Macaro (2001), Jingxia (2010) and other ones agree with the fact that "code-switching serves basic functions which may be beneficial in foreign language learning environments" (2010, 18). A number of teachers were concerned that their students would not understand important information, such as exam details and key grammar concepts, if they only used the target language (L2) in class. However, there are ways to modify the use of L2 to improve student comprehension. These methods include repeating information, speaking more slowly, paraphrasing, simplifying the syntax and vocabulary, and using common phrases and routines that are frequently used in the classroom. In fact, it may be helpful to explicitly teach these phrases and routines from the start (Duff and Polio, 1990). Speaking of environments, Raschka et al. (2009) have found that these codeswitching functions interact in complex ways in an educational context, so a codeswitch can have one or more functions at a time, although sometimes identifying one type of function is not always possible. Some of the categorization difficulties include the influence of the location of the codeswitch on its function, the duration of the codeswitching, the dual function of translation as a metalinguistic function and a sub-function of repetitions, the encroachment of classroom management on the topic switch, the function of questioning that has been placed in the classroom management category, and finally the possibility that one speaker may be influenced by another to use the CS. When it comes to translation, as thoroughly discussed in the few sections above, Jingxia (2010) explains that, for many years, teachers have faced the challenge of conveying the new meanings of a foreign or second language to their students but translating foreign language meanings could be an effective method to help students feel more at ease in an English as a foreign language classroom, even though Duff and Polio (1990) say teachers should moderate their L2-L1 translation and thus help contextualize verbal material by using visuals.

Teachers do not always engage in CS consciously, as stated before, which means that the instructor is unlikely to be aware of the motives, functions, and effects of CS (cf. Sert 2005). Whatever the case may be, CS has the fundamental underlying goal of aiming to benefit instructors, students, and the teaching learning environment. Yet, when looking at the overall

number of CS functions used in the language classroom, many types appear to be surprisingly significantly less common, such as classroom management/questions, repetitions, emotional and linguistic uncertainty. In fact, in Hobbs et al.'s study (2010), the teacher used L1 with her students most of the time, reserving the TL use for new lesson content and formulaic expressions like opening and closing statements and praise. The study (2010) revealed that although the teachers desired to use more TL, issues with timekeeping and classroom management made it "impossible" and "unnecessary." In this regard, Moore (2002) states that whether language has an impact on a learner depends on how much attention they pay to it at a particular time. There are many reasons why a student might not notice or understand language, such as emotional factors, and it can be difficult for the teacher to know when this is happening. However, when the teacher or student switches to using the student's first language, it often catches their attention and leads to more feedback and conversation in both languages. This can help the student better understand the language data and improve their language skills. Jingxia (2010) also found that students used CS to express their state of mind (jokes, teacher's emotion), or to create a humorous atmosphere in order to reduce the stress that they could have. In the study conducted by Raschka et al. (2009), two cram schools (education providers created by the Taiwanese government whose purpose is to prepare their students for specific examinations) were studied. Two classes from two schools were selected: one, class A is taught by a woman with seven years of experience, school A supports better learning through the learner's L1 and promotes intensive listening to English, allowing to benefit from conversational speaking skills over grammar; class B is taught by a man with 10 years of experience, school B proclaims itself predominantly English speaking. Classroom observations and comprehensive interviews with teachers and students were conducted over a two-week period, as well as the recording of classroom interactions in each of the schools which were transcribed. In class A, there was a basic oral vocabulary practice exercise at the beginning of the lesson; students were asked to recall where they left off in the previous class, so classroom management appears not to be didactic at this point; in this class session, there were 288 examples of codeswitching noted in the transcribed data. The teacher uses CS to mark a 'frame shift' (see Lin 1996) by emphasizing the socialization sequence using L2, thus she manages to maintain the pleasant and non-threatening atmosphere she created at the beginning by engaging with her students when they had to explain where they left off in the previous class but also when she interacted with her students by telling about her vacation, even though she did so while using the L1. Her purpose is to build closeness, solidarity, and relationships with her students. This finding is consistent that of Duff and Polio (1990), Zainil et al. (2021) and

Jingxia (2010). This method is actually quite common in Malta since, according to a study by Camilleri (1996), joined by Bruen and Kelly (2014), Rabbidge and Chappell (2014) and Tzagari and Diakou (2015), also reported in Raschka's study (2009), teachers often use L1 to establish rapport with their students by offering praise, comfort, jokes, and encouragement. Hobbs et al. (2010) and Morata (2012) confirm this. Morata (2012) found that teachers make extensive use of L1 for a range of purposes, including giving task instructions, providing metalinguistic and metacognitive explanations, referring to future classroom events, addressing inappropriate behavior, and praising students. One might argue that this reliance on L1 deprives learners of essential linguistic and organizational input that could help them better understand the L2. However, the teacher explains that her decision to use L1 is based on her belief that it helps students feel more confident by ensuring they fully comprehend the classroom content. According to the teacher, students feel lost when she speaks in English, but using L1 helps them feel more in control. These explanations are somewhat consistent with the findings of Macaro's (2001) study, which identified two primary functions for student teachers' use of L1: giving instructions for activities and managing students' behavior. In their study, Hobbs et al. (2010) also found out that, when comparing native speaker and non-native speaker teachers, non-native speakers tended to praise their students in the L2 more frequently than the native ones. When the teacher starts with the content of the lesson, she tends to change her language according to the topic and this was often the case when she was about to talk about grammar and lexicon, whether to give instructions, explanations, this is a finding shared by Sert (2005) in her study. However, in this case, this CS acts as a metalinguistic switch. Sert goes on to say that even if we do not know if this switch is voluntary or not, it still manages to help the transition between known and unknown content, so its purpose is to transfer new material and meanings. Cole (1998) adds, for his part, that the purpose of this change, in addition to helping this transition mentioned above, allows for digging into the learners' L1 learning experience in order to help the understanding of potential new L2 content (Jingxia, 2010; Raschka et al., 2009). Moore (2002) agrees with that statement, she says that if languages are sequenced strategically in content areas, it can lead to improved learning outcomes and higher levels of conceptual development, in addition to linguistic development in both languages. Therefore, Jingxia (2010), Moore (2002) and Raschka et al. (2009) all suggest that on a smaller scale, the exposure to two languages through code-switching can reinforce, enhance, and refine the development and elaboration of new concepts. In conclusion for the class A, not only does the teacher use L1 to engage with her student, she also uses it to give metalinguistic comments and to highlight topic shifts by switching languages, which is, as said previously, what the cram

