

## Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes towards use of first language in EFL classes

Bozorgian, Mojtaba ✉

*Applied Linguistics, Brock University, St. Catharines, ON, Canada* ([mb16qz@brocku.ca](mailto:mb16qz@brocku.ca))

Luo, Cheng

*Applied Linguistics, Brock University, St. Catharines, ON, Canada* ([clu@brocku.ca](mailto:clu@brocku.ca))



ISSN: 2243-7703  
Online ISSN: 2243-7711

OPEN ACCESS

**Received:** 10 February 2018

**Revised:** 22 March 2018

**Accepted:** 20 April 2018

**Available Online:** 17 May 2018

**DOI:** 10.5861/ijrse.2018.3006

### ***Abstract***

English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners' use of first language—known as code-switching (CS)—has long been incorporated in EFL learning classes in which teachers and learners share the same first language (L1). This study explored Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes and strategies corresponding to the use of CS at universities and private language institutions, and the frequency with which CS occurs. Participants comprised 85 female and male EFL teachers aged 20-50 with different education background and years of EFL teaching experience. Data were collected through a questionnaire and semi-structured follow-up interviews. Quantitative results indicate some significant differences among Iranian EFL teachers' use of CS in relation to education degrees and teaching EFL locations. Analysis of interviews also reveals that Iranian EFL teachers used CS strategically as a last resort to some extent in order to enhance pedagogical functions, manage their classrooms, and establish interpersonal relationships with their learners.

***Keywords:*** first language use; second language learning; codeswitching

## Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes towards use of first language in EFL classes

### 1. Introduction

English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) students' use of first language (L1) in second-language (L2) or EFL learning classes has long been a controversial issue globally among scholars with different opinions about L1 usage during the L2 learning process, including conflicting attitudes of Iranian EFL teachers at universities and private language institutions (PLI) who either support students' L1 (in this case Persian) use in EFL classes (e.g., Cook, 2001) or opposing it (e.g., Ford, 2009). Between these opposing views, some scholars (e.g., Bozorgian & Fallahpour, 2015; de la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Scotton & Ury, 1977; Sert, 2005; Yao, 2011) have taken the middle ground by arguing for the strategic use of L1 in L2 classrooms in the form of code-switching, such as when giving task instructions, translating sentences, and explaining grammatical points.

CS often occurs in conversation and collaborative activities between L2 learners who share the same L1. It has been defined differently according to the functions CS serves for its users, such as "the use of two or more linguistic varieties in the same conversation or interaction" (Scotton & Ury, 1977, p. 5), and as "a tool for creating linguistic solidarity, especially between individuals who share the same ethno-cultural identity" (Sert, 2005, p. 2). In terms of L2 educational discourse, Sert (2005) describes CS as the "conscious or unconscious behavior of alternation between L1 and the target language to serve basic functions [such as giving the meaning of an L2 word in L1] that are significant for the learning process" (p. 2). In this sense, CS has been recognized as an asset and a valuable addition to bilinguals' array of communication strategies (Macaro, 2005).

Given the various definitions of CS and considering the purpose and scope of the present study, CS in this research specifically refers to the phenomenon of EFL teachers' switch from L2 (English) to L1 (Persian) or use of L1, in either spoken or written form, in L2 classes for a variety of purposes, including pedagogical evaluation and classroom management, and development of rapport with students. Such pedagogic functions also refer to how CS can serve the teachers in their classes (e.g., teaching vocabulary, grammar, and skill strategies) as contrasted to pedagogical considerations corresponding to how teachers impart knowledge based on the content and objectives of lessons.

#### 1.1 Functions of CS in EFL Context

CS has been recognized as a functional tool in the EFL classroom when used by teachers for three purposes: (a) pedagogical, (b) evaluative and managerial, and (c) psychological and interpersonal.

**CS for Pedagogical Functions** - Pedagogic functions refer to such teaching activities as giving task instruction and explaining grammar and vocabulary (e.g., Liu, Ahn, Baek, & Han, 2004; Weng, 2012). EFL teachers both in PLI or universities used CS mostly to explain grammar and vocabulary, to provide textual background information, and to highlight important points, as well as to teach reading (Liu et al., 2004). Studies have indicated that the teachers switched to L1 to: explicate English lexis and subject lessons (Pennington, 1995; Yao, 2011); clarify textbook lexical items; make lesson materials more understandable to students (Lin, 1996; Martin, 1999; Yao, 2011); reformulate, review, and explain cultural issues (Canagarajah, 1999); deal with grammatical problems (Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005); help lowering feelings of anxiety about a listening task while doing pre-listening activities (Maccaro, 2005); and to assist looking for contextual clues, syntactic clues, and text design clues, as well as making decisions of which bits of language to skip (Macaro, 2005) while having teacher-student bilingual discussions.

Using learners' L1 in the EFL classroom can also facilitate writing tasks in which learners brainstorm vocabulary for a topic, and outline and generate a paragraph in their L1. Bilingual teachers also found it helpful when consulting with their students about the writing task in their shared L1. According to Nation (2003),

“whenever a teacher feels that a meaning based L2 task might be beyond the capabilities of the learners, a small amount of L1 discussion can help overcome some of the obstacles” (p. 3).

***CS Motivated by Evaluative and Managerial Reasons*** - Studies have shown that EFL teachers attributed their CS to their classroom management, such as how they incorporate CS to evaluate their learners' understanding (Martin, 1999; Sali, 2014; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; Yao, 2011), elicit responses from the learners (Martin, 1999; Sali, 2014), elicit an L1 translation, give feedback (Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; Yao, 2011) and disciplining their learners (Canagarajah, 1999) to manage their classrooms efficiently (Qian, Tian, & Wang, 2009). Learners' English proficiency level is among the motivations for teachers' CS. For example, Kang (2008) found that the teacher in his case study used L1 (Korean) in an EFL class because of students' inability to comprehend the target language input. However, researchers (e.g., Gulzar, 2010; Mahmoudi & Amirkhiz, 2011) argue that CS is not always an effective strategy in some EFL classrooms attended by high proficiency level learners (Yao, 2011) because such learners believe that CS would not contribute to their English competence development (Ariffin & Husin, 2011). Therefore, based on the varying opinions about CS for the purpose of students' proficiency level, this factor is considered in this study. However, the findings of the aforementioned studies are mostly based on the attitudes of a relatively small number of teacher respondents who taught intermediate learners. To expand the scope, this study analyzes the attitudes towards CS of a larger number of teachers (n=85) teaching EFL classes at three proficiency levels (basic, intermediate, and advanced) at universities and PLI.

***CS Motivated by Psychological and Interpersonal Reasons*** - Finally, researchers have found that EFL teachers use CS for psychological and interpersonal reasons, such as: encouraging interaction (Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005); gaining students' attention, reducing social distance, and humanizing the classroom atmosphere (Pennington, 1995); establishing rapport with the students to lessen the distance between them and their teachers (Lin, 1996; Sali, 2014); and telling jokes or short stories in their L1 in order to enliven the class (Yao, 2011). A recent example of such research focusing on teachers' attitudes towards CS in EFL classes is Al-Amri's (2016) study that collected data from 20 Saudi Arabian university professors, using a questionnaire and interviews in order to explore their attitudes towards CS in advanced level EFL classes. She found that the instructors believed CS had positive learning outcomes, created a comfortable learning atmosphere in the EFL classroom, and facilitated the interactions between EFL teachers and their students. It should be noted, however, that Al-Amri focused only on university professors' attitudes towards CS without considering instructors in PLI, where the teachers face more restricted curricula and syllabi. Also, Al-Amri did not consider teachers' sociocultural attributes such as education level and teaching location for possible effects on their attitudes towards CS in EFL classes.

Given the high relevance of Al-Amri's (2016) study to the present study, the latter follows Al-Amri's relevant theme and questionnaire format but examines different education background of the teachers, assuming that teachers with different education level (e.g., BA, MA, and PhD) may have different attitudes towards CS. In addition, teachers in PLI may differ from those at universities in terms of the courses they teach and course requirements. The studies reviewed in this research project provide a valuable background for the current study by suggesting the importance of investigating this issue at Iranian universities and PLI in EFL teaching contexts, particularly in relation to the perspectives that these teachers have about L1 use in their classes based on their education level and TEFL locations and their reasons for using or not using CS in EFL classes.

### *1.2 Use of L1 in EFL Classrooms in Iran*

Unlike university professors in Iran, EFL teachers in PLI are required to follow a designated syllabus in which they are instructed not to resort to the learners' mother tongue (i.e., Persian) because the administrators believe the only opportunity for the students to gain exposure to the target language is in their language classes. The education degree of the EFL teachers in PLI often varies as well, ranging from BA, MA, and PhD degrees.

