

## Code-Switching, an asset or a liability in a multilingual classroom? An Investigation into Students' Attitudes towards Code-Switching in L2 Classrooms

Amna Naveed<sup>a</sup>, Shazia Aziz<sup>b</sup>, Dr. Premlata Vaishnava<sup>c</sup>  
<sup>a</sup>[0000-0001-9886-1543](mailto:0000-0001-9886-1543)

<sup>b</sup> ORCID ID: [0000-0001-9566-5053](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9566-5053)

<sup>a, b</sup> COMSATS University Islamabad, Lahore Campus

<sup>c</sup> University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

### Abstract

*With the everchanging focus on different methodologies of teaching a foreign or second language, researchers have been arguing for or against the use of mother-tongue, especially in the context of English language classrooms from teachers' perspectives. Those against codeswitching liken second language learning with first language acquisition or consider the target language and mother tongue as two very distinct entities in the brain and favor its exclusive use in the classroom for maximizing students' exposure to the target language. However, recent research in bilingualism and multilingualism favors a moderate use of the mother tongue. The question arises what is the best practice to adopt for instructors or to what extent the use of L1 is justified to make the process of learning L2 more effective. To investigate students' attitudes towards code-switching, we collected data from the students of various linguistic and cultural backgrounds. They included: Pakistani learners of EFL at a Pakistani University with a Pakistani teacher where students and teachers share the same L1 or lingua franca, that is, Urdu; Afghan EFL students having Pashto/Persian as their L1 and being taught at a Pakistani university by a Pakistani instructor having Urdu as L1; and International multilingual learners learning Hindi as a foreign language at an American University i.e., Michigan State University with an Indian instructor whose mother tongue is Hindi but she uses English with family and in everyday conversations. The students in this group speak English or Spanish as their language of conversation at home. They use English as a lingua franca while studying with American students. Anova used to analyse the data revealed that no matter what the cultural background of the students is, they have a positive attitude towards codeswitching, and consider it a beneficial tool to improve their linguistic abilities in the target language and to clarify some concepts.*

**Key Words:** Code Switching, Multilingualism, L2 Classrooms, Urdu, Hindi, English

### Introduction:

Recent interest in codeswitching by learners and teachers in Foreign or Second/Additional Language Classrooms is an essential topic as it is related to the theory of SLA (Second Language Acquisition), language teaching policy and training and methodology, and student practices and expectations. Moreover, rapid globalization, increasing bilingualism, multiculturalism, mediatization of society, and the increased use of technology in the recent decades have resulted in a significant change in the trends of L2 research.

Code mixing, code-switching, and translanguaging are considered as critical pedagogical assets at the disposal of instructors and learners alike (Atkinson 1987; Auerbach 1993; Bista 2010; Chowdhury 2013; De la Campa & Nassaji 2009; García 2000; Goh & Hashim 2006; Then & Ting (2009; Van Dulm 2007). This study sets out to investigate the perspectives of students from three different classroom situations regarding codeswitching in different foreign language classrooms.

### Literature Review

Using a word or an expression from one language in a group of words whose syntax belongs to a totally different language is termed code mixing (Wardhaugh 1990: 104). Different aspects of

code switching by teachers and learners in the foreign/second language classroom have been a subject of debate among researchers since the 1980s (Poplack 1980; Gumperz 1982; Myers-Scotton 1993; Antón and Dicamilla 1999; Hosoda 2000; Macaro 2001,2004,2014; Martinez 2001; Bergsleithner 2002; Turnbull & Arnett 2002; Söderberg & Jørgensen 2003; Cantone 2007; Lin 2008; Malik 2010).

Many studies advocate essential functions of the use of the mother tongue in a foreign or second language classroom. They include the communicative role, pedagogical contribution, and psychological and sociocultural significance of the learners' L1. Atkinson (1987) and Auerbach (1993), for example, found that in EFL classes with students with low proficiency and motivation, codeswitching helps the teacher in maintaining the flow of the target language interaction by fortifying interaction in response to students' positive achievement or negative responsiveness and helps interlocutors celebrate a common identity. As Losey (2009) has it, code-switching is a natural communicating pattern among bilinguals; hence it would be unnatural to impose monolingual communication upon a multilingual classroom (Kirkpatrick 2014).

Then & Ting (2009) found code-switching by Malaysian ESL learners and instructors as serving essential functions in the learning process. Ariffin & Susanti (2011); and Nordin, Ali, Zubir, & Sadjirin (2013) endorsed it by exploring in their studies that most of the Malaysian ESL learners have positive attitudes towards code-switching believing that it facilitates effective teaching and learning. García (2000: 163) contends that the use of the learners' first language L1 by bilingual students as a cross-linguistic strategy played "a greater role in their reading comprehension than previously had been assumed." This view has been strengthened by Goh & Hashim (2006), who found code-switching to be useful for collaborative reading comprehension strategy utilized by Bahasa Melayu speaking ESL learners to resolve word-related and idea-related difficulties. Naveed (2013) and Zahoor's (2013) studies about Pakistan's ESL classroom context found that teachers as well as students supported maximizing the use of English (TL) and minimizing, but not eliminating the use of Urdu (L1) for situations where it is beneficial, e.g., during vocabulary introduction.