school stands for. “The L1 is increasingly being used not only for engagement but also as a teaching tool, with the classroom appearing to be a community of social practice. Therefore, it appears that CS tactics occur in predictable patterns based on the nature of the classroom engagement and the level of the lesson” (Raschka et al. 2009, 68). In class B, the teacher does not ask students to recall the previous lesson, but does attempt to engage with students with a warming-up oral practice exercise based on conversations from a textbook. The rest of the session followed the same pattern throughout the course: the students were given individual exercises from the textbook in which new linguistic structures were introduced, these were assimilated through repetition. There were 432 instances of codeswitching in the transcript. The teacher of class B taught from the textbook throughout the session and used a lot of codewitching when he used it, i.e. approximately 50%, except when he read the texts in English, and even in this process he used L1 with his students. He used L1 to correct some pronunciation errors and help clarify some vocabulary words, but also to elicit answers that the students had to give in L1 as well. Teachers in Morata’ study (2012) also use the target language to prompt students, either by displaying questions or through TL utterances that serve as prompts for translation. Üstünel (2016) and Macaro (2001) argue, in this regard, that CS might indeed be used to promote student participation. Additionally, the TL is used to correct students’ incorrect responses, with the teacher offering TL corrections in the form of a repetition or rewording of the student’s original utterance (Üstünel, 2016; Macaro, 2001). In this regard, in Moore’s study (2002), a teacher also used code-switching as a corrective function. This type of switching between languages is common in classroom discussions and serves to correct mistakes. It also serves a dual purpose: it confirms that the student and teacher have understood each other in terms of meaning, and that the student has answered the question correctly and it emphasizes the importance of using the second language in the classroom, even when there are mistakes.

In general, it can be seen that the teacher in Class B from Raschka et al. (2009) made greater use of two functions of CS: the metalinguistic function (in order to explain some new structures) and classroom management/questions (i.e. to encourage students to talk). Raschka et al. (2009) conclude by saying that there is clear evidence of a gradual shift in the functions used. The metalinguistic function remains more predominant in this case and peaked twice: the highest when the teacher introduced new language content and the lowest when the students had to orally practice this new content at the word and sentence level. Students’ language use is highly dependent on that of their teachers, so if they use L1, learners tend to follow suit.

When looking at the case of classes A and B, the level of CS is particularly high, with similar degrees of frequency, regardless of their approach to language teaching and learning. In this study (Raschka 2009), CS is not caused by instructors' lack of English language proficiency. Their use of CS, however, is strategic, showing a high level of general communication competence since they were both able to transition between languages to achieve the expected outcomes in terms of socialization, topic switching, classroom management, and metalinguistic functioning. Though Moore (2002) suggests that using L1 as a way to solve problems during language learning can be effective for communication, and may also help with learning the L2, depending on the context and the teacher's approach. Some L1 switches can slow down the conversation because they require negotiation to resolve the issue, while others can facilitate conversation by emphasizing the bilingual nature of the exchange. However, these repairs are often delayed and not negotiated, which can make it difficult to balance both content and form in the conversation. This makes it challenging for students to develop communication skills and proficiency in the foreign language. Yet, we discovered that not only was CS employed to indicate diverse purposes, but it also varied temporally within the discourse of each of the classrooms examined (Raschka et al. 2009).

The factors influencing L1 and L2 use

Around one-third of the studies analyzed by Shin et al. (2009) explored the factors that affect language choice in classrooms. The primary categories of factors that determine the use of L1 in classrooms were found to be:

1. individual student-teacher factors;
2. classroom factors;
3. institutional factors.

Firstly we are going to tackle the first category. The studies revealed that two factors significantly influence the selection of the language used as a medium of learning by individual students. These factors are the student's L2 proficiency and age (Shin et al., 2009). While L2 proficiency may seem to be a significant determinant of the quantity and functional use of L1, as stated McMillan and Rivers (2011), as well as Momenian and Sama (2011) in Shin et al's article (2009), studies carried out Ketabi, Ghavamnia, and Rezazadeh (2012) and Lin and Yu (2015) reported that higher-level students used more L1, while others found the opposite to be true, and some reported no significant difference in the frequency of L1 use. Jingxia (2010)

explains in her study that a very significant factor of code-switching was the students' proficiency. Higher-proficiency students tended to use L1 as a tool for thought, leading to more paraphrasing and restating, and to use more L1 when paired with lower-proficiency peers than with similar-proficiency level peers, while lower-proficiency ones were found to use word-to-word translations. The "distance" between languages is deemed to be another important factor that affects the use of code-switching, along with pedagogical materials, lesson content and objectives, the English proficiency of teachers, their attitudes toward using L2, traditional teaching methods, testing systems, and situational factors, could also come together to influence the actual practice of code-switching (Jingxia, 2010; Duff and Polio, 1990). Duff and Polio (1990) discussed how differences between the L2 and English can affect the amount of L2 used in the classroom. Six teachers mentioned that the languages they taught were too different from English to use only the L2 in class. Other teachers mentioned that grammatical terms in the L2 were significantly different from English, making it difficult for students to understand. Additionally, some of the languages with low L2 use had writing systems different from English. On the other hand, some teachers found it easy to teach grammar in the TL because many of the grammatical terms were cognates with English. The lesson objective alone does not determine the amount of L2 use in the classroom. However, the tasks and instructional means used to achieve the objective have an impact on the use of L2 by teachers. In this regard, six of the thirteen classes observed by Duff and Polio (1990) had as their teaching objective the grammar of comparative forms, yet L2 use across these classes varied considerably. Some teachers believed that English was a more effective medium for introducing important grammar points, but they tried to use the L2 more for follow-up drills and tasks. On the other hand, other teachers believed that they could explain the same grammatical point adequately using the L2. As stated earlier, the language chosen for classroom instruction, both on behalf of teachers or learners, can also depend on the age of the students. Shin et al. (2009) reported a study from Tsagari and Diakou (2015) analyzed 96 secondary students in Cyprus and found that younger students received more instruction in L1 from their teacher compared to older students, and that the instructors were unaware of this pattern in their teaching method. On the other hand, a study by Rabbidge and Chappell (2014) appearing in Shin et al.'s article (2009) in elementary schools found that students in higher grade levels required more L1 explanations from their teachers to comprehend class procedures before engaging in advanced activities. The authors Kim and Elder (2005) suggest that the teachers' language choices were influenced by their past teaching experiences. This finding is consistent with that of Morata (2012) and Duff and Polio (1990), who add that previous training, theoretical convictions as factors in favour of FL while

those against it complained about time limitations, students' lack of understanding and the departmental policies.