Teachers in PLI have expressed attitudes both for and against L1 use in their L2 classes. Some of them advocate the use of Persian in EFL classes to a certain extent because they think L1 scaffolds the learning process (e.g., Antón & DiCamilla, 1999; Swain & Lapkin, 2000). Others believe that EFL learners need more exposure to the target language and that L1 use hinders L2 learning. The advocates of CS usually use Persian in EFL classes for three main purposes: pedagogical; evaluative and managerial; and psychological and interpersonal.

Researchers in Iran found that EFL teachers used CS judiciously and skillfully for the pedagogical functions of giving instructions, explaining important points (i.e., grammar and new words), translating from English to Persian (Rezvani & Rasekh, 2011; Samar & Moradkhani, 2014), elaborating on the course objectives, and clarifying ambiguous points (Bozorgian & Fallahpour, 2015). Regarding evaluative and managerial purposes, most research on CS to date is based on lower level learners (i.e., pre/intermediate) in Iran because the teachers believed that learners lacked the needed proficiency level for understanding difficult concepts in L2 (Bozorgian and Fallahpour, 2015; Rezvani & Rasekh, 2011; Samar & Moradkhani, 2014). As well, Iranian EFL teachers were also found to use Persian in their EFL classes to foster learning through managing and disciplining the class (Rezvani & Rasekh, 2011) and checking students' comprehension (Samar & Moradkhani, 2014). Finally, psychological and interpersonal considerations also help motivate use of CS. Researchers found that Iranian EFL teachers used CS in their classes in order to reduce learners' anxiety and stress by praising and encouraging learners for their good performance (Rezvani & Rasekh, 2011), understanding students' emotional well-being (Samar & Moradkhani, 2014), and establishing a rapport with learners by creating a friendly environment, thus reducing the students' anxiety (Bozorgian & Fallahpour, 2015).

In support of the three above-mentioned functions in an Iranian EFL context, Samar and Moradkhani (2014) investigated four EFL teachers' cognitive processes during their classroom CS. The researchers video-recorded the classes and then held an interview with each of the teachers, asking them to recall instances in which they switched from English to Persian while watching their own performance. Samar and Moradkhani found that Iranian EFL teachers used CS for different purposes, namely students' better comprehension, check students' comprehension, comparison/contrast between L1 and L2, students' emotional well-being, students' lack of comprehension, students' proficiency level, and efficiency. The generalizability of the results of this case study is limited, however, because although the teachers were randomly selected, they all had the same education level (i.e., Bachelor of Arts in English Translation and TEFL) and the students were all from the same proficiency level (i.e., pre-intermediate). Therefore, further research that employs a questionnaire designed in a way to consider different education levels (i.e., BA, MA, and PhD) and different proficiency levels of both teachers and students (i.e., basic, intermediate, and advanced) would be beneficial.

### *1.3 Significance of the study*

The aforementioned studies have added important insights into L1 use in the L2 classroom for various functions and at different locations. However, some gaps remain to be addressed: (a) most of the studies investigated the functions of CS in the pre-/intermediate classes and none of them involved beginner and advanced level classes; (b) none of the studies compared EFL teachers' education levels to identify a possible relationship between their education level and the amount of L1 use; (c) none of the studies explored the relationship between teachers' EFL teaching location (i.e., universities or PLI) and their CS; and (d) none of the studies explored the attitudes of a large number of EFL teachers of a given country (e.g., in this case, Iran) who differ in age, gender, education degree, and TEFL location.

### *1.4 Research question*

Given the controversies and gaps mentioned above in terms of the varying attitudes towards L1 use in EFL classes in Iran, the purpose of this study is to ascertain the current prevailing attitudes among Iranian EFL teachers towards CS in their EFL classes and the extent to which they resort to L1 for the possible functions it serves them while teaching L2. To that end, the present study has incorporated some functions of CS and aspects

of its pedagogical application, as well as the aforementioned gaps in the following research questions in terms of five themes addressing attitudes towards CS and/or the extent to which CS is used:

- What are Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes towards CS in the EFL classroom?
- What are Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes towards CS in relation to the teachers' linguistic proficiency levels and pedagogical considerations?
- How frequently is Iranian EFL instructors' CS related to pedagogical functions (i.e., vocabulary, grammar, skills, etc.)?
- How frequently is Iranian EFL teachers' CS from English to Persian related to classroom management (i.e., learner gender, EFL proficiency level, evaluation, and discipline)?
- How frequently is Iranian EFL teachers' CS from English to Persian related to psychological and interpersonal relationship with the students?
- Is Iranian EFL teachers' CS related to their sociocultural attributes in terms of education level and EFL teaching location (i.e., PLI vs. universities)?

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 Participants

A total of 85 female and male Iranian EFL teachers from various parts of Iran volunteered to participate in the study and completed a questionnaire. They were identified based on age, educational degree, TEFL location, and TEFL experience, as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*Participants by Category*

Variable	Gender		Age group			Education			EFL location			EFL experience		
	Female	Male	20-30	31-40	41-50	BA	MA	PhD	PLI	Universities	Both	Less than a year-5 year	5-10 years	More than 10 years
<i>n</i>	51	34	36	41	8	13	55	17	56	8	21	32	31	22
%	60	40	42	49	9	64.7	20	15.3	65.9	9.4	24.7	38	37	25
Total	<i>n</i>		85			85			85			85		
	%		100			100			100			100		

### 2.2 Instruments

A questionnaire (see appendix) was administered and distributed among Iranian EFL teachers in order to collect their attitudes about, and frequencies of using, CS in their EFL classes. The questionnaire was arranged in three sections: Section A asks about the participants' age, gender, degree, teaching location(s), and years of EFL teaching experience; Section B (B1-B10) solicits the participants' attitudes towards CS using a total of 10 five-point Likert scale items; Section C (C1-C22) asks about the frequencies of CS according to five themes:

- Theme 1: Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes towards CS;
- Theme 2: Iranian EFL teachers' attitude towards CS related to their linguistic proficiency and pedagogical considerations;
- Theme 3: Frequencies of CS for pedagogical functions;
- Theme 4: Frequencies of CS for evaluative and managerial reasons (i.e., learner-related variables, evaluation, and disciplining);
- Theme 5: Frequencies of CS for psychological and interpersonal reasons.

A semi-structured follow-up interview was designed to elicit information from selected respondents regarding the responses observed through the quantitative analysis of the questionnaire.

### 2.3 Procedure

The questionnaire, adapted from Al-Amri (2016), included 32 five-point Likert scale items and was distributed through the Google forms platform, which allows the sharing of a link with the target population (in this case Iranian EFL teachers) in different online applications, such as Telegram channels and websites, such as Facebook. The questionnaire was designed in such a way that when participants chose to participate, they needed first to read the ethically approved invitation and consent form. They were also advised to voluntarily register their email addresses if they were willing to participate in a possible follow-up online interview. A 20-30 minute follow-up interview was conducted following analysis of the responses to the questionnaire to clarify encountered discrepancies and inconsistencies in the responses regarding their neutral, negative, and positive attitudes. A total of 10 interviewees participated in the interviews through Telegram, Line, and Skype. The questions in the follow-up interview were designed to be more open-ended, using a semi-structured format which allowed the researcher to have better control of the flow of information from the interviewees.

### 3. Data analysis

The data were analyzed quantitatively (questionnaire) and qualitatively (interview), in that order the quantitative data were analyzed in two parts: Part I included the responses in sections B and C of the questionnaire based on five themes (two themes for part B and three themes for part C); Part II pertains to the sociocultural attributes (i.e., education level and TEFL location) of the Iranian EFL teachers following the quantitative analysis. Next, the coded qualitative data from the interviews was analyzed and described. The quantitative and qualitative responses were all reported in terms of the five above-mentioned themes.

#### 3.1 Quantitative Analysis: Part I

In order to find answers for the research questions with respect to their corresponding themes, the mean (M) and mean deviation (MD) were calculated for each respondent, each item, and each theme. The MD is the average distance between each observation and the mean, which is included to help identify consistency levels of the responses within a theme. The M and MD were also used to identify potential interviewees, whose selection is specified under the qualitative data analysis section. The quantitative results are presented below by themes.

#### ***Theme 1: Iranian EFL Teachers' Attitudes towards CS***

Table 2 shows the mean (M) and mean deviation (MD) of questions B1-B6 for all 85 respondents as well as for the theme as a whole. It should be noted that the values of the two negatively worded items (B3 and B5) originally designed for identifying respondents' consistencies in answering the questions were reversed before calculations. In addition, potential interviewees were identified based on the M and MD of the theme according to their neutral, negative, and positive positions towards CS ("neutral" M: 2.5-3.5; "negative" M: 1.0-1.4; "positive" M: 3.6-5.0).