Code-switching is actually "a bridge between two languages" (Faltis 1989) and an essential tool for social interactions and language teaching (Van Dulm 2007: 15), especially when one is teaching students having low proficiency level. However, it should not be resorted to at the cost of input and practice in the target language. Cook (2001) contends that we cannot consider L2 acquisition to be equal to L1 acquisition as far as pedagogy is concerned. L1 should preferably be taken as a classroom resource, helping teachers to convey meaning, explain grammar, and organize the class, and for students' collaborative learning and individual strategy use. Code-switching is a common phenomenon across a range of curricular subjects in multilingual post-colonial contact settings like in Africa (Ferguson 2003). De la Campa & Nassaji (2009) found that the instructors of German as a foreign language also code switched for significant instructional purposes.

In the context of the diverse student population in countries like the United States and Australia, Brice (2000) suggests bilingual students' use of code-switching as a solution to

speech-language pathologists' problems of assessing those whose first language is other than English. Code-switching helps the non-English or limited English-speaking students overcome the barrier in communication as code-switching makes part of the proficiency continuum. In a southern American university immersion classroom among bilingual international students, Bista (2010) observed the use of code-switching resorted to for reasons including L2 incompetence; maintaining privacy; easiness of communication; avoiding misunderstanding; sharing information; unfamiliarity with English alternates; for emphasis; for style or to be considered smart.

Gort (2006) says that Bilingual learners' writing is in keeping with Cummins' (1981a) Common Underlying Proficiency model which proposes that if a child possesses skill in one language, s/he has access to the same in the other language (Cummins 1981a, b, 1991). Gort (2006) found strategic code switching as a positive literacy transfer. Butzkamm (2007) recommends that all teachers learn effective bilingual techniques.

Schmitt and McCarthy (1997: 2) and Celik (2003) declare learners' L1 as one of the most critical resources and an efficient technique in learning L2 or FL vocabulary since vocabulary in both languages is organized like synonyms and antonyms in one's L1. In an EFL context at a Turkish university, Üstünel & Seedhouse (2005) observed pedagogically focused and sequenced code-switching helping students to show their alignment or misalignment with the teacher's focus.

The extant literature has found different reasons and uses of code-switching in different contexts. Chowdhury (2013) e.g., asserts that one cannot downplay the classroom code-switching in monolingual EFL contexts like Bangladesh. However, its use should be minimum and target-oriented for the explanation, communication, maintaining classroom discipline, and translation of the unknown terms, and so on. In a Chinese EFL context, Yao (2011) found both the teachers and the taught having a positive attitude to teachers' code-switching if adjusted to the practical teaching and Tian & Macaro (2012) declare teacher codeswitching to be superior to the teacher providing L2-only information for vocabulary teaching. Kaneko (1991), Lo Castro (1996: 49), and Fotos (2001) in their studies found abundant use of Japanese in Japanese EFL classes due to the teachers' limited exposure to the TL and its culture for important pedagogical reasons. Phuntsog (2018) studied the perceptions of teachers regarding Tibetan/English code-switching practices in the Tibetan diaspora classrooms in Dharamsala, India where the medium of instruction is Tibetan till 6<sup>th</sup> grade after which they are instructed in English. To help students overcome linguistic barriers associated with this transition, a majority of teachers teaching 6<sup>th</sup> grade were found to be intentionally engaging in code-switching 'sometimes,' and the others doing so 'frequently.' Teachers teaching science and math used intentional code-switching all the time, while social studies teachers code switched intentionally half of the time. Over half of the respondents made use of code switching as a scaffolding strategy for reinforcement and conceptual understanding. Due to the important role of multilingualism in classrooms, Norro (2022) recommends including multilingual pedagogies in pre-service and in-service teacher education.

Teachers have also been found to code-switch multilingually for better communication and introducing unfamiliar concepts by many researchers. Beck (2016) found that patterns of and attitude towards code-switching among Italian adult learners having a common L1 in an EFL classroom changed with their improved proficiency. However, Sampson (2011) propounds that despite fulfilling many learning and interactional purposes, code-switching is not necessarily linked to ability level as proposed by some researches. He proposes the utilization of the mother tongue for situations like performing contrastive analysis, keeping in mind factors like learners' expectations, learning L2 strategies for tackling communication breakdowns, providing the target input, and the need to prepare learners for L2-only.

### **Research Design**

The researchers used survey based quantitative research design to answer the research questions. For this a five-point Likert scaled questionnaire was used as an instrument for the data collection. questionnaire is widely used because of its authenticity. Moreover, a large amount of data can be collected from a larger audience through a questionnaire.

