FACTORS THAT MOTIVATE ECUADORIAN PUBLIC SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS TO CODE-SWITCH IN THE ENGLISH AS FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

FACTORES QUE MOTIVAN A LOS PROFESORES DE INGLÉS DE LAS ESCUELAS PÚBLICAS ECUATORIANAS A REALIZAR CODE-SWITCH (CAMBIAR DE UN IDIOMA A OTRO) EN EL AULA DE INGLÉS COMO LENGUA EXTRANJERA

Wellintong Intriago
Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador (Ecuador)
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4435-6722

Delia Hidalgo
Universidad Nacional de Loja (Ecuador)
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9051-6833

ABSTRACT

Code-switching is a sociolinguistic phenomenon that usually occurs in bilingual or multilingual communities either to show affection or membership. However, and regarding to the English as Foreign Language teaching (efl), it seems that code-switching is also considered by the Ecuadorian public schools' English teachers within this process. Therefore, this paper attempts to find out and describe the factors that motivate them to code-switch as well as to establish the foundation for further studies on code-switching influence and the role that L1 should play in the English as Foreign Language classroom. This descriptive, combined, and ethnographic research gathered data through surveys consisting of 6 questions framing the Likert scale format, which were answered by 17 Ecuadorian public school English teachers. Likewise, the interview was used to gather the perceptions of 5 English teachers about the usage and acceptance of code-switching. The results show that the factors that motivate them to code-switch are related to pedagogical and affective purposes; in fact, the participants highly accept its usage for pedagogical purposes such as giving examples and explaining the class in the mother tongue. Nevertheless, it seems that code-switching is used according to each teacher's perception, without following any logical nor planned sequence, which seems to be contradictory to well-known theories that explain the effects of the frequent usage of the mother tongue within the second language acquisition process.

RESUMEN

El cambio de código es un fenómeno sociolingüístico que usualmente ocurre en comunidades bilingües o multilingües, principalmente con fines afectivos. No obstante, y en relación a la enseñanza del idioma inglés como lengua extranjera (EFL por sus siglas en inglés), el cambio de código también parece ser considerado como parte de este proceso, por los docentes de inglés de las instituciones educativas públicas del Ecuador. Por lo tanto, este artículo intenta descubrir y describir los factores que los motivan a cambiar de código, así como establecer las bases para futuros estudios sobre la influencia y el papel que el idioma materno debería desempeñar en el aula de enseñanza del idioma inglés como lengua extranjera. Este estudio descriptivo, combinado y etnográfico recopiló datos por medio de encuestas que siguen el formato de la escala de Likert, las cuales fueron contestadas por 17 docentes de inglés de

instituciones públicas. Asimismo, se utilizó la entrevista para obtener la percepción de 5 docentes de inglés sobre el uso, percepción y aceptación del cambio de código. Los resultados muestran que los factores que los motivan a cambiar de código están relacionados con propósitos afectivos y pedagógicos; de hecho, los participantes muestran mayor aceptación hacia motivos pedagógicos, como proveer ejemplos y explicar la clase en el idioma materno. No obstante, el cambio de código parece ser usado de acuerdo a la percepción de cada docente, sin una secuencia lógica ni planificada, lo cual contradice teorías reconocidas que explican los efectos del uso frecuente del idioma materno en el proceso de adquisición de un segundo idioma.

INTRODUCTION

Code-switching is a sociolinguistic phenomenon that usually occurs within bilingual or multilingual contexts. Holmes (2013) claims that the most common reasons for switching codes are related to social status, affection, and amusement where speakers are usually proficient in both languages. Nevertheless, it seems that code-switching is conceptualized under positive and negative attitudes, for example, Holmes (2013) states that «Reactions to code-switching styles are negative in many communities, despite the fact that proficiency in intra-sentential code-switching requires good control of both codes».

Taking into consideration that most of the English teachers worldwide are non-native English speakers, it is highly likely that the mainstreaming of code-switching into English as a foreign language classroom (EFLC) brings about some effects. That might be the reason why researchers such as (Hamadi & Sarem (2012), Pollard (2002), Chowdhury (2013), Johansson (2014), Itmeizeh, Ibnian, & Sha'fout (2017), and Yao (2011) have carried out investigations on code-switching in the EFLC.

