

Functions of Code-Switching and Attitudes toward Them: A Case Study

Almira Dykhanova

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
English Language Teaching

Eastern Mediterranean University
August 2015
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Serhan Çiftçiöđlu
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev
Chair, Department of English Language Teaching

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan

ABSTRACT

Code-switching is a prevalent fact in English medium classes in countries where English language is a foreign language. The principle in English language institutions requires from their instructors using only English in the classroom, when the practical observation could differ. Students' insights and attitudes are worthy of consideration and should be taken into account.

This study is a trial to go behind the functions of code-switching at an English medium university in Kazakhstan. It also seeks to investigate the instructors' attitudes toward their use of code-switching in the class and their students' attitudes toward it. To achieve these goals, the data was collected through the questionnaire, which was distributed to 200 students and 50 teachers. The questionnaire was designed based on Hymes' (1962) framework. The data was analysed via software programme SPSS 20.

The data analysis result revealed that the majority of the instructors' attitude toward code-switching in the class is negative. Most of the students have negative or neutral attitudes toward their teachers' code-switching in the class. In addition, the teachers claim they try not to code-switch in the class. However, when they code-switch they identify that they do it mainly to translate and clarify difficult vocabulary and terminology. Therefore, the main function employed by the teachers is metalinguistic. Moreover, native language, gender, teaching experience and year of study had a considerable effect on attitudes toward code-switching. In general, the teachers fulfil their students' needs.

Keywords: code-switching, code-mixing, native language, attitude toward code-switching, functions of code-switching, English medium of instruction.

ÖZ

Düzenek deęiřtirme, İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olduęu ölkelerin sınıflarında eğitim dili olarak sıkça kullanılan bir fenomendir. İngilizce eğitim veren eğitim kurumlarının, kuralı gereęi öğretmenlerden eğitimde yalnızca İngilizce kullanılmasını talep ederler. Fakat, sınıflarda bu durum farklılık gösterebilir. Öğrencilerin, bu konudaki fikirleri ve tutumları dikkate alınmaya deęer ve hatta alınmalıdır.

Bu çalışma, Kazakistan'da İngilizce eğitim veren bir üniversitedeki öğretmenlerin düzenek deęiřtirmedeki işlevlerini arařtırmak için yapılmıřtır. Aynı zamanda, bu çalışma öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin sınıfta düzenek deęiřtirmeye karřın tavırlarını bulmayı amaçlar. Bu amaca ulaşabilmek için, 200 öğrenci ve 50 öğretmene anket verilmiřtir ve veriler bu anket aracılıęıyla toplanmıřtır. Bu anket, Hymes'in (1962) modelini temel alarak hazırlanmıřtır. Veriler SPSS 20 yazılım programıyla analiz edilmiřtir.

Veri analizinin sonuçları, birçok öğretmenin düzenek deęiřtirmeye karřı tutumunun negatif olduęunu açığa çıkarmıřtır. Öğrencilerin çoęunun, öğretmenlerinin sınıfta düzenek deęiřtirmesine karřı negatif veya tarafsız tutumları olmuřtur. Bununla birlikte, öğretmenler sınıfta düzenek deęiřtirmemeye çalıştıklarını iddia etmiřlerdir. Fakat, düzenek deęiřtirdiklerinde bunu genelde zor kelime veya terimleri çevirmek ve açıklamak için yaptıklarını belirtmiřlerdir. Bu nedenle, öğretmenlerin yaptıęı en önemli faktörü üst dilseldir (metalinguistic). Üstelik, ana dil, cinsiyet, eğitim tecrübesi ve eğitim yılının düzenek deęiřtirmeye karřı tavırlar üzerinde çok önemli etkileri vardır. Genel olarak, öğretmenler kendi öğrencilerinin ihtiyaçlarını yerine getirir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Düzenek deęiřtirme, düzenek karıřtırma, ana dil, düzenek deęiřtirmeye karřın tavır, düzenek deęiřtirmenin iřlevleri, İngilizce dili eęitimi.

DEDICATION

To My Father

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I thank everybody who helped me to write my thesis. Specially, I would like to thank my advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev for his guidance and understanding and Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam and Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan for their contribution.

I am grateful to my friends in Kazakhstan, Alisher Nahimov, Bek Bayguttinov, Shamsiddin Dykhanov, Gainel Chendybayeva, Alexandra Ignatenko and Zarina Zhakhanova, for their cooperation in conducting my survey.

I am also thankful to my university friends, Malek Othman, Rauza Aubakirova, Pouya Zargar, Anas Shajrawi and Mohammad Eghlima, for their considerable help and support.

Finally, I appreciate my father who motivated me to write my thesis, and to who I dedicate it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZ	v
DEDICATION	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Presentation	1
1.2 Background of the Study	1
1.3 Statement of the Problem	4
1.4 Purpose of the Study	5
1.5 Significance of the Study	5
1.6 Definition of Terms	6
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1 Presentation	7
2.2 Definition of Code-switching.....	7
2.3 Approaches, Types and Social Functions of Code-switching.....	9
2.4 Classroom Code-switching	11
2.4.1 Functions of Classroom Code-switching	11
2.4.2 Attitudes toward Classroom Code-switching.....	13
2.4.3 Research Findings of Previous Studies in Different Context.....	16
2.5 Conclusion.....	27

3 METHOD.....	29
3.1 Presentation	29
3.2 Research Design.....	29
3.3 Context and Participants of the Study	30
3.4 Instruments	32
3.5 Data Collection.....	34
3.6 Data Analysis	35
3.7 Conclusion.....	35
4 RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS.....	36
4.1 Presentation	36
4.2 Results related to the first research question:	36
“What are the functions of teachers’ code-switching in the class?”	36
4.3 Results related to the second research question:	40
“What are the teachers’ attitudes towards their own use of code-switching in the class?”	40
4.4 Results related to the third research question:.....	41
“What are the students’ attitudes toward the use of code-switching?”	41
4.5 Results related to the fourth research question:	43
“Do the teacher’ attitudes toward code-switching correspond to the students’ attitudes?”.....	43
4.6 Results of analysis of correlations between variables	44
4.7 Conclusion.....	46

5 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS...	48
5.1 Presentation	48
5.2 Discussion of the Results	48
5.3 Conclusion.....	54
5.4 Implications and Recommendations for the Further Research	56
APPENDICES	76
Appendix A. Teachers' Questionnaire.....	77
Appendix B. Students' Questionnaire.....	80
Appendix C. Descriptive Statistics	83
Appendix D. Table of Correlations between Variables	85
Appendix E. Specification for Preference for Code-switching of Students.....	96
Appendix F. Specification for Preference for Code-switching of Teachers	97
Appendix G. T-test for Students	98
Appendix H. T-test for Teachers.....	99
Appendix I. T-distribution of Comparing Students' and Teachers' Attitudes.....	100

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The summary of the teachers' background information	32
Table 2. The summary of the students' background information	32
Table 3. Distribution of the Respondents Related Functions of the Teachers' Code-switching in the Class.	39
Table 4. Distribution of the Teachers' Respondents Related to the Attitudes toward Code-switching.	40
Table 5. Distribution of the Students' Respondents Related to the Attitudes toward the Teachers' Code-switching.....	42

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Presentation

The chapter aims to introduce the background of the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, and the definitions of the terms.

1.2 Background of the Study

The main purpose of language is communication (Berns, 1990 as cited in Sreehari, 2012). It is assumed that superior part of the world's populace is bilingual today (Grosjean, 2010). Therefore, using two languages in the same society got a norm in the modern world. Bilingual primarily means someone with possession of two languages (Mackey, 1962; Valdes & Figueroa, 1994; Wei, 2000). The existence of two languages in a community is a common situation in many societies (Asali, 2011). Speakers of such communities often use two languages when talking, shifting between the languages. This fact is recognized as 'code-switching'/'code switching'/'codeswitching'. Code-switching is popular in countries where two languages are spoken and in countries with many exterior incomers (Asali, 2011). Code-switching may also mean mixing varieties of the same language (Wardhaugh, 2006). As Wardhaugh (2006) stated, this phenomenon is known as diglossia. Code-switching is often confused with code-mixing although there is a difference between these notions. While code-switching refers to a mixture of words from different languages in one sentence, code-mixing means mixture of different lexical units and grammar (Muysken, 2000).

As Kazakhstan is a multicultural country with more than 120 ethnicities, many languages are spoken there. Hence, code-switching phenomenon is common in Kazakhstan. According to language policy in Kazakhstan, the Kazakh language is proclaimed as a state language, whereas Russian is declared as the language of interethnic communication, or in other words as lingua franca. It is so because Kazakhstan was the only Soviet republic in which the titular nationality constituted less than 50% of the population. Only due to demographic changes of the 1990s, when ethnic Russians, Greeks, Germans and others migrated to their historical motherlands, and ethnic Kazakhs from other countries moved to Kazakhstan, the population of ethnic Kazakhs nowadays constitute 66,1%, ethnic Russians – 21,05%, and other ethnicities constitute the rest of the population (“The population of the Republic of Kazakhstan”, 2015). Moreover, geographically Kazakhstan is close to Russia that made Russian culture influence Kazakhstan. There are many other languages used in different communities, for example, Uyghur, Azerbaijanian, Uzbek, and Turkish.

Since Kazakhstan belongs to the expanding circle according to the categorization of countries with respect to the status and use of English by Kachru (1992), English is a foreign language in Kazakhstan. The functions of English in Kazakhstan are restricted to a few specific domains. It is not officially used and does not have an official status. It is normally used only in communication with foreigners who visit the country. It is also used in English as a foreign language (EFL) classes and in English as medium of instruction classes in some institutions. However, English is popular among young people. They consider English as a language of developed Western countries. European and American style of leaving and culture are promoted

by mass media and contribute to the esteem to English language among young people in Kazakhstan (Akynova, 2014). Another factor that influences the popularity of English in Kazakhstan is that many employers require knowledge of English. Thus, the English language gives an opportunity to get a well-paid prestigious job.

At the same time, the language policy of Kazakhstan promotes multilingualism. It develops the state language, preserves the functional importance of Russian, develops ethnic languages, and fosters the use of English (Nazarbayev, 2007, as cited in Akynova, 2013). This trilingualism policy was introduced in 2007 by the government of Kazakhstan and is encouraged at the state level. Therefore, the popularity of English in Kazakhstan is growing. Consequentially, English language teaching has also gained importance. In 2004, English language started to be taught from the second form in 32 schools all over the state. In 2012, there were 165 schools with English classes starting from the second grade. From the 2013-2014 academic year, English has been taught from the first grade, 3 hours a week. In 2010, there were 7 English-medium schools (Akynova, 2014).

Code-switching has received a great attention from researchers since the 1950 (Ibrahim, Shah & Armia, 2013) and since the 1990s code-switching in ESL and EFL contexts has been widely examined (Weng, 2012).

Scholars have investigated code-switching from different perspectives, such as functions (e.g., Rose, 2006), educational effects of code-switching (e.g., Mokgwathi & Webb, 2013) and attitudes toward it (e.g., Rahimi & Jafari, 2011; Craven, 2011; Valerio, 2015) in different countries such as China, Turkey, India, African countries, Spain, and many other settings.

Code-switching is a debatable issue in classroom discourse. Almost all English language teaching methods have specific rules regarding the classroom language usage for both teachers and students. Some approaches support the mother tongue use, whereas others stand for ban it since native language can prevent target language acquisition.

Eldridge (1996) asserted that with the breakthrough of the Direct Method English-only policy was maintained in many institutions. Consequentially, it led to requirement of native English-speaking teachers who usually do not know learners' native language (Macaro, 2005). It also brought to publication of textbooks on only English language (Butzkamm, 2003).

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The language policy in English medium institutions calls teachers for using only English in the class. The observation of the actual classes may show different practice. Instructors can switch to Russian and Kazakh. English medium teachers are supposed to have great English language skills. Many people consider code-switching as a feature of low level of language competence that makes many instructors avoid code-switching in the class (Palmer, 2009). At the same time, if students have difficulties with communication in English language, code-switching may serve as helpful means of teaching and learning (Huerta-Macia & Quentero, 1992).

Students' insights and impressions are worthy of consideration. Students' attitudes to teachers' code-switching should be taken into account because if their attitude is negative, it may influence their attitude toward the teachers who code-switch and their motivation to learn.

Thus, a necessity to inquire into if the use of code-switching in the class is a bad behaviour or useful teaching technique exists. Teachers should understand functions of code-switching and students' attitude toward it to make their lessons more effective.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The study aims to reveal functions of code-switching in English medium classes at the university in Kazakhstan and the teachers' and the students' attitudes toward the use of code-switching by teachers in the classroom.

There are four research questions of the study:

- 1) What are the functions of the teachers' code-switching in the class?
- 2) What are the teachers' attitudes toward their own use of code-switching in the class?
- 3) What are the students' attitudes toward the teachers' uses of code-switching?
- 4) Do the teachers' attitudes toward code-switching correspond to the students' attitudes?

1.5 Significance of the Study

Many researchers have paid attention to the functions and role of code-switching in EFL and ESL, although not much research has been conducted in English medium classes in countries where English is a foreign language. Moreover, there is no study investigating both teachers' and learners' attitudes toward code-switching in English medium classes in Kazakhstan. Considering these circumstances, the present study investigates code-switching in the classes where English is a medium of instruction in Kazakhstan. The study is a trial to fill this gap. The research is anticipated to be

useful for other researchers investigating this topic. Finally, it will increase our knowledge of functions of code-switching and attitudes toward it.

1.6 Definition of Terms

Attitude: favourable or unfavourable assessment of something, somebody or situation (Asali, 2011).

Code-switching: usage of more than one language during the same conversation (Heller, 1999).

Code-mixing: instances when the lexical units and grammatical features from different languages perform in the same sentence (Muysken, 2000).

First language (L1)/Native language/Mother tongue: a language that is acquired from nativity or during the critical period, a language that the one speaks the best (Bloomfield, 1994). Some people consider notion native language/mother tongue as identification of ethnicity, while the one may have several native languages by being bilingual or may have native language different from his/her ethnicity (Davies, 2003).

