

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Code-Switching: Demythologizing Preconceived Notions and Addressing Pedagogical Dilemmas in the EFL/ESL Instructions

Amensisa Wakuma Rundassa

Lecturer, Department of English Language & Literature, Arsi University, Ethiopia

Abstract

The study investigates the myths of conversational code-switching that have all been established connections with EFL/ESL learning. Thus, extreme code-switching that largely affects students' EFL/ESL learning emanates from misconceptions. Particularly, at the university level, these misconceptions are believed to be longstanding and sowing seeds of skepticism from using English. The purpose of the study is therefore to minimize the likeliness of code-switching. In spite of its pros and cons, students recognize it as always advantageous; however, this hasn't been proven true. The objectives of this study are then ultimately to investigate the myths that force students to enthrone code-switching. Moreover, it is to analyze teachers' pedagogical dilemmas in the area and the relationship between students' myths with their gender. Thus, this trendy practice needs to be shifted at least in the universities. For this investigation the study uses sixty-two (n= 62) first year students and six (n=6) EFL/ESL teachers. In effect, mixed-method (i.e., qualitative followed by quantitative) has been used to interpret data findings. Moreover, the study utilized three instruments: closed and open-ended questionnaire with unstructured interviews. The SPSS software has been used to compute the data of the closed-ended questionnaire. Based on the exploratory sequential analysis, the finding there fore indicate teachers are under persistent pressure from the dichotomous theoretical views, i.e., for vs. against code-switching. They indicate that students largely code-switch during oral communication due to lack of vocabulary. Moreover, students male, 33 % and female, 62.5 % believe that good teachers code-switch or explain the lesson in their L₁ during EFL/ESL instructions. Finally, the study ends with recommendations and educational implications: teachers should bestow intellect, patience and expertise by respecting linguistic rights in the act of enhancing FL/SL proficiency.

Keywords: Dilemma, myth, skepticism

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

"If education goes wrong," as traditional saying points out, "nothing will go right." This maxim fairly taps the deeply held values of education in human life. Doubtlessly, man had never lived happily until he asserts the need for his life. To ensure his growing need, thus, he had to relish researches that vary from intuitive to scholarly level. In this attempt, therefore, it is important in starting this study with due attention to code-switching in English language education.

Vital researches that have been carried out shade light on the past problems though they are still few and far between. Haager, K. Klingner & C. Aceves (2010) said, "Research focusing more on the learning needs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners is growing, but is still scarce" (p.19). Classroom conversational code-switching in FL/SL learning is therefore believed to be the potential area in the field of (applied) linguistics. On this account, the study demands to ponder its dichotomous arguments, pro (for) and con (against) code-switching (henceforth CS).

In fact, CS, at the level of denotation as given by E. Bullock & Jacqueline (2009) and De Palma (2010), is known as 'language-mixing', or 'language shift', or 'language interference'. Thus, researches from every corner throw new light on the advancing nature of CS in the context of multi/pruli- liguism. The arguments are then with sharp controversies, as marked by Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain (2009), the "extreme versions of the virtual opposition". As confirmed by Raschka et al. (2009), cited in J. Shin (2013:137), many language teachers then discourage CS in the classroom. This is because they believe that it hinders the students' learning of the target language. In addition, Richards and Rodgers (2001) point out, "In Natural Method, though acquisition is in focus, a foreign language could be taught without translation or the use of the learner's native language" (p. 11).

Others come out with different views. They adamantly argue against the above-mentioned notion. They long in vain to the backdrop as total immersion in English is virtually impossible. Particularly, "English-only" becomes a lazy rule when everyone in the classroom speaks the same first language. Thus, they questioned why CS in FL classroom is still viewed as undesirable and subjected to negative comments or even sanctions (Raschka et al 2009, p. 137, Knapp and Antos, 2009, pp. 64 -65). Thus, they wonder why some educators have insisted on the "English-only" rule.