Nonetheless, it seems that neither in Ecuador nor in Spanish speaking countries code-switching in EFLC have aroused up the researchers' interest. In fact, the literature review showed that only two researchers focused on code-switching: Rivera (2017) investigated A1 learners' perspectives of code-switching in the EFL classroom in Ecuador, while Vergara (2016) studied teacher's code-switching use in the classroom and its effects on students' learning process in Colombia. Actually, there are more studies about the role and usage of L1 in the EFLC; nonetheless, it seems that some of them confused the mixed terms, which provide the gap to go on with this type of studies.

On the other hand, Payne & Contreras (2019) and Carabajo, González, & Paccha (2020) carried out studies related to translation in the EFLC although it appears that both studies approaches include examples and ask questions about code-switching instead. Therefore, it is necessary to draw the differences between both concepts to focus on the kind of code-switching that will be studied.

Translation and translanguaging

The Dictionary of Cambridge (2020) defines translation as «A piece of writing or speech in one language that has been changed into another language». In the EFL classroom, English Language teachers are familiar with the Grammar-translation method. According to Brown (2000), two features of this well-known method are: (a) vocabulary taught in the form of lists of isolated words, and (b) exercises in disconnected sentences from the target language into the mother tongue.

After some years, the grammar-translation method was criticized, reduced, and sometimes banned since it was thought that its usage affected the SLA process. Concordantly, Carabajo, González, & Paccha, (2020) found that «The translation in a class affects the SLA when it is developed, because the teacher does not increase the interest of the new language if he/she is speaking in his/her mother tongue» (p. 77). This research conceptualizes translation as a mixture of both languages; however, it appears that it is nothing but the confusion between translation and code-switching. Despite its findings, the authors drew the conclusion that most of the time *translation* is the only option for English teachers to make students understand and acquire new learning, which is still under discussion.

Regarding translanguaging, it has gained popularity during the past decade due to new theories about languages acquisition. To illustrate it, Wei (2016) holds that monolinguals learn a second language because they want to become bilinguals or multilinguals not because they want to forget their L1. In the same speech, he also establishes differences between code-switching and translanguaging. The first one is related to sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics studies while the second one is related to the manipulation of L1 and L2 for Language teaching purposes. Furthermore, García (2017) theorizes that Language teachers should not ignore the learners' L1 repertoire, but get both languages working together to achieve better results in the SLA process.

According to the above views, it seems that code-switching and translanguaging are not mutually

exclusive against each other, indeed, translanguaging might be the term introduced to the manipulation that goes beyond the languages' boundaries for pedagogical reasons. That is, when speakers code-switch in the EFLC, they are not commonly aware of this fact while in translanguaging the switching of codes is expected to follow a structured plan to get pedagogical results, although it is not quite clear yet how and when teachers should apply it. Those are the reasons why this research is neither focused on translation nor on translanguaging but on code-switching per se.

Code-switching types

Code-switching is not a new concept, actually, Redouane (2012) states that the earliest definition of code-switching dates back to Weinreich (1953) who realized this phenomenon used to occur between bilinguals or multilingual. From that moment on, many terms related to code-switching have been introduced; therefore, in an attempt to differentiate them as well as to clarify the research approach, only intersentential and the intrasentential switch will be analyzed and they both will be referred as code-switching during the rest of the paper.

On the one hand, Ritchie & Bathia (2008) quoted by (Kim, 2006) postulate that code-mixing refers to the mixing of various linguistic units (morphemes, words, modifiers, phrases, clauses and sentences) primarily from two participating grammatical systems within a sentence. More specifically, code-mixing is intrasentential and is constrained by grammatical principles. That is to say, code-mixing usually occurs inside the sentences' boundaries, therefore, it is likely to end up in languages mixture.