Second language (L2): a language that is acquired or learned after L1 (Cristal, 2003).

Foreign language: a language that is not usually spoken in a specific country or social group (Cristal, 2003).

Bilingualism: instances while two languages are used in a country or social group (Appel & Muysken, 1987).

Multilingualism: instances while more than two languages are spoken in a country or a social group (Aitken, 1992).

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Presentation

The purpose of this chapter is revision and investigation of the literature regarding the topic. The chapter is devoted to the definition of code-switching, approaches to code-switching and social functions of code-switching. The chapter also deals with the literature related to the classroom code-switching, its definition, function, attitudes toward it, and empirical studies of classroom code-switching in various contexts.

2.2 Definition of Code-switching

One of the earliest definitions, according to Redouane (2005), belongs to Weinreich (1953) who describes people speaking two languages as persons switching from one language to the other due to change in conversation (Weinreich, 1953 cited in Redouane, 2005). Code-switching can be broadly designated as the employment of two languages within one conversation (Valdes-Fallis, 1977), or as Heller (1989) denoted, the usage of more than one language during the same conversation. These definitions are combined in Muysken's (1995) one. He defined it as speaking more than one language during the same talk (Muysken, 1995). More specifically, the term can be outlined as shift among languages in the middle of speech when interlocutors know these languages (Cook, 2011), or as Myers-Scotton (1993) defined the choice of the structure from two or more linguistic variation in the same conversation by bilingual or multilingual people.

One more phenomenon peculiar to a multilingual is code-mixing. In many papers code-switching and code-mixing designate the same concept, while in other papers they imply different concepts (Asali, 2011). Muysken (2000) defined code-mixing as instances when the lexical units and grammatical characteristics from different languages perform in one sentence. Similarly, Bhatita and Ritchie (2004) denoted code-mixing as mixing of dissimilar linguistic elements from different grammatical systems inside of a sentence. However, because code-mixing is a fussy concept, Beardsome (1991) rejected the use of this term (Beardsome, 1991). His position is understandable because some other scholars use the term ‘code-mixing’ to refer such occurrence as borrowing, transfer, or code-switching (McClaughin, 1984).

Diglossia is one more event of linguistic analyses of code-switching. According to Ferguson (1959), the term means codified variety of languages that is employed in a specific occasion (Ferguson, 1959 cited in Wardhaugh, 2006). The main feature of diglossia is that the varieties of the language are used in different situations. For instance, some variety can be used in formal occasions such as political speech or news on television, when another variety can be used in informal situations like family conversation or movies. Diglossia often does not make a problem for interlocutors. It can be a problem if it is aimed to diminish areal or social boundaries, or to unite a state language (Wardhaugh, 2006).

Although the difference between code-switching and borrowing exists, the terms are often confused. The similarity of code-switching and borrowing is that they relate to movement in the language where one lexical unit from another language appears in a sentence or utterance (Clyne, 1991). The difference is that monolingual and bilingual

speakers can use borrowing, and code-switching can be used only by bilingual or multilingual speakers (Poplack, 1988).

2.3 Approaches, Types and Social Functions of Code-switching

There are three main approaches to code-switching. Psycholinguistic, linguistic or grammatical and sociolinguistic. Psycholinguistic approach studies different aspects of language abilities that allow speakers alternate languages. Linguistic approach studies the grammatical rules for language shift. Sociolinguistic approach studies the reasons for code-switching (Appel and Muysken, 1987).

The reasons for code-switching and its functions are topics of discussion in many studies. One of the earliest works where code-switching was investigated is “Social meaning in linguistic structures” by Bloom and Gumperz’s (1972). According to them, there are two types of code-switching: situational, which occurs when the situation changes, and metaphorical that occurs while changing a topic (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972). However, in 1982 Gumperz suggested six functions of code-switching: quotation marking, addressee specification, interjection, message qualification, and personalization versus objectivization. Quotation marking is a case when a speaker code-switches to quote or report somebody’s speech. Addressee specification is a code-switching in order to invite to participate in the conversation. Interjections are a code-switching for clarification or better understanding. Message qualification serves a function to qualify a previously mentioned statement. Personalization versus objectivization indicates the difference between fact and opinion, if a statement reflects personal opinion or knowledge, and if it refers to specific instances or to a generally known fact.

In addition, he categorised code-switching into conversational, which occurs when two languages appear within one utterance or between utterances and situational, when code-switching depends on a situation (Gumperz, 1982). He also proposed the concept ‘we-code’ that means the language of minority and ‘they-code’ the language of the dominant group. Gumperz (1982) stated that in some communities codes are connected to political and cultural identity.

Similarly, for some scholars the most salient function of code-switching and code-mixing is identity-making, when a speaker code-switches to show his/her belonging to some community, religion, etc. Heller (1999) viewed code-switching as a political strategy. She described the bounds between language and personality in connection with economics and class. For instance, Arabic and Persian for demonstration of Islamic identity, French for a sophisticated, diplomatic country image in czarist Russia that depicted in Tolstoy’s “War and Peace”, and local languages for ethnic or tribal solidarity in East Africa (Myers-Scotton, 1993).

Myers-Scotton (1993) shared Heller’s (1999) idea and claimed that every language in a multilingual community tied with the particular social role (Myers-Scotton, 1993). Moreover, she distinguished three functions of code-switching: an unmarked choice, a marked choice, and an exploratory choice (Myers-Scotton, 1993). An unmarked choice occurs when code-switching is an expected choice, a marked choice occurs when code-switching is an unexpected choice that aims to show social distance, and an exploratory choice occurs in situations with ambiguity of option of a common language (Myers-Scotton, 1993).

Poplack (1980) identified types of code-switching as inter-sentential switching, intra-sentential switching, and tag switching. Intra-sentential switching happens within clause boundaries and requires competence in both languages in order to integrate two or more linguistic systems. Inter-sentential code-switching happens in a sentence barriers. Tag switches are small units from another language. For example, saying, “you know” at the end of a sentence while speaking another language. Such expressions are used automatically and can be seen as slips of the tongue (Poplack, 1980).

2.4 Classroom Code-switching

This part is devoted to research that includes studies dealing with attitudes toward code-switching and code-mixing and their functions in the classroom in different languages and contexts.

2.4.1 Functions of Classroom Code-switching

Code-switching in the class is the usage of more than one linguistic code by a teacher or students. It can include code-mixing as well as code-switching (Lin, 1990, 2008).

Even if code-switching may be an automatic and unconscious behaviour, it might necessarily serve some function. Different scholars report different functions of code-switching. Ferguson (2003) provided an overview of some recent studies of classroom code-switching using the following three main categories of functions:

- 1) Code-switching to evaluate curriculum, when a teacher code-switches to asses students or their works;
- 2) Code-switching to manage classroom, when a teacher code-switches to control students;

- 3) Code-switching to discuss personal issues, when teacher code-switches while talking to students on topics not related to teaching or learning (Ferguson, 2003 as cited in Wei, 2009).

Similarly, Auerbach (1993) included categories mentioned above to his own differentiation. He suggested such functions of code-switching as:

- 1) Discussion of syllabus;
- 2) Office work;
- 3) Administration of classroom;
- 4) Scene setting;
- 5) Language research;
- 6) Performance of grammar, phonology, morphology, and spelling;
- 7) Discussion of cross-cultural issues;
- 8) Tasks or hints;
- 9) Interpretation of mistakes;
- 10) Evaluation of understanding.

In contrary, Myers-Scotton (1993) categorized code-switching in the classroom according to the markedness model, which, however, corresponds to two previous classifications. Her categorization is as follows:

- 1) Interpretation and clarification of subject;
- 2) Evaluation of comprehension;
- 3) Affirmation and stimulation of participation;
- 4) Management;
- 5) Humour and sign of bilingual identity.

Eldridge (1996) in contrary to previous scholars focused on students' use of code-switching and found four functions:

- 1) Equivalence – using equal lexical units from L1 in target language;
- 2) Floor-holding – filling the gaps with L1 use;
- 3) Reiteration – conformation, underling, or clarification of message that was not understood;
- 4) Conflict – management of clash use of language.

Hymes (1962) also focused on students' switching and offered four basic communicative functions of it:

- 5) Expressive function that suggests use code-switching to express emotions;
- 6) Directive function that suggests a speaker's will to direct someone or to get the listeners' attention;
- 7) Metalinguistic function, which includes the definition of terms, paraphrasing others' words, and some metaphors;
- 8) Poetic functions when during the conversation, the speaker inserts some jokes, stories, poetic quotations to add a sense of humour;
- 9) Contact – using code-switching to makes learners have a sense of belonging or to enhance their activity.

2.4.2 Attitudes toward Classroom Code-switching

Attitudes toward code-switching are diverse. In general, there are two positions toward code-switching: positive and negative. Some scholars support the idea of using L1 in the classroom justifying it by its benefits. Others support the idea of using only the target language in the classroom and put forward other arguments why the mother tongue should not be used (Bock, Forchhammer, Heider & Baron, 1991).

2.4.2.1 Positive attitude toward code-switching in the classrooms

Skiba (1997) reported that code-switching is effective in conveying the meaning. Comparably, Ahmad and Jusoff (2009) proclaimed the same idea and asserted various positive functions of code-switching, such as enriching vocabulary and grammar, relaxing learners that fosters the students' comprehension. Similarly, Brown (2006) was also in favour of using the native language in order to facilitate the process of learning in the classroom and harmonize different capacities of language competency. Auerbach (1993) likewise touched upon psychological effects of code-switching. He stated that L1 made learners feel safe and let them express themselves (Aurbach, 1993).

A number of scholars agreed with the use of code-switching in the classroom. They maintained the position that code-switching should not be considered as a teacher's defect but as a teaching strategy (Chick & McKay, 1999; Schweers, 1999; Burden, 2001; Dash, 2002; Tang, 2002 as cited in Ahmad, 2009). Such parallels are found in Cook's (2002) assentation. He declared that teachers' switching in the class helped learning the world outside (Cook, 2002). Moreover, the use of students' native language in the classroom helped their learning because they feel that their L1 identities are valued (Lucas & Katz, 1994 as cited in Gomez, 2014). Above all, many teachers found it difficult or even impossible to teach target language exclusively in the target language (Cook, 2002). In general, the scholars saw code-switching as facilitating of relaxing and warm atmosphere in the class and easy comprehension.

2.4.2.2 Negative attitude toward code-switching in the classrooms

In contrary to previous views, many scholars believed the use of code-switching in the classroom may be signal that the lesson goes incorrectly (Willis, 1981). For

example, Ellis (1994), Cook (2001), and Richards and Rodgers (2001), claimed code-switching was not always effective. The main reason for that is that using L1 decreases the use of L2 (Cook, 2001). Sert (2005) reported that the students used the vocabulary of their L1 when they did not know the equivalent in the target language and it led to students' loss of fluency. Eldridge (1996) suggested decreasing code-switching and increasing the use of target language in the classroom. Thus, he did not support using the native language in a classroom because it hampers the learning of the target language. However, Osam (1997) criticised Eldridge's (1996) statement. Osam (1997) claimed that shifting from one language to another can be called as "intra language", which has its own benefits in the class. Cook (2002) also commented that code-switching in multicultural classroom may be problematic if there is no mutual language for all the students and if the instructor does not know the mother tongue of the learners.

There can be various reasons for the negative attitude toward code-switching in the classroom. Cook (2002) stated that one reason could be that the use of the target language makes the classroom seem more real and credible. Another reason was that if a class is multilingual with different first languages, it seems unreal to take into account all of them (Cook, 2002). One more reason was naturalistic approach to language teaching, which declares that students should be submerged in the target language and teachers should provide potential for exposure to the target language (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). Therefore, opponents of L1 use view considered the only way in which language should be taught is "no L1 use."

Thereby, attitudes of the scholars toward code-switching are divided into two. Likewise, teachers may have different opinion about the use of code-switching in the

class. They also may have dilemma about using code-switching in the class or not. Their attitude toward code-switching and functions it applies in the class are described below.

2.4.3 Research Findings of Previous Studies in Different Context

2.4.3.1 Code-switching in EFL Classroom

There are many studies in the field of classroom code-switching. Most of them have been conducted in a bilingual setting where English is a lingua franca or a second language (e.g., Setati, 1998; Uys & Dulm, 2001) and where English is a foreign language (e.g., Alinezi, 20010; Sampson, 2011; Hait, 2014).

Various studies have been conducted to find out attitudes toward the first language use in EFL classrooms in Arab countries. For example, Al-Nofaie (2010) examined the teachers' and the students' attitudes toward using Arabic in English classes in Saudi Arabia. She discovered that the attitudes of the teachers and the students about using Arabic were positive. Moreover, the teachers and the students wanted to use Arabic in some cases, though the instructors reported they knew the drawbacks of using native language. In contrast, in Dweik's (2000) study, the students hold negative point of view towards the teachers' use of Arabic because they considered such teachers as weak in English. Hussein (1999) conducted a research into students' attitudes toward code-switching in one of the universities of Jordan and its functions. He found that the students had both negative and positive attitudes. The results indicated that the major reason for code-switching was the absence of equivalents for terms and expressions in English (Hussein, 1999). Hait (2014) also examined code-switching functions in secondary school in Jordan and revealed that students mainly used code-switching to discuss personal, educational or pedagogical issues.

Yletyine (2004) in her study about functions of code-switching in EFL classroom in secondary school in Finland found that teachers used code-switching to help pupils who were less competent, to mark a shift in the lesson, to move from one topic to another, to teach grammar because pupils were not familiar with English terminology. She claimed that code-switching was a useful strategy in the classroom as it saved time. However, the researcher noticed if code-switching is used a lot, the pupils may learn to expect that after the teacher said something in English he/she would repeat it in Finnish (Yletyine, 2004). Thus, they would not pay much attention to the English instruction, as they knew they would hear the same thing in their mother tongue (Yletyinen, 2004). Regarding learners' code-switching she found that they used it to help pupils and to correct each other. Sometimes pupils whose level was high used Finnish instead of English to show to the other pupils that they want to level with them. If they used English, the others might feel that these pupils were showing off their English skills (Yletyinen, 2004).

