



EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practice of Code-Switching: A Case Study at Ba Ria – Vungtau University

Nguyen Thi Phuong Thao¹, Vu Thi Minh Tam²

^{1,2} Faculty of Foreign Languages - Social Sciences, Ba Ria - Vung Tau University, Vietnam

ABSTRACT: This paper presents the practice, including the forms and functions, and beliefs of code-switching practiced by EFL teachers in classroom instruction in the context of a university in Ba Ria - Vung Tau province. Three instruments will be employed in this research including classroom observation, questionnaires, and semi-structured interviews with the participation of 9 EFL teachers and 59 students. The aims of this research are to (1) investigate the functions and forms of code-switching that teachers employed in their classrooms; (2) investigate how teacher's beliefs and attitudes toward employing code-switching; (3) research for the similarities, and differences between teacher's opinion and their actual practice of code-switching in 9 EFL classrooms from a case study at Ba Ria - Vung Tau University (BVU).

KEYWORDS: attitude, belief, codeswitching, non-English major students

1. INTRODUCTION

Code-switching (CS) is a phenomenon that exists in the community of people who are bilingual or multilingual, or who command over more than one variety of languages. People equally aware that in some contexts, one language serves their needs better than the other and switch their language use (Meyerhoff, 2006). According to Myers (2008), Code-switching is referred to as a linguistic term when the user of a second language adds their first language in their speech. In a globalized society, codeswitching becomes popular and affects many aspects of life. Researchers around the world often study codeswitching from linguistic and social perspectives, which lead to different definitions. From a social setting, many researchers study the types and functions of the phenomenon of codeswitching (Poplack, 1980; Gumperz, 1982; Myers-Scotton, 1993) and in an education setting, many other researchers study types and functions of code-switching based on the previous background (e.g., Macaro, 2001; Liu, 2004; Kim & Elder, 2008; Kang, 2013). There are more and more educational researchers place their focus on studying codeswitching in language classroom context around the world for different types of codeswitching, reasons for using codeswitching, the attitude of using codeswitching from teachers and learners, and the effects on the users. Within the background, Vietnamese education of language is also a part of a broader picture in studying codeswitching in the classroom context.

The use of mother language (L1) in L2 learning (ESL, EFL) has been always a contentious issue causing considerable controversy between SLA researchers and education policymakers. Employing codeswitching often appears in a classroom where teachers share the same L1 as students to ensure the smooth delivery of class instruction, especially with low proficiency students (Selamat, 2014). On one hand, the practice of using L1 in the learning and teaching process is considered as the deficit and incompetence of linguistic, supported by the Reform Movement and the Direct Method (Milroy & Muysken, 1995; Boztepe, 2005; Probyn, 2009). The act of overused Code-switching may affect the development of competence in L2 and the acquisition of the target language since the learner should be exposed to as much L2 input as possible. Sert (2005) also asserted that the over practice of code-switching from a teacher may cause the over reliance on L1 and autonomous code-switching behaviors from the students (as cited in Selamat, 2014). Meanwhile, on the other hand, the role of L1 in the learning process is considered as significant importance, especially for low-level students. Numerous researchers argued that L1 should be employed to facilitate the L2 learning process (Addendorff, 1993; Cook, 2001; Willans, 2011 as cited in Nguyen Thi Hang, 2013). The controversy about the practice of code-switching with mixed opinions, therefore, has yet to conclude and a final published policy for teachers and learners. In Vietnam, the education system has been through a long time under the feudal influence which has a high opinion of a teacher in teaching and learning relationship. Teachers were moral leaders and students should follow some rules in the class and only speak when were asked by their teachers. The opinion still affects on teaching and learning process in nowadays education which is students tend to be affected by teachers' choice of code used in classrooms (Nguyen Thi Hang, 2013). In 1986, Vietnam started to renovate, and English became the main language to



be educated in the education system and be examined in level-changing examinations. Then in 1995, Vietnam officially became a member of The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and also ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA). The opportunities require English, as an international language, to become popular in Vietnam to communicate and collaborate with people from other countries. English then has become the number one choice of a foreign language to be learned in Vietnam. However, the effect of the language teaching and learning process was not as expected.

Students have considered English as a subject to pass the exam, not a language to use. For the above reasons, in 2008, the Government of Vietnam perform a national project entitled “Teaching and learning foreign languages in the national educational system from 2008 to 2020” which contains a general objective that students graduating from Universities should be able to communicate and work in an international environment. Teaching and learning a foreign language have become a movement throughout the country. However, there is still not any official policy mentioned to the languages which should be used in the classroom for teachers (Nguyen Thi Hang, 2013). Narrowing the context to the research site, General English in BVU is a compulsory credit to all majors, except English language majors. Students will take a full course with 6 credits from Beginner level to B1 level of English with 45 periods of class time per semester. The number of students in each class is between 25 to 30 students. There is a placement test to classify students’ levels before they officially take English classes in the second semester. However, the effect of the placement test seems not to be high, lead to the fact that there are different major students with different levels of English in the same general English class, and teachers have to use codeswitching to ensure the effect of teaching and learning process. As a result, employing code-switching in BVU is unavoidable.

Typically, classes of general English at BVU are assigned to Vietnamese teachers. At the beginning of the new academic year, there is a meeting where teachers decide the curriculum and marking method for the whole semester. Using L1 (Vietnamese) in L2 (English) class is one of the main topics that appeared in the meeting, almost all teachers agree to limit using L1 in their classroom, but no clear method is approved, and teachers also agree that the action of using code-switching is unavoidable.

