



HIGHER EDUCATION EFL TEACHERS' CODE-SWITCHING PRACTICES: PATTERNS AND FUNCTIONS IN FOCUS

Gebrewahid Tsige Gerezgiher^{a*}, Hailom Banteyerga Amaha^b

^a Adigrat University, Ethiopia

^b Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

*Corresponding author: gebrewahidtsige@yahoo.com

article info

Article history:

Received: 01 December 2023

Received in revised form: 20 June 2023

Accepted: 30 June 2024

Keywords:

Higher Education,
EFL,
Teachers,
Code-switching,
Patterns,
Functions

abstract

This study was conducted to investigate higher education EFL teachers' code-switching patterns and functions. To achieve this objective, data was gathered through classroom observation audio record and semi-structured interview. A total of 24 lessons of 2400 minutes were recorded, and six teachers participated in the interview. The results obtained show that the teachers' CS frequency increased as the students' grade level that they were teaching increased. Besides, it was found that teachers of all grade levels employed inter-sentential CS more dominantly. Finally, the results obtained indicate that teachers of all class years were CS for curriculum access purposes more dominantly. Based on the findings, it is concluded that the different patterns of CS that the teachers were employing at the different grade levels have many functions in the EFL classes, and it helps the teaching and learning of English if it is handled properly. However, the teachers use of CS has to decrease as the students' grade level goes up and the students' EFL performance is improved. Teachers' overuse of CS diminishes students' exposure to the target language and their practice to English language in classes where English is a foreign language. Therefore, teachers' CS patterns and functions should vary depending on their students' grade level. In short, teachers should re-evaluate their CS practices and employ it depending up on their students' CS desire and grade level.

INTRODUCTION

There has been a longstanding debate over whether code-switching (CS) in the EFL classes should be avoided or welcomed (Duff and Polio, 1990). During the grammar translation method, CS in EFL classes was regarded as a tool to help the teaching and learning of English language (Kavari, 2014). However, this good attitude towards CS didn't stay long. The next methods of English language teaching such as the direct method, the audio-lingual method, and the communicative language teaching methods tend to ban the students' native language in the EFL/ESL classes. During these approaches to language teaching, students and/or teachers who code-switch were regarded as guilty and lazy (Mart, 2013; and Bhooth et al, 2014).

Krashen (1985) states that for students who learn EFL, it is the classroom only that exposes them to the target language. So, CS in EFL classes is prohibiting the students' exposure to the target language. Because of this, the use of students' native language or CS in the EFL classroom was treated as a taboo (Atkinson, 1987), a source of guilty (Auerbach, 1993), a symptom of teachers' weakness to teach properly (Cook, 2002), and wastage of time (Krashen, 1985). Nation (2003) also warns that CS in the EFL classroom reduces the amount of input and the opportunity of practice for the target language. As a result, the English only approach has

been an influential and often assumed to be the hallmark of a good language teaching around the world (Atkinson, 1993; and Mouhanna, 2009).

Contrary to this, Song (2009), Timor (2012), Paker and Karaagac (2015), Blackman (2014), and Cook (2001) stated that CS in the EFL/ESL classroom facilitates the target language learning. They added that the use of only the target language is unfashionable to the 21st century of language learning and impractical in the actual classroom. Littlewood and Yu (2011) identified that there is still a lack of agreement on whether the students' native language has a place in the classroom or, if it does, what that role is.

In the context of Ethiopia, many private schools forbid the use of mother tongue both in the EFL classroom and throughout the school compound even at the elementary levels of education. "Use English all the time. The use of any local language other than English in the school compound (in the classroom, playground, cafeteria, and staffroom) is strictly forbidden and leads both teachers and students for punishment (Gibson, 2011:4)." As we can understand from this, let alone CS in the EFL classes and using as medium of instruction, the students' mother tongue is not allowed to enter the school gate. This practice is against the country's education and training policy (Ethiopian Ministry of Education, 1994). Because the policy states, "Cognizant of the pedagogical advantage of the child in learning in mother tongue and the rights of nationalities to promote the use of their languages, primary education will be given in nationality languages (Ethiopian Ministry of Education, 1994:23)." Though the policy says nothing about CS in the EFL classroom, it condemns prohibiting students' mother tongue usage in the classroom other than English classes.