Surprisingly, however, the harder is, as N. Berlin (2005) asked, "How do we convert all this developed theory/philosophy into reality? How do we carry out the practice in the classroom?" (p.8). Indeed, these quoted questions, evoke conversational CS to the focus of this study. Do students at the university level, had to code-switch to negotiate meaning? And, if yes, what could be the possible extent? If not, why not? How about principles, procedures and methods? Let's recap this theme by the following quote. Phillipson (1991) said, "Research and theory cannot act as sources of prescriptions about teaching procedures. There are still too many gaps in our knowledge, especially of individual difference variables and social factors that play important roles in classroom practice" (p.3).

By the same token, there are numerous theoretical analyses on CS to which claims and counter claims are finely balanced. In the empirical evidences then there are noticeable facts. CS in EFL/ESL instruction is the swap from English to mother tongue or any other local language. Thus, it should be kept in mind that this research is a drop to a surplus which may pave ways for additional interests.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

In Ethiopia, the English language has been taught in schools as a FL/SL and serves as a medium of instructions in secondary schools and higher institutions for a long time. However, there is a growing concern over the course of instruction in every ladder. Even at the university, when the time had run out, students adore code-switching (CS). So, where does that come from? To be more precise, languages mix is disturbing the dynamics of linguistic equation presumed for English. By 'equation' is to mean the standstill balance of accuracy and fluency, as well as input and output. Thus, the need to maintain the status quo is hard pressing.

Since negative myths have long been with the students, students diehard to accept teacher's urge. To date this is significantly affecting EFL/ESL instructions. During EFL/ESL instruction, as minutes tick away, students assume either the teacher or the students had to CS; otherwise, they cast sidelong for understanding. The root of this problem, then, lies in an already-established myth. The semi-conceptions must have had something to do with. Thus, those that mesmerize must be bequeathed, deconstructed and demythologized. In fact, ample empirical evidences suggest that there is a practical advantage of CS; however, the concern thereof is the adulation or excessive admiration. In brief, parental languages are incredibly overshadowing EFL/ESL instructions where the time is rushing off to English.

Apart from this, teachers speak limited number of local languages which is another obstacle to entertain CS. Thus, the problem, may go far beyond the tempting fate. After all, students up the education pyramid, the university, shouldn't be very fragile to use English during oral communications. Teachers are also not comfortable when their students are seeking good grades, but not displaying efforts. On the whole, it would have been hard put to explain what challenges had faced EFL/ESL teachers on such a problem.

In this regard, as aforementioned, CS remains a hotly debated topic in EFL/ESL instructions. In countries like Ethiopia, where there is linguistic diversity, the issue is still a fertile ground for researches. For all importance of judgment, thus, as mother tongues are privileged rights the same fate holds true for a FL/SL. The country understands the existing problem so that it is striving to offer globally competitive citizens to the world market.

EFL/ESL teachers are then sandwiched in between the dilemma of synchronizing proven theories and practical obligations in the classroom (i.e., implementations non-compliance with explicit philosophies, theories and techniques). So how shall instructions effectively meet expectations? What is the way out? How do teachers stop pleading students to do and don't instructions? (E.g., "Do speak in English!" "Don't use L₁ always!" "It is English time!"). Thus, EFL/ESL teachers are really having hard times in each course of instructions. To sum up, the outgrowth of language shift from English to mother tongue (L₁) is apparently threatening the utility of English during EFL/ESL instructions.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The main agenda of this research is to inquire about the myths and dilemmas that exist in EFL/ESL instructions; therefore, participants will know to what extent code-switching is acceptable or apprehensive and fearful. To achieve this objective, thus, the study is ultimately to:

- i. investigates students' myths that erred them to extreme CS;
 - analyses the relationship between students' myths to their gender;
 - address English teachers' pedagogical dilemmas loomed out of pragmatics;

1.4. Research Questions

More specifically, the research seeks to address the following questions:

- Is there a relationship between students' gender and their belief about code-switching?
- What dictate students to code-switch during EFL/ESL instruction?
- Do students like speaking in English?