The belief and attitudes of the teachers may affect their choice of language usage and their behaviors in the classroom. A brief interview with some EFL teachers in BVU after the professional meeting and regular classroom observation showed that the awareness of the teachers about codeswitching and the method of using codeswitching in the class were not the same and clear. Some teachers even showed their negative attitudes toward codeswitching even though they were using codeswitching in their class. Their practice of code-switching also happened unconsciously and unnecessarily in some cases. The topic of teachers’ practice of code-switching appears in almost every professional meeting later on without any suggested solutions. While there are pros and cons in using codeswitching and the strategy only supports language development if being used in the appropriate way (Emelie, 2014), there are not any official talks or policies about using code-switching in the class, using codeswitching then depends on each teacher. In Vietnam, a few studies on codeswitching in English classrooms are conducted but mainly focusing on the students’ attitudes toward their teachers’ code-switching (Hoang, Jang, & Yang, 2010; Pham Hoang Hiep, 2005). Even some valuable studies are contributing many methods, findings, and suggestions of Vietnamese University teachers’ code-switching practice (Nguyen Quang Tien, 2012; Nguyen Thi Hang, 2013), for such a broad field, several studies however cannot represent the whole educational system. Additionally, up to date, very few studies in the Vietnamese context compare the similarities and differences between teachers’ attitudes toward code-switching and their actual practice of code-switching in teaching activity. For the above reasons, the studies about the practice of code-switching should be conducted in every school and university with different external elements, combined with the confliction in the teachers’ opinions and actions. The study thus aims to research the issue of practicing code-switching in the educational context has been attached to numerous attention from teachers and researchers around the world. In Vietnam, however, there have been very few studies that can be named relating to this topic. Besides, after an unofficial verbal interview with the researcher’s colleagues, a quick conclusion has been drawn that almost (8/10) interviewed teachers may be deprived of a basic understanding of code-switching. With the desire to investigate the method that non-major English teachers from BR-VT University use codeswitching and their attitudes toward using codeswitching in their teaching progress, the study, therefore, aims to (1) investigate the functions and forms of code-switching that teachers employ in their classroom since this is an opportunity for the teachers to self reflection on their teaching practice; (2) investigate how teacher’s belief and attitudes toward employing code-switching; (3) research for the similarities, and differences between teacher’s opinion and their actual practice of code-switching.

From the above purpose, the research will focus on 2 research questions:



1. What functions and forms of code-switching do the EFL teachers use codeswitching in the teaching process?
2. What are the teachers' attitudes towards employing codeswitching in the teaching process and the similarities and differences between the teachers' opinions and their actual practice of code-switching?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research setting

The research was taken place at BVU, focusing on EFL teachers teaching non English major students at the elementary level. From the researcher's experience and a brief interview with teacher participants, elementary was the appropriate level for this research because, at this level, teachers start considering the method to employ code-switching. At the beginner level, teachers help students to build up vocabulary and get acquainted with the classroom language such as instruction expression and basic classroom communication sentences, requiring teachers to use more L1 in their classes and at elementary, students will have more chance practicing English through daily topics and are also familiar with English instruction and stages of the lesson. teachers now have less pressure to use L2 and consider the purpose and method of using L1 so that students will get many benefits and obtain the habit of replacing L1 with L2 in higher levels. Therefore, the researcher decided to choose the elementary level as the target level to study teachers' codeswitching practice.

2.2. Research methods

As discussed above, the research aims to (1) investigate the reasons and forms of code-switching that teachers employ in their classroom since this is an opportunity for the teachers to self-reflection on their teaching practice; (2) investigate how teacher's attitudes toward employing code-switching; (3) research for the similarities, and differences between teacher's opinion and their actual practice of code-switching. Therefore, below research questions were raised to guide this study:

1. Under what circumstances and forms of code-switching do the EFL teachers use codeswitching in the teaching process?
2. What are the teachers' attitudes towards employing codeswitching in the teaching process and the similarities and differences between the teachers' opinions about and their actual practice of code-switching?

Depending on the research questions, researchers have to choose an appropriate research methodology and data collecting method. In this research, the case study research method was approached as case studies may be used to describe, compare, evaluate, and comprehend various facets of a study issue. There are three reasons for the case study method to be employed in this research which are (1) the researcher aims to answer the questions "why" and "how" codeswitching is employed in the specific case, (2) The actions of those involved in the analysis cannot be manipulated by the researcher, (3) Researcher focuses on happening phenomena that are set in realworld contexts (Yin, 2009). Most qualitative approaches are used in the case study analysis, but quantitative methods are sometimes used as well.

To reach the aim of the first question research, a qualitative approach was employed to investigate the social interaction of users in a given situation. In this study, the observation stages were conducted to help answer the method of using codeswitching, especially the functions and forms of code-switching that were employed by the teachers.

For the second research question, the quantitative methodology was adapted to the study. The main purpose of the second research question is to identify the attitude of teachers of using codeswitching during a classroom on students' learning processes. Data for this stage was collected through questionnaires. Through classifying features, analyzing them, and constructing statistical models, the researcher can answer the research question.

For the second clause of the second question, the aim is to identify and understand the reasons for the similarities and differences between teachers' opinion and their actual practice of codeswitching. The qualitative methodology was adapted to the study. A semi-structured interview was employed to clarify the data collected from the observation stage and questionnaire stage. According to Berg (2009), the semi-structured interview gives teachers a chance to reflect on their beliefs about the teaching and learning experience. The method provided a less formal discussion format and gave teachers more room to discuss what matters to their code-switching experience with both structured and unstructured features and the researcher could also clarify flexibly the questions in case they were not clear to the interviewees.

In conclusion, the triangulation method of classroom observation, questionnaires, and a semi-structured interview was adopted in this research to avoid bias and distortion for the investigating process. In qualitative analysis, triangulation refers to the use of various approaches or data sources to establish a systematic interpretation of phenomena (Patton, 1999). The triangulation method



also ensured the credibility, reliability, validity, and confirmability of the research. Therefore, to answer three research questions as mentioned above, a mixture of data collection methods was chosen, including qualitative and quantitative methods.

2.3. Participants

Referring to the participants, there are 30 Vietnamese EFL teachers, both full time and visiting, teaching in the faculty of foreign languages and social science of BVU. Among them, there are 9 teachers from non-English major elementary level classes of BVU who agreed to be participants in this study. All the teachers hold education diplomas from Vietnamese education and training attitudes with at least five years of EFL teaching experience. All the teachers are the researcher's colleagues and have a social relationship with the researchers. All 10 teachers agreed to attend three data collecting methods including structured classroom observation, questionnaire, and semi-structured interview. Before the data collection progress, each teacher received an email for information note which explained the purpose of the research, the method to collect data, teachers' role in data collecting states and the researcher also organized an individual meeting with them to explain and answer any question may have about the procedure of the research.