As indicated in Table 2, the overall M (2.7) and MD (0.9) showed that the participants mostly and rather consistently had neutral attitude towards CS in their classes. Analyzing item by item and combining "strongly disagree" with "disagree," about 40% (n= 14+19) of respondents disagreed with Persian use in EFL classes (B1). The majority (82%, n=37+33) of them disagreed with using Persian as much as possible in EFL classes (B2). Similarly, for a differently worded question of the same point, they expressed their agreement (72.9%, n=32+30) that teachers should keep their Persian use to a bare minimum (B3). In B4, 37.6% (n=16+16) strongly disagreed or disagreed and 40% (n=27+8) strongly agreed or agreed that teachers' use of Persian has a positive impact on teaching English. This is echoed in B5, an alternately worded version of B4, in which 35.3% (n= 8+22) disagreed and 40% (n=12+22) agreed that teachers' CS hinders EFL learning. Finally, 37.6% (n=8+24) disagreed that teacher's CS helps EFL learners understand and follow the instructions more closely (B6).

**Table 2**

*Iranian EFL Teachers' Attitudes towards CS in the EFL Classes*

Total Respondent Number	Items												Res. M	Res. MD	
	B1		B2		B3		B4		B5		B6				
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n			
85															
Frequency	Strongly disagree	16.5	14	43.5	37	37.6	32	18.8	16	9.4	8	9.4	8	2.7	0.7
	Disagree	22.4	19	38.8	33	35.3	30	18.8	16	25.9	22	28.2	24		
	Neutral	16.5	14	9.4	8	8.2	7	21.2	18	24.7	21	27.1	23		
	Agree	34.1	29	7.1	6	15.3	13	31.8	27	25.9	22	25.9	22		
	Strongly Agree	10.6	9	1.2	1	3.5	3	9.4	8	14.1	12	9.4	8		
Total	100	85	100	85	100	85	100	85	100	85	100	85			
M for Item	3		2		2		3		3		3				
MD for Item	1.1		0.7		0.9		1.1		1.0		0.9				
M for Theme													2.7		
MD for Theme													0.9		

**Theme 2: Iranian EFL Teachers' Attitudes towards CS Related to Their Linguistic Proficiency and Pedagogical Considerations**

As indicated in Table 3, the respondents had various attitudes towards attributing CS in the EFL classes to the instructors' EFL proficiency in items B7 and B8. When "strongly disagree" is coupled with "disagree," a majority of the participants (63.5%, n=30+24) were opposed to ascribing L1 use to instructors' low proficiency in EFL class (B7). Similarly, a total of 83.5% (n=71) of respondents indicated their disagreement with associating highly proficient teachers with more CS (B8). On the other hand, the majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to attributing their reasons for L1 use to the content (B9: 56%, n=33+15) and objective (B10: 61%, n=33+15) of the lessons.

**Table 3**

*Teachers' Attitudes towards CS Related to Teachers' Linguistic Proficiency & Pedagogical Considerations*

Respondent	Theme 2										Overall			
	B7		B8		Res. M	Res. MD	B9		B10		Res. M	Res. MD	Res. M	Res. MD
%	n	%	n	%			n	%	n	%				
85														
Frequency	Strongly disagree	35.3	30	55.3	47			4.7	4	8.2	7			
	Disagree	28.2	24	28.2	24			11.8	10	7.1	6			
	Neutral	15.3	13	11.8	10	2.0	0.5	27.1	23	23.5	20	3.5	0.2	
	Agree	16.5	14	3.5	3			38.8	33	43.5	37			
	Strongly Agree	4.7	4	1.2	1			17.6	15	17.6	15			
Total %	100	85	100	85			100	85	100	85			2.8	0.9
Mean for Item	2.3		1.7				3.5		3.6					
MD for Item	1.0		0.7				0.9		0.9					
Overall M for 2 Items					2.0						3.5			
Overall MD for 2 Items					0.9						0.7			
Overall							M		2.8					
							MD		0.7					

**Theme 3: Frequencies of CS for Pedagogical Functions**

The respondents were also asked to record their frequency of resorting to Persian for the purpose of pedagogical reasons (i.e., teaching vocabulary, grammar, and skill strategies) in Part C of the questionnaire (C1-C10). The results are as follows:

**Table 4***Frequencies of CS for Pedagogical Functions*

Total Respondent Number		Items										Res. M	Res. MD	
85		C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10			
Frequency	Never	%	11.8	32.9	25.9	37.6	51.8	44.7	45.9	38.8	30.6	56.5	2.0	0.6
		n	10	28	22	32	44	38	39	33	26	48		
	Seldom	%	17.6	30.6	23.5	31.8	32.9	34.1	29.4	30.6	23.5	24.7		
		n	15	26	20	27	28	29	25	26	20	21		
	Sometimes	%	27.1	20	24.7	22.4	10.6	12.9	12.9	20	24.7	14.1		
		n	23	17	21	19	9	11	11	17	21	12		
	Often	%	31.8	10.6	22.4	5.9	3.5	8.2	11.8	9.4	16.5	2.4		
		n	27	9	19	5	3	7	10	8	14	2		
	Always	%	11.8	5.9	3.5	2.4	1.2	0	0	1.2	4.7	2.4		
		n	10	5	3	2	1	0	0	1	4	2		
	Total %	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
		N	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85		
M Item		3.1	2.3	2.5	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.9	2.0	1.3	2.4			
MD Item		1.0	1.0	1.1	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.5	1.1			
Theme M		2.0												
Theme MD		0.8												

As shown in Table 4, the overall M (2.0) showed that the participants mostly had lower frequencies in using CS in their classes for pedagogical purposes.

For the first four items, 29.4% (n=10+27) of the respondents never or seldom felt CS would be more effective than using English in C1, as compared with 43.6% (n=27+10) who always or often felt so. However, in C2, 64% (n=28+26) of the respondents never or seldom used Persian in giving instructions about activities of a lesson. Further, in C3, 50% (n=20+22) of them indicated that they never or seldom used Persian while teaching grammatical points. Finally, 69% of the participants (n=32+27) stated they never or seldom used CS to explain new vocabulary in C4. In addition, the majority of the respondents (about 83%, n=44+28) expressed that they never or seldom used L1 for helping learners with listening activities (C5). The respondents had nearly the same opinions about CS in speaking and reading activities, for which 79% (n=38+29) and 75% (n=39+25) of them never or seldom used L1 (C6 and C7), respectively. In addition, about 69% (n=33+26) of the respondents stated they never or seldom used CS for writing activities (C8). Finally, there were 54% (n=26+20) stating they never or seldom used CS in the spoken form (C9) whereas 81% (n=48+21) of the teachers mentioned that they never or seldom used Persian in the written form (C10) in their classes.

Overall, the demonstrated frequencies of CS by Iranian EFL instructors suggest their low frequencies of using, or perhaps reluctance to use, Persian for the pedagogical purposes as analyzed above, which is also captured by the theme M (2.0).

**Theme 4: Frequencies of CS for Classroom Management Reasons (i.e., Learner-Related Variables, Evaluation, and Disciplining)**

The Iranian EFL instructors were also invited to share their opinions about the frequencies with which they used CS in order to manage their classes based on learner-related variables such as gender (C11 and C12) and proficiency level (C13, basic; C14, intermediate; C15, advanced), evaluation such as eliciting learners' responses



and checking comprehension (C16, C17), and disciplining the learners (C18). Their opinions are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5***Frequencies of CS for Classroom Management Reasons*

Total Respondent Number		Items								Res. M	Res. MD	
85		C11	C12	C13	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18			
Frequency	Never	%	72.9	67.1	20	40	63.5	40	36.5	24.7	2.0	0.6
		n	62	57	17	34	54	34	31	21		
	Seldom	%	21.2	25.9	24.7	32.9	25.9	32.9	25.9	23.5		
		n	18	22	21	28	22	28	22	20		
	Sometimes	%	4.7	3.5	24.7	17.6	5.9	17.6	22.4	31.8		
		n	4	3	21	15	5	15	19	27		
	Often	%	1.2	3.5	24.7	9.4	4.7	9.4	11.8	17.6		
		n	1	3	21	8	4	8	10	15		
	Always	%	0	0	5.9	0	0	0	3.5	2.4		
		n	0	0	5	0	0	0	3	2		
	Total	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
		N	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85		
M Item		1.7	1.4	2.7	2.0	1.5	2.0	2.2	2.5			
MD Item		0.7	0.4	1.0	1.2	1.6	0.8	1.0	1.0			
Theme M		2.0										
Theme MD		0.9										

Comparing C11 with C12, the overwhelming majority of instructors (94%; n=80) mentioned they never or seldom used L1 when teaching females in EFL classes compared with a similar case for male learners (93%; n=79), thus suggesting non-significance of gender to CS. Considering C13, C14, and C15, while a notable majority of the teachers mentioned that they never or seldom used CS for advanced (89%) and intermediate (73%) level learners, when it comes to basic learners, only 45% of the respondents never or seldom used CS in the EFL class.