Yletyinen's (2004) findings correspond to Hamidi and Sarem's (2012) research results conducted in Iranian EFL classroom in Language Institute. They reported that the teacher code-switched to make himself understood. The teachers also switched to joke. On the part of the students, they code-switched mainly to help their counterparts to correct themselves when they made mistakes. They investigated an interesting fact. When the teacher code-switched, the students did the same. The students seemed easier to use the language that they knew better (Hamidi & Sarem, 2012). By contrast, Rahimi and Jafari (2011) in their study on students' attitudes toward code-switching found that many students agreed that sometimes teachers and students should not use Persian, even though it facilitated their interactions. Similar

to research mentioned above, Moghadam, Samad and Shahraki's (2012) findings suggested that the students code-switched to verify comprehension, to ask to clarify and to socialise due to the lack of vocabulary knowledge. The teacher used native language to clarify and translate when it was necessary (Moghadam, Samad & Shahraki, 2012). Fatemi and Barani (2014) studied the influence of teachers' code-switching on the vocabulary learning in one of the universities in Iran. They declared that code-switching in the class was not always a barrier or a problem in language learning situation, but helpful technique since it made points more understandable and made the process of transferring knowledge easier for the teachers (Fatemi & Barani, 2014).

Camilleri (1996) conducted a research in a secondary bilingual classroom in Malta where English is a second language. She investigated that Maltese was used to express amicability and to diminish social distance among class participants. The researcher assumed that English remained official language, and its use increased the social distance. Using only English is considered as snobbism in Malta. That is why code-switching served as a way of escaping looking like snob (Camilleri, 1996). She asserted that code-switching needed to be considered as communicative resource as well as a strategy of building special professional identity, to balance the use of English to look educated and to show Maltese identity (Camilleri, 1996).

A number of studies have been done in African countries. English language is the official language of learning and teaching there. Most of the code-switching research carried out there focused on its functions. All of the studies reported that teachers switched to their native languages during classes. Mokgwathi and Webb (2013) asserted that teachers did so because learners were not proficient in English and it

increased learners' participation and comprehension. At the same time, they confessed it did not contribute to develop the learners' proficiency and confidence in speaking English (Mokgwathi & Webb, 2013). They found that code-switching enhanced comprehension, increased participation, and expanded vocabulary. Yet code-switching prevented learners' confidence in speaking English, those who are not competent in their native languages felt discrimination (Mokgwathi & Webb, 2013). Rose (2006) obtained that code-switching helped learners to understand better and to feel free to give their opinion. Uys and Dulm (2011) also focused on functions of classroom code-switching, and they detected code-switching was used to talk about the curricular material and to mark interpersonal relation.

Younas, Arshad, Akram, Faisal, Akhtar and Sarfraz (2014) conducted a research to investigate how EFL teachers affect L2 learners' learning in the Indian university. They reported that a majority of students agreed they felt comfortable when the teacher code-switched because it decreased the pressure of L2 language on students. Mostly, students felt difficult to understand words, concepts, and terms of L2.

Many studies have investigated code-mixing and code-switching between Spanish and English. Similar to Yletyinen's (2004) findings mentioned above, Falomir and Laguna (2012) noted that the main reasons for code-switching were ease of expression and economy of speech due to the learners' limited competence and insecurity, and translation. It was also used to clarify requirements, to translate vocabulary and to restructure patterns in conversations (Falomir & Laguna, 2012). Martinez (2010) shared the similar idea in his study into the significance of code-switching between Spanish and English in enhancement of educational literacy. He claimed that code-switching was a tool that helped students to manage

conversational work (Martinez, 2010). For example, students sometimes used Spanish when they did not know words in English. In addition, he found six functions of code-switching:

- 1) Clarification;
- 2) Quotations and reported speech;
- 3) Joking;
- 4) Marking solidarity;
- 5) Change of voice for different students;
- 6) Showing relations of shades of meaning (Martinez, 2010).

Sampson (2011) shared the same idea as Younas et al. (2014). The results of his research on the functions of code-switching at one of the Colombian schools suggested that code-switching did not depend on students' level of English, but rather served for conveying equivalence, talk about procedures, floor holding, repeating ideas, and making group relationships. This finding somehow agrees with Eldridge's (1996) functions of code-switching in the classroom. He declared that the prohibition of L1 use in the classroom would decrease communication and learning (Sampson, 2011). In contrary to Younas et al. (2014) and Sampson (2011), Ramirez (2012) revealed that less proficient L2 learners switched more frequently than their highly proficient counterparts did. Their L1s helped them organise ideas, write better texts, and understand the tasks (Ramirez, 2012). Schweers (1999) investigated students' attitudes toward teachers' use of code-switching at the university in Puerto Rico. He found out that the majority of the students reported the use of Spanish in their English classes made them feel more comfortable and confident and helped them to learn English.

Gulzar and Qadir (2010) also tried to understand the reasons for teachers' code-switching. They conducted a research in Pakistani classrooms and found that the main reasons for the teachers' code-switching were socialisation and creating a sense of belonging.

Another series of research devoted to the phenomenon of code-switching in the classroom have been done in Turkey. Ustunel and Seedhouse (2005) aimed to uncover the functions of teachers' code-switching in a Turkish university EFL class. They discovered three systematic patterns when the teachers code-switched:

- 1) Long pauses when students did not answer the teacher's question in the L2;
- 2) Encouragement to get the students to speak in the L2;
- 3) Stimulation learners to code-switch (Ustunel & Seedhouse, 2005).

By contrast, Eldridge (1996) aimed to uncover the function of students' code-switching in one of the secondary schools in Turkey. He revealed that the main reason to switch was to ask for clarification or showing understanding by giving the Turkish equivalence (Eldridge, 1996). In general, he came up with the following functions of code-switching: equivalence, floor holding, meta-language, reiteration, group membership, conflict control, alignment, and misalignment.

A huge number of studies on this topic has been conducted in China, Japan, and Southeast Asia. Weng (2012) in his study in Taiwan school asserted that code-switching could be helpful and significant unit for students to learn the language because it facilitated L2 learning (Weng, 2012). The researcher searched for functions of code-switching and attitudes toward it. He indicated that the teacher's and students' attitudes were positive. Functions of code-switching fulfilled Hymes'

(1962) framework, which included expressive, directive, metalinguistic, poetic, and referential functions to analyse the speakers' uses of code-switching in classroom setting (Weng, 2012). Ahmad and shared the same opinion. The researchers considered code-switching of the teachers as useful teaching technique while dealing with low level English students. Their study in the University of Malaysia noted that learners attitudes toward code-switching were positive. The functions of the teachers' code-switching were as follows: review of comprehension, interpret new vocabulary, classroom management, creating relaxed atmosphere and showing the difference between native and English grammar (Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009). Since the majority of the respondents expressed they felt more relaxed when the teachers code-switched, code-switching provided a psychologically favourable learning environment (Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009). This finding goes with Schweer's (1999) results of the study in Puerto Rico. He also found that code-switching helped students feel more comfortable and confident. Then and Ting (2011) suggested that code-switching facilitated learning. They found that the most prevalent functions of code-switching were reiteration and quotation (Then & Ting, 2011). Similarly, Tien (2014) found that majority of pulps in tertiary school in Vietnam wanted the teacher to speak Vietnamese, and some of them did not comprehend if she explained in English (Tien, 2014). Thus, the function of code-switching was to promote understanding. One more function of her switching was making the students feel at ease and safe.

In Japan, the situation is almost the same. Craven (2012) detected the high and low level English proficiency students have different attitudes toward code-switching: low and mid proficiency students wanted the teacher to use Japanese, while high proficiency level students did not want the teacher to use Japanese. Moreover,

students of all proficiency levels wanted their teacher to understand Japanese. Critchley (1999) focused his research on the attitudes of Japanese university students toward code-switching. He found that the majority of students preferred using Japanese in the class (Critchley, 1999). Berger (2011) claimed that using only English in the class seemed to be a public tendency that forced teachers to have classes in English, although the Grammar-Translation Method was still prevailing in high schools of Japan (Berger, 2011).

Ibrahim, Shah and Armia (2013) looked at the teachers' attitudes toward code-switching in the universities in Malaysia. The research demonstrated that although teachers supported using only English in the class, their attitudes toward code-switching were positive (Ibrahim et al., 2013). In general, they found following functions of code-switching:

- 1) Message reiteration: clarification and facilitation of comprehension;
- 2) Message qualification: using L1 for the better message understanding;
- 3) Interjections or sentence fillers: switching for better locution, clarification, or better comprehension;
- 4) Personalisation and objectivisation: specification of distinction between thing and view;
- 5) Quotation: quotations or reported speech;
- 6) Certain features of Islamic English: changing English to let Islamic proper nouns and notions to be understood without deformation (Al Faruq, 1986 as cited in Ibrahim et al., 2013).

Similarly, Jingxia (2010) reported that the majority of the teachers' and the students' attitude toward code-switching was positive and believed that it is beneficial for EFL

class. The main function of code-switching in the class were giving grammar instruction, translation of unknown vocabulary items, management, the introduction of background information, and checking comprehension (Jingxia, 2010). The students reported some other functions of code-switching: providing understanding of languages and cultures, jokes and emotions, giving feedback to students, translation of difficult sentences, creating relaxed and warm atmosphere, stressing on some points, reported speech, shifting topics, attraction of the students' attention, checking comprehension. The researcher also revealed points that provoked code-switching:

- 1) Teachers considered the distance between the languages;
- 2) Pedagogical materials;
- 3) Lesson content and objectives;
- 4) Teachers' English proficiency and department policy on target language use;
- 5) Traditional teaching methods; 6) Testing system (Jingxia, 2010).

Similarly, Cheng (2013) investigated Chinese teachers' attitude toward classroom code-switching. In contrary to Jigxia (2010), his findings suggested that most of the teachers kept negative attitude because if the students code-switched, their language competence could be doubted, and they would break the school regulation. Similarly, in Chowdbury's (2012) study, conducted in Bangladesh school, the teachers believed they better did not switched in the class, although the students possessed a positive attitude toward it. The survey revealed the motives for teachers' switching:

- 1) Easy to communicate;
- 2) Explanation;
- 3) Classroom management;

4) Translation of vocabulary.

Akynova, Zharkynbekova, Aimoldina (2012) studied the phenomenon of code-switching at one of the universities in Kazakhstan among students of English language department. They found out that the students' attitudes toward code-switching were positive and code-switching helped the students feel less stressed. At the same time, many students saw code-switching as negative phenomenon. The researchers assumed that negative attitude might be reflected by the university rules that try to encourage students to use target language exclusively. The majority of students believed that code-switching promoted effective learning of a foreign language (Akynova et al., 2012).

Another research has been conducted by Akynova, Aimoldina and Agmanova (2014) among students from different departments learning English as a foreign language. The researchers found that although some students considered code-switching as negative factor in the class, the attitudes of the majority of the students were positive. The students stated that code-switching contributed to successful second language acquisition. In other words, students learnt difficult words and concepts faster, and explanation of difficult parts of the grammar in the native language assisted in acquiring the English (Akynova et al., 2014). They claimed that code-switching was a facilitating tool in second language acquisition (Akynova et al., 2014).

2.4.3.2 Code-switching in Classes where English is a Medium of Instruction

Some researches have been conducted in English medium schools and universities. The main function of code-switching in these studies was clarification for understanding, and attitudes toward code-switching in the class of the majority of participants were positive. Liang (2006) conducted a study in a Chinese high school.

The major function of code-switching he found was translation of unknown vocabulary. Another noted function was clarification for understanding. There were some reasons for using L: they did not want to look like boasters, especially when they were among friends who did not know English level was not high. They also seemed scared to make mistakes and being made fun of (Liang, 2006). Likewise, Alinezi (2010) investigated students' attitudes toward code-switching among students studying medicine in Kuwait University. Most of the students chose code-switching for better comprehension. The students reported that they respected the instructor more if he/she used code-switching in teaching (Alinezi, 2010). Similar findings had Olugbara (2008). The researcher investigated the effect of IsiZulu-English code-switching in the rural community of the province of South Africa. The majority of the students that preferred code-switching explained that it made materials easier to understand (Olugbara, 2008). Rukh, Saleem, Javeed and Mehmood (2012) investigated business students' attitudes toward English-Urdu code-switching. The students preferred their teachers to use code-switching as it made it easy for them to understand and they felt at ease in the classroom. In addition, they did not consider that a teacher was less proficient if he/she switched to L1. The overall attitude of the students toward teachers' code-switching was positive and they considered it beneficial for their L2 learning (Rukh et al., 2014). Alinezi (2010) also conducted his research on attitude toward code-switching in the Kuwait University. He reported that the majority of the students chose code-switching as some data needed to be interpreted in Arabic for better understanding. The teacher who used code-switching had a higher status among the students (Alinezi, 2010).

Atas (2012) conducted a study in Middle East Technical University. He found out various functions of code-switching, such as dealing with a problem, dealing with a lack of response, dealing with a procedural problem in the task, exemplifying, clarifying, making compliments, personalising, inviting for participation, explaining, eliciting, checking for understanding, lexical compensation, managing the progression of talk, humour, complaining, the progression of talk, humour, complaining, displaying understanding. In most cases, code-switching was used to fill a linguistic gap.

In contrary, Valerio's (2015) findings differ from all research findings mentioned above. The researcher studied attitudes of the students of Quirino State University toward Filipino-English code-switching. The respondents considered a student who talked purely in English was more intelligent than those who mixed languages. They believed that students who mixed their dialects and English had poor communication skill. Moreover, the students suggested code-switchers to take additional speaking lessons (Valerio, 2015).