### **Research Questions**

The present study focuses on investigating the students' attitudes towards codeswitching done by them and their teachers from L2/ target language to L1/mother tongue in an FL classroom. It also focuses on exploring the advantages, or the disadvantages that the students believe are attached to it. In-order to seek in-depth information about their beliefs, the study was based on the following research questions:

1. How do students feel about teachers' codeswitching?
2. How do students feel about students' own codeswitching?
3. What do the students think are the advantages of codeswitching?
4. What do the students think are the disadvantages of codeswitching?
5. What are the differences, if any, among students who are taught by teachers sharing their L1 and those by teachers with an L1 other than theirs?

### **Context**

The data was collected from the BS students at COMSATS (The Commission on Science and Technology for Sustainable Development in the South), University Islamabad, Lahore Campus from Pakistani and Afghan students enrolled at CUI, and (Pinki can enter nationalities of her students here)Michigan State University USA. They all were in the first year of their programs and studying English as a non-core but compulsory course or Hindi as a non-core course.

### **Participants**

One hundred and eighty participants were chosen through convenient sampling for the present study. Out of these 180, 60 were Pakistani, 60 Afghan, and 60 American students; however, only 45 Pakistani and 40 Afghan and 45 American students filled and returned the questionnaire.

All participants in the study were undergraduate students of various programs such as engineering and social sciences and were studying English or Hindi as compulsory subjects. They all came from various cities of Pakistan, Afghanistan as well as of America. They had a

different social and economic background. Moreover, their linguistic abilities were also different from one another.

### **Instrument**

A closed-ended questionnaire, adapted from Naveed (2013), was used for the present study. Since a questionnaire is a handy tool, and it saves time to collect the data as well, therefore, it was used as an instrument for data collection.

The items of the questionnaire were aimed at exploring students' inclination towards codeswitching, and to probe the reasons behind their switching or not switching the code. In order to get the demographic details of the students, four questions related to their name (optional) age, gender, and mother tongue were also asked. However, for the present study, age and gender-based grouping were not considered, and participants from different gender and age groups were given equal value.

Apart from four demographic items, the questionnaire had 30 closed-ended items that were divided into four categories. The first category was about students' attitudes towards teachers' codeswitching, and eight questions were asked in this regard. The second category was the students' attitude towards their code-switching in English or Hindi language classes. In order to explore their attitude towards codeswitching, two questions were asked. In order to probe the reasons for switching or not switching the code, ten questions were asked against each category. The questionnaire-based on a 5-point Likert Scale of strongly disagree to agree strongly. The respondents had to choose the option that best suits their opinion.

### **Ethical Consideration**

Since the data were to be collected from the people of three nationalities, their cultural differences were kept in mind before starting developing the questionnaire. It was ensured that the questionnaire does not contain any biased, opinionated, or misleading questions. Furthermore, it was ensured that only those questions which are required to answer the research questions were included in the questionnaire, and unnecessary or sensitive information was not demanded from the participants.

We collected the data from the participants personally after having explained them the questions. All the participants were informed, in written and verbally, about the purpose of the study and that their participation will be voluntary, and no incentive will be given to them. They were ensured that their information regarding their identities would be kept safe, anonymous, and confidential. They were also told that they had the right to leave any question or withdraw at any point during the study.

### **Data Collection**

The data were collected during the target language lectures. The researchers themselves piloted the questionnaire to check its reliability, with 45 students out of which 15 students were Pakistanis, 15 Afghans, and the remaining 15 students were Americans. These forty-five students

did not participate in the actual study, and the data collected were used for piloting only. The questionnaire was administered in English because the students were proficient enough to understand the English language.

The correlation of each item was obtained which remained between .001 as lowest and 0.94 as the highest correlation. The alpha coefficient of the subscales was also recorded which ranged between 0.93 to 0.97.

In the second step, the questionnaire was distributed among the students in the target language classes. The questionnaires were completed in the supervision of the researchers.

### **Data Analysis**

The data were analyzed quantitatively via the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 23.0.

The demographic data were analyzed through descriptive statistics. However, the second part of the data about the students' attitude towards codeswitching and their reasons was analyzed to find the frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Furthermore, to see the difference between Pakistani, Afghan, and American students' attitudes, Anova was used.

For descriptive statistics, percentages were calculated to check the average response rate and average response types (Agree or disagree). Mean values were calculated to check the overall responses given by respondents that could indicate the cumulative responses of students as a whole and represent an ideal population. Standard deviations were calculated as a prelude to ANOVA to check the degree of variation that existed among the opinions of responses to one variable from that of the responses to the other variable.

ANOVA – Analysis of variances among the results is used to calculate the variances among the mean values of more than two variables in a data set. A high level of variance among the results shows that either the sample chosen for the study is inappropriate, or the opinions don't match with each other. The purpose behind conducting ANOVA in this study was to explore if the mean values of students' feelings and thinking about various aspects (variables) in CS varied significantly from one another or not. A significant level of variance among the mean value of variables accounts for a low validity of the collected and analyzed data. The significant level of close similarity among the results in this research paper showed that overall, the students' opinions about CS resembled each other's and only a few outlier values show that the sample respondents for this study had similar opinions about CS. This highly validates the results of the paper. As a part of the inferential statistics, ANOVA results can also be used to predict the future implications of such studies.