On the other hand, Grosjean (1982) cited by (Kim, 2006) defines code-switching as the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence, or constituent. Intersentential alternations occur when the switch is made across sentence boundaries. In general terms, code-switching usually occurs outside the sentences' boundaries.

Code-switching in the EFLC

As the code-switching term became popular, researchers took up investigations about its effects in the EFLC. In fact, it seems that code-switching was the starting point of what is known as translanguaging. Professor Li Wei (2016) Chair of Applied Linguistics and Director of the UCL Centre for Applied Linguistics at the UCL Institute of Education, University College London, UKW, explained the differences between code-switching and translanguaging and proposed a second explanation as a theory for language acquisition.

According to Wei (2016) code-switching is neither structured nor planned, therefore when teachers switch codes, they do not usually expect any pedagogical outcome while translanguaging is supported on scaffolding or the deliberated manipulation of L1 for pedagogical purposes. That is, translanguaging might me the name given to code-switching when it is structured and planned to get pedagogical purposes in the EFL classroom. Furthermore, García (2017) Professor at the City University of New York, holds that both L1 and L2 should work together as a unitary meaning making system that allows learners to select from their individual repertoire the features to stablish communication.

It appears that both professors' concepts match with that of Krashen (1981) who concludes that the L1 may «substitute» for the acquired L2 as an utterance initiator when the performer has to produce in the target language but has not acquired enough of the L2 to do this. Therefore, it seems that L1 might be useful at the lower levels, since it might show that learners understand the input but it is still too early for them to produce the desired output. In a more updated view Krashen (2021) suggests that there is no problem whether in the early stages of second language acquisition (SLA) learners answer in their L1, the key factor is to know what the L1 role in the SLA is.

The above opinions are more focused on learner's performance; therefore, in an attempt to provide reasons, functions, and effects of code-switching, some researchers studied how teachers use L1 in the EFLC. To illustrate this fact, Hamadi & Sarem (2012) investigated about the reasons behind code switching in the EFLC; Fareed, Humayuny, & Akhtar, (2016) studied the perceptions about English Language teachers' code-switching in class; Azlan & Narasumanb (2012) researched about the role of code-switching as a communicative tool; Mahdi & Almalki (2019) focused on the pedagogical implications of code-switching in the EFL classroom.

Most of the research about code-switching found that this phenomenon seems to be beneficial at lower levels; however, in advanced levels it is likely to be detrimental since this might reduce the learners' exposure to the target language (TL). That might be the reason why, most of those studies suggest reducing or eliminate the use of L1 when it has no pedagogical role to play in the EFLC. Regarding the decrease of L1 input issue, Krashen & Terrell (1998) conclude that «it allows the performer to participate more in conversation, and this could mean more comprehensible input and thus more second language acquisition» (p. 42).

Code-switching in Spanish speaking countries

Taking into consideration the analysis of code-switching in the EFLC, studies related to this issue were carried out in Colombia as well as in Ecuador. For example, Vergara (2016) concludes that «students appreciated when teachers explained instructions, meanings, and grammar elements through code-switching; what is more, it was identified the decrease of code-switching through the semester and students English process was successfully achieved» (p. 61).

In the Ecuadorian context, Rivera (2017) holds that teachers believe that sometimes the use of code-switching is necessary especially in EFLC to be successful; nonetheless, some of them still doubt about how much L1 should be utilized. Therefore, it seems that the role, functions, or effects of code-switching – or what others call translanguaging – are neither explained nor standardized yet. What seems to be clear is that L1 is frequently used in the EFLC; therefore, it should play an established role that provides guidelines to take advantage of its usage. This might be gotten by applying the right strategy at the right moment instead of randomly. That is, L1 shouldn´t be used to get away from providing comprehensible inputs to learners or just because it is much easier to switch to L1 to deal with some aspects within the SLA process.

Likewise, Payne & Contreras (2019) carried out an investigation on translation, despite the research questions were closely related to code-switching instead. For instance, they found that 90% of students believed that they would learn more English if the L1 were used as a medium of instruction. It is clear that the findings were not related to translation but to code-switching. Finally, Payne & Contreras, (2019) concluded that «It can be perceived that most level 1 students prefer to include Spanish in their English classes, while most level 6 students do not» (p. 69).