In spite of the fact that the country's policy and the private schools' actual practices are different, many parents and students are seen favoring private schools than the government schools for various reasons. Contrary to the private schools, in the government schools, the mother tongue is used not only in the school compound and other subjects (as medium of instruction) but also in the EFL classes. This indicates that there are two opposite practices on the use of mother tongue in the EFL classrooms, one that allows the use of L1 and another one which condemns its usage.

Generally, throughout history, there have been methods that encouraged teachers and students to use the first language and some that did not allow it. As a result, both teachers and students followed different principles to address this issue. Not having one opinion on how to address it has made it even more confusing to the students to either use it or not as they come through different teachers who either encourage or prohibit it.

Though many researches have been conducted on the use of mother tongue, none of the researches looked at code-switching with heterogeneous students. Cook (2001) and Sert (2005) stated that the use of CS in the EFL classes shouldn't be oversimplified if the students and the teacher share the same mother tongue. How about if the students have different L1? What about if the students and the teacher have varied L1? This was a gap that the former researches have not investigated.

As to Cook (2002) and Blackman (2014), the practice of CS depends on the students' and teachers' target language competence, the country's/school's language policy, students' sitting arrangement, grade level and age of the students, content and type of the lesson, the teachers' teaching experience, and the students' multilingualism. Sert (2005) and Alenezi (2010) stated that the functions of code-switching and the factors for doing so in the EFL classroom varies depending on various factors. Therefore, as the students and/or teachers were multilingual (with different linguistic background) and were at a higher level, their practice of CS and the functions for CS could be different from the researches conducted so far. So, this was a new area which needs a thorough investigation.

As far as the knowledge of these researchers is concerned, there is no research work conducted on CS at university level where the students and teachers are heterogeneous. Therefore, this research is conducted to fill this gap and address the following research questions: (1) What proportion of Amharic to English does higher education EFL teachers employ?; (2) What CS pattern does higher education EFL teachers use more dominantly?; and (3) For what purposes do higher education EFL teachers code-switch more frequently?

METHOD

The descriptive research design was used for this study since the study was intended to investigate the proportion of Amharic to English, the patterns of CS, and the functions of CS. The study took place at Mekelle University, one of the 47 autonomous and secular Ethiopian government higher educations, which was established in 1993. The university's English Language and Literature Department had 50 Ethiopian EFL teachers and three batches of students with one section each. Each section was taking six English major courses which were delivered by six different EFL specialized teachers. Data was collected through classroom observation (audio record) and semi-structured interview.

Cohen (2000) stated that observation provides a live data from naturally occurring social situations. Due to this, observation was conducted by the presence of the researchers with a non-participatory role along with an audio-recording. A randomly selected six teachers who were teaching six different courses, two teachers from each batch, were observed for a month. Because, if the observation was conducted for a few days, the teachers could hide their actual behavior of CS.

Almost all of the English language courses of the English major students at university level have three credits per week. One credit is 50 minutes. The programs were arranged in such a way that the two credits were taught consecutively – with no interruption between them and the other one credit on another day. The one credit hour period was observed and recorded during the pilot study. So, the two credits hour period was observed and recorded for this study.

When this study was taking place, the students of all batches were taking six courses per semester. One semester is four months (16 weeks). This indicates that 48 hours is allotted for one course. Two courses from each batch, which were selected randomly so as to avoid bias, were observed for one month (four weeks). In other words, six teachers were observed. This shows that almost 8 hours (17%) of the courses were observed and recorded. This sample represents the whole hours of the course as Sing (2007) suggests 10- 20% to be taken for generalizing large samples. Therefore, four lessons (100 minutes per lesson) for each course of all batches, with a total of 24 lessons or 2400 minutes, were observed, recorded, and transcribed.