In C16, the majority of the respondents, 61% (n=34+28), mentioned that they never or seldom switched code for eliciting responses from the EFL students. This trend was almost the same in C17 in which 62% (n=31+22) never or seldom used CS for checking learners' comprehension. However, although the general negative trend continues in terms of using L1 in disciplining learners (C18), the rate of the Iranian EFL teachers with such negativity declined somewhat to 47% (n=21+22) in C18.

Overall, the results for this theme (M=2.0, MD=0.9) suggest that the Iranian EFL instructors were generally reluctant to use CS for managerial and evaluative reasons, in that they did not consider learners' gender a relevant factor for teachers' CS, that they were more reluctant to use CS with higher level learners than with basic-level learners, and that they used CS more frequently only in disciplining their students than for other reasons in this theme.

**Theme 5: Frequencies of CS for Psychological and Interpersonal Reasons**

Finally, the Iranian EFL teachers were asked to register the frequencies of using L1 for psychological and interpersonal reasons in their EFL classes, including encouraging students (C19), engaging their attention (C20), making a joke and enlivening the atmosphere (21), and providing L1 input as requested by the students (C22). The results are shown in Table 6.

According to figures shown in Table 6, about 59% (n=29+21) of the participants mentioned they never or seldom used CS to encourage students (C19), and 55% (n=27+21) never or seldom used CS to engage their attention (C20). However, this trend of reluctance slightly declined to 40% (n=14+20) when it comes to using

CS to make a joke and enliven the atmosphere (C21). Then again, 61% (26+26) of the participants mentioned they never or seldom used Persian when their students asked them to do so (C22). Overall, the respondents seem to take a neutral stance about using CS for psychological and interpersonal reasons, as suggested by the M (2.4) for the theme.

**Table 5***Frequency of CS for Psychological and Interpersonal Reasons*

Total Respondent Number		Items				Res. M	Res. MD	
85		C19	C20	C21	C22			
Frequency	Never	%	34.1	31.8	16.5	30.6		
		<i>n</i>	29	27	14	26		
	Seldom	%	24.7	24.7	23.5	30.6		
		<i>n</i>	21	21	20	26		
	Sometimes	%	24.7	23.5	27.1	25.9		
		<i>n</i>	21	20	23	22		
	Often	%	12.9	14.1	23.5	11.8	2.4	0.6
		<i>n</i>	11	12	20	10		
	Always	%	3.5	5.9	9.4	1.2		
		<i>n</i>	3	5	8	1		
	Total %	%	100	100	100	100		
		<i>N</i>	85	85	85	85		
	M Item	2.3	2.4	2.9	2.2			
	MD Item	1.0	1.1	1.0	0.9			
	Theme M	2.4						
	Theme MD	0.9						

*3.2 Quantitative Analysis: Part II*

Given the generally negative sentiment about using L1 in EFL classroom as revealed in the analysis of Part I, it is important to perform analyses in terms of two sociocultural attributes of the respondents—namely education level and EFL teaching location—to see if the use of L1 is affected by such variables. In that regard, research question 6 is explicated as the following null hypotheses:

- H<sub>01</sub>: There is no difference between Iranian EFL instructors with different education levels in using CS in EFL classes.
- H<sub>02</sub>: There is no difference among Iranian EFL instructors by TEFL locations in using CS in EFL classes.

In order to test these hypotheses, a one-way ANOVA and Post Hoc comparison using Tukey were conducted with a set significant level of ( $p < .05$ ).

**Education Level of the Instructor** - Tables 7 and 8 show the results of analysis pertaining to the education variable for both theme-based analysis and item-based analysis. As shown in Table 7, H<sub>01</sub> is accepted for all themes except for themes 3 and 5 ( $p=.018$  and  $p=.011$ , respectively), showing a significant difference among the three groups. The post hoc analysis indicated significant differences between BAs and PhDs for both themes at  $p>.017$  and  $p>.008$ , respectively. The results suggest that Iranian EFL teachers with PhD degrees have a greater tendency towards CS for pedagogical functions (Theme 3) and for psychological and interpersonal reasons (Theme 5) than those with BA. The same analysis was run for each of the 32 items to pinpoint specific facets with significant differences among the groups.

**Table 6***One-Way ANOVA and Tukey Post Hoc Comparison for EFL Teachers' Education Level (Theme-Based)*

Index	Mean			SD			Mean Difference			<i>p</i>	<i>p</i> (Post Hoc)		
	BA	MA	PhD	BA	MA	PhD	BA & MA	BA & PhD	MA & PhD		BA & MA	BA & PhD	MA & PhD
Theme 1	2.42	2.61	3.01	0.48	0.56	0.55	-.195	-.582	-.387	.139	.733	.150	.226
Theme 2	2.5	2.7	3.1	0.7	1.0	0.9	-.237	-.580	-.342	.068	.507	.064	.180
Theme 3	1.75	2.08	2.54	0.40	0.52	0.55	-.380	-.896	-.516	.018	.354	.017	.078
Theme 4	1.8	2.0	2.3	0.3	0.5	0.6	-.229	-.514	-.285	.111	.510	.099	.279
Theme 5	1.92	2.40	2.94	0.06	0.35	0.34	-.477	-1.02	-.547	.011	.218	.008	.083

**Table 7***One-Way ANOVA and Tukey Post Hoc Comparison for EFL Teachers' Education Level (Item-Based)*

Index	Mean			SD			Mean Difference			<i>p</i>	<i>p</i> (Post Hoc)		
	BA	MA	PhD	BA	MA	PhD	BA & MA	BA & PhD	MA & PhD		BA & MA	BA & PhD	MA & PhD
B1	2.62	2.96	3.41	1.04	1.33	1.28	-.348	-.796	-.448	.234	.655	.218	.423
B2	1.92	1.71	2.18	0.76	0.94	1.07	.214	-.253	-.467	.195	.742	.746	.180
B3	1.77	2.09	2.47	0.83	1.25	1.12	-.322	-.701	-.380	.264	.649	.243	.477
B4	2.54	2.95	3.24	1.20	1.34	1.15	-.407	-.697	-.290	.342	.561	.309	.696
B5	3.00	3.05	3.29	1.00	1.22	1.36	-.055	-.294	-.240	.745	.989	.791	.760
B6	2.69	2.89	3.47	1.03	1.18	1.01	-.199	-.778	-.580	.117	.836	.153	.159
B7	2.31	2.15	2.65	1.44	1.24	1.06	.162	-.339	-.502	.346	.905	.738	.315
B8	1.62	1.60	1.94	1.19	0.85	0.83	.015	-.326	-.341	.391	.998	.594	.368
B9	2.85	3.58	3.88	1.14	1.08	0.70	-.736	-1.03	-.301	.023	.059	.021	.546
B10	3.15	3.56	3.82	1.07	1.20	0.81	-.410	-.670	-.260	.268	.461	.238	.679
C1	2.54	3.15	3.59	0.97	1.19	1.23	-.607	-1.050	-.443	.057	.218	.044	.346
C2	2.08	2.18	2.65	1.19	1.14	1.37	-.105	-.570	-.465	.318	.956	.402	.344
C3	2.15	2.49	3.00	0.99	1.26	1.06	-.337	-.846	-.509	.140	.629	.135	.275
C4	1.62	1.98	2.53	0.96	1.05	0.87	-.366	-.914	-.548	.042	.465	.040	.126
C5	1.46	1.67	1.94	0.88	0.82	1.09	-.211	-.480	-.268	.329	.720	.310	.521
C6	1.69	1.78	2.18	1.03	0.90	1.01	-.090	-.484	-.395	.265	.949	.348	.291
C7	1.38	1.84	2.53	0.96	0.92	1.18	-.452	-1.145	-.693	.006	.299	.006	.034
C8	1.69	1.98	2.47	1.03	0.95	1.23	-.290	-.778	-.489	.103	.631	.104	.204
C9	1.23	1.27	1.65	0.60	0.59	0.70	-.042	-.416	-.374	.077	.973	.165	.079
C10	1.69	2.44	2.88	1.03	1.13	1.41	-.744	-1.190	-.446	.027	.108	.020	.365
C11	1.92	1.65	1.65	1.50	0.84	0.86	.269	.276	.007	.654	.644	.721	1.00
C12	1.62	1.33	1.65	1.12	0.61	0.70	.288	-.032	-.320	.182	.405	.992	.256
C13	2.15	2.69	3.24	1.14	1.18	1.20	-.537	-1.081	-.544	.049	.309	.039	.227
C14	1.46	2.00	2.24	0.78	1.00	0.97	-.538	-.774	-.235	.090	.173	.081	.655
C15	1.31	1.49	1.76	0.85	0.81	0.75	-.183	-.457	-.274	.288	.743	.280	.444
C16	1.62	1.93	2.35	1.04	0.94	1.00	-.312	-.738	-.426	.111	.550	.102	.257
C17	1.77	2.15	2.71	1.09	1.13	1.21	-.376	-.937	-.560	.076	.536	.072	.186
C18	2.15	2.58	2.47	1.14	1.12	1.12	-.428	-.317	.111	.467	.435	.725	.932
C19	1.85	2.15	3.00	1.07	1.10	1.22	-.299	-1.154	-.855	.010	.662	.017	.020
C20	1.92	2.33	2.88	1.26	1.25	1.05	-.855	-.855	-.855	.094	.529	.087	.232
C21	2.00	2.91	3.35	0.82	1.21	1.27	-.909	-1.353	-.444	.008	.036	.007	.363
C22	1.92	2.20	2.53	1.12	1.04	1.01	-.277	-.606	-.329	.285	.669	.264	.496