### **Results & Discussion**

The questionnaire was distributed to a hundred and eighty participants; however, only 130 of them filled and returned the questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to answer five research questions and was divided into two main parts and five subparts. The first part was about participants' demographic details which are given below:

**Demographic Details:**

Total Number of Students: 130  
 Pakistani Students: 45  
 Afghan Students: 40  
 American Students 45

The second part was divided into four sub-parts:

1. The students' attitude towards their teachers' code-switching.
2. The students' attitude towards their code-switching.
3. Advantages or the reasons that they attach to switch.
4. Disadvantages or reasons for not switching.

The detailed analysis of these parts is hereunder:

**Students' Attitude Towards Code-switching**

The students' attitude towards their language teachers' codeswitching was measured through six items in the questionnaire. The percentages of responses against each item and the average of all responses are given below in table number 1. (Annexure)

**Table 1: Students' attitude towards their teachers' codeswitching**

	Questionnaire Items	SD %	D %	N %	A%	SA %
1	I prefer my teacher to use L1 in the lessons of target language.	18.3	24.4	19.8	26.0	10.7
4	A teacher should explain language grammar, its rules and examples in L1.	12.2	20.6	16.0	34.4	14.5
5	New vocabulary of the target language should be explained in L1.	9.9	19.8	14.5	34.4	20.6
7	Use of L1 by the teacher makes me listen more attentively.	7.6	26.7	18.3	24.4	19.8
17	I feel more comfortable if the exam instructions are given in L1.	21.4	28.2	22.1	15.3	12.2
23	I feel glad when my classmates demand the teacher to use the target language in the language classes.	4.6	14.5	32.8	24.4	22.9
	<b>Mean of all</b>	12.33	22.36	20.58	26.48	16.78
	<b>Sum of SD&amp; D, SA&amp; A</b>	34.69		43.26		

It is evident from Table 1 that 34.69% of students disagreed with the idea of the use of L1 by the teachers in target language classes. However, 43.26% of students agreed that their teachers must use the mother tongue in the target language classrooms, and 20.58% remained undecided in this regard. The closer analysis of the data shows the reasons for which they urge their teachers to use the mother tongue in the classrooms. The students were asked six questions to know about teachers' codeswitching. As is evident from table 1 that around half of the participants, i.e., 43.2

%, have a positive attitude towards codeswitching. Similarly, 55% of students agreed with the statement that a teacher should use L1 to introduce and explain new vocabulary to the students. The findings are consistent with Henni (2017) Rukh (2014); Fareed (2016); Chowdhury (2013); Alenezi (2010); Ahmad and Jusoff (2009) and Schmitt & McCarthy (1997).

Many students, i.e., 44.2%, agreed that when a teacher uses L1 in the classroom, they listen more attentively and pay more attention to the lesson. Similarly, it is evident from the data item no. 4 and 5 that 34.4% students appreciate teachers' use of L1 in the class for reasons like communication, giving instructions, introducing rules, teaching new vocabulary or teaching grammar, and so forth. The findings are in line with Cahyani (2018), Amorim (2017), Furgoson (2003), Setati (2002), Duff & Polio (1990), Levine (2003), Storch & Wiggleworth (2003) and de la Campa & Nassaji's (2009) studies. It addresses the first research question in the sense that students feel positive, motivated, attentive, and appreciative of teachers' use of L1 in the second language classroom.

### Students' Attitude towards their Codeswitching

Four items were included in the questionnaire to see whether students appreciate their switching the code or not. The results for these are listed below:

**Table 2 Students' Attitude towards their Codeswitching**

	<b>Questionnaire Item</b>	<b>SD%</b>	<b>D%</b>	<b>N%</b>	<b>A%</b>	<b>SA%</b>
2	I prefer to ask my second language teacher questions in L1.	8.4	20.6	27.5	30.5	12.2
3	During the target language lessons, I prefer to talk to my classmates in L1.	7.6	16.0	26.7	35.9	13.0
28	I prefer to get registered with the teacher who gives ample opportunities to students to use the target language.	5.3	5.3	21.4	43.5	23.7
29	I feel happy if the teacher makes us communicate in the target language during class activities and discussions.	4.6	9.9	25.2	36.6	22.9
	<b>Mean of all</b>	6.47	12.95	25.2	36.62	17.95
	<b>Sum of SD&amp; D, SA&amp; A</b>		19.42		54.57	

The table 2 reflects students' attitudes and perceptions towards their code-switching. It is evident from the findings that the majority of the students, i.e., 54.57%, agreed that they would like to switch the code in the language classrooms. Contrary to this, 19.42% of students disagreed with the idea of using the mother tongue in the target language classrooms. The results are in line with the findings of Macaro (1997), Volkovic (2015), Stylianou (2015), and Rauf (2017), who propound that students value code-switching either for facilitating communication or learning second language concepts. Students' agreement using L1 among each other for communication and for asking the teachers questions shows an inclination towards using L1 for classroom communication. However, at the same time, they appreciate the use of target language by the teacher in classroom communication.