2.5 Conclusion

The conclusion to be drawn from these studies is that code-switching in the classroom takes place for various purposes such as educational, social, and psychological. For instance, teachers and learners code-switch to explain lessons, to cast humour, to give instructions, to express emotions, to show solidarity, and clarifying understanding. Although some teachers' and students' attitudes toward code-switching are negative, most of the respondents' attitudes are positive. The majority of the studies focused on code-switching between different languages in EFL contexts or in English medium classes in ESL context although English as a

medium of instruction is widely introduced into various non-native English-speaking countries. This fact inspired the researcher for the present study to investigate the functions of code-switching in a Kazakhstani English medium classroom.

Chapter 3

METHOD

3.1 Presentation

This chapter describes the methodology employed in this study, context, participants, instruments of data collection, data analysis, and the procedure of the study.

3.2 Research Design

The present study is a case study which adopts quantitative data collection procedures. A case study is one of five (narrative, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, case study) approaches to qualitative research categorised by Creswell (2007). The purpose of the case study is to find a holistic description of language learning or use within the specific population or setting (Mackey & Gass, 2005 as cited in Atas, 2012). The researcher in case study investigates a bound systems or multiple bound system over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information: observation, interviews, audio-visual material, and documents (Creswell, 2007).

Quantitative research provides findings about correlations among measured variables and testing hypotheses to interpret, to predict and to control appearance (Leedy & Onnrod, 2005 as cited in Olugbara, 2008). In quantitative research, information is converted into numbers, tables, into numbers, tables, charts and frequencies that are statistically tested in accordance to some standard, for example, norm, average, percentiles and tendencies (Neuman, 2006 as cited in Olugbara, 2008). One of the

main aims of quantitative research is that it the power for constituting data on big amount of participants (Bryman, 2000 as cited in Olugbara, 2008).

Thus, the quantitative approach for data collection is used in this study to enhance the accuracy of the results. The eventual data is analysed using percentages to examine the distinctions in the performance of the participants.

3.3 Context and Participants of the Study

The research was conducted in Kazakh-British Technical University (KBTU). KBTU is a state university that offers bachelor, master and doctor programmes in various departments. The programmes are offered in three languages: Kazakh, Russian, and English. The University was established 2001, in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan and Science and the British Council. KBTU is considered as one of the best universities in Kazakhstan. The university is recognized by British higher education. The instructors of the university are from the UK, the USA, Russia, and Kazakhstan (“History of Kazakh-British Technical University”, 2015).

The sample includes 50 local teachers and 200 students who volunteered to participate in the study. The majority of the teachers has (60%) doctor degree and the rest (40%) has master degree. Their teaching experience varies from 1 year to 25 years. More than half of the teachers (60%) are females and males constitute less than half (40%). This number is not equal because in Central Asian countries usually women work as teachers. The gender of the students’ is almost equally shared: 55.5% of them are males and females constitute 49.5%. The students do their bachelor degrees at such departments as Oil and Gas Engineering, Information

Technology, Digital Media Technologies, Business, Economics, and Maritime Academy. The teachers teach courses at the same departments. Almost half of the students are in their third year of studying, the rest are in first, second and fourth year of studying. The participants, both teachers and students, have different ethnicities and different native languages. In total, there are 204 Kazakhs, 36 Russians and 12 members of the other ethnicities. The Russian is native for 197 of them, for 50 of them the Kazakh language is native, and for 3 of them another language is native. Therefore, most of the instructors (74%) are Kazakhs but Russian dominates among native languages (90%). Similarly, the majority of the students (82.5%) are Kazakhs but for most of them (76%) native language is Russian.

Even though ethnicities are different, for the majority of the participants native language is Russian. It is so because in Soviet period the main language of instruction in educational system was Russian. In the capital of Soviet Kazakhstan Alma-Ata (now Almaty) there was only one secondary school where the language of instruction was Kazakh (“Think Globally, Teach Locally: English in Kazakhstan”, 2010). Moreover, the population of ethnic Kazakhs constituted less than half of the population (“The population of the Republic of Kazakhstan”, 2015). Hence, many people in Kazakhstan with Kazakh or another ethnicity do not usually know their native languages in a high level and use Russian as their native language. Russian language became a native language for many ethnic Kazakhs, Koreans, Tatars, Germans, Greeks, and other ethnicities. Table 1 demonstrates the summary of the teachers’ background information and Table 2 demonstrates the summary of the students’ background information.

Table 1. The summary of the teachers' background information

Characteristics	Categories	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	20	40
	Female	30	60
Degree of education	Master	20	40
	PhD	30	60
Teaching experience	1-5 years	15	30
	6-10 years	10	20
	11-15 years	6	12
	16 years or more	19	38
Ethnicity	Kazakh	37	74
	Russian	7	14
	Other	6	12
Native language	Kazakh	5	10
	Russian	45	90
	Other	0	0

Table 2. The summary of the students' background information

Characteristics	Categories	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	99	55.5
	Female	101	49.5
Year of studying	1 st year	49	24.5
	2 nd year	40	20
	3 rd year	91	45.5
	4 th year	20	10
Ethnicity	Kazakh	165	82.5
	Russian	29	14.5
	Other	6	3
Native language	Kazakh	45	22.5
	Russian	152	76
	Other	3	1.5

3.4 Instruments

The data was collected through two separate sets of questionnaires: for teachers (See Appendix A) and for students (See Appendix B).

The questionnaire designed for the teachers (Appendix A) consists of two parts:

- 1) Background information;
- 2) Functions of code-switching and attitudes toward it.

The first part deals with the participants' background and comprises nine personal questions, whereas the second part investigates functions of teachers' code-switching in the classroom and their attitudes toward their use of code-switching. It consists of ten items investigating functions of code-switching and eight items investigating attitudes toward code-switching.

The questionnaire designed for the students (Appendix B) has the same structure as the teachers' one. The first one deals with the students' background and comprises seven items, while the second part deals with the participants' attitudes to the teachers' use of code-switching and its functions in the classroom. It is made of the same ten items as in teachers' questionnaire investigating functions of code-switching and eight items investigating attitudes toward code-switching.

In order to investigate the functions of code-switching, Hymes' (1962) framework was employed in developing the questions as the conceptual framework. Hymes' (1962) framework is frequently used in research investigating functions of code-switching and it involves almost all basic functions of code-switching found by code-switching/mixing:

- 1) Expressive function – using code-switching to express emotions;
- 2) Directive (Conative/Pragmatic/Rhetorical/Persuasive) functions – using code-switching to direct someone or to get the listeners' attention;
- 3) Metalinguistic functions – using code-switching to explain the definition of terms, paraphrasing others' words, and metaphors;
- 4) Poetic functions – using code-switching to joke, to tell stories, to quote, and to add a sense of humour;

- 5) Contact – using code-switching to make learners have a sense of belonging or to enhance their activity.

The questions investigating the participants' attitudes are adapted from the survey instruments used by Rukh, Saleem, Javeed and Mehmood (2012) and Alenezi (2010). Items were modified to meet current study requirements and context. The changes were minor so that they did not seem to influence validity and reliability. The questionnaire is designed in a form of a 5-Likert scale from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree". The original questionnaires were written in English language. To make sure that the participants fully understand them, the questionnaires were translated into Russian. The researcher with cooperation of translator whose L1 is Russian translated the questionnaires into Russian. To make sure that that the translation was accurate, the philologist of Russian language whose L1 is Russian and who does not know English language revised the questionnaires and made some corrections on language use.

3.5 Data Collection

Based on the research questions involved in this study, the research design was set up as follows. At first, the researcher piloted the questionnaire to check their reliability. A limited number of students who did not participate in the study answered the questionnaires. The students confirmed that it was clear as they could answer all the questions without any major problems. Yet some modifications were made based on their feedback. Thus, the printing types of letters were changed and more instructions for better understanding were added.

Then, the questionnaires were distributed to the students and to the teachers. Completion of the questionnaire was conducted under control of the instructors after a brief introductory talk explaining the completion process to the participants. After the confidential completion of the questionnaires, the copies were returned.

3.6 Data Analysis

The data was analysed quantitatively. The quantitative data collected through questionnaire was analysed via Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software programme, version 20.0.

The demographic data gotten from the first part of the questionnaires was analysed using descriptive statistics. The data about functions of code-switching and attitudes toward it gotten from the second the second part of the questionnaire was analysed through SPSS to find frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations for each response of the questions. Later on correlations between variables were found out with a help of Ordinary Least Squares method, which is used in econometrics. The aim of this method is to find a regression line so that sum of perpendicular distances between each observed data point and the corresponding point on the regression line is minimum. After that a correspondence between two groups of participants, the teachers and the students, were calculated.

3.7 Conclusion

The chapter presented overall research design and methodology used in the present study. The data collection process was explained. Then the context and background information about the participants of the study were provided. After that, data collection instrument and data collection procedures were presented. Finally, the analysis of the data was explained.

Chapter 4

RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Presentation

This chapter provides the findings and discussions of the analysis of the collected data that investigated the functions of code-switching in the class and attitudes toward it among students and teachers of Kazakh-British Technical University in Kazakhstan.

4.2 Results related to the first research question:

“What are the functions of teachers’ code-switching in the class?”

The data collected through the questionnaires has been analysed by SPSS 20 software programme and showed that teachers mainly avoid code-switching. In reply to the first two items, which elicits respondents’ using code-switching for Expressive function, the data shows that while 10% of the teachers report that they code-switch to express emotions and feelings, 90% of them state they do not code-switch to express emotions and feelings. The students’ responses correspond to teachers’ ones. Thus, 14% of the students claim that teachers use code-switching to express the emotions and 10.5% of the claim the teachers code-switch to express feelings and 22.5% decide to be neutral about this statement. However, 62.5% of the students report that the teachers do not use code-switching for expressing emotions and 64% of them state the teachers do not code-switch to express feelings.

In response to the second pair of questions, which elicit respondents’ using code-switching for Directive function, the data reveals that the teachers have almost the

same answers as for the Expressive functions. Whereas 8% of the teachers state they code-switch to give tasks, 2% of them are neutral, and 90% of the teachers report they do not code-switch to give tasks or instructions. However, the students' answers differ. The students' responses are almost equally shared. Therefore, 34.5% of the students report that the teachers code-switch to give tasks, 32.5% of them state they code-switch to give instructions and 18% are neutral. Yet, 47.5% of the students state that the teachers do not code-switch to give tasks and 49.5% report the teachers do not code-switch to give instructions.

The third couple of questions are related to Metalinguistic function according to Hymes' (1962) framework. In response to these questions, the data shows that 38% of the teachers state they use code-switching to translate vocabulary and 48% report they use it to translate and clarify terminology. Still, 62% of the teachers assert they do not code-switch to translate and clarify difficult vocabulary and 52% of them say they do not code-switch to translate and clarify terminology. As for the students, the majority of them state that the teachers use the native language for translation and clarification of difficult vocabulary and terminology. Thus, 75% of the students report that the teachers code-switch to translate vocabulary and 74% report the teachers code-switch to translate terminology, whilst 11% disagree that teachers code-switch to translate vocabulary and 17% disagree the teachers code-switch to translate terminology and 14% are neutral about the this statement.

In response to the next couple of questions, which elicit respondents' using code-switching for Poetic function, the data shows that only 4% of the teachers affirm they code-switch to joke with students, 4% decide to be neutral, and 92% of the teachers state they do not code-switch to joke around with students. In addition, 6% of the

teachers are neutral about code-switching to say poetic quotations, 94% of them assert they do not code-switch to say poetic quotations, and none of them agree they code-switch to quote. The students' responses correspond to teachers' ones. Hence, 10.5% of the students claim that teachers use code-switching to joke, 8% of them claim that teacher's code-switch to quote, and 12% are neutral. Yet, 77.5% of the students report that the teachers do not use code-switching to joke around with them or to say quotations.

The last couple of questions are related to Contact function. In response to these questions, the data shows that 6% of the teachers state they code-switch to raise participation, 12% of the teachers report they use code-switching to create a sense of belonging and 2% are neutral about code-switching to raise participation. While 92% of the teachers report they do not code-switch to boost students to participate, 88% of them assert they do not code-switch to create a sense of belonging. The students' responses correspond to teachers' ones. Therefore, 7.5% of the students claim that teachers use code-switching to boost students to participate, 19% are neutral about this statement, 15% of the students say the teachers code-switch to create a sense of belonging, and 14.5% are neutral about this statement. However, 73.5% of the students say that the teachers do not use code-switching to make them participate in the class and 62.5% of them report the teachers do not switch to create a sense of belonging.

Therefore, according to the analysis results the teachers usually do not code-switch. Mainly, they use code-switching to translate and clarify difficult vocabulary and terminology. Thus, the most frequent function of code-switching in the class is Metalinguistic. Nevertheless, some students report that the teachers code-switch to

create a sense of belonging and to give tasks. Therefore, Contact and Directive functions of code-switching are also frequent in the class and the least frequent functions are Emotional and Poetic. Table 3 demonstrates the participants' replies.

Table 3. Distribution of the Respondents Related Functions of the Teachers' Code-switching in the Class.

Items		SA+A %		Neutral %		D+SD %	
		Ts	Ss	Ts	Ss	Ts	Ss
1	I use mixture of languages to express my emotions.	10	14	0	22.5	90	63.5
2	I use mixture of languages to express my feelings.	10	10.5	0	25.5	90	64
3	I use mixture of languages to give tasks.	8	34.5	2	18	90	47.5
4	I use mixture of languages to give instructions.	0	32.5	10	18	90	49.5
5	I use mixture of languages to translate and clarify difficult vocabulary.	38	75	0	14	62	11
6	I use mixture of languages to translate and clarify terminology.	48	74	0	9	52	17
7	I use mixture of languages to joke around with students.	4	10.5	4	12	92	77.5
8	I use mixture of languages to say poetic quotations.	0	9	6	13.5	94	77.5
9	I use mixture of languages to boost students to participate.	6	7.5	2	19	92	73.5
10	I use mixture of languages to create a sense of belongings.	12	23	0	14.5	88	62.5

4.3 Results related to the second research question:

“What are the teachers’ attitudes towards their own use of code-switching in the class?”