This method of data gathering tool (the observation) was used since it provides researchers the opportunity to identify the proportion of Amharic to English, the patterns of CS employed, and the possible functions of CS employed by the teachers in the classroom (Singh, 2007). In this method, the observers neither manipulated nor stimulated their subjects. Because of this, the activities in the classroom were observed as they were presented without any interruption on behalf of the observers. The purpose of this observation was to pay attention when the teachers code-switched while they use it inside the classroom.

Classroom observations took first. Then interviews continued. This procedure was used for two reasons. First, the participants could hide their actual behavior if they were well informed of what the study was about. Secondly, the interview questions were asked based on what was observed in the classroom. Therefore, the interview was used as a follow up for the classroom observation. A triangulation of classroom observation along with an audio-recording and interviews were employed so as to check the reliability and validity of the data gathered.

Semi-structured interview was used since it enables the researcher to probe questions depending on what was observed in the classroom observation (Singh, 2007). Dornyei (2007) revealed that semi-structured interview allows modification of the previous prepared questions as well as the addition of new questions that emerged during the interview. Cohen et al (2007) adds that a semi-structured interview is one type of interview where the researcher plans a set of questions to be raised before the interview takes place, but builds in considerable flexibility about how and when these issues are raised and allows for a considerable number of additional topics to be built in response to the dynamics of conversational exchange. The semi-structured interview was conducted with the six teachers whose classrooms was observed. Many of the interview questions were adapted and developed from Selamat (2014) and Mokgwathi (2011).

The results obtained through the aforementioned data gathering tools were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The data gathered from the semi structured interview were analyzed qualitatively. Results of the classroom observation (audio recording) were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. The qualitative data was analyzed using thematic analysis. To illustrate it more, after the audio recording was transcribed in verbatim; extracts were taken, coded thematically, and discussed to show what patterns of CS they were used and to indicate the functions they were used for. Again, the utterances were categorized as Amharic and English by using a word as a counting unit. Next to tallying the verbatim transcription in to the above listed categories, they were converted into percentages. This helps to express and quantify how much percent of Amharic to English was used in the EFL classes, the dominant CS patterns employed, and the functions that Amharic language was used for.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Teachers CS Frequency

The teachers who were teaching the three batches were using Amharic in the EFL classes. The detail of the teachers' use of Amharic in the EFL classes in the different class years' observation is presented in the following table.

Table 1: The proportion of Amharic and English language words uttered by teachers in the different grade levels

Class Year	Teachers	Lessons	English Words		Amharic Words		Total Words	
			#	%	#	%	#	%
1 st Year	Teacher 1	Lesson 1	2085	100	0	0	2085	100
		Lesson 2	1816	97.9	38	2.1	1854	100
		Lesson 3	1886	99.1	17	0.9	1903	100
		Lesson 4	2096	97.5	53	2.5	2149	100
	Teacher 2	Lesson 1	1395	76.9	418	23.1	1813	100
		Lesson 2	1849	87.1	274	12.9	2123	100
		Lesson 3	1564	80.2	386	19.8	1950	100
		Lesson 4	1575	75.6	509	24.4	2084	100
		Total	14,266	89.3	1,695	10.7	15,961	100
2 nd Year	Teacher 1	Lesson 1	1825	76.3	568	23.7	2393	100
		Lesson 2	1503	76.1	473	23.9	1976	100
		Lesson 3	2487	79.5	641	20.5	3128	100
		Lesson 4	1974	74.7	669	25.3	2643	100
	Teacher 2	Lesson 1	1508	75.5	490	24.5	1998	100
		Lesson 2	2536	78.5	695	21.5	3231	100
		Lesson 3	1776	74.3	613	25.7	2389	100
		Lesson 4	2231	75.2	734	24.8	2965	100
		Total	15,840	76.4	4,883	23.6	20,723	100