As indicated in Table 8, significant differences are found between BA and PhD groups, in that PhDs use L1 significantly more than BAs when considering content of a lesson (B9,  $p=.023$ ), feeling that L1 is more effective than using L2 (C1,  $p=.044$ ), explaining new vocabulary (C4,  $p=.046$ ), helping learners with reading activities (C7,  $p=.006$ ), using CS in its written form (C10,  $p=.020$ ), teaching basic-level EFL learners (C13,  $p=.039$ ), encouraging students (C19,  $p=.017$ ), and making a joke and enlivening the atmosphere (C21,  $p=.007$ ). In addition, the MA and PhD groups differ significantly in that the PhD group use L1 significantly more than MAs in order to help learners with reading activities (C7,  $p=.034$ ) and to encourage students (C19,  $p=.020$ ). Further,

the BA and MA groups differ significantly only in that MA group use L1 significantly more than BAs in order to make a joke and enliven the atmosphere (C21,  $p=.036$ ).

The results suggest that the education level of EFL teachers may have an impact on their attitudes towards and frequencies of using CS and its functions in EFL classes in some way. EFL teachers with PhDs tend to favor CS more than their MA and especially BA counterparts. In addition, MA holders have a slightly greater tendency towards CS in their EFL classes in comparison with BA holders. It seems, therefore, that the higher the education degree, the more likely teachers are to use CS for certain purposes. However, it should be noted that for most questions, there is no significant between-group differences.

**The TEFL Location Variable** - Null Hypothesis 2 states that there is no difference among Iranian EFL instructors at different TEFL locations (i.e., PLI or universities (Uni., and Both) in terms of their CS in EFL classes. The analytic results are as follows:

**Table 8**

*One-Way ANOVA and Tukey Post Hoc Comparison for TEFL Location (Theme-Based)*

Index	Mean			SD			Mean Difference			p	p (Post Hoc)		
	PLI	Uni.	Both	PLI	Uni.	Both	PLI & Uni.	PLI & Both	Uni. & Both		PLI & Uni.	PLI & Both	Uni. & Both
Theme 1	2.51	3.38	2.80	.51	.76	.55	-.876	-.294	.582	.015	.016	.343	.206
Theme 2	2.58	3.28	3.01	.86	1.15	1.06	-.691	-.419	.271	.005	.022	.043	.593
Theme 3	2.01	2.65	2.21	.48	.70	.52	-.639	-.203	-.435	.081	.080	.562	.369
Theme 4	1.89	2.33	2.17	.42	.48	.59	-.435	-.283	.151	.095	.202	.227	.849
Theme 5	2.22	2.81	2.86	.34	.07	.36	.591	-.639	-.048	.014	.206	.021	.991

According to Table 9, significant among-group differences exist for Themes 1, 2, and 5 ( $p=.015$ ,  $p=.005$ ,  $p=.014$ , respectively). The post hoc analyses located them between PLI and universities for themes 1 and 2 ( $p>.016$  and  $p>.022$ ), between PLI and Both for themes 2 and 5 ( $p>.043$  and  $p>.021$ ). The results suggest that Iranian EFL teachers in PLI tend to have a more negative attitude towards CS (Theme 1) and tend to relate use of CS to their linguistic proficiency concerns and pedagogical considerations (Theme 2) than those at universities. Further, those teaching in PLI only tend to relate use of CS to their linguistic proficiency concerns and pedagogical considerations (Theme 2) and to psychological and interpersonal reasons (theme 5) less than those teaching at both PLI and universities.

In order to locate specific aspects of such between-group differences, an item-by-item analysis was performed, which yielded the following results.

**Table 9**

*One-Way ANOVA and Tukey Post Hoc Comparison for TEFL Location (Item-Based)*

Index	Mean			SD			Mean Difference			p	p (Post Hoc)		
	PLI	Uni.	Both	PLI	Uni.	Both	PLI & Uni.	PLI & Both	Uni. & Both		PLI & Uni.	PLI & Both	Uni. & Both
B1	2.86	3.88	3.05	1.33	0.83	1.24	-1.018	-.190	.827	.111	.093	.828	.266
B2	1.71	2.13	2.05	0.93	1.13	0.92	-.411	-.333	.077	.261	.487	.357	.979
B3	2.02	2.75	2.14	1.18	1.16	1.15	-.732	-.125	.607	.261	.231	.909	.431
B4	2.79	3.63	3.10	1.30	1.41	1.14	-.839	-.310	.530	.185	.196	.611	.578
B5	2.95	3.88	3.19	1.23	1.36	1.03	-.929	-.244	.685	.117	.105	.705	.356
B6	2.71	4.00	3.29	1.16	0.76	0.96	-1.286	-.571	.714	.003	.006	.103	.255
B7	2.16	2.63	2.43	1.30	1.41	0.98	-.464	-.268	.196	.493	.586	.678	.923
B8	1.57	2.00	1.81	0.87	1.41	0.75	-.429	-.238	.190	.332	.425	.560	.868

Table 10 ... continued

Index	Mean			SD			Mean Difference			p	p (Post Hoc)		
	PLI	Uni.	Both	PLI	Uni.	Both	PLI & Uni.	PLI & Both	Uni. & Both		PLI & Uni.	PLI & Both	Uni. & Both
B9	3.27	4.13	4.00	1.09	0.99	0.77	-.857	-.732	.125	.006	.070	.016	.952
B10	3.34	4.38	3.81	1.21	0.52	0.81	-1.036	-.470	.565	.022	.035	.211	.422
C1	2.98	4.13	3.19	1.18	0.83	1.21	-1.143	-.208	.935	.038	.030	.764	.136
C2	2.20	3.25	2.05	1.17	1.67	0.92	-1.054	.149	1.202	.041	.049	.872	.039
C3	2.41	3.13	2.67	1.22	1.13	1.15	-.714	-.256	.458	.251	.259	.681	.627
C4	1.88	2.75	2.19	0.99	1.28	0.93	-.875	-.315	.560	.056	.061	.441	.378
C5	1.66	2.00	1.67	0.88	1.31	0.73	-.339	-.006	.333	.597	.575	1.00	.642
C6	1.70	2.38	2.05	0.89	0.92	1.02	-.679	-.351	.327	.087	.136	.307	.674
C7	1.80	2.13	2.10	1.00	0.99	1.14	-.321	-.292	.030	.450	.690	.515	.997
C8	1.86	2.63	2.29	0.92	1.41	1.10	-.768	-.429	.339	.065	.120	.223	.703
C9	1.29	1.75	1.33	0.62	0.46	0.66	-.464	-.048	.417	.147	.124	.952	.245
C10	2.34	2.38	2.62	1.21	1.19	1.28	-.036	-.280	-.244	.671	.997	.647	.881
C11	1.66	2.13	1.62	1.00	1.36	0.67	-.464	.042	.506	.413	.415	.984	.421
C12	1.38	1.75	1.48	0.70	0.46	0.87	-.375	-.101	.274	.386	.368	.851	.641
C13	2.52	3.25	3.05	1.22	1.28	1.07	-.732	-.530	.202	.098	.241	.198	.912
C14	1.93	2.38	1.90	1.02	0.92	0.89	-.446	.024	.470	.465	.456	.995	.486
C15	1.43	1.75	1.67	0.78	1.04	0.80	-.321	-.238	.083	.365	.548	.488	.967
C16	1.77	2.50	2.29	0.93	0.93	1.01	-.732	-.518	.214	.030	.110	.091	.851
C17	2.04	2.38	2.57	1.14	0.92	1.25	-.339	-.536	-.196	.180	.717	.171	.912
C18	2.39	2.50	2.76	1.12	1.20	1.09	-.107	-.369	-.262	.441	.965	.407	.841
C19	2.02	2.88	2.71	1.09	1.25	1.19	-.857	-.696	.161	.019	.116	.047	.937
C20	2.05	2.88	3.05	1.18	0.83	1.20	-.821	-.994	-.173	.003	.154	.004	.932
C21	2.73	2.75	3.24	1.18	1.28	1.30	-.018	-.506	-.488	.266	.999	.243	.603
C22	2.07	2.75	2.43	1.06	0.71	1.08	-.679	-.357	.321	.137	.200	.375	.737