There were 59 students to be participants in this research and answered the questionnaires about their attitude toward their teachers' code-switching. These students were attending in EFL classes of the teacher participants. The main subject of this research is the teacher participants, however, the researcher still employed students as participants of the research because the answers of the student participants to the questionnaire helped discourage the researcher from drawing conclusions based on her abstract logic or imagination. The researcher informed students of some information about the research, explained the data collecting stage for students, and answered some questions from students about the research. Students took the questionnaires home and had 03 to 05 days to finish the questionnaires before the researcher came and recollect the questionnaires.

2.4. Instruments

For classroom observation, the primary focus is accessing the real situation where the act of using codeswitching between teachers and students happens during the lesson (Matthews & Ross, 2010). The observation method is also described as the heart of every case study by Cohen et al. (2007) for several advantages. First, the classroom observation will reveal the uninformed information from other data collection tools since participants may not be aware of or unwilling to share in the interview (Patton, 2002). Second, through observation, the researcher can obtain indepth information about language phenomena. Third, the researcher can observe the first-hand information of the setting and can be inductive when on site. Therefore, observation should be conducted at the first stage of data collection in this research and can be used to answer the first research question for the form and functions of code-switching practice.

The main purpose of the classroom observation is to study how the teachers use codeswitching during the teaching progress, especially, the form and the function of codeswitching and the data of observation tool is also used to explore the similarities and differences between teachers' opinions and their actual practice of code-switching. In this research, the researcher preferred using a structured observation form which means data collected through actual observing rely on a ready checklist but also include a free note. The reason for the choice is that a structured form will enhance the reliability of the process and the data will be analyzed later by the statistical procedure. In the structured observation which is processed under standardized conditions (EFL classroom with a planned lesson in a syllabus), the researcher is also a "focused participant" observer as only focused on using codeswitching of teachers in the class.



Table 1: Summary for the time and length of observations

Observed Teachers	Time of observation	Date	Length of observation/ voice recording time
T1	4	Mar 01st to Mar 15th	3:00:16
T2	4	Mar 01st to Mar 15th	3:25:00
T3	4	Mar 01st to Mar 15th	4:00:00
T4	4	Mar 01st to Mar 15th	3:20:00
T5	4	Mar 01st to Mar 15th	3:45:20
T6	4	Mar 01st to Mar 15th	3:35:00
T7	4	Mar 01st to Mar 15th	2:45:30
T8	4	Mar 01st to Mar 15th	4:02:26
T9	4	Mar 01st to Mar 15th	3:25:00
TOTAL	36		31:29:33

For the questionnaire, it was partly adapted from related studies mentioned in table 2. More specifically, for studying about functions of codeswitching, the list of functions from Selamat’s research had been adapted. This list was based on the research of several researchers such as Ahmad and Jusoff (2009), Canagarajah (1995), and closed to the researcher’s experience. For the questions about teachers’ belief in codeswitching, the questions from Yao’s study were adapted for several reasons. First, Yao’s study has similar aims of study with this research, for teachers’ attitudes towards employing codeswitching in EFL classes. Second, Yao’s questions list was divided into four sections including teachers’ persona, subject access, classroom management, and interpersonal relation. It means these questions included both teachers’ own opinions towards their use of codeswitching and the three main functions of codeswitching in the classroom. Finally, the questionnaires focused on teachers’ attitudes and students’ attitudes toward teachers’ codeswitching with the Cronbach alphas figure were 0.852 and 0.713 respectively, which means that the teacher questionnaire's reliability is very good, and the student questionnaire's reliability is reasonable. However, Yao’s research did not present how teacher participants practice codeswitching comparing with their belief, then this study hopes to fill the gap through employing his research tool.

Table 2. Summary of the questionnaire

MAIN PARTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE		QUESTION ITEMS
PART 1 - General information	Teachers’ personal information	1.1 to 1.5
PART 2 – Functions of Codeswitching (When)	WHEN to use codeswitching: Context of using codeswitching	2.1 to 2.17
PART 3 – How teachers’ belief in codeswitching (How and Why)	Teachers’ opinion toward the value roles of codeswitching and The extent towards the teachers uses Codeswitching	
	A. teacher’s persona	3.1 to 3.20
	B. subject assessment	3.1 to 3.5
	C. classroom management	3.6 to 3.10
	D. interpersonal relations	3.11 to 3.15
	E. others	3.16 to 3.20
	Open question about teachers’ opinion of CS	3.21 to 3.24



For the interview, the structure of the interview questions is designed based on the aim to study the teacher's belief and practice on codeswitching. The question board then was designed with 2 parts of open questions. The first part (A) includes 14 questions about the teachers' opinion towards codeswitching (A1 to A14) and the second part (B) is questions added after the questionnaire and classroom observations to clarify information collected from the methods for the differences between teachers' responses from questionnaires and what actual teacher behaved in the observation stage. In part A, the questions were designed based on the theories in table 2.1, initially starting with the question for teachers' basic knowledge of codeswitching, 4 groups of questions to clarify the information from the answers in the teachers' questionnaire, and 9 other questions for teachers' opinion of codeswitching. In part B, there is a table with 3 columns. The first column stated the situation when the actual practice of teachers was different from their opinions, the second column is teachers' explanation for the differences and the last column is for the researcher to note after analyzing the teachers' answers. Even though all participants are English teachers, the English-speaking proficiency of each teacher is various. To avoid the effect of this factor on the quality and quantity of the responses, also to help build a friendly environment between the interviewer and interviewees, the interview questions were presented in both English and Vietnamese. The transcripts were also presented in both English and Vietnamese.