3 rd Year	Teacher 1	Lesson 1	1413	68.1	661	31.9	2074	100
		Lesson 2	1333	68.3	620	31.7	1953	100
		Lesson 3	1576	69.1	705	30.9	2281	100
		Lesson 4	1234	67.5	593	32.5	1827	100
	Teacher 2	Lesson 1	1811	72.9	672	27.1	2483	100
		Lesson 2	1261	71.1	513	28.9	1774	100
		Lesson 3	2224	76.6	680	23.4	2904	100
		Lesson 4	1365	65.2	727	34.8	2092	100
	Total		12,217	70.3	5,171	29.7	17,388	100

The teachers who were teaching first year students delivered 15961 words throughout the eight observed class sessions. Among these, 14266 (89.3%) of them were English words while the remaining 1695 (10.7%) were Amharic words. With regard to the teachers who were teaching second year students, they spoke 20723 words. From these words, the 15840 (76.4%) were English, and the other 4883 (23.6%) were Amharic. As far as the teachers who were teaching third year students is concerned, it was found that they uttered 17388 words. This was the sum of 12217 (70.3%) English and 5171 (29.7%) Amharic words.

The data obtained through the teachers' interview indicated that using Amharic which is less than ten percent facilitates the learning process while its usage more than that it diminishes the learners' exposure to the target language and increases the learners' dependency on the native language.

Example:

"The students English language performance is poor. Therefore, using of Amharic up to ten percent helps the students to understand the lesson better." Year 2; Teacher A

"It is difficult to tell you in percent. Because some students are good in both languages, and others are poor again in both languages. By the way, using up to ten percent is harming the students' exposure to English. Because it is only in the classroom that they got English." Year 3; Teacher B

"In my opinion, Amharic has not to be used as much as possible because there are students who do not listen Amharic. If not, up to five percent is welcome." Year 1; Teacher A

As scholars like Atkinson (1987), Tang (2002), Littlewood and Yu (2011), Macaro (2001), Afzal (2013), Duff and Polio (1990), and Kayaoglu (2012) reported the amount of Amharic used by teachers of second year and third year students was excessive. The use of more than 10% L1 in the EFL classroom hinders the students' learning and exposure to English.

All in all, the teachers who were teaching first year students used less Amharic (which was an appropriate) than the teachers of second year and third year students. Moreover, the third-year teachers code-switched more frequently than the first year and second year teachers which is beyond expectation because the teachers' CS has to decrease as the students' grade level increased. This is because the students' target language competence is believed to be improved as their grade levels increased.

Teachers' CS Patterns

It was found that teachers were using inter-sentential code-switching, intra-sentential code-switching, and tag switching in all class years with a varied amount as it was depicted through the 24 observed class lessons for each class years. The detail is provided below.

Table 2: The occurrence of the patterns of CS employed by teachers in class time in the different grade levels

Class Year	Teachers	Inter sentential CS		Intra sentential CS		Tag switching		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1 st Year	Teacher1	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22	9	100
	Teacher2	9	69.2	4	30.8	0	0	13	100
	Total	14	40	19	54.3	2	5.7	35	100
2 nd Year	Teacher1	37	77.1	11	22.9	0	0	48	100
	Teacher2	23	65.7	8	22.9	4	11	35	100
	Total	80	71.4	27	24.1	5	4.5	112	100
3 rd Year	Teacher1	21	41.2	26	51	4	7.8	51	100
	Teacher2	48	57.8	33	39.8	2	2.4	83	100
	Total	121	59	77	37.6	7	3.4	205	100

As indicated in the above table, the teachers who were teaching at first year uttered 140 patterns of code-switching. The table also shows that there were 448 and 820 CS patterns at the second year and third year teachers respectively. The finding disclosed that the dominant pattern for all class year teachers was inter-sentential code-switching with 54.5%, 59%, and 71.4% for first year, second year, and third year teachers respectively. Tag switching was the less frequently employed pattern of code-switching by all class year teachers. Of all class year teachers, third year teachers used less amount of tag switching (3.4%) followed by second year (4.5%) and first year (5.7%) teachers with a small variation. In line with this finding, Rezvani and Rasekh (2011) found inter-sentential CS to be far outweighed the intra-sentential CS, which was in turn more than tag-switching. They explained that the higher frequency occurrence for inter-sentential CS can be attributed to teachers' intention of giving clearer instruction and eliciting more responses or sustaining students' interest and encouraging their participation though mostly it is practiced unintentionally or as a habit.