Taking into consideration the above literature, this research will attempt to answer the next questions: What are the factors that motivate Ecuadorian English teachers to switch codes in the EFLC? Is code-switching used for affective and pedagogical purposes in the EFLC? Therefore, the research aim will be to find out and describe the factors that motivate Ecuadorian English teachers to switch codes as well as to establish the foundations for further research on the effects and role that L1 should play in the EFLC.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Research materials

To begin with, the instruments utilized to gather data were a survey and an interview. The survey was designed by using google forms applying the Likert scale format which includes indicators ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. It was organized in three sections: The first one shows a brief explanation about code-switching so that the participants are able to understand what the questions will be about; the second section allows the participants consent their participation in the research; the third section displays 6 structured questions about both affective and pedagogical factors that might motivate them to switch codes in the EFLC.

In January 2021 the survey was piloted within a group of 15 English teachers, who were pursuing the Masters' program «English as a Foreign Language Pedagogy» developed at Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador. Once the survey was completed, some suggestions were made to narrow its scope as well as to edit some features for embracing the study purpose. In the end, the survey was sent via WhatsApp to 17 English teachers, who work in 4 public schools, located in the cities of Quito, Ibarra, Salcedo, and Gualaquiza.

The interviews were carried out through WhatsApp in the interviewees' L1 (Spanish) since its main purpose was to gather their perceptions on code-switching. The conversation was free, but it followed a 5 semi-structured questionnaire about code-switching which were typed in Word files and organized individually in order to present the findings in a qualitative way while the data obtained from the surveys was organized and tabulated by using Excel worksheets. Both results will be discussed and analyzed in the next section.

Research methods

As this investigation attempts to identify and describe the factors that motivate teachers to code-switch in the EFLC, the chosen type of investigation was descriptive. In this respect, Bernal (2010) holds that «En tales estudios se muestran, narran, reseñan o identifican hechos, situaciones, rasgos, características de un objeto de estudio […] pero no se dan explicaciones o razones de las situaciones, los hechos, los fenómenos, etcétera». [Such studies show, narrate, review, or identify facts, issues, features, characteristics of a study object […] but they neither give explanations nor reasons on the situations, facts, phenomena, etc.]. (p. 113) which frames this study that also seeks to establish the foundation for further investigations on code-switching in the EFLC.

Furthermore, this study is also supported on the ethnographic method, which seeks to describe what usually occurs in the day-to-day English teaching practice. Bernal (2010) claims that «[e]l propósito específico de la investigación etnográfica es conocer el significado de los hechos de grupos de personas, dentro del contexto de la vida cotidiana». [The ethnographic

research' specific purpose is to know people's meaning of facts in the daily life context]. (p. 65). Consequently, this research expects to gather English teachers' perceptions about code-switching in the EFL classroom, which is part of their daily routines.

It is worth pointing out that this investigation will apply the mixed method to analyze the gathered data. Regarding the qualitative method, Bernal (2010) states that «Su preocupación no es prioritariamente medir, sino cualificar y describir el fenómeno social a partir de rasgos determinantes, según sean percibidos por los elementos mismos que están dentro de la situación estudiada». [Its concern is not mainly to measure but qualify and describe the social phenomenon from determining features, as perceived by the elements within the studied issue]. (p. 60).

Concerning the quantitate method, Bernal (2010) sets that «Se fundamenta en la medición de las características de los fenómenos sociales, lo cual supone derivar de un marco conceptual pertinente al problema analizado». [It is based on the measurement of social phenomena features which are supposed to be derived from a conceptual framework related to the analyzed problem]. (p. 60).

The above concepts match the research purpose since, on the one hand, it seeks to get the general view on code-switching through a set of semi-structured questions asked to 5 interviewees. On the other hand, it is expected to find out the factors that motivate them to code-switch in the EFLC through surveys made up of a set of structured questions that were answered by the participants.