3, FINDINGS

3.1. *What teachers understanding of codeswitching and their opinion toward using codeswitching in EFL classrooms.*

To analyze the data of the research, the researcher decided to analyze from the very first question of the interview stage which was to investigate how the teachers understand codeswitching. There were 6 out of 9 teachers who showed their understanding of codeswitching quite similar to the definition of Lin (2013) and that they had learned about codeswitching in their master program. Three other teachers presented that they had not had a specific idea of codeswitching until reading about it through the letter of study from the researcher. However, data collected from the observation stage showed that all teachers employed codeswitching in their teaching process. Moreover, all of the teachers can name 7 or 8 out of 12 basic functions of codeswitching. It proves that even if teachers have a full understanding of codeswitching or not, they still use it in their classes for specific purposes. In the teachers' opinion of employing codeswitching in teaching English, the teachers' answers for questions 6 in the interview stage showed that there were 7 teachers who agree that codeswitching was an unavoidable method in EFL classes. The answer of teacher 1 below is one of the examples.

Example 1: Teacher' positive opinion of codeswitching

Teacher 1: "It is clear that codeswitching is unavoidable. Actually, It is not avoidable or unavoidable. Because codeswitching is a natural action. If we use it correctly, correct situation, It brings many benefits to teaching process."

Or below the opinion of teacher 9 even showed more particular points in the research context.

Example 4.2: Teacher' positive opinion of codeswitching (with particular context)

Teacher 9: "Teaching University classes with a high number of mix-level students, codeswitching definitely happens. The point here is how appropriate the teachers use the codeswitching to bring the most benefits."

However, teacher 4 and teacher 5 shared their different ideas of employing codeswitching in teaching English. Teacher 4 said that she always tried to avoid using unnecessary L1 in her classes and would use English only in her higher classes when all the students had suitable ability to understand all the content. Teacher 5 considered that if there was a policy of single language in English classes, teachers still have their ways to use English only in those classes.

3.2. *When and how teachers use codeswitching*

To study the functions and forms of codeswitching that the teacher participants employed in their classes, data from observation stages were analyzed, and below tables and figures are the results of the time of codeswitching.



Table 3. The total times teachers switched code

Observed teachers	Times teachers switch code
T1	198
T2	159
T3	190
T4	137
T5	197
T6	173
T7	138
T8	175
T9	133

Firstly, the time that teachers switched codes in all four observed classes was counted. The results showed that the teachers had an almost similar number of codeswitching times. Among the top three of most frequency of employing codeswitching, teacher 1 and teacher 5 held BA degrees with 5- and 6-year experience of teaching respectively, teacher 3 held MA degree with 10 years of teaching. Meanwhile, in the top three of the least, teacher 2 and teacher 4 held MA degrees and teacher 7 held a BA degree, all 6 years of teaching. The results showed that the number of times that the teachers employed codeswitching is not related to their teaching experience or qualification. Based on the tally marks from the observation schemes and transcriptions of the voice recordings, the total number of teachers' codeswitching for each function was calculated and presented in table 4.

Table 4. The number of codeswitching by function by each teacher

Observed teachers	Explain vocabulary	Explain grammar	Give instruction	Explain difficult topic	Introduce new topics	Control classroom discipline	Give feedback to students'	Motivate students in their	Build a good relationship with	Check for comprehension	Reduce students ' anxiety	Check information	Chang topic	Assign students ' group	Give learning tip	Tell joke	Wrap up lesson	Give information/get attention	Give warning
T1	51	13	57	17	1	2	11	1	2	15	1	12	4	1	1	1	2	5	1
T2	38	19	21	17	0	4	9	0	0	22	0	0	17	7	0	0	2	8	0
T3	16	31	34	24	6	2	7	0	4	34	1	6	14	1	0	2	0	1	2
T4	15	6	32	6	0	2	17	3	2	11	3	17	5	4	2	1	0	16	0
T5	23	9	44	16	0	3	17	5	4	14	8	22	2	6	0	2	0	22	0
T6	35	19	19	25	0	2	8	6	0	27	3	5	8	8	0	1	2	2	3
T7	9	19	15	12	0	0	6	5	0	28	3	9	11	6	0	3	0	10	2
T8	19	27	19	20	0	0	5	3	0	45	4	7	7	3	0	3	0	11	2
T9	39	2	12	19	0	2	8	0	0	23	3	1	9	11	0	0	0	4	0
Total	245	145	253	156	7	17	88	23	12	219	26	79	77	47	3	13	6	79	10



In table 4, each teacher has a different purpose to switch code in their teaching process. Nevertheless, most of the switching is for explaining vocabulary, grammar points, and difficult topics, giving instruction, and checking for students' comprehension.

Table 5. Forms of codeswitching

Observed teachers	Frequency of teachers' codeswitching	Forms of codeswitching			
		Inter-sentential	Intra-sentential	Extra-sentential	Single switch
T1	198	52	48	4	92
T2	159	28	43	11	92
T3	190	51	25	2	112
T4	137	3	38	1	95
T5	197	5	63	5	124
T6	173	10	54	4	105
T7	138	13	48	8	69
T8	175	16	61	4	94
T9	133	8	43	8	74
Total	1500	186	423	47	857
P	100%	12.4	28.2	3.133	57.13

In table 5, there was a total of 1500 times codeswitching used by teachers from observation classes. Among those times, the inter-sentential accounted for 12,4% with a total of 186 times. The number is almost half of intra-sentential with 28,2% in 423 times. The extra-sentential form is used the least by the teachers with 47 times, only 3,33% of all switching time. The final form of codeswitching presented on the table accounted for more than half of the total codeswitching time, 857 times, approximately 57.13%. The fourth form 'Single Switch' can be defined as the kind of switching to L1 that there are not L2 sentence appears before, within, or after the switch.

3.3. How teachers' attitude and belief in using codeswitching

The answers from the teacher and student responses for a group of questions in part 2 of the questionnaires including questions were counted to investigate the teacher participants' belief in their purposes to employ codeswitching. Almost all the teachers agree that they employed codeswitching to present those functions in their classes.