According to Table 10, significant differences are found between teachers at PLI and universities, which suggest that teachers at universities use L1 significantly more than those of PLI when believing L1 helps EFL learners to understand and follow instruction more closely in English learning (B6,  $p=.006$ ), and when considering the objectives of a lesson (B10,  $p=.035$ ), feeling that L1 will be more effective than using L2 (C1,  $p=.030$ ) and giving instructions about activities of a lesson (C2,  $p=.049$ ). In addition, teachers at both PLI and universities use L1 significantly more than those at PLI when considering the content of a lesson (B9,  $p=.016$ ), encouraging students (C19,  $p=.047$ ) and engaging students' attention (C20,  $p=.004$ ). Finally, teachers at both PLI and universities use L1 significantly more than those at universities only when giving instructions about activities of a lesson (C2,  $p=.039$ ).

The results suggest that the teaching locations of EFL teachers may have an impact on their attitudes towards and frequencies of using CS and its functions in EFL classes in some way. EFL teachers at universities tend to use CS more often than those at PLI. In addition, EFL teachers at both locations have greater tendencies to use CS only when giving instructions about activities of a lesson than those at PLI and at universities. However, it should be noted that for most questions, there is no significant between-group difference.

There was one item (C16) for which the ANOVA test showed significant difference among groups at  $p=.030$ . However, the post hoc test could not detect any between-group difference regarding this item, perhaps because this test was not that sensitive to show small difference between groups.

### 3.3 Qualitative Results

Ten interviewees were selected for interviews based on their representative orientations of attitudes towards CS (neutral, negative, and positive) for each of the five themes ("neutral" M: 2.5-3.5; "negative" M: 1.0-1.4; "positive" M: 3.6-5.0). The selection was also based on consideration of those whose responses showed higher than normal inconsistencies (i.e., MDs > 1.0) as well as balance of interviewees in terms of gender, age,

education, TESL location, and TESL experience. Table 11 shows the information about the interviewees.

**Table 11**

*Information about the Final Interviewees*

No	Res. #	Age group	Gender	Education	EFL location	EFL experience	Attitude
1	10	26-30	Female	MA	PLI	2-5 years	Neutral
2	25	41-50	Female	PhD	Both	More than 10 years	Positive
3	38	20-30	Female	MA	PLI	5-10 years	Negative
4	43	31-40	Male	MA	PLI	5-10 years	Negative
5	47	26-30	Female	MA	PLI	2-5 years	Negative
6	49	20-30	Male	MA	PLI	2-5 years	Neutral
7	56	31-40	Male	PhD	University	5-10 years	Positive
8	61	31-40	Male	PhD	Both	2-5 years	Neutral
9	73	41-50	Male	PhD	Both	More than 10 years	Negative
10	74	31-40	Female	MA	PLI	2-5 years	Neutral

The purposes of the interviews are (a) to confirm and clarify certain responses from the questionnaire, and (b) to explore reasons for using or not using CS in Iranian EFL classrooms. The following section summarizes the interview results pertaining to each theme.

***Theme 1: Iranian EFL Teachers' Attitudes towards CS in the Iranian EFL Context***

All interviewees from “negative” (participants 38, 43, 47, and 73), “neutral” (participants 10, 49, 61, and 74), and “positive” (participants 25 and 56) groups believed that CS could not be ignored in EFL classes and mentioned they used CS to some extent depending on their TEFL locations. However, the interviewees with negative perspectives specified that their restricted use of CS was because the teachers are required to make the most of the class time and give the students an equal share of exposure to English language.

***Theme 2: Iranian EFL Teachers' Attitude towards CS Related to Their Linguistic Proficiency and Pedagogical Considerations***

Regardless of their neutral, negative, and positive positions, the interviewees argued that teachers' CS depends on other factors, such as the level of the learners and TEFL locations, than teachers' linguistic proficiency, because at PLI the students are mostly homogeneous, whereas the students at universities are heterogeneous in terms of their language proficiency. Therefore, teachers at universities have greater tendency to use CS than those at PLI.

In addition, the majority of the interviewees (i.e., neutral and positive) mentioned they code-switched to address their pedagogical concerns because they wanted to make the lessons more understandable for their learners.

***Theme 3: Frequencies of CS for Pedagogical Functions***

Some interviewees provided reasons for CS in terms of their TEFL locations. Regardless of their negative orientations in the questionnaire, the majority of the interviewees (i.e., participants 10, 38, 43, 47, 49, and 74) mentioned that they used CS for low-proficient learners as a last resort to avoid being a model of bilingual dictionary for their learners. They found CS more efficient and “cost effective” when giving task instruction and explaining some grammatical points and newly taught vocabulary. On the other hand, participants 25 and 61 stated that they often used CS when they taught special courses, such as linguistics, translation, metacognitive strategies in listening, speaking, reading, and writing at universities in order to help students better understand and negotiate meaning and structures in relevant exercises, locate information in a passage, consider intonations and stress, brainstorm related vocabulary, generate ideas, and write in a paragraph (participant 25) because at the end of the terms the learners were required to pass exams in these courses (participant 61). The overwhelming majority of the interviewees confirmed that they mainly used oral CS in their EFL classes, specifically with the

low-proficiency learners because they wanted to save class time.

***Theme 4: Frequencies of CS for Classroom Management Reasons (i.e., Learner-Related Variables, Evaluation, and Disciplining)***

The interviewees with negative (38, 43, 47, and 74) to neutral (10 and 49) orientations stated that they did not want to be a model of L1 use to prevent learners' reliance on teachers' CS. They mentioned that they sometimes or seldom used CS to elicit responses, check learners' understanding, and discipline lower-level learners because these learners lack the required words in L2 and attention. Nevertheless, interviewees with positive outlook (e.g., 25, 56, 61, and 73) added that they used CS in accordance with the courses they taught and the levels of the learners in their classes because in this way teachers could have a better outlook about students' progress in the course and have a better idea of what to incorporate next in their teaching.

In terms of learner gender, some interviewees (38 and 49) mentioned they used CS more with boys at PLI because they thought boys were lazy and needed more help, whereas the majority of interviewees did not ascribe using CS to the gender of the learners.

***Theme 5: Frequencies of CS for Psychological and Interpersonal Reasons***

The more negatively oriented interviewees mentioned they rarely used CS only as a last resort with basic learners for the purpose of Theme 5 in order to decrease the stress of L2 learning and encourage them to continue learning. On the other hand, the neutral and more positively oriented interviewees (e.g., participants 25, 56, 61, and 73) mentioned that they sometimes used CS to tell jokes in order to establish rapport and have friendlier relationships with their adult learners and tried to encourage them to pay more attention to the key points for better understanding.

#### **4. Discussion**

The quantitative and qualitative results of the study indicate Iranian EFL teachers have largely negative to neutral attitudes towards CS in their EFL classes. The findings of the current study will now be compared to the findings of the relevant literature to find similarities and differences from previous research findings.

##### *4.1 What Are Iranian EFL Teachers' Attitudes towards CS in the EFL Classroom?*

The majority of the respondents to the questionnaire and the majority of the interviewees indicated their neutral attitudes towards CS. Although some respondents (e.g., participant 73) were identified as opponents of using CS based on the statistical analysis in Part I, they later confirmed, in the interviews, their conditional support for CS in their classes as the last resort, which itself showed that CS does exist in EFL classes. This finding is consistent with those of previous studies (e.g., Antón & DiCamilla, 1999; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Weng, 2012): that L1 use is not an obstacle to L2 learning and associate L1 use with a cognitive, affective, and linguistic tool which scaffolds the development of the L2 learners.

##### *4.2 What Are Iranian EFL Teachers' Attitudes towards CS Related to the Teachers' Linguistic Proficiency Levels and Pedagogical Considerations?*

Although the majority of the participants in the questionnaire strongly disagreed with ascribing CS to the teachers' linguistics proficiency (B7 and B8), such disagreement was lessened for teachers with lower L2 proficiency as compared with those with higher proficiency. This was confirmed in the interviews, in which the interviewees attributed use of CS to other factors such as pedagogical issues (e.g., teaching new vocabulary and hard grammatical point). This finding differs from those of Kang's (2008) study.