Research sample

The Ecuadorian Ministry of Education (Currículo, 2016) establishes the English proficiency levels in which high schoolers attending the 3 years of Bachillerato General Unificado (BGU) are expected to master proficiency levels starting from A2 to B1 of the Common European Framework of References (CEFR). Thus, the research population is focused on BGU Non-native English teachers who currently teach these levels. The participants are 5 English teachers, 4 males and 1 female, while the survey participants are 17 English teachers, 9 males, and 8 females, who have taught English for more than 5 years in Ecuadorian public institutions. This experience provides the academic background so that they express valid and reliable opinions on this issue.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION
Results

As explained above, the interview is based on 5 topics about code-switching. In an attempt to clarify individual perceptions, they will follow the same sequence so that the results and perceptions are displayed in a logical and organized way. The interview results are organized in Word tables where each question is analyzed taking into consideration the interviewee number, if the answers are similar the interviewee number is written in the interviewee column and only one perception is written. On the contrary, if the answers are not similar they will be presented with the correspondent interviewee number and their perceptions. An extract of introductory statements and the questions asked to the responders are shown in each heading.

Statement: At the beginning of each school year, it is almost a must to give directions and explain the course rules quickly to meet the deadlines set by the principals and authorities (see Table 1).

Statement: Code-switching saves time when explaining difficult grammar structures and vocabularies as well as when providing individual feedback to English learners, especially in large classes (see Table 2).

Statement: Some teachers believe that code-switching is useful in lower levels but it should be reduced in advanced ones. On the other hand, others believe it slows down Second Language Acquisition at any level; therefore, it should be eliminated at all (see Table 3).

Statement: Code-switching is effective to motivate, engage, and challenge EFL learners to do activities in the TL as well as to build rapport and show empathy within the class (see Table 4).

Statement: It might sound unfair to force both English teachers and learners to avoid switching codes in the EFLC since this is a bilingual context where they share the L1. If so…

Taking into consideration the above perceptions, most English teachers code-switch to cope with both pedagogical and affective factors; therefore, its usage in the EFLC should be planned so that it is not overused (see Table 5). Finally, the agreement columns show that code-switching should not be eliminated in lower levels but reduced in advanced ones to broaden the L2 exposure.

Surveys results

In the next section, the data obtained from the 6 survey questions will be shown orderly. Questions 1 to 3 are related to pedagogical factors while the last 3 questions are focused on the affective factors that code-switching might bring to the EFLC.

Graph 1 shows that 2 respondents (12%) strongly agree; 8 (12%) agree; 4 (23%) hold a neutral view; 2 (12%) disagree; and 1 (6%) strongly disagree with

Table 1. Do you explain these details in Spanish or English?

Interviewee	Perception	Agreement
1, 2, 3, 4, 5	English teachers should be the ones who choose in which Language to give directions and explain the course rules as long as the learners understand every aspect.	It depends on learners' English proficiency levels.

Table 2. What is your opinion about this statement?

Interviewee	Perception	Agreement
1	Beyond code-switching, it is important to consider the best way to transfer knowledge	If L1 helps, there is no reason to avoid it, but it is important not to overuse it.
2	Sometimes, it is a must to switch codes as it might be useful tool to save time.	
3, 4, 5	In advanced levels, there is no need to use L1, but if they find it difficult L1 might help with further explanations.	It depends on the learners' level

Table 3. Which methodology do you think is more effective?

Interviewee	Perception	Agreement
1	The curriculum should consider all the available resources to learn any Language.	It should not be eliminated but reduced in higher levels.
2, 3, 4, 5	In advanced levels, there is no need to code- switch, but L1 might support SLA in lower levels.	

Table 4. Do you agree with this statement?

Interviewee	Perception	Agreement
1	Code-switching allows learners to gain confidence which creates a funny and interactive learning environment.	In lower levels, it provides support, but it has an opposite effect in higher ones.
2, 3, 4, 5	In advanced levels there is no need to switch codes since these aspects should be approached in English.	

Table 5. Could you support your choice?