The analysis of the teachers’ questionnaire investigating shows that the 92 % of the teachers believe that teaching courses only in English language is beneficial to students. 58% of them consider that using code-switching does not make courses easy to understand for students, 34% of the teachers’ opinion is neutral about this statement and only 8% of them agree that code-switching makes courses easy to understand. 8% of the teachers prefer using code-switching, 4% are neutral and 88% do not prefer to use code-switching in the class. 86% prefer using only English in the class, 6% of the teachers are neutral about this point and 8% of them do not prefer using only English in the class. 64% of the teachers think that code-switching leads to the weakness of students’ English, 26% are neutral and 10% disagree with this statement. 6% believe that code-switching in the class strengthens students’ English, 28% of them are neutral and 66% do not think code-switching strengthens English. 10% of the teachers feel more comfortable in communication with their students in their native language, 10% are neutral about this point, and 80% reported they do not feel comfortable using native language while communicating with the students. 88% of them feel more comfortable communicating with the students in English, 6% are neutral and 6% do not feel comfortable using English with their students. Table 4 represents the analysis of the teachers’ attitudes toward code-switching in the class.

Table 4. Distribution of the Teachers’ Respondents Related to the Attitudes toward their own Code-switching.

Items		SA+A %	Neutral %	D+SD %
1	Teaching courses only in English	92	4	4

	language is beneficial to students.			
2	Teaching courses in English and a language other than English makes it easy for students to understand.	8	34	58
3	I prefer teaching courses using mixture of different languages.	8	4	88
4	I prefer teaching courses only in English.	86	6	8
5	Using a mixture of languages leads to the weakness of students' English.	67	26	10
6	Using a mixture of languages strengthens students' English.	6	28	66
7	I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my students in language other than English.	10	10	80
8	I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my students in English.	88	6	6

4.4 Results related to the third research question:

“What are the students’ attitudes toward the use of code-switching?”

The analysis of the results of the students’ questionnaire reveals that the majority of the students’ attitude is negative. As Table 5 depicts, 73.5% of the students believe that English-only approach is beneficial to them, 10.5% are neutral, and 16% do not agree with this point. Almost half of them are not sure if code-switching makes courses easy to understand. Therefore, 35% agree that code-switching makes courses easy to understand, 45.5% of them are neutral about this points. In addition, many of the students are not sure they want their teachers to code-switch. Hence, 27% of the students prefer the teachers to code-switch, 40% of them are neutral, and 32% do not want their teachers to code-switch. At the same time, 55% of the students report they want teachers using only English in the class, 27% are neutral, and 13% do not prefer teachers to use only English in the class. The students’ opinion about code-switching leading to the weakness of English is also shared. Thus, 34.5% agree that code-

switching makes their English weak, 32% are neutral, and 33.5% do not think the same. Nonetheless, 18% believe code-switching strengthens their English, 37% are neutral about this point, and 45% report that code-switching does not strengthen their English. Almost half of the students are not sure if they feel more comfortable with communicating with the teachers in the native language. Therefore, 22% state they feel more comfortable with communicating in the native language with their teachers, 45.5% are neutral, and 32.5% do not feel comfortable communicating in the native language with their teachers. Similarly, 41% of the students feel more comfortable with communicating with their teachers in English only, 52.5% of the students are neutral about this statement, and 6.5% do not feel more comfortable with it. Table 5 demonstrates the students' distribution of the responses.

Table 5. Distribution of the Students' Respondents Related to the Attitudes toward the Teachers' Code-switching

Items		SA+A %	Neutral %	D+SD %
1	Teaching courses only in English language is beneficial to students.	92	4	4
2	Teaching courses in English and a language other than English makes it easy for students to understand.	35	45.5	19.5
3	I prefer teaching courses using mixture of different languages.	27	41	32
4	I prefer teaching courses only in English.	55	27	13
5	Using a mixture of languages leads to the weakness of students' English.	27	41	32
6	Using a mixture of languages strengthens students' English.	18	37	45
7	I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my students in language other than English.	22	45.5	32.5
8	I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my students in English.	41	52.5	6.5

4.5 Results related to the fourth research question:

“Do the teacher’ attitudes toward code-switching correspond to the students’ attitudes?”

The results revealed that generally the teachers share their opinion with the students regarding functions of code-switching in the class. The students and the teachers’ attitudes toward code-switching in the class are almost the same. Thereby, the vast majority of the participants both the teacher and the students believe that teaching courses only in English language is beneficial to students. Most of the teachers think that code-switching does not make courses easy to understand for students. However, half of the students are neutral about this point and a limited amount of the students believe that code-switching makes courses easier for understanding. The vast majority of the teachers do not want to code-switch in the class and prefer using only English language. While almost half of the students are neutral about the teacher’ code-switching, still the majority of them wants the teachers to use only English in the class. Many of the teachers suppose that using code-switching leads to the weakness of students’ English. Yet the students’ opinion is almost equally divided by three. Thus, some of them agree that code-switching makes their English weak, some think the opposite and the rest are neutral. Most of the of the teachers do not think code-switching strengthens students’ English and less than a half of the students share his opinion. The vast majority of the teachers feel more comfortable communicating with the students in English. However, the half of the students are neutral about this point and less than a half feel more comfortable with communicating with their teachers in English.

Therefore, the teachers' attitude toward code-switching seems to be very negative, when the students' attitude is more or less neutral. Nevertheless, the majority of the both, the teachers and the students, attitude toward code-switching is negative and they prefer using only English in the classroom. Comparing students and teachers' attitudes through statistical analysis is depicted in Appendix I.

4.6 Results of analysis of correlations between variables

The analysis reveals that the most frequent function of the code-switching in the class is Metalinguistic. The analysis also shows that the most important factors affecting code-switching are native language and gender. Therefore, such variables as native language, gender and using code-switching for translating and clarification difficult vocabulary and terminology are highly correlated with preference for using code-switching at significant 1% level. This finding is depicted in the table in Appendix D. The table demonstrates the correlation matrix of different variables for both groups of participants: the students and the teachers.

The analysis also finds out that the second and third frequent functions of code-switching are Contact and Directive respectively. The teachers use code-switching to give tasks and invite for participation. There was found a correlation between native languages, gender and using code-switching for giving tasks, which belongs to Directive function and using code-switching to boost participation, which belongs to Contact function with preference for using code-switching at significant 5% level. This finding is also depicted in the table Appendix D.

The impact of personal characteristics such as native language, gender, year of studying and ethnicity on preference of code-switching was analysed through

examining different measures of variables and using data set collected by 250 questionnaires.

The extent to which determinants of preference for code-switching for students differ from those for teachers was analysed through two sets of regressions. The data was divided into two categories of students and teachers, and run the regression for each of them separately.

In the empirical model, code switching(CS) depends upon different variables which represent native language (Kazakh), gender (Male), year of studying (Y) and ethnicity (E).

$$CS_i = C_i + \beta_{i1}L_i + \beta_{i2}G_i + \beta_{i3}Y_i + \beta_{i4}E_i + \varepsilon_i$$

Where i denotes the person (i=1... 200 for students, i=1... 50 for teachers).

Estimates with fixed effects specification for preference for code-switching of 200 students are reported in table in Appendix E. As this table shows, the most significant determinants of preference for code-switching in the sample are year of studying, native language and gender. Native language and year of studying are significant at 1% level and gender is significant at 10% level. Ethnicity is not significant, which means that preference for code-switching is not affected by ethnicity. The preference for code-switching is affected by native language, year of study and gender respectively. The coefficients of Kazakh as native language and Male are positive. It means any increase in these variables leads to increase in preference for code-switching. This significance also implies that those whose native language is Kazakh prefer code-switching in comparison to those whose native language is Russian, and males prefer code-switching in comparison to females. On

the other hand, the coefficient of Y is negative. It means the students with lower year of studying prefer code-switching more than those with higher year of studying.

The result of running regression for teachers is reported in table in Appendix E. This table shows that the most significant determinants of preference for code-switching in the sample are native language and gender. Native language is significant at 1% level and gender is significant at 10% level. Experience and ethnicity are not significant.

It means that preference for code-switching is not affected by ethnicity, but it is affected by native language and gender respectively. The coefficients of Kazakh as native language and Male are positive. It means that any increase in these variables leads to increase in preference for code-switching. Experience is not significant but its negative coefficient implies the teachers with lower experience prefer code-switching in the class more than those teachers with higher experience.

Therefore, native language and gender affect preference for code-switching for both students and teachers. In addition, the students' preference for code-switching is also affected by their year of studying and the teachers' preference for code-switching is affected by their experience.

4.7 Conclusion

The statistical analysis revealed that although the teachers try not to code-switching often, the most frequent function of code-switching in the class is Metalinguistic. Contact and Directive functions of code-switching are also frequent in the class and the least frequent functions are Emotional and Poetic. Most of the teachers' and the students' attitude toward code-switching are negative. Nevertheless, many of the

students hesitate to decide if they prefer their teachers to code-switch in the class or not. Some variables such as native language, gender, experience and year of studying affect the responses.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS

5.1 Presentation

This chapter provides the discussion of the results in the light of research question by considering relevant literature, conclusions, limitations and delimitations, implications, and recommendations for a further research.

5.2 Discussion of the Results

The results of the analysis of the questionnaire investigating functions of the teachers' code-switching in the class shows that the most common function of code-switching are as following.

The most frequently used function of code-switching by teachers is Metalinguistic as they code-switch to translate and clarify difficult vocabulary and terminology. This function of code-switching had the highest frequency among the participants. Perhaps, this is because teachers might find it difficult or even impossible to teach exclusively in the English (Duff and Polio, 1990). Another rationale might be that clarifying and translating can be a useful strategy in the classroom as it saves time (Yletyinen, 2004). The use of Metalinguistic function is goes along with many other findings (Eldridge, 1996; Hussein, 1999; Liang, 2006; Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009; Jingxia, 2010; Martínez, 2010; Atas, 2012; Chowdhury, 2012; Falomir & Laguna, 2012; Hamidi & Sarem, 2012; Moghadam, Samad & Shahraki, 2012; Weng, 2012).

For example, Liang (2006) detected that the major function of code-switching was unknown vocabulary, or Hussein (1999) found that the most important reason for code-switching was the lack of equivalents in students' L1 for English terms or expressions. Similarly, Atas (2012) also found that code-switching was used to fill a linguistic gap. Likewise, Moghadam, Samad and Shahraki (2012) found that the teacher code-switched because of clarification and translation into L1.

The second and the third highest functions of the teachers' code-switching in the class are Contact and Directive since some students state that the teachers code-switch to create a sense of belonging and to give tasks. Some researchers have also suggested these functions of code-switching (Camilleri, 1996; Yletyinen, 2004; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; Weng, 2012; Rose, 2006; Gulzar & Qadir, 2010; Jingxia, 2010; Sampson, 2011; Moghadam, Samad & Shahraki, 2012; Mokgwathi & Webb, 2013). For instance, Camilleri (1996) investigated that code-switching was used to decrease the social distance between the teacher and the learners, or Atas (2012) also revealed that teachers code-switched to deal with classroom discipline, to give tasks and invite for participation. Mokgwathi and Webb (2013) found that teacher code-switched to increase learners' participation that suits to Contact function. Similarly, Rose (2006) obtained that code-switching helped learners to feel free. Likewise, Gulzar and Qadir (2010) revealed that the main function of the teachers' code-switching were socialization and creating a sense of belonging. Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) also found that one of the teachers' function of code-switching was encouragement to get the students to speak. Jingxia (2010) also revealed that teachers code-switched to create a humorous atmosphere and to reduce the distance between the languages.

Finally, the last common functions of the teachers' code-switching are Emotional and Poetic. These functions of code-switching had the lowest frequency among the participants. The use of these functions has been found in many other studies (Jingxia, 2010; Martínez, 2010; Then & Ting, 2011; Atas, 2012; Hamidi & Sarem, 2012; Weng, 2012; Ibrahim, Shah & Armia, 2013). For instance, Hamidi and Sarem (2012) reported that the teacher code-switched to joke. Similarly, Martínez (2010) found that one of the functions of classroom code-switching was joking and teasing. Jingxia (2010) also reported that the students asserted such situations of code-switching as expressing emotions and creation a humorous atmosphere. Then and Ting (2011) found that the most prevalent functions of code-switching were reiteration and quotation. Likewise, Ibrahim, Shah and Armia (2013) reported that one of the function of classroom code-switching was direct quotations or reported speech.

The results of the teachers' questionnaire investigating their attitudes towards their own use of code-switching in the class indicated that the teachers' attitudes toward their own code-switching in the class in negative. Thus, the vast majority of the teachers believe that teaching courses only in English is beneficial to students. Moreover, they suppose that using code-switching leads to the weakness of the students' English proficiency level. In addition, they assert they feel more comfortable using only English when communicating with their students. The vast majority do not believe that using code-switching makes materials easy to understands or strengths students' English level of proficiency. This finding goes along with some researchers' findings (Chowdhury, 2012; Cheng, 2013; Mokgwathi & Webb, 2013). For instance, Mokgwathi and Webb (2013) reported that teachers

confessed code-switching did not contribute to developing the learners' proficiency and confidence in speaking English. Likewise, Chowdhury (2012) found that even though the students possess a positive attitude toward code-switching, the teachers did not prefer code-switching in the classroom.

At the same time, this result does not coincide with many other research findings (Camilleri, 1996; Yletyinen, 2004; Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009; Al-Nofaie, 2010; Jingxia, 2010; Then & Ting, 2011; Akynova, Zharkynbekova & Aimoldina, 2012; Weng, 2012; Akynova, Aimoldina & Agmanova, 2014). For example, Al-Nofaie (2010) found that even though the teachers were aware of disadvantages of the use of code-switching in the class, the attitudes of the teachers were positive. Similarly, Fatemi and Barani (2014) reported that code-switching can be a useful strategy in classroom activities. Likewise, Ahmad and Jusoff (2009) found that teachers' code-switching was an effective teaching strategy.