In regards of the second category, according to Shin et al. (2009), teachers' inadequate L2 skills can be a significant factor in L1 use (Hlas 2016; Khresheh 2012; Lin 2012). Khresheh (2012, 5) also conducted a study in Saudi Arabia that appears in the said article and found that college teachers' use of L1 (Arabic) "was motivated by a desire to avoid making grammar mistakes and to prevent themselves from feeling embarrassed in front of their students". Additionally, according to the article mentioned before (Shin et al., 2009), Thompson and Harrison (2014, 5) discovered "that teacher-initiated language choices had a more substantial impact on students' language selection than those made by their peers". Regarding the last category, the article shows that Moore (2013) conducted a study in a Japanese university English classroom and found that L1, or the students' native language, which was Japanese, was used mainly for tasks that were familiar and less challenging, as well as for procedural talk. During collaborative talk between students, L1 Japanese was employed consistently, particularly for procedural and off-task talk. In the second oral performance task, there was an increase in L1 use due to task and partner familiarity. Furthermore, conflicts with partners also resulted in increased L1 use. In a separate study concerning teaching techniques, Moghadam, Samad, and Shahraki (2012) discovered that the use of English-Persian dictionaries, instead of English-English dictionaries, prompted students to use more L1 as a teaching tool (Shin et al., 2009).

Consideration of institutional factors is crucial when examining the choice of language in academic settings. These factors encompass a range of variables including time limitations, curriculum, policies, the type of institution, and university entrance exams. While there is limited empirical evidence to indicate the predominant role of any one institutional factor in language selection, it is important to recognize that these factors can collectively impact language use. Shin et al. (2009) explain that Yan et al. (2016) conducted a study that revealed a significant decrease in the use of L2 during classroom interactions among senior secondary students compared to their junior secondary counterparts. This could be attributed to the heightened focus of senior students on developing their L2 skills in preparation for college entrance exams. It was also observed that higher-ranking senior secondary schools were able to utilize L2 more frequently due to the availability of additional qualified teachers and better-prepared students. Institutional policies often advocate for the maximal or exclusive use of L2

in academic settings, either explicitly or implicitly. However, this approach can lead to conflicts between teachers and other stakeholders, as well as a one-way teaching method that disregards the opinions of students. According to Shin et al. (2009), Mora Pablo et al. (2011) argue that such policies create an unbalanced learning environment where teachers are the only ones delivering instruction in L2 and Jingxia (2010), along with Duff and Polio (1990) adds that these policies can also be a factor of the use of codes-switching.

In some cases, Shin et al. (2009) explain that individual teachers may choose to use their own judgment when selecting the language to use in their classroom, rather than following institutional policies. They provide the example of the study carried out by Tsagari and Diakou (2015) about three Greek teachers who used L1 instead of L2. However, the decision-making process of teachers regarding language selection is influenced by various internal factors such as their bilingualism, experiences, and classroom environment (Shin et al, 2009; Üstünel, 2016; Duff and Polio, 1990). For example, as Macaro's study (2001) showed, teachers use L1 to reprimand students or keep control of the classroom. Hobbs et al. (2010) found that exact thing in their study. However, in this Macaro's study (2001), sometimes, teachers are influenced by governmental agencies and let them override their personal beliefs. In this regard, Kim and Elder (2005) did not thoroughly explore the factors that restrict TL use, but it implies that the lesson type and the teachers' beliefs about language learning and TL use might affect their language choices. This is consistent with that of Üstünel (2016). Indeed, Hobbs et al. (2010) and Macaro (2001) emphasized the significance of teachers' beliefs in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and revealed that only 2 out of 10 instructors actually implemented the methods that CLT advocates, such as role-play. In contrast, the other teachers preferred more conventional approaches, like presenting grammar through teacher-led instruction. They (2010) go by saying that the teachers learning and cultural background had a significant influence on their teaching philosophy and approach, particularly in their limited use of the TL. As Duff and Polio (1990) explain, some teachers prefer to use more of the TL in class for various reasons, such as having received training or having theoretical convictions about its effectiveness. One teacher also believes that it is more challenging and enjoyable for students to be exposed to more of the TL.

In summary, the literature suggests that individual teacher factors such as their proficiency in the L2 language and their language choices can significantly influence L1 use

in classrooms. Teachers with inadequate L2 skills may rely on L1, and their language choices can also influence their students' language selection.

Policies about the use of code switching in classrooms

However, although at the level of national policies, this monolingual principle has been accepted and implemented in the regulations of several institutions in several countries, as for example in China, in Hong Kong precisely, where the current English Language Curriculum Guide (Primary 1 – 6) (Curriculum Development Council 2004, 109) urges teachers to create ‘a language-rich environment [which] incorporates, for example, the use of English in all English lessons and beyond: teachers should teach English through English and encourage learners to interact with one another in English’. This is not the only country. As Üstünel explains in his study (2016, 83): “some language schools in Turkey have a general policy of requiring teacher to speak English as the language of instruction to maximize learners’ contact with the TL. Zainil et al. (2021) explain that the same applies to Indonesia: the curriculum recommendation is to maximize the students’ exposure to L1. On the other hand, there is generally encouragement or at times teacher’s insistence rather than the pressure of official rules on learners who make their decisions about whether to use English or Turkish in EFL classes offered by private language schools. In this context, teacher code-switching is discouraged in the classroom unless learners are at a very low level such as A1.” The United Kingdom also advocates for a total exclusion of the use of L1 but has a gradual change in policy. Moreover, Littlewood & Yu (2011) state that according to Turnbull & Arnett (2002, 211) at the end of several studies in different countries, that 'there is near consensus that teachers should aim to make maximum use of the TL'. However, while no consensus is definitive in Belgium, our country, some have strict guidelines for language education regarding the use of L1. Some argue that L1 should be excluded because it can hinder the acquisition of a second language or send negative messages about the target language. For example, in England and Wales, the National Curriculum for Modern Foreign Languages suggests that the target language should be used for instruction and classroom management from the beginning. OFSTED, which inspects schools in England, also recommends that teachers use the target language for all aspects of a lesson (Macaro, 2001). Furthermore, OFSTED reports have found that when teachers use the target language more frequently in Attainment Target 2 (Speaking), students' performance improves. (Department of Education and Science, 1988, p. 12; Department of Education and Science, 1990, p. 58; OFSTED, 1993a:

section 37; OFSTED, 1993b, p. 5). The Ministry of Education (2000) continues to insist that the use of L2 is recommended and that the use of L1 remains for planned purposes such as raising language awareness and helping learning through comparisons between the TL and L1, ‘such as explaining or translating abstract English words and expressions, or special English structures.’ However, some government agencies, such as France for example, have a different position on the subject. Macaro (2001) explains that the ‘Ministère de l’Education Nationale’ (1993, p.11) states: “the learner must be "led gradually towards distancing himself/herself from the mother tongue” and “learning a foreign language implies a gradual awareness of the way that they function. This reflection on the language, including reflection on French (L1), contributes to the development of conceptual abilities and encourages autonomy of expression” (1996, p.15). Fachriyah (2017), in this regard, explains that English is mandatory in all school levels in Indonesia, even though it is considered a foreign language. According to TESOL (2008, p.1), the perception of English as a "foreign" language is decreasing, and it is increasingly viewed as an additional language that is essential to learn. This is because Indonesia's neighboring countries, major trading partners, and international organizations use English as the primary means of communication. Shin et al. (2009) explains that before the late 1800s, the teaching of second language (L2) primarily relied on the native language (L1), using a grammar-translation method that concentrated on written texts and grammatical analysis (Ghobadi and Ghasemi, 2015). Nonetheless, different approaches that focused on spoken L2 emerged, including the direct method, audiolingual method, natural approach, communicative approach, and task-based approach. Kim and Elder (2005) precise that task-based activities were found to be more effective in promoting rich TL input, but only if the teacher was willing and capable of using TL for these activities. These methods recommended using only L2 in the foreign language (FL) classroom, contradicting the long-standing tradition of L1 usage. More current approaches, like the communicative approach, highlight the importance of an authentic L2 environment that provides extensive input and output opportunities, effectively reducing the need for L1 (Bruen and Kelly, 2014; Ghobadi and Ghasemi, 2015). As a result, L1 has become less significant in modern language classes focused on practical communication but according to a literature review written by Hall and Cook's (2012) found in Macaro’s study (2001), there has been a gradual and deliberate shift since the 1990s towards reevaluating the use of the native language (L1) in language education. The review found that incorporating L1 in the classroom was a practical option and served a valuable purpose in various teaching functions.

Educational policy makers and people such as school principals are those in positions of institutional authority and these two groups of people tend to perceive CS in the classroom more as something negative and they even go so far as to talk about a form of behavior deficit. Raschka (2009) explains that this negative view is probably due to the expansion of the exclusive L2 principle, as well as the need to adhere to it, especially if the teachers work in English-speaking countries (cf. Levine, cited in Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2005, 234). The educational ideal, as these two groups of educational authorities emphasize, is to use this monolingual principle exclusively and place it as a model in EFL classrooms. They remain aware of the grade expansion of CS as a learning strategy but advise teachers to monitor it during their lessons (Fergusson 2003, 46). It is therefore certain that policymakers influence and almost create institutional pressures on teachers by asking them not to use L1 in the classroom, or at least to reduce it, as Macaro says (2001), but, according to Liu et al. (2000), reported by Macaro (2001) in his article, they do so just to promote fluency in order to compartmentalize languages in learners' brains and create a context of L1 acquisition type, but they are aware that this requirement of TL use may prevent natural and spontaneous communication, especially since there is no evidence that L1 increases learning efficiency. Overall, little attention has been made to the use of CS in EFL classrooms in the literature, although four major types of conflicts and tensions about it in pedagogical contexts tend to arise: institutions and educators, institutions and learners, educators and learners; and learners and learners. Raschka et al.'s study (2010) which will be explained a little later proves that the level of CS use is significant in classrooms even when official policies attempt to control it. This could be a potential source of conflict. In general, limits on CS appear to be 'managed' by a policy driven by external factors in many institutions. Many studies have shown that the 'English-only' principle is nearly unachievable in EFL classroom settings. When the actors in the classroom setting, such as teachers and learners, share the same L1, the possibility of this exclusive L1 use is lowered even further. "If institutions and teachers recognize that absolute immersion is not always in the best interests of teachers or students, then the onus is on them to demonstrate how CS can best serve the requirements of EFL classroom participants. Therefore, language policy can also play a significant role in shaping codeswitching practices in the classroom. In some contexts, codeswitching may be prohibited or discouraged, while in others it may be more acceptable. For example, in some countries, there may be official policies that promote the exclusive use of the target language in the classroom, while in others, codeswitching may be viewed as a legitimate pedagogical tool (Macaro, 2001, p. 192). We conclude that 'English-only' is a lazy rule in that it means that we do not have to think about

when and where CS is valid and useful and where and when it is pedagogically invalid and less than useful” (Raschka et al., 2010).

Conclusion

Code-switching is a widespread phenomenon that occurs when a speaker alternates between two or more languages within the same conversation. It is commonly observed in multilingual settings, where individuals have varying degrees of proficiency in multiple languages and is often seen as a natural and effective means of communication (Shin et al., 2009; Macaro, 2001).

The purpose of this thesis was to investigate the use of code-switching in classrooms and to identify the functions and the extent of its use. Based on the research conducted, it was found that code-switching is a common practice in many classrooms around the world. Teachers use code-switching extensively, whether consciously or unconsciously and regardless of their teaching experience or general profile (Moore, 2002; Hobbs et al., 2010). In particular, the study revealed that code-switching is used for a variety of functions, including, **inter alia**, facilitating comprehension, expressing identity, and building **relationships** with students (Raschka et al., 2009; Üstünel, 2016).

One of the key findings of this study was that the use of code-switching in the classroom is influenced by a number of factors, such as the linguistic backgrounds of teachers and students, the language policies of the **country or the school**, and the content being taught in lessons (Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Duff & Polio, 1990). This suggests that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to language education, and that educators must be mindful of the specific needs and backgrounds of each student when determining the appropriate use of code-switching in the classroom.

Another important finding of this study was the ongoing debate surrounding the use of L1 and L2 in the classroom. While some educators argue that the exclusive use of L2 can be beneficial for language acquisition, others believe that incorporating L1 can enhance students' understanding and motivation (Kim et al., 2005; Jingxia, 2010). The study suggests that a balanced approach, which takes into account the specific needs and backgrounds of each student, may be the most effective.

Overall, the findings of this study have important implications for language education policies and practices. By shedding light on the various factors that influence code-switching in classrooms, the study can help educators make informed decisions about language use and promote more inclusive and effective teaching practices. It also highlights the importance of promoting linguistic diversity and recognizing the value of multilingualism in education (Zainil et al., 2021; Morata, 2012; Fachriyah, 2017).

In conclusion, the use of code-switching in the classroom is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that is influenced by a range of factors. The findings of this study have provided valuable insights into the functions, policies, and attitudes associated with the use of code-switching in the classroom, and have highlighted the ongoing debate surrounding the use of L1 and L2 in language education. It is hoped that this study will contribute to a deeper understanding of the use of code-switching in classrooms and will help educators to create more inclusive and effective learning environments for all students, regardless of their linguistic backgrounds.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Suner Munoz, for his help and support throughout these past few months. His feedback has been significant in shaping my work.