Interviewee	Perception	Agreement
2	More than unfair, it seems to be inevitable since English teachers have to cope with many issues that might be solved easily in L1.	It is not necessary to force English teacher to eliminate L1 from the EFL classroom, but its usage should have a goal or purpose in the EFLC
3	If learners acquire enough vocabulary, grammar, and knowledge, they will not need to use L1.	
1, 4, 5	Forcing English teachers to eliminate the L1 from the EFLC might lead learners to frustration.	

the usage of code-switching to facilitate the flow of classroom discipline, give instructions and explain the course rules. The results might be related to time constraints usually faced in public institutions by teachers to give directions and instructions as well as to the need for clear explanations about the course´s rules and discipline to avoid future drawbacks due to learners' misunderstanding that might occur in the L2.

Graph 2 shows that 2 participants (12%) strongly agree; 9 (53%) agree; 3 (17%) hold a neutral view; 2 (12%) disagree; and 1 (6%) strongly disagree with the usage of code-switching as a pedagogical tool to teach grammar and vocabulary as well as to draw similarities between L1 and L2, especially in large classes contexts. It seems they perceive code-switching as a teaching strategy that facilitates grammar and vocabulary acquisition in the EFLC which is reinforced through the presentation of similarities between L1 and L2.

Graph 3 shows that 2 interviewees (12%) strongly agree; 9 (53%) agree; 3 (17%) hold a neutral view, and only 2 (12%) disagree with the usage of code-switching to teach English at lower levels as well as to provide individual feedback to those learners who face problems at understanding some content or structure. According to the results, it seems pretty clear that most of the Ecuadorian Public Schools English teachers code-switch in the EFLC during early learning stages where L1 is also used to make the feedback more understandable to learners.

Graph 4 shows that 2 teachers (12%) strongly agree; 7 (41%) agree; 4 (23%) neither agree nor disagree, 3 (18%) disagree, and 1 (6%) strongly disagree with the usage of code-switching to get learners engaged, motivate them or to foster their participation during the class. The results display divided opinions about this statement since almost half of the teachers believe there are more options than switching to L1 either to motivate schoolers to learn English or to empower their participation in the EFLC. This outcome might be interpreted as a kind of rejection to the usage of code-switching for these purposes.

Graph 5 shows that 1 respondent (6%) strongly agrees; 9 (53%) agree; 4 (23%) neither agree nor disagree, and 3 (18%) disagree with the usage of code-switching to build rapport, avoid embarrassment, and show affection in the EFLC. The results reveal a favorable tendency toward the usage of code-switching to deal with affective factors. It is likely this phenomenon is not considered as part of the teaching practice per se, since this sort of interaction usually happens before and after the hour class when teachers play the role of counselors.

Graph 6 shows that 3 interviewees (17%) strongly agree; 10 (56%) agree; 4 (22%) neither agree nor disagree, and 1 (5%) disagree with the usage of code-switching to create better learning environments. It appears that Ecuadorian public schools' English teachers switch codes to create better learning environments where it is likely the affective filter is lowered, since in this type of setting learners usually pay attention to the class and are eager to acquire new knowledge.

ANALYSIS

As it was already mentioned, graphs 1, 2, and 3 are related to pedagogical factors. The findings indicate that at the beginning of the school year about a half of teachers usually switch codes to establish a better channel of communication that permit them clearly explain all the aspects related to the course, but it is limited by the learners' levels. Furthermore, more than a half of teachers switch codes to establish similarities between L1 and L2 as well as to teach grammar and vocabulary. Finally, it is evident a rising tendency toward the L1 utility to teach English at lower levels as well as to provide individual feedback.

Graphs 4, 5, and 6 have to do with affective factors while teaching English as a foreign language. The findings demonstrate diverse opinions about whether code-switching is useful to motivate and get schoolers eager to participate in the EFLC. It is also revealed that about a half of the teachers are not quite sure about switching codes to show affection or to build rapport. The only graph that shows a determining acceptance is the one related to the creation of better learning environments. It appears that code-switching is determined by the class phase since motivation and affection might be shown within the class period while the creation of a better learning environment may start and finish out of its boundaries.