In response to the two questions regarding students' preference of getting registered with the teachers who encourage the students to use the target language in the classrooms, 67.2 and



59.5% agreed to which means they want to have maximum opportunities of speaking the target language. A small number of students, i.e., 10.6% and 14.5% of students, disagreed, and 21.4% and 25.2% of students, remained neutral in this regard. It reflects a mixed kind of attitude towards code-switching. As the data shows 35.9% students agreed that they prefer code-switching in student-to-student communication and 30.5% prefer code-switching in student-to-teacher communication. Thus, we infer from the results of item no. 2 and 3 i.e. I prefer to ask my second language teacher questions in L1 and during the target language lessons, I prefer to talk to my classmates in L1 that codeswitching is the preference of L2 students only as communication starters/a communication starter. Nevertheless, the same is not their expectation while listening to their teachers' communication in the classrooms. This fact further highlights that using the target language for classroom communication is likely to bring better prospects for teachers already practicing it.

**Advantages/ Reasons to Switch:**

Eleven items were included in the questionnaire to investigate the reasons that motivate the students to switch the code in second/ foreign language classrooms.

**Table 3 Advantages/ Reasons to Switch**

	<b>Questionnaire Item</b>	<b>SD%</b>	<b>D%</b>	<b>N%</b>	<b>A%</b>	<b>SA%</b>
6	Use of L1 enables me to express my ideas that I cannot explain in the target language.	6.1	12.2	20.6	35.9	24.4
8	Use of L1 makes communication between the teacher and students easier.	2.3	8.4	21.4	42.7	24.4
9	Use of L1 leaves a stronger impression on my mind than the use of the target language does.	6.1	28.2	21.4	32.8	9.9
10	When I am unable to communicate in the desired language during language lessons, I use L1.	4.6	7.6	17.6	51.1	18.3
11	Use of L1 makes the topic of discussion (in the classroom) more interesting.	8.4	22.1	29.0	29.0	10.7
12	Use of L1 helps in memorizing the concepts.	3.8	14.5	19.8	42.0	19.0
13	Use of L1 helps in the flow of communication.	6.1	10.7	26.0	40.0	16.0
14	Use of L1 clarifies a point that a speaker wants to make.	3.8	11.5	26.0	42.0	16.0
15	Use of L1 makes the boring topics very interesting.	12.2	26.0	25.2	23.7	12.2
16	Code switching manifests skills in both (L1 and desired) languages.	6.9	22.1	39.7	23.7	6.1
30	The use of target language helps me in understanding the content of other subjects as well.	3.8	14.5	20.6	35.1	25.2
	<b>Mean of all</b>	5.8	16.16	24.3	36.18	16.56
	<b>Sum of SD&amp; D, SA&amp; A</b>		21.96		52.74	

Table 3 shows that more than half of the students, i.e., 52.74% believe in the communicative advantages that they associate with switching the code in language classrooms. However, the data show that 35.9% and 51.1% students agreed on the use of L1 as their last resort because it enables them to express their ideas that they can't explain in target language and the students use L1 when they are unable to communicate in the desired/target language. They use it only when

they have no other means to express themselves adequately. They use it when they are unable to use L2. The percentage of the agreement remained very high, ranging from 67.4% to 55% on seven items that show that students agree with the statements that the use of L1 enables them to communicate efficiently and memorize the concepts. Besides, they acknowledge that the use of L2 reflects their skill in the target language that they have attained to a certain level, and on the other hand, their willingness to use the target language in every classroom situation, unless the use of L1 becomes indispensable.

Furthermore, they believe that the use of L1 makes boring topics very interesting. Based on the results given above, we can say that the students prefer switching the code when they fail to communicate in the target language, but only with a purpose to keep the flow of communication. Moreover, they see resorting to L1 as an added asset, and not a weakness, in case of failure to find alternate expressions in the target language because it helps display their skills in both the languages and helps them overcome barriers and keep the flow of conversation. Thus, it can be inferred from these data that students using L1 only to express themselves adequately or to develop an interest in the subject, need more study to develop their speaking skill for better understanding and memory enhancement.