Similarly, Farooq and Umer (2013) also found that teachers use more of inter-sentential CS than the other patterns of CS. They also recommend teachers to use intra-sentential CS. They expressed their fear that in intra-sentential CS, students are not exposed long enough to any one language and then it would be difficult for the students to derive the grammatical, semantic, and lexical rules of both languages. Thus, with the settlement of these issues, both teachers and students can establish classroom discourse in accordance with the requirement of the EFL learning paradigms. The teachers are assumed to have good command of both languages. If one is fluent bilingual, he/she produces more of inter-sentential CS (Bista, 2010) as he/she is not aware of which language he/she is using because Dereje and Abiy (2015) and Bista (2010) reported that inter-sentential CS is used unconsciously. Similar to this, the teachers in the interview reported that they used Amharic rarely. The classroom observation, however, revealed that they used it excessively. This indicates that they were not aware of whether they were CS or not this could be one of the reasons why the teachers employed inter-sentential CS more dominantly.

Here are some examples of the different patterns of code-switching employed by the teachers.

Extract 1: Student: የተወሰነውን ሞክርያሉሁ። ግን አልጨረስኩትም። (Taken from lesson 1 year 1)

Teacher: So. ግማሹን የሰራችሁ አጃቹሁን አውጡ ማለት ነበረብኝ?

Translation: So. **Should I have to say raise your hands those of you who did it partially?**

This is a student induced code-switching employed by the teacher. As the teacher used the English word “so” which has no function in the Amharic sentence he used, it is a tag switching.

Extract 2: Teacher: በሜድየቫል period የነበሩ ገፀ ባህርያት act የሚያደርጉት ታማኝ በመሆን፣ ለሰዎች ክብር በመስጠት እና ግዴታዎቻቸውን በመወጣት ነበር። (Taken from year 3 lesson 1)

Translation: Characters of the medieval period literature acts as being loyal, honor, and performing their duty.

This is an example of intra-sentential code-switching performed by the teacher. He used some English words in the Amharic sentence.

Extract 3: Teacher: if there was no printing press, how were the literary works presented? ማተምያ ካልነበረ ስነ ፅሑፉ በምን ይቀርብ ነበር ታዲያ? በእጅ እየተፀፈ ነበር ወደ ህዝቡ የሚቀርበው ማለት ነው? (Taken from year 3 lesson 2)

Translation: ...if there was no printing press, how were the literary works presented? Were they written by hand and presented to the public?

In this case, the teacher used one clause in English and two clauses in Amharic which is an example of inter-sentential code-switching.

Teachers’ CS Functions

The following table depicts the different types of code-switching functions employed by teachers in the different grade levels of students.

Table 3: Teachers’ functions of Amharic use in the EFL class and their proportion across the three grade levels