DISCUSSION

The interview results and findings establish that Ecuadorian public school English teachers think there is no need to eliminate L1 from the EFLC but to reduce its usage, particularly in advanced levels. According to them, there is a need to continue using L1 as long as it is used to avoid learners' frustration in lower levels as well as to achieve pedagogical aims. In this respect, García (2017) concludes that L1 and L2 should work as a team to create a meaning system that fosters the SLA. By the same token, Wei (2016) sets that L1 should be manipulated to get pedagogical purposes which eventually lead teachers to make the input more comprehensible, especially in lower levels. Likewise, Krashen (2021) posits that beginner learners might

switch codes to answer any question during the silent period; indeed, a right answer in either language may be the best tool to measure input comprehension.

On the other hand, All the interviewees agree with using code-switching at lower levels; nevertheless, they acknowledge its overuse can be detrimental in advanced ones due to the lack of exposure to the target language. Along the same vein, Johansson (2014) figured out that English teachers not only switched codes, but it also had an important function and regarded it as an essential tool in their teaching practice, despite in the previous interviews they had rejected the idea of switching codes during their teaching practice.

The survey results and findings, it seems quite clear that most of the teachers use code-switching to draw similarities between L1 and L2, teach grammar and vocabulary, and provide individual feedback in lower levels. That is the reason why it appears that code-switching is considered a pedagogical tool that is also used to give directions and explain course's rules. Contrasting this view, Itmeizeh, Ibnian, & Sha'fout, (2017) recommended that English teachers should look for diverse teaching methods to avoid switching which, in turn, would encourage students to use the L2. That is, English teachers should facilitate the SLA instead of promoting the use of the L1.

As far as affective factors are concerned, code-switching seems to be used by English teachers to create better learning environments; nevertheless, to motivate, build rapport, and show affection there is a divided view about whether it would be better to do it in L1 or L2. Contrasting this divided view, Karakaya & Dikilitaş (2020) conclude that English teachers utilize code-switching for interpersonal relations as well as to encourage participation, and enhance motivation, which is somehow similar to create better learning environments.

As a result, there is a high possibility that Ecuadorian English teachers related affection and rapport to the interaction that usually occurs within the class time and the creation of better learning environments to the interaction that usually surrounds it. Therefore, it is recommended to carry out further studies not only in online modality but also in face-to-face classes in order to compare whether Ecuadorian English teachers perceive code-switching in the same way they do during the pandemic lockdown.

CONCLUSION

Based on the gathered data, results and findings obtained from the application of the research instruments, most of the questions show a light tendency that favor the usage of code-switching in the EFLC. That is to say, Ecuadorian

public school English teachers switch codes for pedagogical and affective purposes mainly in lower levels. Nonetheless, the broadest tendency is that related to the use of code-switching to draw similarities between L1 and L2, teach grammar and vocabulary, which according to previous findings and some theorists should be avoided since it cuts down the exposure to the TL. This fact clearly demonstrates that the role that L1 should play in the EFL classroom is not fully understood, since it seems that code-switching is used to teach English instead of using it for affective factors or to deal with issues that surround the teaching practice per se.

The research contribution is based on the fact that most of the communicative methods are focused on the English teachers' role, since they are meant to provide comprehensible input in the TL, although how to measure it and how and when its application benefits the SLA has not been studied yet. Therefore, this investigation expects to establish the foundations for further studies about the effects of code-switching in different contexts.

On the other hand, the main limitation was to get the participations consents due to the pandemic lockdown which reduced the sample that might have been larger. Another limitation was that this study was not carried out to measure code-switching effects in the EFLC and was mainly focused on teachers who teach A2 and B1 levels in Public schools, which might be broadened in the future.

REFERENCES

Azlan, N. M. & Narasumanb, S. (2012). *The role of code-switching as a communicative tool in an esl teacher education classroom*. 6th International Conference on University Learning and Teaching (pp. 458-467). Selangor, Malaysia: Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA.

Bernal, C. (2010). *Metodología de la investigación* (3.ª ed.). Pearson.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Logman.