Table 6. Students’ answers for functions of codeswitching

ITEMS	CHOICES					
		never	Hardly ever	often	Almost all the time	every time
2.1 To explain vocabulary meaning	F	0	1	3	3	2
	P	0	11.1	33.3	33.3	22.2
2.2 To explain grammar point	F	0	0	4	3	2
	P	0	0	44.4	33.3	22.2
2.3 To explain activity instruction	F	0	2	3	4	0
	P	0	22.2	33.3	44.4	0
2.4 To explain difficult concept	F	0	0	2	2	5
	P	0	0	22.2	22.2	55.6
2.5 To introduce new and unfamiliar topic	F	0	1	4	1	3
	P	0	11.1	44.4	11.1	33.3
2.6 To explain the differences between L1 and L2	F	1	0	5	1	2
	P	11.1	0	55.6	11.1	22.2
2.7 To control classroom discipline	F	2	2	3	2	0
	P	22.2	22.2	33.3	22.2	0
2.8 To give feedback or compliment to students’ responses	F	0	2	3	4	0
	P	0	22.2	33.3	44.4	0
2.9 To motivate students in their learning	F	1	1	2	4	1
	P	11.1	11.1	22.2	44.4	11.1
2.10 To build good relationship between teacher and students	F	0	0	4	2	3
	P	0	0	44.4	22.2	33.3
2.11 To check for comprehension	F	0	2	5	1	1
	P	0	22.2	55.6	11.1	11.1
2.12 To reduce students’ anxiety in learning	F	0	1	4	3	1
	P	0	11.1	44.4	33.3	11.1
2.13 To give students learning tips	F	0	0	1	7	1
	P	0	0	11.1	77.8	11.1
2.14 To assign groups or students	F	0	1	4	3	1
	P	0	11.1	44.4	33.3	11.1
2.15 To give warning	F	0	1	4	4	0
	P	0	11.1	44.4	44.4	0
2.16 To change topics or activities	F	0	4	3	2	0
	P	0	44.4	33.3	22.2	0

In table 6, most of the teachers believed that they employed codeswitching for multi-purposes. The percentages of all functions are often more than 55,5%. However, in question 2.6, a teacher answered that she never used codeswitching when she explained the differences between L1 and L2. Two other teachers also choose never to employ code-switching to control classroom discipline. In question 2.9 and 2.11 for the function of motivating students in their learning and check comprehension, there were also two teachers choosing never. This result was also in line with the students’ answers in their questionnaires as presented in table 7 below.



Table 7. Teachers’ answers for functions of codeswitching

CHOICES QUESTIONS		never	Hardly ever	often	Almost all the time	every time
	2.1 To explain vocabulary meaning	F	0	3	20	19
	P	0	5.1	33.9	32.2	28.8
2.2 To explain grammar point	F	0	0	24	21	14
	P	0	0	40.7	35.6	23.7
2.3 To explain activity instruction	F	0	6	22	20	11
	P	0	10.2	37.3	33.9	18.6
2.4 To explain difficult concept	F	0	2	10	12	35
	P	0	3.4	16.9	20.3	59.3
2.5 To introduce new and unfamiliar topic	F	0	7	16	18	18
	P	0	11.9	40	17.6	30.5
2.6 To explain the differences between L1 and L2	F	1	1	32	12	13
	P	1.7	1.7	54.2	20.3	22
2.7 To control classroom discipline	F	2	15	20	8	14
	P	20.7	25.4	33.9	20	0
2.8 To give feedback or compliment to students’ responses	F	0	11	23	13	12
	P	0	18.6	39	22	20.3
2.9 To motivate students in their learning	F	1	1	20	19	18
	P	1.7	1.7	33.9	32.2	30.5
2.10 To build good relationship between teacher and students	F	0	5	15	14	25
	P	0	8.5	25.4	23.7	42.4
2.11 To check for comprehension	F	1	7	18	17	16
	P	1.7	11.9	30.5	28.8	27.1
2.12 To reduce students’ anxiety in learning	F	0	2	22	19	16
	P	0	3.4	37.3	32.2	27.1
2.13 To give students learning tips	F	0	2	19	17	21
	P	0	3.4	32.2	28.8	35.6
2.14 To assign groups or students	F	0	9	28	15	7
	P	0	15.3	47.5	25.4	11.9
2.15 To give warning	F	0	7	24	15	13
	P	0	11.9	40.7	25.4	22
2.16 To change topics or activities	F	0	8	24	16	11
	P	0	13.6	40.7	27.1	18.6

Comparing the teacher's and students’ answers in section 2 of the questionnaires, the results are similar. Refer to the result of section 2 of the teachers and students’ questionnaires at table 6 and 7 above, with questions from 2.1 to 2.16 are the functions of codeswitching as presented on the observation scheme, both teachers and students have confirmed that these functions appeared in their classes.

Specifically, in question 2.1, 66.6% of teachers and 66.1 % of students agreed with teachers’ use of codeswitching to explain new vocabulary happened often or almost all the time. In question 2.2 for the use to explain grammar points, the percentage of students and teachers who choose often or almost all the time were similar, 77.7% and 76.3% respectively. Similar consequences also appeared in questions 2.5, 2.7, 2.9, and 2.14. For the other questions, the discrepancy appeared only when more students agree that the codeswitching was employed more times than teachers’ answers.

However, in question 2.17, an open question to know if the teachers and students have realized any other functions of codeswitching out of the list, 8 students and 5 teachers listed 5 other functions such as telling the joke, giving information, giving warning, changing topics and wrapping up the lesson. The other students or teachers did not name any other functions that actually appeared in their classes. The explanation shared by the teachers in the interview stage was that they had not attended to the situation of codeswitching that appeared less in their classes or they might not know how to name those functions.

To conclude, the functions of teachers’ code-switching were classified and characterized in this study based on the scenarios in which they code-switched and the tasks that instructors were required to do in their classes. Almost all teachers answered that they switched codes for all 16 functions listed in the questionnaires. Some teachers also listed out some other functions which were not on the list and some teachers admitted that they could not tell any other functions out of the list.