1.5. Hypothesis of the Study

The following hypotheses were formulated for the study:

- H_0 - There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of students and their beliefs associated with teacher CS when alpha level ≤ 0.05 .
- H_A - There is statistically significant relationship between gender of students and their beliefs associated with teacher CS when the alpha level ≤ 0.05 .

1.6. Significance of the Study

The surge in the demand of studying about CS constantly and ultimately springs out of collective experience. Being an EFL/ESL teacher in the multilingual classroom by itself, therefore, a useful chance to witness the tension between professional expertise and realities in each and every classroom. Due to this reason, with no doubt, the pitfalls hard press and become formidable challenge for teachers of the ELLD in the universities. Thus, the study has somewhat significant to FL/SL instructions at least for the following three reasons:

- It becomes a starting point for other researches in the area;
- It scrutinizes the degree of CS in FL/SL instructions;
- It distinctively minimizes variability problems to handle CS;

1.7. Delimitation of the study

This research is entirely focused on Arsi University. Thus, English instructors and students were selected as the population of the study. Thus, the domain of the study is delimited and can't be made generalization to other universities which are found near and far.

1.8. Scope & Limitation of the Study

The scope and limitations of this study are clear: financial, sample size and generalization.

1.9. Operational Definitions

- Code-switching (CS) is an alternate use of two languages in the same stretch of discourse by a bilingual speaker or the shifting from one language to another during an utterance or during instruction (E. Bullock & Jacqueline, 2009, p.1 & DePalma, 2010, p.44).
- demythologizing is deconstructing ideas that many people think true but that do not exist.
- dilemma is a situation which makes problems, often one in which you have to make a very difficult choice between things of equal importance (OALD, 2010, 8th ed.).
- Myth is something that people believe; a fiction or half-truth; that forms part of an ideology.

2. Literature Review

Empirical researches have an answer for everything. Similarly, researches in the (applied) linguistics have been constructing lines of comments, criticisms, arguments, and result on the psycho-educational values of CS. However, as Andrews (2007) said, "There is very little about language teaching and language learning that could justifiably be described as obvious" (p.8). As far as its values are concerned, therefore, this chapter addresses a review of contemporary literature on four of the following fundamental issues: code-switching, teacher dilemmas, students' beliefs, and Teacher Language Awareness (TLA).

2.1. Why Code-switching (CS)?

As is evident under the background of this study, CS in EFL/ESL instructions need linguistic elaboration to wipe confusions off instructions. The attempt then lies in the advice of professionals validated through researches. From the multilingual point of view, Ustünel (2016) said, "Code-switching is a common phenomenon in language classrooms" (p.30). It is worth noting at this point, however, that CS provides fertile ground for researchers.

As part of this endeavour, F. Cantone (2007) identified Meisel's 1989 book to avoid the confused notion in the minds of researchers. Then, he stated that there has been confusion in the literature when it comes to define terms CS and language mixing. Thus, it would be more appropriate to use the former when children have already acquired proficiency in both languages, and language mixing happens at an earlier age during acquisition. Moreover, most definitions of CS are about adult mixing (pp.32-3). So, the ambiguity concern surfaced as a discrepancy must be on the ground of empirical evidences. In summary, then, CS, the withholding its definition, is the shift of language either by the teacher or the students for various reasons.

2.2. Teachers' Dilemmas

Existing empirical evidences pose dilemmas to EFL/ESL teachers. Teachers then swing in between to cope with students' CS. This perpetuates the problem. Students are vulnerable – in one way or another - to misperceptions and misconstrued ideas about language learning. Thus, how do teachers strengthen students' communicative skills? The role of the teacher is then to guide students for which are which; however, from their very outset, the existing dichotomous empirical evidences are a big concern to EFL/ESL teachers. Therefore, teachers should be cautious and studious in look for congruent pedagogy. In view of this, therefore, below are the two existing research dilemma as: First, L2 learning benefits much from L1 so that CS is beneficial. Second, there is a view of "English-only" which doesn't seem realistic to multi/plurilingual context.