SN	Functions/purposes of Amharic language Use		1 st Year Teacher		2 nd Year Teacher		3 rd Year Teacher		TOTAL	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Interpersonal Relation	To talk about personal experiences	1	2.4	6	4.6	3	1.4	10	2.6
		To tell jokes	4	9.8	26	20	10	4.6	40	10.2
		To talk about issues not related to the lessons	2	4.9	5	3.9	8	3.6	15	3.8
		TOTAL	7	17.1	37	28.5	21	9.6	65	16.6
2	Classroom Management	To direct a message to one or more addressees	6	14.6	3	2.3	20	9.1	29	7.4
		For topic change or introducing a new topic	0	0	0	0	3	1.4	3	0.8
		To talk about course policies, announcements, home works, exams, assignments, & instructions	3	7.3	23	17.7	35	15.9	61	15.6
		To motivate students to participate	0	0	1	0.8	14	6.4	15	3.8
		To discipline students	0	0	4	3.1	8	3.6	12	3.1
		To organize where students sit	0	0	0	0	6	2.7	6	1.5
		To check attendance	3	7.3	5	3.9	0	0	8	2.1
		To praise correct answers	1	2.4	7	5.4	11	5	19	4.9
TOTAL	13	31.6	43	33.2	97	44.1	153	39.2		
3	Curriculum	To give example	7	17.1	22	16.9	12	5.5	41	10.5
		To explain difficult concepts	4	9.8	7	5.4	2	0.9	13	3.3
		To check comprehension	0	0	2	1.5	7	3.2	9	2.3

3	To explain grammar rules	1	2.4	0	0	20	9.1	21	5.4
	To give the meaning of new vocabulary	0	0	1	0.8	3	1.4	4	1
	To ask and/or respond questions	3	7.3	6	4.6	1	0.5	10	2.6
	To ask for clarification	0	0	1	0.8	3	1.4	4	1
	To give feedback or comments	4	9.8	0	0	16	7.3	20	5.1
	To emphasize	2	4.9	11	8.5	38	17.3	51	13
TOTAL		21	51.3	50	38.5	102	46.6	173	44.2
GRAND TOTAL		41	100	130	100	220	100	391	100

The above table displayed that teachers of all class years code-switched from and into Amharic language in the EFL classes for interpersonal relations, classroom management, and curriculum access purposes. Among these three purposes of CS, teachers of all class years code-switched for curriculum access purposes more dominantly with 51.3%, 38.5%, and 46.6% for first year, second year, and third year teachers respectively. The next code-switching function that was employed by teachers of all grade level students was for classroom management with 31.6%, 33.2%, and 44.1% for first year, second year, and third year teachers respectively.

Among the different types of interpersonal relation purposes of code-switching, teachers of all grade levels used more Amharic in the EFL classes for joking with 9.8%, 20%, and 4.6% for first year, second year, and third year teachers respectively. With regard to the classroom management purposes of code-switching, the teacher who was teaching first year students used more Amharic for directing messages to one or more addressees (14.6%) while both second year and third year teachers code-switched for talking about course policies, announcements, home works, exams, assignments, and instructions with 17.7 % and 15.9 % respectively. As far as the curriculum access functions of code-switching is concerned, teachers of first year and second year code-switched more for giving examples with 17.1 % and 16.9 % respectively while third year students' teacher code-switched more for emphasizing (17.3 %).

Here are examples of the teachers' CS for curriculum access, classroom management, and interpersonal relations respectively which are taken from the classroom record.

Extract 4: Teacher: ዝም እስኪ በዩ አንቺ። ከፈለግሽ አብረሻት ሂጁ።

Translation: **Keep quite! If you need, you can go out with her.**

This is a CS employed by the teacher who was teaching for first year. He used code-switching for managing the student who was talking when her friend was leaving the class.

Extract 5: Teacher: እሺ! ምን እንዳልኩ እስኪ ንገሩኝ?

Translation: **Ok! Can you tell me what I said?**

This code-switching was uttered by the teacher who was teaching second year. He used this code-switching when he finished his lesson. He used Amharic to check whether the students understood what he told them which is a curriculum access purpose of code-switching.

Extract 6: Teacher: በጣም ወሳኝ ስለነበረ ነው፤ ይቅርታ። ምንም ማድረግ አልችልም።

Translation: **It was very important, sorry. I can do nothing.**

The teacher who was teaching third year used this CS for interpersonal relations which is talking about personal issues. He used this CS when his phone rang and went out to reply the phone.