The reason for negative attitude toward code-switching, avoiding it, and trying to use only English in the class might be the idea that teaching in English seems to be a national trend, which pushes teachers to conduct classes only in English (Berger, 2011). Another reason for having negative attitude might be the fact that the students expected their teachers to speak English. Thus, if they code-switch, their language competence could be doubted. Dweik (2000) provided arguments for this option. He found that the students hold negative viewpoints towards the teacher who code-switched, as they believed their teacher to be incompetent in English. Moreover, they could break the university language regulation (Cheng, 2013).

According to the results of the students' questionnaire investigating the students' attitudes toward the use of teachers' code-switching shows that the majority of the students' attitudes are negative. Although almost half of them believe that code-switching strengthens their English proficiency level, most of them do not want their teachers to code-switch. In addition, many of them could not determine if code-switching makes learning process easier or what language they feel more comfortable to communicate with the teachers. These findings correspond to some others (Liang, 2006; Dweik, 2000; Rahimi & Jafari, 2011) For example, Rahimi and Jafari (2011) found that majority of students believed that teachers should not code-switch, even though they it facilitated their interactions. Dweik (2000) reported that the students hold negative viewpoints towards the teacher who code-switched.

However, these findings are not supported by many other studies (Critchley, 1999; Schweers, 1999; Olugbara, 2008; Alenezi, 2010; Martínez, 2010; Rukh, Saleem, Javeed & Mehmood, 2012; Weng, 2012; Akynova, Aimoldina & Agmanova, 2014; Younas, Arshad, Akram, Faisal, Akhtar & Sarfraz, 2014). For instance, Younas, Arshad, Akram, Faisal, Akhtar and Sarfraz (2014) reported that a majority of students agreed they feel comfortable with the teacher's code-switching, because they feel difficult to understand words, concepts and terms of L2. Similarly, Schweers (1999) revealed that the majority of the student code-switching made them feel more comfortable and confident and helped to learn English. Olugbara (2008) reported that the majority of the students preferred code-switching since it made subjects easier to understand. Likewise, Akynova, Zharkynbekova, Aimoldina (2012) found that the majority of students believed that code-switching promoted effective learning.

The reason for negative attitude toward code-switching and preference of using only English in the class might be the effect of the prestigious status of English in Kazakhstani society. Thus, even if the only-English approach may seem difficult to the students, they would like to prefer it as a sign of high status. Another reason could be that the students would like to show off as speaking English can make smart and cool image for them. One more reason for negative attitude toward code-switching might be reflected by the university rules that try to encourage students to use only English in the class.

It also was found that those participants whose native language is Kazaks, both the teachers and the students, prefer code-switching in the class more than those whose native language is Russian. Male participants, both the teachers and the students, prefer code-switching more than female participants. This results could be caused by less number of those whose native language is Kazak and male participants. It also was found that the students of lower year of studying prefer code-switching more than those of higher year of studying. As for the teachers, those with smaller experience prefer code-switching more than those of bigger experience. Perhaps, the students of lower years of studying have lower level of English proficiency and less experience of studying in English. Due to this factor, they might prefer code-switching more than those of higher year of studying whose English level of proficiency and experience of studying in English might be higher. The reason for preference for code-switching among less exercised teachers could be the same. Due to less experience of teaching, they might prefer code-switching in the class more than those who have bigger experience of teaching.

5.3 Conclusion

This study attempted to make an analysis in the functions of teachers' code-switching in the class at Kazakh-British University in Almaty in the Republic of Kazakhstan. It also looked into the teachers' attitudes toward their own use of code-switching and the students' attitudes toward the teachers' use of code-switching. Besides, it tried to find out if the teachers' attitudes corresponded to the students' attitude.

The participants of the study constituted 50 teachers and 200 students. The teachers taught courses at different departments and had different teaching experience (from 1 up to 25 years) and degree (MA/PhD). The students also studied at different departments and were at different (from 1 up to 4) years of studying. All of the participants had different ethnicities but native language for most of them was Russian.

The study applied quantitative method of data collection. Therefore, the data was collected through two questionnaires – students' questionnaire and teachers' questionnaire.

The results of the data analysis showed that the most frequently used function of code-switching by teachers was Metalinguistic since the teachers code-switched to translate and clarify difficult vocabulary and terminology. Contact and Directive functions are also used in the class by teachers because some students stated that the teachers code-switched to create a sense of belonging and to give tasks. Emotional and Poetic functions of code-switching are used rarely. In general, the teachers participated in the survey kept code-switching to an effective minimum and do not

usually used the native language in the class. Most of the teachers' attitudes toward their own use of code-switching were negative. They believed that teaching courses only in English is beneficial to students. They also did not believe that using code-switching made materials easy to understand or strengthens students' English level of proficiency. On the contrary, they thought that using code-switching led to the weakness of the students' English proficiency level. Moreover, they seemed to feel more comfortable using only English when communicating with their students.

As for students, most of them also had a negative attitude toward teachers' code-switching. Almost half of them believed that code-switching strengthens their English proficiency level. Many of them also could not determine if code-switching made the learning process easier or what language they feel more comfortable to communicate with the teachers. Despite this, most of them did not want their teachers to code-switch. Thus, the teachers mostly cater to the needs of the students.

When the teachers' and the students' attitudes were compared, it was revealed that the students were more positive than the teachers regarding the teachers' use of code-switching in the class. It was found that the students kept a position that is more neutral, while the teachers were against code-switching in the class.

It also was found that some personal characteristics such as native language, gender, year of studying and teaching experience affect preference for code-switching in the class. Thus, those participants whose native language is Kazakh prefer code-switching more than those whose native language is Russian. Males also prefer code-switching more than females. The students of lower year of studying prefer code-switching more than those of higher year of studying. As for the teachers, those with smaller experience prefer code-switching more than those of bigger experience.

5.4 Implications and Recommendations for the Further Research

The study provides some implications for language policy makers, teachers, and researchers. Since the results of the study identified limited use of code-switching in the class and the students' preference of medium of instruction seems satisfied, the decision makers should keep their language policy. The teachers should minimise the use of code-switching in the class and switch only when it is necessary so that the students would be able to comprehend materials and the teachers talk. The teachers should also be aware of the cases when they should code-switch so that it could be beneficial for the students. Observation committee should visit classrooms from time to time to check if the teachers' code-switching minimised and if it is beneficial for the students. The observation committee should also give feedback to the teachers.

The researcher can give some suggestions to minimise code-switching. Firstly, the teachers can explain and clarify difficult vocabulary and terminology by giving definitions and synonyms in English. It will make the students get used to only-English and not to expect translation. In opposite case, the students may learn to expect that the teachers would translate vocabulary and they will not pay attention to the English instructions (Yletyinen, 2004). It also will make them not to code-switch, as they tend to follow their teachers (Yletyinen, 2004). In addition, the teachers can use visual aids to make materials and their speech more comprehensible. The researchers can suggest the discussion of new issues regarding the field. It should be noted that not much research has been done in the issue of code-switching in the educational space of Kazakhstan. This thesis is an attempt to make a step towards the explanation of the functions of the teachers' code-switching in the class and attitudes toward it and requires further investigation. In order to attain more

findings, the further research on this issue may include increasing the sample population and conducting individual interviews. The same may include the different ages, proficiency level and various speech communities. A further study can investigate the influence of code-switching on students' English proficiency level.

5.5 Limitations and Delimitations

It is important to mention that this study has limitations that can be addressed in future students. The findings of the study cannot be generalised to other contexts. It is so because of the limited number of participants and not taking into consideration all possible variables (e.g., proficiency level of the participants, the students learning styles, the teachers' believes), which can influence the use of function of code-switching and attitudes toward it. Moreover, the data was collected only through the questionnaire that cannot give in-depth results.

At the same time, there are some delimitation of the study. It results can be a sufficient due to the number of the population regarding the university where the research has been conducted. In addition, there has not been conducted a study in this context to investigate teachers' use of code-switching in the class, their attitude toward their own use of it and students attitude toward teachers' code-switching in the class.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, B. (2009). Teachers' Code-switching in the Classroom Instructions for Low English Proficient Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2, 2, 49-55.
- Aitken, A. (1992). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Akbar, R. (2007). *Students' and Teachers' attitudes toward Kuwaiti/English Code-switching* (PhD dissertation). Cardiff University. Cardiff, United Kingdom.
- Akynova, D., Zharkynbekova, S., & Aimoldina, A. (2012). Code-switching and second language acquisition in the educational space of Kazakhstan. *GSTF International Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 2, 1, 224-230.
- Akynova, D. (2013). Code-switching and EFL in the Educational Space of Kazakhstan. *Journal of Teaching and Education*, 2, 1, 31-39.
- Akynova, D., Aimoldina, ., & Agmanova, A. (2014). English in Higher Education: pragmatic Factors of Kazakh-English Code-switching. *Life Sci J*, 11, 10, 414-420.
- Akynova, D., Zharkynbekova, S., gmanova, A., Aimoldina, A., & Dalbergenova, L. (2014). Language Choice among the Youth of Kazakhstan: English as a Self-Representation of Prestige. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 143, 228-

Alenezi, A. (2010). Students' Language towards Using Code-switching as a Medium of Instruction in the College of Health Sciences: an Exploratory Study. *Arcls*, 7, 1-22.

Anderson, T. (2006). *Spanish-English Bilinguals' Attitudes Toward Code-switching: Proficiency, Grammaticality, and Familiarity* (PhD dissertation). The Pennsylvania State University. Pennsylvania, USA.

Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.

Asali, S. (2011). *Attitudes of Arab American Speakers in the USA towards English-Arabic Code-switching* (Master thesis). Middle East University. Amman, Jordan.

Atas, U. (2012). *Discourse Functions of Students' and Teachers' Code-switching in EFL Classroom: A Case Study in a Turkish University* (Master thesis). Middle East Technical University. Turkey, Ankara.

Auer, P. (2002). *Code-switching in Conversation*. London and New York. Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 1, 9-32.

- Azuma, S. (1997). Lexical Categories and Code-switching: A Study of Japanese/English Code-switching in Japan. *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 31, 2, 1-24.
- Bauman, R., & Sherzer, J. (1975). The Ethnography of Speaking. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 4, 95-119.
- Beardson, H. (1991). *Bilingualism: Basic Principles*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Berger, M. (2011). *English-only Policy for All? Case of a University English Class in Japan*. *Polyglossia*, 20, 27-43.
- Bhatia, T., & Ritchie, W. (2004). Social and psychological in language mixing. In Ritchie, W., & Bhatia, T (eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 226-352). Blackwell Publishing.
- Bland, M., & Alman, D. (1995). Multiple significance test: the Bonferroni method. *BMJ*, 310, 170. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.310.6973.170>
- Blom, J., & Gumperz, J. (1972). Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code Switching in Northern Norway. In Gumperz, J. & Brock-Utne, B. (2002). The most recent developments concerning the debate on language of instruction in Tanzania. *Institute for Education Research*. Oslo: University of Oslo.

- Bloomfield, L. (1994). *Language*. India: Motilal Banarsidass Publisher.
- Bloom, J. (2008). *Pedagogical Code-switching: a Case Study of the Language Practices of three Bilingual Content Teachers* (PhD dissertation). Columbia University. New York, USA.
- Block, A., Forchhammer, K., Heider, J., Baron, C. (1991). Selenoprotein synthesis: an expansion of the genetic code. *Trends in Biochemical Science*, 16, 463-467.
- Brown, K. (2006). *Encyclopaedia of language & linguistics*. Elsevier, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Boztepe, E., (2003). Issues in Code-switching: Competing Theories and Models. *Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics*. 3, 2, 1-27.
- Butzkamm, W. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongues in FL classroom: death of a dogma. *Language Learning Journal*, 28, 1, 29-39.
- Camilleri, A. (1996). Language Values and Identity: Code switching in Secondary Classroom in Malta. *Linguistics and Education*, 8, 85-103.
- Cheng, X. (2013). Research on Chinese College English Teachers' Classroom Code-switching: Beliefs and Attitudes. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4, 6, 1277-1284.

- Chimbaganda, A., & Mokgawathi, T. (2012). Code-switching in Botswana's ESL Classroom: A Paradox of Linguistic Policy in Education. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2, 2, 21-32.
- Chowdhury, N. (2012). Classroom Code Switching of English Language Teachers at Tertiary Level: A Bangladeshi Perspective. *Stamford Journal of English*. 7, 40-61.
- Clyne, M. (1991). *Community Language: The Australian Experience*. Cambridge University Press.
- Corcoll, C. (2013). Developing children's language awareness: switching codes in the language classroom. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 10, 1, 27-45.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 3, 402-415.
- Cook, V. (2002). *Portraits of the L2 User*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Craven, L. (2002). An Investigation of Attitudes toward Mother Tongue /usage in Junior High School Oral Communication Classes. *CiNii*, 4, 1-9.
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (5th ed.). London: Blackwell.
- Davies, A. (2003). *The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics*. New York: Blackwell.
- Dewaelea, J. & Li, W. (2014). Attitudes towards code-switching among adult mono- and multilingual language users. *Journal of Multiannual and Multicultural Development*. 35, 3, 235-251.
- Dweik, B. (2000). Linguistic and cultural maintenance among the Chechen of Jordan. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 13, 184-195.
- Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal*, 50, 4, 303-311.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Falomir, L., & Laguna, S. (2012). Code Switching in Classroom Discourse: A Multiannual Approach. *Utrecht Studies in Language and Communication*, 24, 295-319.

- Fatemi, A., & Barani, G. (2014). The Impact of Teachers' Code-switching on the Vocabulary Learning of Iranian University EFL Learners. *Journal of Language Sciences & Linguistics*, 2, 4, 91-98.
- Ghaharia, S. (2014). Iranian bilinguals' reverse codeswitching: an impact quest for power? *Journal of World Languages*, 1, 3, 171-191.
- Gomez, A. (2014). How do native Spanish speakers engage with and respond to bilingual instructional strategies in the ESL classroom? Retrieved <http://bilingualstrategiesinesl.weebly.com/>
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: life and reality*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press.
- Gulzar, M., & Qadir, S. (2009). Socialized Patterns of Discourse: Language Choice in Teachers' Talk. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research*, 13, 1, 121-130.
- Gulzar, M. (2014). Teachers' Code-switching in a Content-focused English as a Second Language (ESL) Classroom: Patterns and Functions. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6, 4, 130-153.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics*. New-York: Holt, Rnehart & Winston.