2.2.1. What do EFL/ESL Classes Benefit from L1 Learning?

"The language each of us speaks is deeply entwined with our sense of identity and our affiliations with social and cultural groups (Valdés, Bunch, Snow, & Lee, 2005)" (Lucas, 2011, p. 57). Therefore, the benefit from L1 in FL/SL learning is greatly influenced from widely held views of linguistic right; consequently, teachers should carefully weigh the

appropriateness of stopping their students from using it. Ustünel (2016) said, "Unless the teacher is capable of using all the L₁s, she must not venture in such a difficult task, lest she could compromise her authority in the classroom" (p.31).

On top of this, the pragmatic modes of instructional delivery can be a discrete or separate, dichotomy or a corpus that sustains in parallel. The outcome of existing research paradigms on this must make things clear to teachers. Hence, if they are real research, not on the vested interest of the authors, therefore, which pathway makes teachers' effort safe and sound? Is there a clear pathway to oppose both (CS & English-only)? Indeed, L₁ free lessons seem unthinkable even when the classroom teacher is nonnative herself (Brown, 2000)

Furthermore, in the context of multi/pluri-lingualism, languages enjoy robust constitutional rights and recognitions as deemed necessary. A study of Unamuno, 2008, Ustunel (2016) claims that, "CS is used as a tool and an interlinguistic strategy that enables pupils to display their languages, cultures, and linguistic behavior as well as their diversification and plurality" (p.96). All put together, at best, inadequate attention to indigenous language can't be logically correct and its outcome could be counterproductive.

2.2.2. The "English-only" view

This view has been suggested by different scholars. For instance, Richards & Rodgers (2001) bestowed the direct method for EFL/ESL teaching, learning where learners can benefit a lot from foreign language use. Apart from any connection, T. Zacharias & Manara (2013) say that failing to use English in the classroom, or teaching 'about' English into another language, denies learners access to the language" (p.35).

On top of this, DePalma (2010) points out that whatever the value of CS is, its use in the classrooms, by the teacher, is rather problematic since it removes the need of attending to the less familiar language. Above all, this advocacy has been further established by Richards & Rodgers (2001). Accordingly, in their Direct Method and CLT approach, L₁ use in the L₂ classroom strictly discourages L₂ usage; indeed, it inhibits the aim of teaching and training learners how to think in L₂ they come across new information (Richards & Rogers, 2001, Ustunel 2016, p.89).

2.3. Students' Beliefs

"Beliefs are viewed as "individual, subjective understandings, idiosyncratic truths, which are often value-related and characterized by a commitment not present in knowledge (Alexander & Dochy, 1995)" (Kalaja, Maria, & Barcelos, 2006, p.16). More specifically beliefs in the form of powerful myths permeate every facet of students' language learning; indeed, their preconceived notions are negatively affecting their language learning.

Kalaja, Maria, & Barcelos, (2006) said, "Students' met cognitive knowledge constitutes their 'theories in action' that help them to reflect on what they are doing to develop potential for learning" p. 16. As hereinbefore mentioned, therefore, students' beliefs play prominent roles that correspond to their language learning. This has long-term impact upon their learning. Therefore, the first thing to do is to demythologize or remove the myth they portrayed. Indeed, the mechanisms are to recognize, analyze and capitalize literary evidences.

2.4. Teacher Language Awareness (TLA)

In the instructional system, CS needs careful handling. Indeed, teachers should know why and how CS is being going within the classroom. Thus, teacher language awareness has recently gained considerable attention in the area of (applied) linguistics. Accordingly, several researchers have drawn their attention to examine the interrelationship of beliefs, knowledge and experience. This helps them to analyze how they influence their pedagogical practice. In effect, the teacher's knowledge of subject matter (or the limitations of that knowledge) plays a central role in the teacher's thinking and decision-making (Andrews, 2007, pp. 71 – 74).