I would also like to thank my partner who provided emotional support throughout the ups and downs of the writing process of this thesis.

I would like to acknowledge my friends. Their feedback and encouragement were also important.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the growth I experienced during this process. It would not have been possible without the opportunities that led me to this point.

References

- Adinolfi, L., & Astruc, L. (2017). An exploratory study of translanguaging practices in an online beginner-level foreign language classroom. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 7, 185 - 204.
- Ahmad, B., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' Code-Switching in Classroom Instructions for Low English Proficient Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2, 49-55.
- Anton, M., & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, 314-342.
- Arthur, J. (1996). Code-switching and collusion: Classroom interaction in Botswana primary schools. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(1): 17–33.
- Asiyaban, A. R., and M. S. Bagheri. (2012). Does Translation Contribute to Learners' Free Active Vocabulary? *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics* 16 (1): 111–121.
- Atkinson, D. (1993). Teaching in the target language: A problem in the current orthodoxy. *Language Learning Journal*, 8, 2-5.
- Auer, P. (1998). Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity. Routledge.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (2010). Language assessment in practice: Developing language assessments and justifying their use in the real world. Oxford University Press.
- Benson, P., & Voller, P. (Eds.). (2014). Autonomy and independence in language learning. Routledge.
- Bruen, J. & Kelly, N. (2014). Using a shared L1 to reduce cognitive overload and anxiety levels in the L2 classroom. *The Language Learning Journal*. 45. 1-14. 10.1080/09571736.2014.908405.
- Butzkamm, W. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: Death of a dogma. *Language Learning Journal* 28.1, 29–39.
- Butzkamm, W. & J. A. W. Caldwell (2009). The bilingual reform: A paradigm shift in foreign language teaching. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Cain, A., Briane, C., & Morgan, C. (1998). Rôle et limites de l'alternance dans l'acquisition de compétences linguistiques et culturelles en classe de langues [The role and limitations of codeswitching in the acquisition of linguistic and cultural competence in the language classroom]. *Etudes de Linguistique Appliquée*, 108, 485-494.
- Camilleri, A. (1996). Language values and identities: Code-switching and secondary classrooms in Malta. *Linguistics and Education*, 8: 85–103.
- Campbell, L. (1997). Non-concatenative morphology in Yimas: A case study of grammatical creativity. *Studies in Language*, 21(2), 375-423.
- Caukill, E. J. A. (2015). The influence of Bislama on lexical choices in children's written English: A case study in Vanuatu [Unpublished PhD thesis, Queensland University of Technology].
- Chambers, G. (1992). Teaching in the target language. *Language Learning Journal*, 6, 66-67.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, J. (2019). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring teacher practices and perceptions in the context of university English as a foreign language classrooms in China (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Bath.
- Cheng, T. (2013). Codeswitching and Participant Orientations in a Chinese as a Foreign Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 97 (4): 869–886. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12046.
- Chiou, B. (2014). Rethinking the Role of L1 in the EFL Classroom. *English Teaching & Learning* 38 (4): 53–78. doi:10.6330ETL.2014.
- Cole, S. (1998). The use of L1 in communicative English classrooms. *The Language Teacher*, 22: 11–13.
- Conteh, J. (2018). Translanguaging. *ELT Journal* 72 (4): 445–447.
- Cook, V. (1991). The poverty-of-the-stimulus argument and multi-lingualism. *Journal of Child Language*, 18(1), 37-41.
- Cook, G. (2008). Plenary: An Unmarked Improvement: Using Translation in ELT. In *IATEFL 2007 Aberdeen Conference Selections*, edited by B. Beaven, 76–86. Canterbury: University of Kent, IATEFL.
- Cook, G. (2010). Translation in Language Teaching: An Argument for Reassessment. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Cook, V. (2000). Second language learning and language teaching. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press and Edward Arnold* (Publishers) Limited.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57.3, 402–423.
- Coste, D. (1995). La question du “bon” usage de la langue dans les situations de contact des langues: Une approche européenne. *Linguistique et Didactique*, 2(2), 7-32.
- Coste, D. (1998). Alternances didactiques. *Etudes de Linguistique Appliquée*, 108, 393-400.
- Coste, D. (2000). La communication plurilingue. Entre l’écologie des langues et la didactique des langues-cultures. In D. Coste & O. Houdart (Eds.), *Plurilinguisme et éducation: Actes du colloque de Jèrri* (pp. 17-26). Institut National de Recherche Pédagogique.
- Coste, D., & Pasquier, A. (1992). *Le français, langue seconde: état des recherches*. Hachette.
- Crawford, J. (2004). Language choices and the sociopolitical dynamics of the classroom. In B. Norton & K. Toohy (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 141-156). Cambridge University Press.
- Dabaghi, A., and M. Rafiee. (2012). Incidental Vocabulary Learning and the Development of Receptive and Productive Vocabulary: How Gloss Types Work. *Suvremena Lingvistika* 38 (74): 175–187. 12 J.-Y. SHIN ET AL.
- Dailey-O’Kane, J. and G. Liebscher. (2009). Teacher and student use of the first language in foreign language classroom interaction: Functions and applications. In *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*, eds. M. Turnbull and J. Dailey-O’Cain, 131–44. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters
- DiCamilla, F. J., and M. Antón. 2012. “Functions of L1 in the Collaborative Interaction of Beginning and Advanced Second Language Learners.” *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 22 (2): 160–188.
- Dodson, C. J. (1972). *Language teaching and the bilingual method* (2nd edn.). London: Pitman.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). *The psychology of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2013). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Routledge.
- Duff, P., & Polio C. (1990). How Much Foreign Language Is There in the Foreign Language Classroom? *The Modern Language Journal* 74 (2): 154–66.
- Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.
- Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *System*, 33, 209-224.
- Fachriyah, E. (2017). The Functions of Code Switching in an English Language Classroom. *Studies in English Language and Education* 4 (2): 148–56.
- Flyman-Mattsson, A., and N. Burenhult. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of French. Lund University, Dept. of Linguistics 1 . *Working Papers* 47 : 59 – 72.
- Freidlander, A. (1990). Composing in English: Effects of first language on writing in English as a second language. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 109-125). Cambridge: Cambridge University
- Fulcher, G. (2010). *Practical language testing*. Hodder Education.
- Gajo, L., & Serra, M. (1999). Code-switching and language change: One thing leads to another? In L. E. Filppula, K. Klemola, & H. Pitkänen (Eds.), *Language Contacts and Lexical Enrichment in Fennoscandia* (pp. 233-243). John Benjamins.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden/Oxford: Wiley/Blackwell.
- García, O., and T. Kleyn. (2016). Translanguaging Theory in Education. In *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students*, edited by O. García and T. Kleyn, 23–47. New York: Routledge.
- García, O., and A. M. Lin. (2017). Translanguaging in Bilingual Education.” In *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, edited by O. García, A. M. Lin, and S. May, 117–130. Switzerland: Springer.
- Gauci, H., and A. Camilleri Grima. (2013). Codeswitching as a Tool in Teaching Italian in Malta. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16 (5): 615–631. doi:10.1080/13670050.2012.71681.
- Gearon, M. (1998). L’alternance entre l’anglais et le français chez les professeurs de français langue étrangère en Australie [Codeswitching between English and French among teachers of French as a foreign language in Australia]. *Etudes de Linguistique Appliquée*, 108, 467-474.
- Ghobadi, M., & Ghasemi, H. (2015). Promises and Obstacles of L1 Use in Language Classrooms: A State-of-the-Art Review. *English Language Teaching*, 8, 245-254.