According to items B9 and B10, the respondents and all the interviewees showed a greater orientation towards using CS for the content and objectives of the lessons in their classes in order to make them more

understandable. However, some of them also cautioned that they would delay CS to the end of the class or use it as a last resort. This finding is consistent with previous studies (Bozorgian & Fallahpour, 2015; Canagarajah, 1999; de la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Martin, 1999; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Yao, 2011). This study differs from the previous studies in that this study compared the results taken from a large number of teachers and their attitudes.

#### *4.3 How Frequently Is Iranian EFL instructors' CS Related to Pedagogical Functions (i.e., Vocabulary, Grammar, Skills, etc.)?*

In previous studies, the majority of the respondents ascribed their CS to the pedagogical functions, such as finding CS more efficient and time saving than using English (Cook, 2001; Qian et al., 2009) when explaining difficult grammar, vocabulary, and idioms, giving instruction, (Alamri, 2016; Bozorgian & Fallahpour, 2015; de la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Liu et al., 2004; Pennington, 1995; Scotton & Ury, 1977; Sert, 2005; Turnbull, 2001; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; Yao, 2011), as well as teaching skills strategies such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Bozorgian & Pillay, 2013; Liu et al., 2004; Macaro, 2009).

According to the quantitative data of this study, the majority of the respondents tended not to use CS in teaching listening, speaking and reading; however, they showed slightly less reluctance of using CS for teaching writing skills. On the other hand, the interviewees clarified that at PLI, they did not have the same amount of skill strategy instruction as compared to universities, where EFL learners take courses in listening, speaking, reading and writing, which are taught for three consecutive terms from basic to advanced levels. Due to these reasons, the Iranian EFL teachers use more CS for skill enhancement at universities than the teachers at PLI. This finding is in line with the findings of some researchers (e.g. Macaro, 2009; Bozorgian & Pillay, 2013). In addition, a minority of the interviewees maintained that they used CS while teaching reading strategies, which is consistent with Liu et al. (2004).

The participants also confirmed that they used more oral CS in their classes than written CS because they found oral CS saves time and the knowledge could be imparted better than the written CS (Alamri, 2016; Hobbs, Matsuo, & Payne, 2010; Liu et al., 2004; Qian et al., 2009; Rezvani & Rasekh, 2011; Samar & Moradkhani, 2014).

#### *4.4 How Frequently Is Iranian EFL Teachers' CS from English to Persian Related to Classroom Management (i.e., Learner Gender, EFL Proficiency Level, Evaluation, and Discipline)?*

The majority of the respondents, either from questionnaire or from interview, strongly disagreed with using CS related to the specific gender of the learners. As no relevant research to date has considered the gender variable, this study could add to the literature that the gender factor is not an influential factor for CS. Further, comparing combined agreements and disagreements for using CS with different proficiency levels, about one third of the participants agreed that they used CS more when teaching basic-level learners to help them understand the previously taught materials.

This finding is to some extent consistent with several previous studies (e.g., Canagarajah, 1999; Lin, 1996; Liu et al., 2004; Martin, 1999; Pennington, 1995; Rezvani & Rasekh, 2011; Sali, 2014; Yao, 2011).

Although a minority of the Iranian EFL teachers ascribed their CS to its evaluative and managerial function in their classes while recording their attitudes in the questionnaire, the majority of the interviewees stated that they used CS for evaluative and managerial functions, which conforms to existing literature, such as eliciting responses from learners (Martin, 1999; Sali, 2014; Yao, 2011), checking their comprehension (Sali, 2014; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005) and disciplining the learners (Canagarajah, 1999; Rezvani & Rasekh, 2011; Sali, 2014; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005), which some interviewees in the current study found helpful for learners in lower-level classes.



#### *4.5 How Frequently Is Iranian EFL Teachers' CS From English to Persian Related to Psychological and Interpersonal Relationship with the Students?*

Like the more or less neutral attitudes of the respondents in answering the questionnaire, the interviewees demonstrated neutral to positive attitudes towards CS for the purpose of establishing an interpersonal relationship with their learners, which suggests that the Iranian EFL teachers used CS to some extent in order to encourage their learners (as noted in Pennington, 1995; Rezvani & Rasekh, 2011; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005), to engage their attention (Liu et al., 2004; Pennington, 1995; Sali, 2014; Yao, 2011), to make jokes and enliven the class atmosphere (Yao, 2011), and to accommodate learners' needs as they ask their teachers to switch code form English to Persian (Kang, 2008; Liu et al., 2004; Samar & Moradkhani, 2014).

In addition to the reasons relating to the previous research findings and supported by the participants of this study, some additional pedagogical purposes have emerged, based on the TEFL location at university. Specifically, the university professors mentioned that they used CS due to the courses they teach at university which are not included in PLI syllabi. The university teachers in the current study ascertained that they use CS when they teach skill strategies in listening, speaking, reading, and writing courses. They also mentioned they had to use L1 for courses where they need to compare and contrast the translated sentences.

The researcher also tried to uncover possible reasons for CS based on the education and TEFL locations of the respondents, which yielded the following interesting results that were not obvious in the findings of previous studies.

#### *4.6 Is Iranian EFL Teachers' CS Related to Their Sociocultural Attributes such as Education Level and TEFL Location?*

Iranian EFL teachers with higher education levels (e.g., PhD) have a greater tendency towards CS to some extent for some of the functions in Themes 3 and 5 than those with lower education levels (e.g., BA). However, theme-wise, there was not any statistical significant difference between PhD and MA holders as well as between MA and BA holders.

On the other hand, the item-based results suggest that the education level of EFL teachers does have an impact on their attitudes towards CS and its functions in EFL classes in some aspects, where EFL teachers with PhDs have a greater tendency towards CS than BA and MA holders. In addition, MA holders occasionally tend to use CS more than BA holders in their EFL classes.

In terms of TEFL location, the theme-based results suggest that Iranian EFL teachers' TEFL locations do have an effect on their decision to use CS in their EFL classes. Accordingly, EFL teachers at PLI tend to use less CS in their classes regarding its functions in Themes 1, 2, and 5.

On the other hand, the item-based results suggest that Iranian EFL teachers' TEFL locations do have an influence on their decision to use CS in their EFL classes. EFL teachers at PLI are least likely to use CS in their classes regarding its functions. In addition, EFL instructors teaching at both TEFL locations have a greater tendency towards CS than their counterparts at PLI and those at universities have been identified as the most frequent CS users in EFL classes. These are new findings that emerged from the current study which could add to the relevant literature.

## **5. Conclusion and Suggestions for Future Research**

This study gathered and analyzed opinions of 85 male and female Iranian TEFL teachers from different age groups, with different education degrees and TEFL experiences, and at different TEFL locations. Such diversity and complexity of the participants add external validity to the findings of the current study with respect to their attitudes towards CS from English to Persian and the ways they prefer to use or not use CS in their EFL classes.

Some of the teachers also iterated some reasons in the interview sessions which echoed the responses obtained through the questionnaire.

The quantitative and qualitative data of the current study demonstrate that CS is being used at relatively low frequencies in EFL classes in the Iranian context. According to the three attitudinal positions of neutral, negative, and positive, the respondents to the current study assert that they use Persian as a last resort in the form of CS for various motives, including pedagogical reasons, evaluative and managerial purposes, and establishment of interpersonal relationships. In addition, the participants reiterated that L1 was used with lower-level learners as a last resort in EFL classes to serve the above-mentioned functions in order to not let students become reliant on their teachers' CS and to avoid overshadowing the L2 exposure in EFL classes. This study also demonstrates the importance of CS in the skill strategies instructions in EFL classes at universities, especially in teaching listening and reading. As there has been little empirical research on Iranian EFL teachers' CS and their L1 use for skill strategy instruction in speaking and writing, and since Iranian EFL teachers recorded more instances of CS for writing activities in their classes compared to other skills in the questionnaire and reiterated such point of view in the interview sessions, this may offer some orientation for future research. However, the interviewees at private language institutes mentioned that they do not use CS for skill strategies instructions in their classes because they have limitations based on their syllabi.

Finally, the results of the current study indicate there are some statistically significant differences among Iranian EFL teachers' use of CS for some questions in terms of their education levels and their TEFL locations. Specifically, EFL teachers with higher degrees have a greater tendency towards CS than their lower-degree counterparts. EFL teachers at PLI are least likely to use CS in their classes regarding its functions. In addition, EFL instructors teaching at both TEFL locations have a greater tendency towards CS than their counterparts at PLI and those at universities have been identified as the most frequent CS users in EFL classes.