Table 8. Teachers’ and students’ attitudes to code-switching in teachers’ persona

Items No.	Agree %		Agree little %		neutral %		Disagree little %		disagree %	
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S
3.1 CS helps teachers express themselves more clearly	44.4	69.5	22.2	16.9	22.2	8.5	11.1	3.4	0	1.7
3.2 CS may cause difficulty in understanding	0	16.9	11.1	13.6	22.2	13.6	33.3	15.3	33.3	40.7
3.3 CS may pollute languages	0	33.3	22.2	11.9	44.4	13.6	22.2	15.3	11.1	54.2
3.4 CS indicates teachers’ deficiency in English	0	3.4	0	1.7	11.1	6.8	33.3	18.6	55.6	69.5
3.5 CS indicates teachers’ proficiency in English	11.1	49.2	22.2	23.7	33.3	16.9	11.1	3.4	22.2	6.8

In table 8, there were 66.6% of the teachers and 86.4% of the students choosing “agree” or “agree little” that codeswitching helps teachers express themselves freely and clearer in both languages. There was not any teacher and only 1 student disagreeing with this statement. This result fairly matches the teachers’ responses in the interview. In questions 3.2 and 3.4, which questioned the negative effect of codeswitching on teachers’ persona such as causing difficulty in understanding, and proving that teachers are deficient in English, the major number of teachers and students disagree or disagree little about the statement. The teacher shared in the interview that codeswitching helped their students understand the lesson better and language limitations were not always represented by switches.

In question 3.3, teachers showed various opinions on the question of codeswitching pollutes the languages. There were 22.2% of teachers agreeing little about this assertion, 44.4% of the teachers not having a clear opinion about the point of view and 33.3% of the teacher disagreeing on it. However, there were 45.2% of students who chose agree or agree little and 69,5% disagree or disagree little on the view.

Question 3.5 elicits a difference between teachers' and students’ opinions on whether code-switching practice proves that teachers are proficient in English. The percentages of teachers who show their opinion on this question are equal for three groups of opinion, 33.3% for agree, neutral, and disagree. Meanwhile, 72,9% of the students agree or agree little on this statement. This result shows that students might believe in their teachers’ codeswitching method, and the teacher seemed not to be controversial about the statement.

Table 9. Teachers’ and students’ attitudes to code-switching to subject access

Items No.	Agree %		Agree little %		neutral %		Disagree little %		disagree %	
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S
3.6 CS can be employed in multiple topics	66.7	50.8	11.1	35.6	11.1	8.5	11.1	5.1	11.1	0
3.7 CS helps Teachers better explain grammar and vocabulary	88.9	84.7	11.1	11.9	0	1.7	0	1.7	0	0
3.8 CS helps Teachers better explain culture topics	77.8	81.4	11.1	15.3	11.1	1.7	0	1.7	0	0
3.9 CS helps Teachers better elicit students’ responses	55.6	79.7	22.2	8.5	22.2	10.2	0	1.7	0	0
3.10 CS helps Teachers better clarify the lesson content	55.6	81.4	22.2	11.9	22.2	3.4	0	3.4	0	0

As seen, in question 3.6, more than 75% of the teachers agreed that they could employ codeswitching in any kind of topic, however, some teachers, 22.2%, still chose to disagree or disagree little with the several reasons shown in the interview stages. Responds to question 3.7 and 3.8 shows that both teachers and students agreed that codeswitching helped teachers explain grammar and culture topics better. In questions 3.9 and 3.10, there was a minor difference between teachers' and students’ responses. 77,8% of teachers agreed that codeswitching helped them better elicit responses from students and clarify the lesson content, meanwhile, this number for students is 88,2% and 99,3% respectively.



Table 10. Teachers’ and students’ attitudes to code-switching to classroom management

Items No.	Agree %		Agree little %		neutral %		Disagree little %		disagree %	
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S
3.11 CS helps teachers better clarify task instruction	33.3	69.5	33.3	20.3	22.2	6.8	11.1	3.4	0	0
3.12 CS helps teachers better discipline the students	33.3	44.1	0	16.9	55.6	30.5	11.1	6.8	0	1.7
3.13 CS helps teachers better engage students’ attention	22.2	33.9	0	25.4	66.7	30.5	11.1	6.8	0	3.4
3.14 CS helps teachers better request quiet	11.1	32.2	11.1	16.9	33.3	33.9	22.2	10.2	22.2	6.8
3.15 CS helps teachers better direct students	33.3	30.5	22.2	30.5	22.2	28.8	22.2	8.5	0	1.7

Question 3.11 about whether codeswitching helps teachers better instruct their students to do tasks, 66.6% of teachers chose to agree or agree little but 89.8% of students agreed or agreed little. In order to explain this fact, T8 answered that most of the tasks had examples and quite familiar to students, then teachers did not need to switch code to instruct tasks. This explanation is in line with the other 4 teachers in the interview, however, the observation stages revealed that the teacher employed codeswitching most when giving task instruction. T2 and T3 had different ideas on this matter. They said that they prefer to explain the instruction in English but then translate it again in Vietnamese to ensure that students understand the way to do tasks. In questions 3.12, 3.13, and 3.14, the differences between teachers’ and students’ opinions seemed to be more matter. Most of the teachers considered to be neutral on the questions. While there were more students choosing agree or agree little on the questions. In the interview, most of the teachers expressed that they often used simple sentences or actions to discipline students, keep quiet, or helped students pay more attention to the lesson. Nevertheless, they admitted that sometimes they had to repeat the sentences several times to get students’ attention if not using codeswitching. This answer seemed to be aligned with students’ responses that they think codeswitching might help their teachers better in those situations. In the last question of the group, 3.15, teachers and students had similar choices. They agreed or were neutral to answer that codeswitching helped teachers better direct students.