All in all, the teachers of all batches were found employing CS for curriculum access purposes more dominantly. The second dominant function of CS was reported to be classroom management. On top of this, the data obtained from the classroom observation shows that among the classroom management functions, the teachers' CS was found to be high for talking about course policies, announcements, home works, exams, assignments, and instructions.

In consistent to this finding, Atkinson (1987), Auerbach (1993), and Cameron (2001) suggests teachers to use L1 for curriculum access purposes more dominantly since the purpose of teaching and learning is to develop students understanding of the target language though it is possible to use it for classroom management and interpersonal relations which facilitates the learners' target language.

CONCLUSION

Code-switching, the use of native language in target language learning and teaching, is a common practice by both teachers and students in classes where English is taught or learned as a foreign language. The proportion of native language to foreign language usage by teachers varies depending on many factors. One of these factors is the students grade level. The teachers' CS frequency was found different based on the students' grade level whom they were teaching. The teachers who were teaching first year employed 10.7% percent of Amharic in the EFL classes. On the contrary, teachers who were teaching second year were using 23.6 % of Amharic while the teachers who were teaching third year were using 29.4%. This indicates that the teachers' CS increased as the students grade level increased. However, the teachers CS frequency has to decrease as the students' grade level increased because when the students grade level goes up, their English language performance is believed to be high. In classes where the students' English language performance is high, the use of native language has to decrease. Native language has to be used in target language learning only to help students understanding, to avoid students' language confusion, and when the need arises from the students. In classes where English is a foreign language, it is only the classroom that exposes the students to the target language. In such cases, the use of more than 10 % of native language is very dangerous to the learning of EFL. This becomes more dangerous when it is used at university level where the students are going to be English language teachers after a year. Besides, there are students who know little or no Amharic which is a second language to majority of the students.

The teachers who participated in this study were using inter-sentential CS, intra-sentential CS, and tag switching at all grade levels. However, the dominant one that the teachers of all class years were using was inter-sentential CS. The teachers' CS patterns has to vary depending up on the students' grade level. Students of all grade levels have different knowledge and performance of the native language (Amharic) and the target language (English). Therefore, the teachers' CS patterns should not be the same to the three different grade levels.

Teachers of all grade levels were CS for interpersonal relations, classroom management, and curriculum access purposes. The teachers of all grade levels were CS for curriculum access more dominantly. Teachers, however, should be flexible with regard to the functional use of CS. First year students, for example, are observed to have difficulty of socializing with their classmates and teachers. This to mean that teachers have to use CS for interpersonal relations for first year students since interpersonal relations play an important role in the teaching and learning process. Researches show that first year students drop out their learning due to tensions and anxiety which arises from lack of interpersonal relations and difficulty of the country's

lingua franca. Therefore, the teachers' CS functions should vary depending up on their students CS desire and grade level.

Finally, although this study has apparently gained useful insights into the patterns and functions of code-switching employed by teachers in the EFL teaching and learning at one of the Ethiopian government higher educations and contributed to the body of knowledge on second language learning pedagogy, there might be need for further research into what is practiced at other government universities and private universities where the students have different linguistic backgrounds.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements should be made only to those who have made a substantial contribution to the study. Authors are responsible for obtaining written permission from people acknowledged by name in case readers infer their endorsement of data and conclusions.