3. Research Methodology

Under this heading the design of the research, research area, methods used in the research are highlighted.

3.1. Study Area

The data collection was taken place at Arsi University. It is found in Asella town which is about 165 km to the southeast of the capital Addis Ababa.

3.2. Research Design

Mixed or a combination of qualitative and quantitative design has been used to examine a number of various variables. Thus, the study used the following three instruments: open-ended questionnaire, unstructured interview and closed-ended questionnaire respectively. The first two have been used for teachers while the last one has been used for students and teachers.

3.2.1. Open-ended Questionnaire

This questionnaire has been drafted, rearranged and designed to assess teachers' views. Later on, six ($n=6$) English language teachers completed the items being arranged to access free response. Basically, the questionnaire has two parts: teacher's bio-data and body. Each question has been chronologically arranged so that respondents get a clear view on items. At last, the data have been coded, categorized and finally interpreted.

3.2.2. Unstructured Interview

The interview is the second data gathering tool. It has been used to further investigate the problem. Therefore, an individual face-to-face interview is being administered to check against related data (i.e., open ended) among teachers. To conduct the interviews, here are the procedures: One-to-one interview has been conducted with teachers at different times. Thus, each interview lasted approximately from ten (10) to fifteen (15) minutes. While interviewing, the researcher has been trying to be respectful to guide the conversation towards CS in the EFL/ESL classroom settings. To this end, the researcher is extending his deepest appreciation to the respondents for their patience and commitment to communicate their valuable views.

3.2.3. Closed-Ended Questionnaire

This is the third and last administered instrument. It has been administered to six ($n=6$) teachers and sixty-two ($n=62$) students. Since the items focus on attitudinal judgments, they have been designed with a 5-point Likert scale where respondents indicate their agreement or disagreement. For ease of quantitative comparison, the items have been designed from extreme right most to extreme left most known as "Strongly Agree" to Strongly Disagree". (i.e., 5: Strongly Agree; 4: Agree; 3: Neutral; 2: Disagree; 1: Strongly Disagree). The mid-range "Neutral" is given in case the respondents unable to decide for the idea. Last but most important, the data would be interpreted with the use of statistical software known as SPSS.

3.3. Population and Samples

The target population includes English teachers and first year students. Overall, the teachers are those who have been teaching first year students, and the students are from first i.e. 2018/19 candidates.

3.3.1. Subjects of the Study

The subjects of the study are, therefore, six ($n=6$) English language teachers and sixty-two ($n=62$) students. Thus, Table 1 of the following provides the numeric data.

		Gender				Age						Remark
		1	%	2	%	19	%	20	%	21	%	μ
Students	f	54	87.1	8	12.9	6	9.7	45	72.6	11	17.7	20.01
Teachers		1	%	2	%	37	%	45	%	49	%	μ
	f	6	100	0	0	1	17	3	50	2	33	45

Table 1: Students' & Teachers' Gender & Age

Key: [f = frequency],[Gender: 1 = Male, 2= Female], [μ = mean]

As can be seen from the students' data given in rows and columns above, 87.1% of them are male and 12.9% are female. The mean of their age is ($\mu=20.01$). Similarly, teacher's data show that all of them are male and their mean age is ($\mu=45$).

3.3.2. Sampling Techniques

For practical purposes, the samples were drawn from English teachers with the rationale of their specialization. However, students were selected randomly based on English courses they have taken. All first students have equal chances of being selected; therefore, as a matter of course, careful planning and execution have been appropriately fixed for each college and department.

3.4. Data Analysis Procedures

First, the qualitative data that came from open-ended questionnaire and unstructured interview were being analyzed and interpreted. Thus, they were coded and the schemes categorized according to their specific criteria (e.g., variables like sex, age and CS practice), and later interpreted verbally. Next, the data from closed-ended questionnaire were arranged and interpreted based on requirements for comprehensible evaluation in the context of CS.