Cambridge. (2020, January 18). *Cambridge Dictionary*. Retrieved from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/es/diccionario/ingles/translation

Carabajo, Í. R., González, S. D. & Paccha, M. d. (2020). *Advantages and disadvantages of teaching English as a second language in a Spanish-speaking country: a case study at the coastal zone in Ecuador, 4*(31). Pro Sciences. https://doi.org/10.29018/issn.2588-1000

Chowdhury, N. (2013). Classroom code switching of english language teachers at tertiary level: A Bangladeshi perspective. *Stanford Journal of English,* 7, 40-61. https://doi.org/10.3329/sje.v7i0.14462

Currículo. (2016, February 2). *Mineduc. Retrieved from: Currículo de lengua extranjera inglés.* https://educacion.gob.ec/curriculo-lengua-extranjera/

Fareed, M., Humayuny, S. & Akhtar, H. (2016). English language teachers' code-switching in class: ESL learners' perceptions. *Journal of Education & Social Sciences, 4*(1), 1-11. DOI:10.20547/jess0411604101

García, O. (2017, November 11). Translanguaging during the multilingualism. *Diversity lectures.* retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5l1CcrRrck0

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two language. An introduction to bilingualism*. Harvard University Press.

Hamadi, H. & Sarem, S. N. (2012). A closer look at some reasons behind code-switching: a case of iranian EFL classrooms. *ELT Voices-India*, 90-102.

Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4.ª ed.). Routledge.

Itmeizeh, M., Ibnian, S. S., & Sha'fout, M. (2017). Code-switching among teachers of english language service. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, 05. https://www.ajouronline.com/index.php/AJHSS/article/view/4892

Johansson, S. (2014). Code-switching in the English classroom: What teachers do and what their students wish they do. *Semantic Scholar.*

Karakaya, M. & Dikilitaş, K. (2020). Perceptions of the students and the teachers towards the use of code switching in EFL classrooms. *The Literacy Trek*, 40-73.

Kim, E. (2006). Reasons and motivations for. *Issues in EFL, 4*(1), 43-61. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Reasons-and-Motivations-for-Code-Mixing-and-Kim/ae406457161f9cccea34a54fba06c67246de2d72

Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* Pergamon Press Inc.

Krashen, S. D. (2021, January 20). Bilingualism in second language acquisition. (J. Matts, Interviewer). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tWr4bMaRLKM

Krashen, S. D. & Terrell, T. D. (1998). *The natural approach: language acquisition in the classroom*. Prentice Hall ELT.

Mahdi, A. & Almalki, M. S. (2019). Teachers' perceptions towards pedagogical implications of code switching: Saudi EFL classroom context in focus. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL), 7*(1), 1-9. http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0703001

Payne, M. & Contreras, J. P. (2019). Ecuadorian students' perception on the use of translation in the EFL classroom. *Studies in English Language and Education, 6*(1), 61-70. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v6i1.12072

Pollard, S. (2002). The benefit of code switching within a bilingual education program. *Honors Project,* Paper 2. http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/hispstu_honproj/2

Redouane, R. (2012). Linguistic constraints on code-switching and code-mixing of bilingual moroccan arabic-french speakers in Canada. *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism,* 1921-1933. http://www.lingref.com/isb/4/149ISB4.PDF

Ritchie, W. C. & Bathia, T. K. (2008). Social and psychological factors in language mixing. *The Handbook of Bilingualism*, 336-352. DOI: 10.1002/9780470756997.ch13

Rivera, W. (2017). *Perspectivees of code-switching in EFL A1 learners of an Ecuadorian public university.* Escuela Politécnica del Litoral, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales y Humanísticas.

Vergara, A. V. (2016). *Code-switching: uses and perceptions an the EFL classroom at Uniminuto.* Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios. http://hdl.handle.net/10656/4453

Wei, L. (2016, December 06). Translanguaging as a theory of language. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fnOx-8GjPvj4

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact, findings and problems. New York, NY: Linguistic Circle of New York.* Linguistic Circle of New York.

Yao, M. (2011). On attitudes to teachers' code-switching in EFL classes. *World Journal of English Language, 01.* https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v1n1p19