Overall, it can be concluded that although this study finds that Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes towards CS is largely neutral and their use of CS is less than frequent, instances of more positive attitudes and more frequent uses suggest that EFL teachers can use their shared L1 in their EFL classes strategically to benefit from CS for the appropriate functions, such as pedagogical, evaluative and managerial, and psychological and interpersonal. This study is limited by its lack of observation of EFL classes along with administration of the questionnaire and the subsequent follow-up interviews in the Iranian EFL context. Hence, it is suggested that future research focus on a triangulated exploratory study by adding observation of Iranian EFL teachers teaching at different TEFL locations in order to obtain a better outlook of the functions that CS might actually serve in their classes. Further, the curriculum designers for TEFL locations in Iran should consider these findings and include a section for strategic use of pedagogical CS in their syllabi.

## 6. References

- Al-Amri, A. (2016). *A case study of Arab instructors' attitudes toward code switching in English-major university classrooms* (Unpublished master's Major Research Paper). Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario.
- Antón, M., & DiCamilla, F. J. (1999). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 233-247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00018>
- Ariffin, K., & Husin, M. S. (2011). Code-switching and code-mixing of English and Bahasa Malaysia in content-based classrooms: Frequency and attitudes. *The Linguistics Journal*, 5(1), 220-247.
- Bozorgian, H., & Fallahpour, S. (2015). Teachers' and students' amount and purpose of L1 use: English as foreign language (EFL) classrooms in Iran. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 3(2), 67-81.
- Bozorgian, H., & Pillay, H. (2013). Enhancing foreign language learning through listening strategies delivered in L1: An experimental study. *International Journal of Instruction*, 6(1), 105-122.
- Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University

- Press.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>
- de la Campa, J. C., & Nassaji, H. (2009). The amount, purpose, and reasons for using L1 in L2 classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(4), 742-759. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2009.01052.x>
- Ford, K. (2009). Principles and practices of L1/L2 use in the Japanese university EFL classroom. *JALT Journal*, 31(1), 63-80.
- Gulzar, M. A. (2010). Code-switching: Awareness about its utility in bilingual classrooms. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 32(2), 23-44.
- Hobbs, V., Matsuo, A., & Payne, M. (2010). Code-switching in Japanese language classrooms: An exploratory investigation of native vs. non-native speaker teacher practice. *Linguistics and Education*, 21(1), 44-59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2009.12.004>
- Kang, D. M. (2008). The classroom language use of a Korean elementary school EFL teacher: Another look at TETE. *System*, 36(2), 214-226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2007.10.005>
- Lin, A. M. Y. (1996). Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic domination, resistance and code switching in Hong Kong schools. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(1), 49-84. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898\(96\)90006-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(96)90006-6)
- Liu, D., Ahn, G. S., Baek, K. S., & Han, N. O. (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), 605-638. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588282>
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 63-84). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Mahmoudi, L., & Amirkhiz, S. (2011). The use of Persian in the EFL classroom: The case of English teaching and learning at pre-university level in Iran. *English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 135-140. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n1p135>
- Martin, P. (1999). Bilingual unpacking of monolingual texts in two primary classrooms in Brunei Darussalam. *Language and Education*, 13(1), 38-58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500789908666758>
- McMillan, B. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2011). The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes toward "English only." *System*, 39(2), 251-263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.011>
- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 1-8.
- Pennington, M. C. (1995). Pattern and variation in use of two languages in the Hong Kong secondary English class. *RELC Journal*, 26(2), 80-105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829502600205>
- Qian, X., Tian, G., & Wang, Q. (2009). Codeswitching in the primary EFL classroom in China: Two case studies. *System*, 37(4), 719-730. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.09.015>
- Rezvani, E., & Rasekh, A. (2011). Code-switching in Iranian elementary EFL classrooms: An exploratory investigation. *English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 18-25. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n1p18>
- Rivers, D. J. (2011). Politics without pedagogy: Questioning linguistic exclusion. *ELT Journal*, 65(2), 103-113. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq044>
- Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System*, 42, 308-318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.021>
- Samar, R. G., & Moradkhani, S. (2014). Codeswitching in the language classroom: A study of four EFL teachers' cognition. *RELC Journal*, 45(2), 151-164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214534796>
- Scotton, C. M., & Ury, W. (1977). Bilingual strategies: The social functions of code-switching. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 1977(13), 5-20. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1977.15.193.5>
- Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11(8), 1-6.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 253-276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880000400304>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.4.531>

- Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 302-325.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00093.x>
- Weng, P. S. (2012). Code-switching as a strategy use in an EFL classroom in Taiwan. *US-China Foreign Language*, 10(10), 1669-1675.
- Yao, M. (2011). On attitudes to teachers' code-switching in EFL classes. *World Journal of English Language*, 1(1), 19-28. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjelv1n1p19>

## Appendices

## Code-Switching Questionnaire

A) Participant's information:

Gender	Male		Female	
Age group	20-30	31-40	41-50	
Education	BA	MA	PhD	
TEFL location	Institute	University	Both	
TEFL experience	Less than 1 year-5 years	5-10 years	More than 10 years	

B) Please read the following statements carefully and indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each. (Please choose only one option):

Items	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
1. Persian should be used in an EFL classroom.					
2. EFL instructors should use Persian as much as possible.					
3. EFL instructors should keep the use of Persian to a bare minimum.					
4. Instructors' use of Persian in an EFL classroom has a positive impact on teaching English.					
5. Instructors' use of Persian in an EFL classroom hinders English learning.					
6. Instructors' use of Persian in an EFL classroom helps EFL learners to understand and follow instruction more closely in English learning.					
7. Instructors with lower EFL proficiency should use <i>more</i> Persian in the EFL class.					
8. Instructors with higher EFL proficiency should use <i>more</i> Persian in the EFL class.					
9. The frequency of EFL instructors' use of Persian depends on the content of a lesson.					
10. The frequency of EFL instructors' use of Persian depends on the objectives of a lesson.					

C) Please read the following statements carefully and indicate the frequency that applies to each. (Please choose only one option):

Items	Never 1	Seldom 2	Sometimes 3	Often 4	Always 5
1. I use Persian in the EFL classroom if I feel that it will be more effective than using English.					
2. I use Persian in the EFL classroom in order to give instructions about activities of a lesson.					
3. I use Persian in the EFL classroom to explain grammatical points.					
4. I use Persian in the EFL classroom to explain new vocabulary.					
5. I use Persian in the EFL classroom in order to help learners with listening activities.					
6. I use Persian in the EFL classroom in order to help learners with speaking activities.					
7. I use Persian in the EFL classroom in order to help learners with reading activities.					
8. I use Persian in the EFL classroom in order to help learners with writing activities.					
9. I use Persian in the EFL classroom in its spoken form.					
10. I use Persian in the EFL classroom in its written form.					
11. I tend to use Persian when I am teaching female learners.					
12. I tend to use Persian when I am teaching male learners.					
13. I tend to use Persian when I am teaching basic-level EFL learners.					
14. I tend to use Persian when I am teaching intermediate-level EFL learners.					
15. I tend to use Persian when I am teaching advanced-level EFL learners.					
16. I use Persian in the EFL classroom to elicit responses from the students.					
17. I use Persian in the EFL classroom to check students' comprehension.					
18. I use Persian in the EFL classroom to discipline students.					
19. I use Persian in the EFL classroom to encourage students.					
20. I use Persian in the EFL classroom to engage their attention.					
21. I use Persian in the EFL classroom to make a joke and enliven the atmosphere.					
22. I use Persian in the EFL classroom when students ask me to do so.					

### Interview Guide

**Theme 1:** Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes towards code-switching (CS) in Iranian EFL context

- What is your attitude towards CS in the EFL classes considering your experience/s of EFL teaching at different EFL locations (i.e., PLI, universities, or both)? (Positive=agree / neutral/ Negative=disagree) Explain why?

**Theme 2:** Iranian EFL teachers' attitude towards CS related to their linguistic proficiency and pedagogical considerations

- Do you think Iranian teachers with low EFL proficiency use more or less CS than their high proficient counterparts? Why?
- Do you think Iranian EFL teachers use CS for the purpose of the content of a lesson and its objectives? Why?

**Theme 3:** Frequencies of CS for pedagogical functions

- Do you use CS while teaching grammar and vocabulary? Why?
- Do you use CS while teaching skill strategies for listening, speaking, reading and writing? why?
- According to your own experience of EFL learning and teaching, how do you switch from English to Persian, oral or written? (written e.g. writing the meaning on the board in L1, giving comments in learners' books and notebooks in L1)

**Theme 4:** Frequencies of CS for evaluative and managerial reasons

- Do you think Iranian EFL teachers use CS teaching due to learner-related variables (i.e. gender and proficiency level)? why?
- Why do/do not you use CS in your class in order to evaluate your learners' and elicit responses?

**Theme 5:** Frequencies of CS for psychological and interpersonal reasons

- Do you use CS for the purpose of establishing interpersonal relationship? Why?