4. Results and Discussions

This chapter includes a discussion of the data from open ended questionnaire, unstructured interview and closed-ended questionnaire. In effect, teachers' and students' views are being organized to the following two basic elements: results & discussions.

4.1. Results

Multilingual classrooms are basically vulnerable to conversational CS; nevertheless, they create a playing field that foster tolerance and coexistence. Meanwhile, in a country like Ethiopia, where more than 80 languages are being spoken, the pressure on EFL/ESL instruction is mounting. This serves as a pretext for CS. Circumstances like lack of vocabulary in part intrigue CS. To address the results the data let's see developments from the instruments.

As aforementioned, the data from the open-end edquestionnaire show that all the EFL/ESL teachers are male in gender. In the context of their perspectives, all of them can speak two more languages other than English. For the reasons they soon discover during classroom instructions, students CS because they lack of vocabulary. Thus, they said that there

is no question that the shift of language from English to L₁ is trapping students' accuracy fluency practice. On top of this, about 80% of them recommend that English teachers should seldom code-switch to his L₁ since students from different linguistic background which may differ from his own.

Moreover, the data from teacher unstructured interview significantly show that conversational CS is taken place in range of interests. Teachers see it as a pedagogical dilemma that they encounter with during implementations. They explained the knowledge and understanding therein; however, implementations need good wellness or the state of being in the homogeneous linguistic environment.

Moreover, in-depth data results from the student's closed-ended questionnaire allow the researcher to provide further evidence. The percentage, range, minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis have been computed for all student participants. Moreover, all the variables, ordinal or scale, are then computed using the SPSS software. Accordingly, the results show that students' meanage is ($\mu=20$) & SD = 0.53. On top of this, in normal distribution the value of the ninety-five of all cases lies between the two ranges (+1.96 to -1.96) assumed for standard deviations.

SN	Descriptive Statistics								
		N	Range	Min	Max	μ	σ	Skew	Kurt
1	Age	62	2.00	19.00	21.00	20	.53	.021	.804
	Beliefs about learning English								
2	Myth 1: A student who likes learning English likely improves his English.	62	4.00	1.0	5.0	3.82	1.21	-.857	-.108
3	Myth 2: All students who like speaking in English are clever.	62	4.00	1.0	5.0	3.51	1.08	-.363	-.604
4	Myth 3: English is the most difficult language to learn.	62	4.00	1.0	5.0	2.92	1.11	-.287	-.629
5	Myth 4: There is no benefit from speaking English language.	62	3.00	2.0	5.0	4.16	.98	-.769	-.660
	Beliefs about the "English-only" option								
6	Myth 5: English must be taught in English only.	62	3.00	2.00	5.00	3.55	.92	-.147	-.743
7	Myth 6: I can explain myself in English.	62	4.00	1.00	5.00	2.73	1.39	.361	-1.248
8	Myth 7: The shift from English takes English time during Instruction.	62	4.00	1.00	5.00	3.63	1.18	-.664	-.329
	Beliefs about code-switching								
9	Myth 8: English must be taught through code-switching.	62	4.00	1.00	5.00	3.71	1.29	-.875	-.347
10	Myth 9: Language shift during English instruction is bad.	62	4.00	1.00	5.00	3.24	1.17	-.301	-.587
11	Myth 10: Good English teacher explain instructions in my L1.	62	4.00	1.00	5.00	3.21	1.19	-.180	-.901
12	Myth 11: Students don't explain themselves in English & so do I.	62	4.00	1.00	5.00	3.61	.89	-1.136	-1.236
13	Myth 12: I switch to my L1 to make myself clear.	62	3.00	2.00	5.00	3.79	1.03	-.501	-.822

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Key: N = Number, μ = Mean, Σ = Standard Deviation

Moreover, the skew data are used to describe data which is not symmetrical. This means the negative data show the lower value of the data on a graph looks being chopped off to the left when compared to the right side so it is known as it is skewed to the left. It is another way of describing frequency distribution. Thus, it can be inferred that the mean of the student population is less than the median, which is often less than the mode. On a similar basis, Kurtosis is a tail weight for the marginal distributions on a graph. It measures the shape of the distribution of values. So as indicated in the table its values are negative (platykurtic) which are near zero, an indicative of a normal distribution. Moreover, let's see the summary of the myths.