REFERENCES

- Afzal, S. (2013). Using of the First Language in English Classroom as a way of Scaffolding for both the Students and Teachers to Learn and Teach English. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 4 (7), pp. 1846-1854.
- Alenezi, A.A. (2010). Students' Language Attitude Towards Using Code-switching as a Medium of Instruction in the College of Health Sciences: An Exploratory Study. *ARECLS*, 7(1), pp. 1-22.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The Mother Tongue in the Classroom: A Neglected Resource? *ELT Journal*, 41(4), pp. 241-247.
- Atkinson, D. (1993). Teaching in the Target Language: A Problem in the Current Orthodoxy. *Language Learning Journal*, 8(1), pp. 2-5.
- Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), pp. 9-32.
- Bhooth, A., Azman, H., and Ismail, K. (2014). The Role of the L1 as a Scaffolding Tool in the EFL Reading Classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118(1), pp. 76 – 84.
- Bista, K. (2010). Factors of Code Switching among Bilingual English Students in the University Classroom: A Survey. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes World*, 29(9), pp. 1-19.
- Blackman, N. (2014). EFL Teachers' Perceptions on the Use of L1 in a Primary and Secondary Classroom in Belarus. University of Edinburgh: British Council
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching Language to Young Learners*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Cohen, L. (2000). *Research Methods in Education* (5th Ed.). New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., and K. Morrison (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6th Ed.). London: Routledge.
- Cook, G. (2002). Breaking Taboos. *English Teaching Professional*, 23(1), pp. 5-7.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), pp. 402-423.
- Dereje, A. and Abiy, Y. (2015). Male and Female Secondary School EFL Teachers Code Switching to L1 in their Classes: Their Attitudes, Reasons and Beliefs about the Functions of Code Switching. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Science*, 10(2), pp. 97-112.
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duff, P.A. and Polio, E.G. (1990). How Much Foreign Language is there in the Foreign Language Classroom? *Modern Language Journal*, 74(2), pp. 154-166.

- Ethiopian Ministry of Education. (1994). Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia: Education and Training Policy. Addis Ababa: Ethiopia: St. George Printing Press.
- Farooq, U.M. and Umer, M. (2013). Inter-sentential Patterns of Code-switching: A Gender-based Investigation of Male and Female EFL Teachers. *International Education Studies*, 6(11), pp. 144- 159.
- Gibson, L. (2011). *Gibson Schools System Handbook*. Addis Ababa: GSS.
- Kavari, K.E. (2014). To Use or Not to Use Mother Tongue in ELT Classrooms, That is the Question. *A Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(6), 206-212.
- Kayaoglu, M.N. (2012). The Use of Mother Tongue in Foreign Language Teaching from Teachers' Practice and Perspective. *Journal of Education*, 32(2), 25-35.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. London: Longman.
- Littlewood, W. and Yu, B. (2011). First Language and Target Language in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Journal of Language Teaching*, 44(1), pp. 64-77.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing Student Teachers' Code Switching in Foreign Language Classrooms. *Modern Language Journal*, 85(1), pp. 531-548.
- Mart, C.T. (2013). The Facilitating Role of L1 in ESL Classes. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(1), pp. 9-14.
- Mokgwathi, T.S. (2011). *Role of Code-switching in Teaching and Learning in Selected Senior Secondary Schools in Botswana*. University of Pretoria: Unpublished PhD Thesis.
- Mouhanna, M. (2009). Re-examining the Role of L1 in the EFL Classroom. *UGRU Journal*, 8(1), pp. 1-18.
- Nation, P. (2003). The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), pp. 1-8.
- Paker, T. and Karaagac, O. (2015). The Use and Functions of Mother Tongue in EFL Classes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199(1), pp. 111 – 119.
- Rezvani, E. and Rasekh, A. E. (2011). Code-switching in Iranian Elementary EFL Classrooms: An Exploratory Investigation. *English Language Teaching*, 4(1), pp. 18- 25.
- Selamat, T. J. (2014). *Code Switching in the Malaysian ESL Classroom*. University of Otago: Unpublished MA Thesis.
- Sert, O. (2005). The Functions of Code Switching in ELT Classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11(8), pp. 1-6.
- Singh, Y. K. (2007). *Research Methodology*. New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.
- Song, Y. (2009). An Investigation into L2 Teacher Beliefs about L1 in China. *Shanghai International Studies*, 24(1), pp. 30-39.
- Tang, J. (2002). Using L1 in the English Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 40(1), pp. 36-42.
- Timor, T. (2012). Use of the Mother Tongue in Teaching a Foreign Language. *Journal of Language Education in Asia*, 3(1), pp. 7-17.