**Advantages/ Reasons for not Switching the Code:**

The last subpart of the questionnaire aimed to probe the reasons as to why students do not switch the code in the language classrooms. The findings of this part are below:

**Table 4 Advantages/ Reasons for not Switching the Code**

	<b>Questionnaire Items</b>	<b>SD%</b>	<b>D%</b>	<b>N%</b>	<b>A%</b>	<b>SA%</b>
18	Use of L1 prevents me from learning the target language.	21.4	25.2	14.5	22.1	14.5
19	Use of L1 in the language class shows my lack of knowledge about the target language.	14.5	18.3	19.8	32.1	13.7
20	Use of L1 in language classrooms reduces my motivation to learn and speak the target language.	16.0	24.4	18.3	21.4	19.1
21	I feel less creative if I use L1 in second language class rooms.	9.2	30.5	15.3	31.3	12.2
22	It is not possible to learn the skills of the target language if L1 language is used in second language class rooms.	11.5	24.4	20.6	25.2	17.6
26	Use of the target language shows that the speaker is more educated than others.	16.0	17.6	22.9	26.7	16.0
27	Use of the target language in the language class rooms boosts up my confidence.	5.3	6.9	16.0	46.6	23.7
	Mean of All	13.41	21.04	18.22	29.34	16.68
	<b>Sum of SD&amp; D, SA&amp; A</b>		34.45		46.02	

Table 4 indicates that the majority of the students, i.e., 70.3% agree with the belief that if they use the target language in the classroom, it increases their confidence. In addition to this, 40.5% of students agreed that if they use L1 in the classroom, it reduces their motivation level. Furthermore, the responses indicate that almost 46% of the students view that they cannot learn

the target language in the presence of L1. Moreover, they feel that if they use L1 in the classroom, it shows their lack of creativity.

The overall results from the response of students indicate that forty-nine percent of the students believe the use of target language in the language classrooms leads to success. However, the negative or indifferent feedback from the remaining half too is noteworthy. On the one hand, a significant majority of those respondents opines that they appreciate the use of L2 for communication in the classroom. On the other, they seem to resist the opinion that it affects their motivation level positively. It pertains to the fact that the effectiveness of L2 in improving the confidence and motivation level of the students remains challenging and more research provoking in a similar language and communication environment. This indicates that some unknown factors influencing the learners' motivation in the classroom might be at work in hindering their motivation level.

**The difference in Students' Attitude towards Codeswitching based on their Nationality**

**Table 5 Difference in Students' Attitude towards Codeswitching based on their Nationality**

Student's Origin		Teachers' code-switching	Students' code-switching	Reasons to switch codes	Reasons not to switch codes
Pakistani	Mean	19.7619	21.6667	35.8333	26.3000
	N	42	42	42	40
Afghan	Mean	18.0851	22.1915	31.8936	25.9574
	N	47	47	47	47
American	Mean	20.3250	20.9024	35.3750	25.4634
	N	40	41	40	41
Total	Mean	19.3256	21.6154	34.2558	25.9063
	N	129	130	129	128

The table 5 shows the mean difference in the students' perceptions of codeswitching in class with references to ethnicity in percentages. The mean percentage value of the Pakistani students' perception about the extent to which they appreciate the teachers' codeswitching in the target language classroom is 19.76%. While 18.09% of Afghan students hold a similar opinion and the percentage of American students with this opinion makes up to 19.33%. The percentage mean values are quite close to each other. It reflects that the origin of the students, the L2 they are studying, or the teachers' and students' L1 does not significantly affect their perception of appreciation of the teachers' code-switching in the language classroom. The students' perception about the appreciation of teachers' codeswitching in the second language classroom is devoid of their region of identity. The mean value for Pakistani students' perception of their code-switching in the language classroom is 21.67%. The same percentage value for Afghan students is 22.19%,

while that of American students is 21.62%. It reflects that the mean percentage of second language students about their perception of codeswitching in the language classroom among themselves is not significantly different from each other. They are equally positive towards their perception of codeswitching in the language classroom. Students believe that code-switching is positive. The mean percentage value of Pakistani students' perception about the reasons for their code-switching in the class, as mentioned in the question items, is up to 35.8%. The percentage for the Afghan students is 31.9%, and that for American students is 35.4%. All values do not show any significant difference, pointing to the fact that the perception of second language learning students about the positivity of their attitude towards codeswitching in the second language classroom is quite ethnicity-free.

Similar is the case with the perception of the students for not codeswitching in the second language classroom. The mean percentage value of the perception of Pakistani students is 26.3%. The value for Afghan students is 26%, while that for American students is 25.5%. Their perception resembles each other in terms of this percentage of opinion. Overall, the perception of students about code-switching in the second language classroom is free of ethnic background and the second language they are studying. It helps this research infer that Pakistani, Afghan, and American students have the same perceptions about codeswitching in a second language classroom.

It is quite evident from the findings that codeswitching is an inevitable and rather indispensable phenomenon in target language classes. The data shows that undergraduate students hold a positive attitude towards codeswitching and consider it beneficial for their learning a second language. The results are in agreement with previous studies such as Cahyani (2016); Rukh (2014); Fareed (2016); Chowdhury (2013); Alenezi (2010); Ahmad and Jusoff (2009) and Selamat (2014) whose results indicate that the teachers' codeswitching facilitates the students to learn new concepts and vocabulary.