- Giannikas, C. N. (2011). L1 in English Language Learning: A Research Study in a Greek Regional Context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 21 (3): 319–339.
- Green D., & Wei, L. (2014). A control process model of code-switching. *Language and Cognitive Processes*. 29. 10.1080/23273798.2014.882515.
- Green, D. W. (1998). Mental control of the bilingual lexico-semantic system. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1(02), 67-81.
- Grosjean, F. (1998). Studying bilinguals: Methodological and conceptual issues. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1(02), 131-149.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Guthrie, E. (1987). *Six Cases in Classroom Communication: A Study of Teacher Discourse in the Foreign Language Classroom*. Research in Second Language Learning: Focus on the Classroom. Ed. James Lantolf & Angela Labarca. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 173-93.
- Guthrie, E. E. (1984). Intake, communication and second language learning. In J. Sauvignon & M. Berns (Eds.), *Initiatives in communicative language teaching* (pp. 35-54). Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Ha, D. T. (2017). The Impact of Different Instructions on Vietnamese EFL Students' Acquisition of Formulaic Sequences. *English Language Teaching* 10 (8): 18–31. doi:10.5539/elt.v10n8p18.
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 45, 271 - 308.
- Hall, J. K., & Nilep, C. (2015). Code-switching. In B. Aarts, J. Close, G. Leech, & S. Wallis (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of English grammar* (pp. 851-865). Oxford University Press.
- Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 46, 75-90.
- Hawkins, E. W. (1987). *Modern languages in the curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jeon, I.-J. (2008). Korean EFL teachers' beliefs of English-only instruction. *English Teaching* 63.3, 205–229.
- Heller, M. (1988). Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hermans, D., Bongaerts, T., de Bot, K., & Schreuder, R. (1998). Producing words in a foreign language: Can speakers prevent interference from their first language? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1 (3), 213-229.
- Hlas, A. C. (2016). Secondary Teachers' Language Usage: Beliefs and Practices. *Hispania* 99 (2): 305–319
- Hobbs, V. (2010). Code-Switching in Japanese Language Classrooms: An Exploratory Investigation of Native vs. Non-Native Speaker Teacher Practice | Elsevier Enhanced Reader.” *ScienceDirect: Linguistics and Education* 21: 44-59.
- Ibrahim, E. H. E., Shah, A. M. I., & Armia, N. T. (2013). Codeswitching in English as a foreign language classroom: Teachers' attitudes. *English Language Teaching*, 6(7), 139–150.
- Izquierdo, J., V. G. Martínez, M. G. G. Pulido, and S. P. A. Zúñiga. (2016). First and Target Language use in Public Language Education for Young Learners: Longitudinal Evidence from Mexican Secondary-school Classrooms. *System* 61: 20–30.
- Jeon, I.-J. (2008). Korean EFL teachers' beliefs of English-only instruction. *English Teaching* 63.3, 205–229.
- Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' Code-Switching to the L1 in EFL Classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal* 3 (1): 10–23.
- Källkvist, M. (2013). Linguaging in Translation Tasks Used in a University Setting: Particular Potential for Student Agency? *The Modern Language Journal* 97 (1): 217–238.
- Kang, D.-M. (2008). The classroom language use of a Korean elementary school EFL teacher: Another look at TETE. *System* 36.2, 214–226.
- Kelly, N., and J. Bruen. (2015). Translation as a Pedagogical Tool in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Qualitative Study of Attitudes and Behaviours. *Language Teaching Research* 19 (2): 150–168.
- Kern, R. G. (1994). The role of mental translation in second language reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 441-4
- Ketabi, S., M. Ghavamnia, and M. Rezazadeh. (2012). Hypermedia Reading Strategies Used by Persian Graduate Students in TEFL: A Think-aloud Study. *Reading* 12 (1): 39–49.
- Khan, M. S. (2016). The Impact of Native Language use on Second Language Vocabulary Learning by Saudi EFL Students. *English Language Teaching* 9 (5): 134. doi:10.5539/elt.v9n5p134.
- Khreshah, A. (2012). Exploring When and Why to Use Arabic in the Saudi Arabian EFL Classroom: Viewing L1 Use as Eclectic Technique. *English Language Teaching* 5 (6): 78. doi:10.5539/elt.v5n6p78.