Table 11. Teachers’ and students’ attitudes to code-switching to interpersonal relations

Items No.	Agree %		Agree little %		neutral %		Disagree little %		disagree %	
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S
3.16 CS helps teachers better encourage students	22.2	44.1	55.6	44.1	11.1	8.5	11.1	3.4	0	0
3.17 CS helps teachers better praise students	22.2	25.4	44.4	33.9	22.2	32.2	11.1	6.8	0	1.7
3.18 CS helps teachers better enliven the atmosphere	44.4	52.5	22.2	25.4	11.1	13.6	0	3.4	22.2	5.1
3.19 CS helps teachers better comment on the students’ response	33.3	49.2	22.2	27.1	22.2	18.6	11.1	3.4	11.1	1.7
3.20 CS helps teachers better negotiate with students	55.6	62.7	33.3	28.8	11.1	6.8	0	1.7	0	0

In question 3.16, 77,8% of the teachers and 88,2% of the students chose agree or agree little in their responses. In the interview, most of the teachers explained that encouraging students in Vietnamese made them and their students feel more honest and truthful. They often use words like “cố lên!” (go on!) or “luyện thêm chút nữa là được em nhé” (practice a little more will be better). This result is similar to the one in question 3.17 because these questions study how teachers motivate their students in learning English. In question 3.18, both teachers and students agreed that codeswitching helps teachers better in changing classes’ atmosphere. Teachers explained in the interview that when they felt that their students were tired of listening to English or doing exercises, they would switch to Vietnamese, often to tell a funny story or make a funny joke, to help their students engage better in classes. However, in question 3.19 about the effect of codeswitching in helping teachers comment on their students’ responses, there was a difference in teachers’ and students’ answers. While 55,5% of the teachers agreed or agreed little on it, the proportion for students is 76,3%. Finally, in question 3.20, both teachers and students shared the same answers. The majority chose that codeswitching helps teachers better discuss with their students. The proportions for teachers are 88,9% and for students is 91,5% to agree or agree little on the statement. This result is in line with the fact that the teachers discuss with their students in Vietnamese and if their students start the conversation in English, they will use English as much as possible. To sum up, table 11 indicates that both teachers and students have a positive viewpoint on supportive functions of codeswitching, however, in some statements, there were a discrepancy between



teachers' and students' answers. These inconsistencies also imply that code-switching in EFL classrooms should be depended on the needs of the students.

4. CONCLUSION

Regarding the first research questions for functions and forms of codeswitching employed by teachers, there were 19 functions of codeswitch found through the observation stages of 9 teachers' classes. The usage of code exchanging by the teachers serves different purposes which can be divided into three wide categories, specifically (1) code-switching for subject access such as explaining the vocabulary, grammar points or task instruction, (2) code-switching for classroom administration consists of keeping up classroom discipline and (3) code-switching for maintaining interpersonal relations, especially to encourage students in learning. Several functions of codeswitching can be considered as main functions since teachers switched code most frequently for these functions such as to check comprehension, give information, check information, change the topic, etc. Other functions appeared less that the teacher did not aware of or name in their open questions in the questionnaires.

Studying forms of codeswitching is also one of the main parts of the first research question. As mentioned in the literature review, there are three forms of codeswitching including inter-sentential, intra-sentential, and extra-sentential/tag/filler which are found in numerous previous studies. In this research, these forms also appeared. However, there was one other form of codeswitching that was employed the most popular than other forms, named "Single Switch" by the researcher. This form was to describe the form of codeswitching that appear without related English utterance before or after the code.

The second research question about teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward codeswitching was also answered in this research. it can be assumed that the teachers and student participants of this study for the most part have positive support approximately the employing of code-switching within the EFL classrooms since it is beneficial to the teaching and learning process. The number of times teachers switched codes in their observed classes, the teachers' and students' responses in the questionnaires and interview stages also confirmed this conclusion. However, there was one teacher who expressed that she did not support the use of codeswitching in the classes even she did switch codes and admitted to the positive effect of codeswitching. The explanation from the teacher was also revealed in the data analysis and discussion that If the English-only policy were officially applied in the English classes, teachers might find some other more effective method to employ, instead of codeswitching.

Nevertheless, some data figures also showed that teachers and students had a slightly different point of view about codeswitching in some cases such as when teachers check the information or wrap up the lessons; and the differences were explained by most teachers that teachers' unintentional practice of codeswitching in these situations may cause the confusing of using code for their students and pollute the languages. The data from the interview stages also revealed that the teachers may also be reluctant to switch codes in the classroom due to increasing assumptions about the idea of ideal English classrooms and monolingual values in teaching English. Teachers' attitudes toward code-switching in the classroom and teaching methods have been affected by these views. While teachers understand the advantages and benefits of code-switching in the ESL classroom, they have varying views on the negative aspects of code-switching and its effect on language learning.

The last part of research questions aimed to study the similarities and differences between teachers' beliefs and practice of codeswitching in the teaching process. Some convergences were identified from the research such as teachers' attitude towards codeswitching really affected the number of their codeswitching times or method of employing codeswitching in their classes. The teacher who expressed unupportiveness to codeswitching had the least times of codeswitching and vice versa. In addition to this, teachers' judges of the English skill or stage which required the least of codeswitching to teach also matched with the teachers' practice of codeswitching in the teaching process of the skill. Among four skills (listening, reading, writing, and speaking), listening skill seemed to be the skill that both teachers and students agreed that can be taught and learned well in English only.

Regarding the differences, some teachers thought that they switch code least in teaching some English skills, however, in reality, they switched code mostly in these skills teaching process. Besides, in some cases, teachers assumed that they never employed codeswitching or switch codes every time and these cases were contrary to their actual practice. The explanation for the discrepancies was the amount of code switching a teacher did was determined by a variety of variables, including the students' language proficiency, their comprehension during classes, time pressure, teachers' emotion, and the lesson content.