- Hait, S. (2014). *The Functions of Code Switching Used by Secondary Students in English Classes* (Master thesis). Middle East University. Amman, Jordan.
- Hamidi, H., & Sarem, S. (2012). A Closer Look at Some Reasons behind Code-switching: A Case of Iranian EFL Classrooms. *ELT Voices – India*, 2, 5, 90-102.
- Heller, M. 1990. *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity*. London: Longman.
- Huerta-Macias, A., & Quinterro, E. (1992). *Code Switching, bilingual and biliteracy: Case Study*. Duluth: University of Minnesota.
- Hussein, R. (1999). Code-Alternation among Arab college students. *World Englishes*, 18, 281-289.
- Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In Gladvin, T., & Kim, M. (2008). Are cases of unconventional code-switching useless? *The Panels*, 44, 2, 139-149. The Panels, 44, 2, 139-149.
- Iqbal, L. (2011). Linguistic Features of Code-switching: A Study of Urdu/English Bilingual Teachers' Classroom Interactions. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1, 14, 188-194.
- Ibrahim, E., Shah, M., & Armia, N. (2013). Code-switching in English as a Foreign

Language Classroom: Teachers' Attitudes. *English Language Teaching*, 6, 7, 139-150.

Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' Code-switching to the L1 in EFL Classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 3, 10-23.

Kachru, B. (1992). *Teaching world Englishes. The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Kracht, M., & Klein, U. (2014). *The Grammar of Code Switching*. Netherlands: Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht.

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T., (1983). *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. San Francisco: The Alemany Press.

King, N., & Hornberger, N. (Eds.) *Encyclopaedia of Language and education: Research methods in language and education* (2nd ed.). New York: Springer Science.

Levine, G. (2014). Principles for code choice in the foreign language classroom: A focus on grammaring. *Language Teaching*. 47, 3, 332-348.

Liang, X. (2006). Identity and Language Functions: High School Chinese Immigrant Students' Code-switching Dilemmas in ESL Classes. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 5, 2, 143-167.

- Lin, A. (1990). *Teaching in Two Tongues: Language Alternation in Foreign Language Classrooms*. Research Report. Hong Kong, City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.
- Lin, A. (2008). Code-switching in the classroom: Research paradigms and approaches. In Lin, A. (2013). Classroom code-switching: three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4, 1, 195-218.
- Lugolobi-Nalunga, M. (2013). *Teaching and learning English in a multilingual classroom* (Degree project). Karlstad University. Karlstad, Sweden.
- Macaro, E. (2005). Teaching Use of Codeswitching in the Second Language Classroom: Exploring 'Optimal' Use. In Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.). *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 35-49). Great Britain: MPG Books Group.
- MacSwann, J. (2000). The Architecture of the Bilingual Language Faculty: Evidence from Intrasentential Code Switching. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 3, 1, 37-54.
- Mackey, W. (1962). The description of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 7, 51-85.
- Martinez, R. (2010). Spanglish as Literacy Tool: Toward an Understanding of the

Potential Role of Spanish-English Code-switching in the Development of Academic Literacy, *Research in the Teaching of English*, 45, 2, 124-149.

McKay, S., & Hornberger, N. (2009). *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McLaughlin, B. (1984). *Second-language acquisition in childhood: Preschool children*, Hillsdale: NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mokgwathi, T., & Webb, V. (2013). The educational effects of code-switching in the classroom – benefits and setbacks: A case of selected senior secondary schools in Botswana. *Language Matters: in the Languages of Africa*, 44, 3, 108-125.

Moghadam, S., Samad, A., & Shahraki, E. (2012). Code switching as a Medium of Instruction in an EFL Classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2, 11, 2219-2225.

Murad, T. (2003). Arab Practicum Guides Code-switch to Hebrew: Attitudes, Factors and Reasons. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4, 6, 1160-1166.

Muysken, P. (1995). *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for code-switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, C., & Janice J. (2001). Four Types of Morpheme: Evidence from Aphasia, Code Switching, and Second-Language Acquisition. *Linguistics*, 38, 6, 1053-1100.

Nilep, C. (2006). "Code Switching" in Sociocultural Linguistics. *Colorado Research in Linguistics*, 19, 1-22.

Ogechi, N. (2002). *Trilingual Code Switching in Kenya-evidence from Ekegusii, Kiswahili, English and Sheng* (Unpublished PhD dissertation). University of Hamburg. Hamburg, Germany.

Osam, N. (1997). *Correspondence*. Criticism on Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal*, 50, 4, 303-311. *ELT Journal* Volume 51/3, 311.

Palmer, D. (2009). Code-switching and Symbolic Power in a Second-Grade Two-Way Classroom: A Teacher's Motivation System Gone Awry. *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association of Bilingual Education*, 32, 1, 42-59.

Poplack, Sh. (1980). Sometimes I'll start sentence in Spanish y termino en espanol:

Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18 (233-234), 581-618.

Rahimi, A., & Jafari, Z. (2011). Iranian Students' Attitudes toward the Facilitative and Debilitative Role of Code-switching; Types and Moments of Code-switching at EFL Classroom. *The Buckingham Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 4, 14-28.

Ramirez, J. (2012). *Language switching: a qualitative clinical study of four-second language learners' composing processes* (PhD dissertation). University of Iowa. Iowa City, USA.

Rasekh, A. (2009). Code-switching as a new strategy: Speak English to overcome your shyness. *Iranian Journal of Language Studies*, 3, 2, 225-234.

Richards, J. & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, S. (2006). *The Function of Code-switching in Multicultural high school* (MPhil dissertation). Stellenbosch University. Maitland, South Africa.

Rukh, S., Saleem, N., Javeed, N., & Mehmood, N. (2012). Students' Attitudes towards Teachers' Code-Mixing/Code-Switching to L1 and Its Influence on Their L2 Learning: A Case of Business Students in Sargodha. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 3, 5, 1111-1116.

- Sampson, A. (2011). Learners' code-switching versus English only. *ELT Journal* Volume, 66, 3, 293-303.
- Sehiling, Y., & Setiawan, S. (2014). The Students' Attitudes toward the Instructor's Code Switching in ELT Classroom. *Language Horizon*, 2, 1, 1-15.
- Sell, J. (2003). The effect of code-switching in international language on task performance in the English class. *Encuentro Revista de investigacion e innovation en la clase de idiomas*, 13, 14, 185-198.
- Sert, O. (2005). The Functions of Code Switching in ELT Classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11, 8, 1-6.
- Setati, M. (1998). Code-switching in a Senior Primary Class of Second-language Mathematics Learners. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 18, 1, 34-40.
- Schweers, W. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 3, 6, 13.
- Simasiku, L., Karasanda, C., & Smit, T. (2015). Can Code Switching Enhance Learners' Academic Achievement? *English Language Teaching*, 8, 2, 70-77.
- Skiba, R. (1997). Code switching as a countenance of language interference. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 3, 10.

Sreehali, P. (2012). Communicative Language Teaching: Possible and Problems.
English Language Teaching, 5, 12.

Sturtevant, W. (Eds.), *Anthropology and human behaviour*. Washington, DC:
Anthropological Society of Washington.

Suchana, A. (2014). Code Switching of Bilinguals in Content Area Classrooms at
Tertiary Level. *Journal of SUB*, 5, 1, 77-89.

Then, D., & Ting, S. (2011). Code-switching in English and science classrooms:
more than translation. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 8, 4, 299-323.

Tiena, N. (2012). English-Vietnamese Code-Switching in Tertiary Educational
Context in Vietnam. *Asian Englishes*, 15, 2, 4-29.

Ustunel, 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.

Uys, D., & Dulm, V. (2011). The functions of classroom code-switching in the
Siyanda District of the Northern Cape. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied
Language Studies*, 29, 1, 67-76.

Valdes, G., & Figueroa, R. (1994). *Bilingualism and Testing: A special Case of Bias*.
Norwood: NJ: Ablex.

- Valerio, M. (2015). Filipino- English Code switching Attitudes and Practices and their Relationship to English Academic Performance among Freshman Students of Quirino State University. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2, 1, 76-98.
- Vu, N., & Burns, A. (2014). English as a Medium of Instruction: Challenges for Vietnamese Tertiary Lecturers. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 11, 3, 1-31.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (5th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wei, L. (2000). Introduction: dimensions of bilingualism. In Wei, L. (2000). *The Bilingualism Reader*. New York: Rutledge.
- Wei, L. (2009). Conflicts and tensions in classroom codeswitching: an introduction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12, 2, 117-122.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Language in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Weng, P. (2012). Code-Switching as a Strategy Use in an EFL Classroom in Taiwan. *US-China Foreign Language*, 10, 10, 1669-1675.

- Willians, F. (2011). Classroom code-switching in a Vanuatu secondary school: Conflict between policy and practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14, 1 23-38.
- Willis, J. (1981). *Teaching English through English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Wilkerson, C. (2008). Instructors' use of English in Modern Language Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41, 2, 310-320.
- Yletynen, H. (2004). *The unctions of Codeswitching in EFL Classroom Discourse* (Pro Gradu thesis). University of Jyvaskyla. Seminaarrinkatu, Finland.
- Younas, M., Arshad, S., Akram, K., Faisal, M., Akhtar, M., & Sarfraz, K. (2014). Code-Switching and Code-Mixing A Case of EFL Teachers Affecting L2 Learners' Learning. *Language in India*, 14, 516-522.
- Zabrodskaia, A. (2007). Russian-Estonian code-switching in the university. *Arizona working papers in SLA & Teaching*, 14, 123-139.
- History of Kazakh-British Technical University (2015). Retrieved from http://www.kbtu.kz/wps/portal/Home/newhome/about_kbtu/History/!ut/p/z1/hZDNC4JAEMX_1g4ec8bdvui2lkUfFBqSzSUUtk0wNzZL-u-LOhmmc5vh_XjvDRBEQHn8SFVcpDqPs_d-oMGRL9BDp-es5r47RTEI18GkP-MYcth_BPhnBAJV-N2QofC9gLONx9B3anmBbsBcjjfsh_-j3 DQStPH0lTghpBtWJbSWpLsQRSmU6-Dxd5wkcKyMiTNNLYd_M n4viehtbaGFZlrbSWm

XSNncL64izvhUQVYSwkzlcL2EYYbroUvLkpei8AkxQfCY!/
dz/d5/L2dJQSEvUUt3QS80TmxFL1o2X0sxSTJISEswS0dTNUew
QVNPSjdQOEUXQ0M1/

The population of the Republic of Kazakhstan on certain ethnic groups at the beginning of 2015. (2015). Retrieved from <http://stat.gov.kz/getImg?id=ESTAT100232>

Think Globally, Teach Locally: English in Kazakhstan. (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.slideshare.net/Terry34/think-globally-teach-locally-english-in-kazakhstan>

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Teachers' Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to find out your opinion about the language of teaching at your classes. Please respond to all the questions below carefully and honestly. Put the tick in the appropriate for u box. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, and will only be used for the purpose of this study. Your answers will not prejudice you in any way.

Section A: Biographical information

1. What is your gender?
 Female Male
2. Education level: MA/MS PhD
3. Teaching experience: _____
4. What is your native* language? (*by “native language” we mean a language that you speak the best and use for thinking)

-
5. What language(s) do you speak other than your native?

-
6. To what ethnical group do you belong?

-
7. Which language(s) you used while teaching courses?
-

Section B: Teachers' views about functions of code-switching in classes.

Guideline:

During your classes, you often use other languages (e.g. Kazakh or Russian) in combination with English. This is known as code-mixing or code-switching. Please read each of the

following statements very carefully and tick the answer which best describes your degree of agreement or disagreement.

I use mixture of languages to	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Express my emotions.					
Express my feelings.					
Give tasks					
Give instruction.					
Translate and clarify difficult vocabulary.					
Translate and clarify terminology.					
Joke around with students.					
Say poetic quotations.					
Boost students to participate.					
Create a sense of belongings.					
Teaching courses only in English language is beneficial to students.					
Teaching courses in English and a language other than English makes it easy for students to understand.					
I prefer teaching courses using mixture of different languages.					
I prefer teaching courses only in English					
Using a mixture of languages leads to the weakness of students' English.					
Using a mixture of languages strengthens students' English.					
I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my students in language other than English.					

I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my students in English.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

Thank you for your cooperation!

About the author

The author is a MA student at English language teaching department in Eastern Mediterranean University, Cyprus. She graduated with BA degree in Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Kazakhstan. She currently works on her thesis, for which she conducting this survey.

If you have any questions, please, contact the e-mail: Almira-88@mail.ru

Appendix B. Students' Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to find out your opinion about the language of teaching at your classes. Please respond to all the questions below carefully and honestly. Put the tick in the appropriate for u box. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, and will only be used for the purpose of this study. Your answers will not prejudice you in any way.

Section A: Biographical information.

1. What is your gender?

Female

Male

2. What is your age?

3. What was your previous language as medium of instruction before you entered this university?

Kazakh

Russian

Other _____ (name which one)

4. What your year of studying are you in?

First-year

Second-year

Third-year

Fourth-year

5. What is your major?

6. What is your native* language? (*by “native language” we mean a language that you speak the best and use for thinking)

7. What language(s) do you speak other than your native?

8. What language(s) do use at your home with family members?

9. What language(s) do you use in communicating with your classmates and teachers in classes?

10. What is your ethnicity?

Section B: Students' views about functions of code-switching in classes.

Guideline:

During your classes, your teachers often use other languages (e.g. Kazakh or Russian) in combination with English. This is known as code-mixing or code-switching. Please read each of the following statements very carefully and tick the answer which best describes your degree of agreement or disagreement.