However, the result contradicts Jingxia (2010) and Yao's (2011) findings. They believe that teachers' use of L1 boosts students' confidence to participate in class. In contrast, the results of the present study indicate that students feel more confident when they get the opportunity to use the target language in the classroom.

### **Conclusion & Limitations**

The findings of the study reveal that code-switching is not only preferred by Pakistani students of English i.e., a context having students and teachers sharing the same L1, but Afghan students of English i.e, a situation with teacher and students having different L1, and multicultural group of students of Hindi as well i.e., a situation where both teacher and students have different L1s and different languages of family conversations, which shows that code-switching is not local but a global phenomenon among multilingual or bilingual students. The paper reveals various aspects of students' beliefs about code-switching and the prospective advantages and disadvantages associated with it.

Keeping in mind the findings of the study, we may conclude that codeswitching is a useful teaching strategy. However, its use should be justified on the part of the student as well as the teacher because the primary purpose of second/ foreign language classes is to improve students' linguistic abilities of the target language through ample practice.

## References

- Alenezi, A.A., 2010. Students' Language Attitude Towards Using Code-Switching as a Medium of Instruction in the College of Health Sciences: An Exploratory Study. *Annual Review of Education, Communication & Language Sciences*, 7.
- Antón, M. and DiCamilla, F., 1998. Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian modern language review*, 54(3), pp.314-342. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.54.3.314>
- Ariffin, K. and Susanti Husin, M., 2011. Code-switching and Code-mixing of English and Bahasa Malaysia in Content-Based Classrooms: Frequency and Attitudes. *Linguistics Journal*, 5(1).
- Auerbach, E.R., 1993. Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *Tesol Quarterly*, 27(1), pp.9-32. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586949>
- Beck, E. P. 2016. "Adult Learners' Code-Switching in the EFL Classroom: An Analysis of Frequency and Type of Code-Switching." *International Journal of Cognitive and Language Sciences, World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology* 3(11).
- Bergsleithner, JM, 2002. Grammar and interaction in the EFL classroom: A sociocultural study.
- Bista, K., 2010. Factors of Code Switching among Bilingual English Students in the University Classroom: A Survey. *Online Submission, English for Specific Purposes World*. 9(29), pp.1-19.
- 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), pp.19-28. <https://doi.org/10.3109/14417040008996783>
- Cahyani, H., de Courcy, M. and Barnett, J., 2018. Teachers' code-switching in bilingual classrooms: exploring pedagogical and sociocultural functions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(4), pp.465-479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1189509>
- Cantone, K.F., 2007. *Code-switching in bilingual children* (Vol. 296). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Celik, M., 2003. Teaching vocabulary through code- mixing. *ELT Journal*, 57(4), pp.361-369. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/57.4.361>
- Chowdhury, N., 2012. Classroom code switching of English language teachers at tertiary level: A Bangladeshi perspective. *Stamford Journal of English*, 7, pp.40-61. <https://doi.org/10.3329/sje.v7i0.14462>
- Cook, V., 2001. Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian modern language review*, 57(3), pp.402-423. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>
- Ferguson, G., 2003. Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts: Functions, attitudes and policies. *AILA review*, 16(1), pp.38-51. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.16.05fer>
- Fotos, S., 2001. Codeswitching by Japan's unrecognised bilinguals: Japanese university students' use of their native language as a learning strategy. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, pp.329-352.

- Gardner-Chloros, P., 2009. *Code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gort, M., 2006. Strategic codeswitching, interliteracy, and other phenomena of emergent bilingual writing: Lessons from first grade dual language classrooms. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 6(3), pp.323-354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798406069796>
- Gulzar, M.A., 2010. Code-switching: Awareness about its utility in bilingual classrooms. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 32(2), pp.23-44.
- Gumperz, J.J., Drew, P. and Goodwin, M.H. eds., 1982. *Language and social identity* (Vol. 2). Cambridge University Press.
- Hornberger, N.H. and Link, H., 2012. Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), pp.261-278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.658016>
- Iannacci, L., 2008. Beyond the pragmatic and the liminal: Culturally and linguistically diverse students code-switching in early-years classrooms. *TESL Canada Journal*, pp.103-123. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v26i1.132>.
- Jingxia, L., 2010. Teachers' code-switching to the L1 in EFL classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 3(10), pp.10-23. DOI: [10.2174/1874913501003010010](https://doi.org/10.2174/1874913501003010010)
- Kamwangamalu, N.M., 2010. Multilingualism and codeswitching in education. *Sociolinguistics and language education*, 116. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847692849>
- Kang, D.M., 2008. The classroom language use of a Korean elementary school EFL teacher: Another look at TETE. *System*, 36(2), pp.214-226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2007.10.005>
- Kirkpatrick, A., 2014. The language (s) of HE: EMI and/or ELF and/or multilingualism?. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), pp.4-15.
- Levine, G.S., 2011. *Code choice in the language classroom*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847693341>
- Liang, X., 2006. Identity and language functions: High school Chinese immigrant students' code-switching dilemmas in ESL classes. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 5(2), pp.143-167. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jlie0502\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jlie0502_3)
- Lin, A., 2013. Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(1), pp.195-218. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0009>
- Lin, A.M., 2008. Code-switching in the classroom: Research paradigms and approaches. *Encyclopedia of language and education*, pp.3464-3477. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02329-8\_34-1
- Liu, D., AHN, G.S., BAEK, K.S. and HAN, N.O., 2004. South Korean high school English teachers' code switching: Questions and challenges in the drive for maximal use of English in teaching. *Tesol Quarterly*, 38(4), pp.605-638. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588282>