REFERENCES

1. Addendorff, R. (1993). Code-switching amongst Luzu-speaking teachers and their pupils: Its functions and implications for teacher education. *Language and Education*, 7(3), 141-161
2. Ahmad, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teacher's code-switching in classroom instruction for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 49-55. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n2p49>
3. Atkinson, D. 1987. The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ETL Journal*, 41, 4, pp. 241–247.
4. Bista, K. (2010). Factors of code switching among bilingual English students in the university classroom: *A survey, English for specific purposes World*, 29 (9), 1-18.
5. Boztepe, E. (2005). Issues in Code-Switching: Competing Theories and Models
6. Bozorgian, H., & Fallahpour, S. (2015). Teachers' and Students' Amount and Purpose of L1 Use: English as Foreign Language (EFL) Classrooms in Iran. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 3(2), 67-81.
7. Brice, A. (2000). Code-switching and code-mixing in the ESL classroom: A study of pragmatic and syntactic features. *Advances in Speech – Language Pathology*, 2(1), 19-28. doi: 10.3109/14417040008996783
8. Berg, B. L. (2009). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (7th ed.): Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
9. Canagarajah, A.S. (1995). Functions of code switching in the ESL classrooms: Socializing bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multi-Cultural and Multilingual Development*, 16(3), 173-196.
10. 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
11. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & K. Morrison. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). London & New York: Routledge
12. Cook, V.J. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 403-423.
13. Cook, V. (2008). *Second language learning and language teaching* (4th ed.). London, UK: Hodder Education
14. Cummins, J. & M. Swain. (1986). *Bilingualism in Education*. Harlow: Longman
15. Dailey-O'Cain, J., & Liebscher, G. (2009). Teacher and student use of the first language in foreign language classroom interaction: *Functions and applications*. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp.131-144). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
16. Eastman, C. (1995). Codeswitching. In J. Verscheuren, J. Blommaert, C. Bulcaen and C. Östman (Eds). *Handbook of pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
17. Emelie, S. (2014), *The influences of Code-switching in the Second Language Classroom in connection to language development*, Malmö högskola publisher
18. Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development: A study of classroom interaction and language acquisition*. Pergamon.
19. Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. P. (2005). *Analysing learner language*: Oxford University Press Oxford.
20. Ferguson, G. (2009). What next? Towards an agenda for classroom codeswitching research. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2), 231-241. doi: 10.1080/13670050802153236
21. Frohlich, M., Spada, N. and Allen, P. (1985) 'Differences in the communicative orientation of L2 Classrooms', *TESOL Quarterly* 19(1): 27-57.
22. Grant, L. E., & Nguyen, T. H. (2017). Code-switching in Vietnamese university EFL teachers' classroom instruction: A pedagogical focus. *Language Awareness*, 26(3), 244-259.
23. Greggio, S., & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and learners' use of code switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: A qualitative study. *Linguagem & Ensino*, 10(2), 371-393.
24. Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life in two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
25. Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies - Studies in interactional sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
26. Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
27. Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behaviour*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania
28. Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. (4. [rev.] ed.) Harlow: Longman.



29. Hobbs, V., Matsuo, A., & Payne, M. (2010). Code-switching in Japanese language classrooms: An exploratory investigation of native vs. non-native speaker teacher practice. *Linguistics and Education*, 21, 44–59.
30. Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
31. Hammers, Josiane F. and Michael H.A., Blanc. (2000). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
32. Hoang, N. T. B., S. H. Jang & Y. Yang (2010). English-Only classrooms: Ideology versus reality. Paper presented at the 2010 AARE Annual Conference, Melbourne.
<http://www.aare.edu.au/data/publications/2010/1755HoangJangYang.pdf> (access 28/11/2014).
33. Johansson, S. (2013). Code-switching in the English classroom. *Karlstads University*. Sweden.
34. Jamshidi, Azam & Mahdieh Navehebrahim. 2013. Learners[sic!] use of code switching in the English as a foreign language classroom. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*. 7(1): 186-190
35. Jingxia, L. (2009). Switching to L1 in the EFL Classroom: The perspective of adaptation. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 2, 45-49.
36. Kachru B. (1978), "Toward structuring code-mixing: An Indian perspective". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 16, 28-46
37. Anh, K. H. K. (2012). Use of Vietnamese in English Language Teaching in Vietnam: Attitudes of Vietnamese University Teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 119-128.
38. Grant, E. & Nguyen (2017). Code-switching in Vietnamese university EFL teachers' classroom instruction: a pedagogical focus. *Language Awareness*, 17(1),
39. Lee, H. L. J. (2010). Code switching in the teaching of English as a second language to secondary school students. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 6, 1–45
40. Lin, A. M. Y. (1996). Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic domination, resistance and codeswitching in Hong Kong schools. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(1), 49–84
41. Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories & decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 531-548.
42. Makulloluwa, E. (2013). Code switching by teacher in the second language classroom. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*.
43. Meyerhoff, M. (2006). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. London and New York. Routledge.
44. Milroy, L. & Gordon, M.J (2003). *Sociolinguistics: Method and interpretation*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
45. Milroy, M., Muysken, P. (1995). *One speaker, two languages - Cross disciplinary perspectives on code switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
46. Nguyen, Q. T. (2012). English-Vietnamese code-switching in tertiary educational context in Vietnam. *Asian Englishes*, 15(2), 4–29
47. Nguyen, T. H. (2013). English-Vietnamese Bilingual Code-switching in Conversations; How and Why. *Hawaii Pacific University TESOL Working Paper Series*, 10.
48. Nguyen, X.Q. (1999). *The role of the Vietnamese language in the English teaching and learning in Vietnam*. Unpublished master thesis, Hanoi University of Foreign Studies & Ho Chi Minh City University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.
49. Raschka, C., Sercombe, P., & Huang, C. L. (2009). Conflicts and tensions in codeswitching in Taiwanese EFL classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2), 157–171. doi:10.1080/13670050802153152
50. Rolin-Ianziti, J., & Brownlie, S. (2002). Teacher use of learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58(3), 402-426.
51. Selamat, J. T. (2014). *Code switching in the Malaysian ESL classroom* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Otago).
52. Turnbull, M, & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' use of the target language and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204-218.
53. Tien, C. (2009). Conflict and accommodation in classroom code switching in Taiwan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12, 173–192



54. Tayjasant, C. (2014). Codeswitching in Universities in Thailand and Bhutan. In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Code-switching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian perspectives* (pp. 92-104). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters
55. Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to sociolinguistics*. Madon, MA: Blackwell publishing.
56. Xiaoil, C. (2013). Research on Chinese Colleague English Teachers' Classroom Codeswitching: Beliefs and Attitudes. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4, 1277-1284.

Cite this Article: Nguyen Thi Phuong Thao, Vu Thi Minh Tam (2024). EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practice of Code-Switching: A Case Study at Ba Ria – Vungtau University. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 7(5), 2755-2770