- Kim, S.-Y. (2001). The interactional context of code-switching in Korean-English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(8), 1275-1305.
- Kim, S.-Y. (2008). Five years of teaching English through English: Responses from teachers and prospects for learners. *English Teaching* 63.1, 51–70.
- Kim, S.-Y. (2011). Exploring the relationship between heritage language proficiency and ethnic identity among Korean Americans. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(1), 39-46.
- Kim, S.H., & Elder C. (2005). Language Choices and Pedagogic Functions in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Cross-Linguistic Functional Analysis of Teacher Talk. *Language Teaching Research* 9 (4): 355–80.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (1992). Effects of first language on second language writing: Translation versus direct composition. *Language Learning*, 42, 183-215.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kroll, J. F., & Dussias, P. E. (2017). Bilingualism, mind, and brain. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 3, 377-394.
- Lee, H. H. (2007). Using the L1 in teaching the L2 in the Philippines. *RELC Journal*, 38(3), 369-380.
- Lee, J. H., and E. Macaro. (2013). Investigating Age in the Use of L1 or English-only Instruction: Vocabulary Acquisition by Korean EFL Learners. *The Modern Language Journal* 97 (4): 887–901. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12044.x.
- Levine, G. 2009. Building meaning through code choice in second language learner interaction: a discourse analysis and proposals for curriculum design and teaching. In *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*, eds. M. Turnbull and J. Dailey-O’Cain, 145–62. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *Modern Language Journal*, 87, 343–364.
- Li, W. (1998). The "why" and "how" questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching.
- Liebscher, G. and Dailey-O’Cain, J. (2005). Learner Code-Switching in the Content-Based Foreign Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89: 234-247.
- Lightbown, P. (2001). L2 Instruction: time to teach. *TESOL Q*; 35: 598-99.
- Lin, A. (1996). Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic domination, resistance and code-switching in Hong-Kong schools. *Linguistics and Education* 8 : 9 – 84.
- Lin, Z. (2012). Code-switching: L1-Coded Mediation in a Kindergarten Foreign Language Classroom. *International Journal of Early Years Education* 20 (4): 365–378.
- Lin, L. C., and W. Y. Yu. (2015). A Think-Aloud Study of Strategy Use by EFL College Readers Reading Chinese and English Texts. *Journal of Research in Reading* 38 (3): 286–306. doi:10.1111/1467-9817.12012.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W., & Baohua Y. (2011). First Language and Target Language in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Language Teaching* 44 (1): 64–77.
- Littlewood, W.T., & Yu, B. (2009). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44, 64 - 77.
- Liu, D., Ahn, G., Baek, K. and Han, N. (2004). South Korean high school English teachers’ code switching: Questions and challenges in the drive for maximal use of English in teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4): 605–38.
- Liu, Y., and A. P. Zeng. (2015). Loss and Gain: Revisiting the Roles of the First Language in Novice Adult Second Language Learning Classrooms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 5 (12): 2433–2440.
- Lo, S. W. (2016). L1-L2 Translation Versus L2 Writing Tasks: An Empirical Study on Non-language Major Students’ Improvement in Writing Proficiency. *Writing & Pedagogy* 8 (3): 483–518.
- Lo, Y. Y. (2015). How much L1 is too much? Teachers’ language use in response to students’ abilities and classroom interaction in content and language integrated learning. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(3), 270–288.
- Macaro, E. (1995). Target language use in Italy. *Language Learning Journal*, 11, 52-54. Macaro E. (1996). Teacher use of the target language (part 1). *Languages Forum*, 1 (5)
- Macaro, E. (1996). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 80(4), 487-496.

- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing Student Teachers' Codeswitching in Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making. *The Modern Language Journal* 85 (4): 531–48.
- Macaro, E. (1997). Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy. Clevedon: *Multilingual Matters*.
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: a communication and learning strategy. In *NonNative Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges, and Contributions to the Profession*, ed. E. Llorca, 63–84. Boston, MA: Springer.
- Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: exploring 'optimal' use. In *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*, eds. M. Turnbull and J. Dailey-O'Cain, 35–49. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Macaro, E., and J. H. Lee. (2013). Teacher Language Background, Codeswitching, and English-only Instruction: Does Age Make a Difference to Learners' Attitudes? *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a Second Dialect* 47 (4): 717–742. doi:10.1002/tesq.74.
- Martin-Jones, M. (1995). Codeswitching in the classroom: Two decades of research. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 180-199). Cambridge University Press.
- McManus, K., and E. Marsden. (2017). L1 Explicit Instruction Can Improve L2 Online and Offline Performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 39 (3): 459–492. doi:10.1017/S027226311600022X.
- McMillan, B. A., and D. J. Rivers. (2011). The Practice of Policy: Teacher Attitudes Toward "English Only". *System* 39 (2): 251–263. doi:10.1016/j.system.2011.04.011.
- Meiring, L. & N. Norman (2002). Back on target: Repositioning the status of target language in MFL teaching and learning. *Language Learning Journal* 26, 27–35.
- Merritt, M. (1993). Code-switching in the classroom: Two decades of research. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 209-235). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Merritt, M., Cleghorn, A., Abagi, J.O. and Bunyi, G. (1992). Socialising multilingualism; determinants of code-switching in Kenyan primary classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13(1–2): 103–21.
- Milk, R. D. (1990). Interaction in two bilingual instructional settings: Code-switching, discourse, and social roles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(3), 379-404.
- Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (1995). Authority in language: Investigating language prescription and standardisation. *Routledge*.
- Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (Eds.). (1995). *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ministère de L'Éducation Nationale. (1993). *Anglais: Classes de Collèges, 6e, 5e, 4e, 3e* [English: Classes in lower secondary school, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th year]. Paris: Centre Nationale de Documentation Pédagogique.
- Ministry of Education of the PRC (2000). *English Syllabus for Full-time Senior High Schools (revised and testing version)*. <http://www.zgxl.net/teach/learn/ksdg/gzyysyxd.htm>.
- Mitchell, R. (1988). *Communicative language teaching in practice*. London: CILT.
- Mitchell, T. & Johnstone, R. (1986). The recognition of partially predictable phonological units. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 25(4), 390-405.
- Moghadam, S. H., Samas, A. A., & Shahraki, E. R. (2012). Code switching as a medium of instruction in an EFL classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(11), 2219–2225.
- Mohebbi, H., and S. M. Alavi. (2014). Teachers' First Language Use in a Second Language Learning Classroom Context: A Questionnaire-based Study. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature* 7 (4): 57–73.
- Momenian, M., and R. G. Samar. (2011). Functions of Code-switching among Iranian Advanced and Elementary Teachers and Students. *Educational Research and Reviews* 6 (13): 769–777.
- Moore, D. (2002). Code-Switching and Learning in the Classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 5 (5): 279–93.
- Mora Pablo, I., M. M. Lengeling, B. Rubio Zenil, T. Crawford, and D. Goodwin. (2011). Students and Teachers' Reasons for Using the First Language Within the Foreign Language Classroom (French and English) in Central Mexico. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development* 13 (2): 113–129.