Losey, K.M., 2009. Written codeswitching in the classroom: can research resolve the tensions?. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(2), pp.213-230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802153228>

Macaro, E., 2001. Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), pp.531-548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00124>

Macaro, E., 2005. Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In *Non-native language teachers* (pp. 63-84). Springer, Boston, MA.

Macaro, E., 2014. Overview: Where should we be going with classroom codeswitching research. *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives*, pp.10-23. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090914>

Martínez, R.A., 2010. Spanglish as literacy tool: Toward an understanding of the potential role of Spanish-English code-switching in the development of academic literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 45(2), p.124.

Myers-Scotton, C., 1993. Common and uncommon ground: Social and structural factors in codeswitching. *Language in society*, 22(4), pp.475-503. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500017449>

Naveed, Amna., 2013. Students' Attitude Towards Code Switching. *Language Teacher Research in Higher Education: Potential and Challenges*, pp. 59

Nordin, N.M., Ali, F.D.R., Zubir, S.I.S.S. and Sadjirin, R., 2013. ESL learners' reactions towards code switching in classroom settings. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90, pp.478-487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.117>

Norro, S. (2022). Namibian teachers' practices in a multilingual context. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2022.2065280>.

Phuntsog, N. (2018). Tibetan/English code-switching practices in the Tibetan diaspora classrooms: perceptions of select 6th grade teachers. *International journal of multilingualism*, 15(2), 214-229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1378658>.

Poplack, S., 1980. Sometimes i'll start a sentence in spanish y termino en espanol: toward a typology of code-switching1. *Linguistics*, 18(7-8), pp.581-618.

Pousada, A., 1992. Rodolfo Jacobson and Christian Faltis (eds.), Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling. Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters, 1990. Pp. xiv+ 193. *Language in Society*, 21(1), pp.167-169. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500015190>

Rukh, S., Saleem, N., Javeed, H.G.M. and Mehmood, N., 2014. Students' Attitudes towards Teachers' Code-Mixing/Code-Switching to L1 and Its Influence on Their L2 Learning: A Case of Business Students in Sargodha. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 3(5), pp.1111-1116.



Salim, M.T.H., 2014. Mother Tongue in Other Tongue Learning: The Third Way. *Journal of SUB*, 5(1), pp.97-117.

Sampson, A., 2011. Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT journal*, 66(3), pp.293-303. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr067>

Salamat, J.T., 2014. *Code switching in the Malaysian ESL classroom* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Otago).

Seng, G.H. and Hashim, F., 2006. Use of L1 in L2 reading comprehension among tertiary ESL learners. *Reading in a foreign language*, 18(1), pp.29-54.

Skiba, R., 1997. Code switching as a countenance of language interference. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 3(10), pp.1-6.

Söderberg Arnfast, J. and Jørgensen, J.N., 2003. Code-switching as a communication, learning, and social negotiation strategy in first-year learners of Danish. *International journal of applied linguistics*, 13(1), pp.23-53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00036>

Swain, M. and Lapkin, S., 2000. Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language teaching research*, 4(3), pp.251-274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688000400304>

Then, D.C.O. and Ting, S.H., 2009. A Preliminary Study of Teacher Code-Switching in Secondary English and Science in Malaysia. *Tesl-Ej*, 13(1), p.n1.

Tian, L. and Macaro, E., 2012. Comparing the effect of teacher codeswitching with English-only explanations on the vocabulary acquisition of Chinese university students: A Lexical Focus-on-Form study. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(3), pp.367-391. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168812436909>

Turnbull, M. and Arnett, K., 2002. 11. Teachers' Uses of the Target and First Languages in Second and Foreign Language Classrooms. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 22, p.204. DOI:10.1017/S0267190502000119

Üstünel, E. and Seedhouse, P., 2005. Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International journal of applied linguistics*, 15(3), pp.302-325.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00093.x>

Yao, M., 2011. On attitudes to teachers' code-switching in EFL classes. *World journal of English language*, 1(1), p.19. doi:10.5430/wjel.v1n1p19

Zahoor, A., 2013. Student and Teacher Views about Using the L1 in English Classrooms. *Language Teacher Research in Higher Education: Potential and Challenges*, p.49.