Teachers use code-switching to	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Express their emotions.					
Express their feelings.					
Give tasks.					
Give instruction.					
Translate and clarify difficult vocabulary.					
Translate and clarify terminology.					
Joke around with students.					
Say poetic quotations.					
Boost students to participate.					
Create a sense of belongings.					
Teaching courses only in English language is beneficial to me.					
Teaching courses in English and language other than English makes it easy for students to understand.					
I prefer teachers using mixture of different languages.					
I prefer teachers using only English					
Using a mixture of languages leads to the weakness of my English.					
Using a mixture of languages strengthens my English.					

I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my teachers in a language other than English.					
I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my teachers in English.					

Thank you for your cooperation!

About the author

The author is a MA student at English language teaching department in Eastern Mediterranean University, Cyprus. She graduated with BA degree in Kazakh Ablai khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Kazakhstan. She currently works on her thesis, for which she conducting this survey.

If you have any questions, please, contact the e-mail: Almira-88@mail.ru

Appendix C. Descriptive Statistics

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Teachers use code-switching to express their emotions.	3.72	1.145	250
Teachers use code-switching to express their feelings.	3.8	1.054	250
Teachers use code-switching to give tasks.	3.3	1.273	250
Teachers use code-switching to give instructions.	3.31	1.228	250
Teachers use code-switching to translate and clarify difficult vocabulary.	2.37	0.972	250
Teachers use code-switching to translate and clarify terminology.	2.46	1.119	250
Teachers use code-switching to joke with students.	3.87	1.071	250
Teachers use code-switching for quotations.	3.97	1.06	250
Teachers use code-switching to boost participation.	3.8	0.95	250
Teachers use code-switching to create sense of belongings.	3.47	1.166	250
Teaching courses only in English language is beneficial to students.	2.25	1.063	250
Teaching courses in English and language other than English makes it easy for students to understand.	2.87	0.881	250
I prefer teachers using mixture of different languages.	3.09	0.902	250
I prefer teachers using only English	2.4	0.972	250
Using a mixture of languages leads to the weakness of students English.	3.03	0.953	250
Using a mixture of languages strengthens students English.	3.32	0.879	250

I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my teachers/students in a language other than English.	3.19	0.866	250
I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my teachers/students in English.	2.62	0.794	250

Appendix D. Table of Correlations between Variables

			Correlations																						
			Ethnicity	Comfortable with English	Comfortable with language other than English.	Mixture of languages strengthens students' English	Mixture of languages weakens students' English	I prefer English	I prefer mixture of different languages	Language other than English is beneficial to students.	Only in English language is beneficial to students.	Teachers use code-switching to create a sense of belonging.	Teachers use code-switching to boost participation.	Teachers use code-switching to quote.	Teachers use code-switching to joke with students.	Teachers use code-switching to translate terminology.	Teachers use code-switching to translate vocabulary.	Teachers use code-switching to give instructions.	Teachers use code-switching to give tasks.	Teachers use code-switching to express their feelings	Teachers use code-switching to express their emotions.	Year of study	Gender	Native native language	
			0.056	-.097	.113	0.099	.046	-.106	0.0945	-0.44**	-.102	.192*	.160*	0.0189	0.0273	0.411**	.395*	.160*	.189*	.090	.077	0.0933	.040	1	
			.120	.171	.111	.105	.514	.135	.077	.005	.150	.040	.024	.117	.110	.007	.006	.048	.020	.204	.279	.090	.570		
			250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	
		native language																							
		Correlation																							
		Sig																							
		N																							

gender	Correlation		1	0.0222	-.107	-.141*	0.1387*	0.162*	0.4786**	0.4310**	.003	.004	0.1414*	0.1849*	-.082	-.0385**	-.163*	.057	.022	.021	-.053	.021	-.006
	Sig			.102	.130	.046	.036	.029	.003	.006	.967	.955	.046	.031	.251	.006	.022	.419	.761	.768	.455	.771	.930
	N		250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250
year of study	Correlation			1	0.0174	0.01258	.309*	.454**	.338*	.282*	0.0433	0.0467	.386*	.506*	.101	0.19*	0.028	0.0235	.139*	0.0192	.099	.014	0.0254
	Sig				.140	.130	.000	.000	.000	.000	.700	.800	.000	.000	.156	.020	.100	.101	.049	.106	.163	.841	.200
	N			250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250
emotions expressive	Correlation				1	0.0911	0.0725	0.0612	0.0304	0.0393	0.0721	0.0621	0.0513	0.0404	-.005	.226*	.196**	.207**	.139*	.139	.135	.022	.155*
	Sig					.670	.150	.240	.200	.150	.232	.210	.130	.340	.939	.001	.006	.003	.050	.050	.056	.758	.028
	N				250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250

feelings expressive	Correlation					1	.706*	.671**	.288*	.384*	.702**	.700**	.600*	.445*	-.036	.160*	.193**	.254**	.187**	.037	.135	.073	.164*
	Sig						.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.615	.024	.006	.000	.008	.603	.057	.304	.020
	N					250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250
tasks directive	Correlation						1	.797**	.482*	.502*	.662**	.653**	.554*	.411*	-.059	.18*	.442**	-.032	-.069	.072	.118	-.161*	.156*
	Sig							.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.404	.020	.000	.653	.328	.313	.095	.022	.027
	N						250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250

instruction directive	Correlation							1	.539*	.426*	.638**	.653**	.548*	.587*	-.100	.16*	.444**	.029	-.044	.194**	.184**	-.098	.285**
	Sig								.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.161	.040	.000	.686	.535	.006	.009	.168	.000
	N							250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250
vocabulary metalinguistic	Correlation								1	.772*	.388**	.375**	.441*	.479*	.050	0.46*	.232**	.063	-.054	.008	.171*	-.069	.140*
	Sig									.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.480	.001	.001	.374	.448	.914	.015	.328	.048
	N									250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250

terminology metalinguistic	Correlation									1	.512**	.413**	.455*	.323*	.166*	.233*	.117	.101	.073	.027	.085	-.106	.028
	Sig										.000	.000	.000	.000	.019	.001	.099	.156	.302	.705	.230	.134	.698
	N									250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250
	Correlation										1	.842**	.716*	.553*	.087	0.09	.295**	.195**	.191**	.203**	.176*	-.040	.196**
joke poetic	Sig											.000	.000	.000	.221	.110	.000	.006	.007	.004	.013	.576	.005

	N										250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250
quatrains poetic	Correlation											1	0.08 22	0.06 64	.10 4	0.029 5	0.03 12	.214 **	.164 *	.070	.092	- .081	.155 *	
	Sig												.140	.410	.14 4	.150	.230	.002	.020	.328	.197	.256	.028	
	N										250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	
participate contact	Correlation												1	.551 *	.19 9**	.17 *	.254 **	.314 **	.087	- .010	.091	.005	.185 **	
	Sig													.000	.00 5	.046	.000	.000	.220	.891	.200	.944	.009	

	N														250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250
engl.other	Correlation															1	.299**	-.212**	.045	0.0447	0.0186	-.188**	-.217**
	Sig																.000	.003	.528	.250	.108	.008	.003
	N															250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250
prefer.mix	Correlation																1	-.319**	-.299**	.476**	.482**	-.459**	.120
	Sig																	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.090
	N																	250	250	250	250	250	250

mix:strength	Correlation																		1	.345**	-.251**	-.044
	Sig																			.000	.000	.539
	N																		250	250	250	250
comfortable:other	Correlation																			1	-.266**	-.066
	Sig																				.000	.354
	N																				250	250

comfortable:engl	Correlation																				1	.071	
	Sig																						.318
	N																					250	250
ethnicity:ethnicity	Correlation																						1
	Sig																						
	N																						250
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).																							
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).																							

Appendix E. Specification for Preference for Code-switching of Students

Dependent Variable: CS

Method: Panel Least Squares

Total panel (balanced) observations: 200

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	5.814025	0.082041	70.86693	0.0000
E	0.277262	0.241343	1.148829	0.2513
Kazakh	0.766290	0.193606	3.957983	0.0001
Y	-0.432292	0.155238	-2.784708	0.0056
Male	0.349793	0.122891	2.846368	0.0670

Effects Specification

Cross-section fixed (dummy variables)

R-squared	0.946025	Mean dependent var	5.559613
Adjusted R-squared	0.931799	S.D. dependent var	3.312513
S.E. of regression	0.865072	Akaike info criterion	2.732418
Sum squared resid	289.6110	Schwarz criterion	3.614100
Log likelihood	-566.4425	Hannan-Quinn criter.	3.078686
F-statistic	66.50012	Durbin-Watson stat	1.386410
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000		

Appendix F. Specification for Preference for Code-switching of Teachers

Dependent Variable: CS

Method: Panel Least Squares

Total panel (balanced) observations: 50

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	6.131381	0.086253	71.08593	0.0000
E	0.197225	0.233560	0.844430	0.3991
Kazakh	0.590622	0.198557	2.974578	0.0032
Experience	-0.250746	0.156075	-1.606573	0.1092
Male	0.163555	0.087452	1.870224	0.0625

Effects Specification

Cross-section fixed (dummy variables)

R-squared	0.966248	Mean dependent var	5.607091
Adjusted R-squared	0.954335	S.D. dependent var	3.277344
S.E. of regression	0.700347	Akaike info criterion	2.346194
Sum squared resid	141.7505	Schwarz criterion	3.389663
Log likelihood	-356.8540	Hannan-Quinn criter.	2.759749
F-statistic	81.11148		
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000		

Appendix G. T-test for Students

One-Sample Test					
	t	df	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
Gender	3.11	199	1.495	1.43	1.56
Year of study	2.22	199	2.410	2.28	2.54
Native language	5.25	199	1.790	1.73	1.85
Ethnicity	1.54	199	1.205	1.14	1.27
Teachers use code-switching to express their emotions	.98	199	3.655	3.50	3.81
Teachers use code-switching to express their feelings	1.43	199	3.740	3.60	3.88
Teachers use code-switching to give tasks	1.98	199	3.240	3.07	3.41
Teachers use code-switching to give instructions	1.96	199	3.245	3.08	3.41
Teachers use code-switching to translate and clarify difficult vocabulary	4.32	199	2.310	2.18	2.44
Teachers use code-switching to translate and clarify terminology	3.81	199	2.395	2.24	2.55
Teachers use code-switching to joke with students	1.32	199	3.805	3.66	3.95
Teachers use code-switching to quote	1.44	199	3.905	3.76	4.05
Teachers use code-switching to boost participation	2.21	199	3.735	3.61	3.86
Teachers use code-switching to create a sense of belongings	1.02	199	3.405	3.25	3.56
Teaching courses only in English language is beneficial to students	2.13	199	2.185	2.04	2.33
Teaching courses in English and a language other than English makes it easy for students to understand	1.67	199	2.810	2.69	2.93
I prefer teachers teaching courses using mixture of different languages	1.84	199	3.030	2.91	3.15
I prefer teachers teaching courses only in English	1.95	199	2.340	2.21	2.47
Using a mixture of languages leads to the weakness of students' English	1.01	199	2.970	2.84	3.10
Using a mixture of languages strengthens students' English	.96	199	3.255	3.14	3.37
I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my teachers in language other than English	1.43	199	3.125	3.01	3.24
I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my teachers in English	1.55	199	2.560	2.45	2.67

Appendix H. T-test for Teachers

	t	df	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
Gender	2.11	49	1.459	1.401	1.531
Experience	3.22	49	2.374	2.251	2.511
Native language	4.25	49	1.754	1.701	1.821
Ethnicity	1.04	49	1.169	1.111	1.241
Teachers use code-switching to express their emotions	0.78	49	3.619	3.471	3.781
Teachers use code-switching to express their feelings	1.33	49	3.704	3.571	3.851
Teachers use code-switching to give tasks	1.08	49	3.204	3.041	3.381
Teachers use code-switching to give instructions	1.96	49	3.209	3.051	3.381
Teachers use code-switching to translate and clarify difficult vocabulary	3.32	49	2.274	2.151	2.411
Teachers use code-switching to translate and clarify terminology	1.51	49	2.359	2.211	2.521
Teachers use code-switching to joke with students	1.02	49	3.769	3.631	3.921
Teachers use code-switching to quote	1.04	49	3.869	3.731	4.021
Teachers use code-switching to boost participation	1.21	49	3.699	3.581	3.831
Teachers use code-switching to create a sense of belongings	1.32	49	3.369	3.221	3.531
Teaching courses only in English language is beneficial to students	2.43	49	2.149	2.011	2.301
Teaching courses in English and a language other than English makes it easy for students to understand	1.67	49	2.774	2.661	2.901
I prefer teachers teaching courses using mixture of different languages	0.54	49	2.994	2.881	3.121
I prefer teachers teaching courses only in English	1.05	49	2.304	2.181	2.441
Using a mixture of languages leads to the weakness of students' English	1.21	49	2.934	2.811	3.071
Using a mixture of languages strengthens students' English	0.76	49	3.219	3.111	3.341
I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my teachers in language other than English	1.27	49	3.089	2.981	3.211
I feel more comfortable when I communicate with my teachers in English	1.08	49	2.524	2.421	2.641

Appendix I. T-distribution of Comparing Students' and Teachers' Attitudes

<u><i>Null Hypotheses</i></u>	Teachers		Students	
	<u><i>t-stat</i></u>	<u><i>decision</i></u>	<u><i>t-stat</i></u>	<u><i>decision</i></u>
"I prefer teachers teaching courses only in English" does not affect code-switching	1.03	Accept	1.35	Accept
"Using a mixture of languages leads to the weakness of students' English" does not affect code-switching	1.21	Accept	1.01	Accept
"Using a mixture of languages leads to the weakness of students' English" does not affect code-switching	0.76	Accept	0.96	Accept
"I feel comfortable with communicating with my students/teachers in language other than English" does not affect code-switching	1.27	Accept	1.43	Accept
"Teaching courses only in English language is beneficial to students" does not affect code-switching	2.43	Reject	2.13	Reject
"Teaching courses in English and a language other than English makes it easy for students to understand" does not affect code-switching	0.54	Accept	0.84	Accept
"I feel comfortable with communicating with my students/teachers in EEnglish" does not affect code-switching	1.08	Accept	1.55	Accept