- Morata, M., & Coyle, Y. (2012). Teaching English Through Spanish: A Secondary School EFL Teachers's Language Choices in the Foreign Language Classroom.
- Munro, J. (1999). Interpreting as a teaching tool. *Language Learning Journal* 20, 3–7.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes. *Oxford University Press*.
- Nassaji, H. (2015). Qualitative and Descriptive Research: Data Type versus Data Analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 19, 129-132.
- Nakatsukasa, K., and S. Loewen. (2015). A Teacher's First Language Use in Form-focused Episodes in Spanish as a Foreign Language Classroom. *Language Teaching Research* 19 (2): 133–149. doi:10.1177/1362168814541737.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). Learning vocabulary in another language. Cambridge University Press.
- Nordin, Noli Maishara et al. (2013) ESL Learners' reactions towards code switching in classroom settings. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 90: 478-487.
- Nukuto, H. (2017). Code Choice Between L1 and the Target Language in English Learning and Teaching: A Case Study of Japanese EFL Classrooms. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 49 (1): 85–103. doi:10.1080/03740463.2017.1316631.
- Nunan, D. (2003). Practical English language teaching. *McGraw-Hill*.
- OFSTED. (1993). The Initial Training of Primary School Teachers. London: The Stationery Office.
- Otheguy, R., O. García, and W. Reid. (2018). A Translanguaging View of the Linguistic System of Bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics Review* 10 (4): 625–651.
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, et al. (2021) The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *PLOS Medicine* 18(3): e1003583. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003583>
- Pennington, M. C. (1995). The power of language frameworks for viewing language use in bilingual classrooms. *Language in Education: Theory and Practice*, 77, 23-33.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). Linguistic imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Polio, C. G. & P. A. Duff (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target-language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal* 78.3, 313–326.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y Termino en Espanol: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*; 18: 581-616.
- Poplack, D. (1989). Code-switching in Montreal: A case study of emigrant bilingualism. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Rabbidge, M., and P. Chappell. (2014). Exploring Non-native English Speaker Teachers' Classroom Language Use in South Korean Elementary Schools. *TESL-EJ* 17 (4): 1–18.
- Raschka, C., & al. (2009). Conflicts and Tensions in Codeswitching in a Taiwanese EFL Classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12 (2): 157–71.
- Reyes, I. A. (2004). Language mixing in Chicano bilingualism. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 227-251). Blackwell Publishing.
- Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: The nature of approaches and methods in language teaching.
- Rivera, C., & Mazak, C. M. (2017). Linguistic practices and multilingualism in the home: A case study of a transnational family. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(4), 385-401. doi: 10.1080/14790718.2017.1308233
- Robert, P. F. and Ellis, R. (1987). Interlanguage variation in narrative discourse: style shifting in the use of the past tense. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 9(1), 1-20.
- Romaine, S. (1989). Bilingualism (Vol. 5). *Wiley-Blackwell*.
- Romaine, S. (1995). Bilingualism (2nd ed.). *Blackwell*.
- Samian, H. V., T. C. V. Foo, and H. Mohebbi. (2016). The Effects of Giving and Receiving Marginal L1 Glosses on L2 Vocabulary Learning by Upper Secondary Learners. *English Language Teaching* 9 (2): 66. doi:10.5539/elt.v9n2p66.
- Sampson, A. (2011). Learner Code-switching Versus English Only. *ELT Journal* 66 (3): 293–303. doi:10.1093/elt/ccr067.
- Sawin, T. (2018). Media and English. In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, edited by J. I. Liontas, Vol. 8, 1–15. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Scheffler, P. (2013). Learners' Perceptions of Grammar-translation as Consciousness Raising. *Language Awareness* 22 (3): 255–269. doi:10.1080/09658416.2012.703673.
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Seedhouse, P. (1999). Task-based interaction. *ELT Journal* 53.3, 149–156.
- Sert, O. (2005). The Functions of Code-Switching in ELT Classrooms. *Online Submission*, 11(8).
- Shin, J., & al. (2020). An Updated Review on Use of L1 in Foreign Language Classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 41 (5): 406–19.
- Simon, D.-L. (1998). Alternance codique en classe de langue: Rupture du contrat ou survie? [Codeswitching in the language classroom: The breaking of a contract or survival?]. *Etudes de Linguistique Appliquée*, 108, 445-455.
- Skiba, Richard. (1997). Code Switching as a Countenance of Language Interference". *The Internet TESL Journal*.
- Skinner, D. (1985). Access to meaning. The anatomy of the language/learning connection. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6, no. 5: 369–89.
- Thomason, S.G. (2001). *Language contact. An introduction*. Washington: Georgetown UP.
- Thomas, W. P. (2001). Code-switching in the classroom: Two decades of research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 169-187.
- Thompson, G. L., and K. Harrison. (2014). Language use in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals* 47 (2): 321–337. doi:10.1111/flan.12079.
- Tian, L., and E. Macaro. (2012). Comparing the Effect of Teacher Codeswitching with English-only Explanations on the Vocabulary Acquisition of Chinese University Students: A Lexical Focus-on-Form Study. *Language Teaching Research* 16 (3): 367–391. doi:10.1177/1362168812436909.
- Tsagari, D., and C. Diakou. (2015). Students' and Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Use of the First Language in the EFL State School Classrooms. *Research Papers in Language Teaching & Learning* 6 (1): 86–108.
- Turnbull, M. (1999). Code-switching and learning in the classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 258-276). Cambridge University Press.
- Turnbull, M. and J. Dailey-O'Cain. (2009a). Introduction. In *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*, eds. M. Turnbull and J. Dailey-O'Cain, 1–14. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Turnbull, M. and J. Dailey-O'Cain. (2009b). Concluding reflections: moving forward. In *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*, eds. M. Turnbull and J. Dailey-O'Cain, 182–6. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but ... *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57.4, 531–540.
- Turnbull, M. & K. Arnett (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22, 204–218.
- Üstünel, E. (2016). *EFL Classroom Code-Switching*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Viakinnou-Brinson, L., C. Herron, S. P. Cole, and C. Haight. (2012). The Effect of Target Language and Code-Switching on the Grammatical Performance and Perceptions of Elementary-Level College French Students. *Foreign Language Annals* 45 (1): 72–91. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01170.x.
- Vosoughi, M. (2012). Enhancing Lexical Knowledge Through L2 Medium Tasks. *English Language Teaching* 5 (10): 34. doi:10.5539/elt.v5n10p34.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. MIT press.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2000). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Foreign language teaching and Research Press.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (6th ed.). Fabulous Printers Pte Ltd.
- Wei, L. (2005). "How can you tell?" Towards a common sense explanation of conversational code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatic*, 37, 375–389.
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics* 39 (1): 9–30.
- Wing, B. (1987). The Linguistic and Communicative Function of Foreign Language Teacher Talk. *Foreign Language Learning: A Research Perspective*. Ed. Bill VanPatten, Trisha Dvorta & James Lee. New York: Newbury House, 158-73.
- Yao, M. (2011). On Attitudes to Teachers' Code-switching in EFL Classes. *World Journal of English Language* 1 (1): 19–28. doi:10.5430/wjel.v1n1p19.
- Zainil, Y., & Safnil A. (2021). Teachers' Perception of Their Code-Switching Practices in English as a Foreign Language Classes: The Results of Stimulated Recall Interview and Conversation Analysis. *SAGE Open* 11 (2): 21582440211013800.

Zhao, T., and E. Macaro. (2016). What Works Better for the Learning of Concrete and Abstract Words: Teachers' L 1 use or L 2-Only Explanations? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 26 (1): 75–98. doi:10.1111/ijal.12080.