4.1.1. Myths 1 – 4: Students' Belief about English Language Learning

As can be seen from the above table, students differ in the values they have conceived. For instance, let us see the mean which is the most common measure of the center of values for the variables. Since it is a one-tailed test comparing the mean for the population is enough for interpretation. Accordingly, mean ($\mu=2.92$) is the smallest and ($\mu=4.16$) the largest of all. This shows there is no perfectly symmetrical peak in opinion among the respondents. And, if so, what do these figures stand for? So, what rationale can they provide for EFL/ESL learning? The result shows the highly polarized opinion among the students (i.e., they seldom believe that English is a difficult language, but speaking the language doesn't make any sense for them).

4.1.2. Myths 5 – 7: Students' Belief about the English-Only Option

This is about the English- only medium of communication in the EFL/ESL classroom. On similar basis, the mean ($\mu=2.73$) shows the smallest and ($\mu=3.63$) is the largest. This also shows the extent of disparity to the perfect symmetrical peak in opinion among the respondents. There is, therefore, a need to interpret for sets of students' beliefs about the English only option. Hence, in EFL/ESL instruction the respondents less likely prefer the English only option since the smallest weighted mean ($\mu=2.73$) and the highest weighted mean ($\mu=3.63$).

4.1.3. Myths 8 -12: Students' Belief about Code-Switching

As stated earlier, to compare the common place for ($n=62$) students statistical mean (μ) is very important. the lowest and the highest central tendency could give the extent of existing opinion among the respondents. In this regard, therefore the lowest mean ($\mu=3.27$) and the highest mean ($\mu=3.79$) significantly indicate the inside story of EFL/ESL classroom instructions. Thus, figures point out the scenario of students' need or favor for English teachers who translate English to their mother tongue. At the same time, the highest mean shows the need for language shift from English to their mother tongue during conversations or presentations.

4.1.4. Gender and the Beliefs about English Learning

Let's see if there is a sort of relationship between gender and their preference for English learning. Accordingly, value numbers are assigned to categories for nominal variables (e.g., male = 1 and female = 2). Then, abbreviations are given as a variable name.

Gender of Respondents * Like Learning English Cross-Tabulation								
		Students' beliefs about English learning					Total	
		SDA	DA	N	A	SA		
Gender of respondents	Male	Count	4	5	11	16	18	54
		% within Gender of respondents	7.4%	9.3%	20.4%	29.6%	33.3%	100.0%
	Female	Count	0	0	1	2	5	8
		% within Gender of respondents	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	25.0%	62.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	4	5	12	18	23	62
		% within Gender of respondents	6.5%	8.1%	19.4%	29.0%	37.1%	100.0%

Table 3: Cross-Tabulation of Gender and the Beliefs about English Learning
Key: SDA = Strongly Disagree, DA= Disagree, N= Neutral A= Agree, SA= Strongly Agree

As can be inferred from the table above, 33.3% male and 62.5% female students have strong beliefs towards learning English language by, contrast, 7.4% male show the opposite. Thus, in the table above, the results show that a significant number of students have the curiosity of learning English language.

Gender of respondents * Like speaking English Cross-tabulation								
			I like speaking English					Total
			SDA	DA	N	A	SA	
Gender of respondents	Male	Count	2	10	12	19	11	54
		% within Gender of respondents	3.7%	18.5%	22.2%	35.2%	20.4%	100.0%
	Female	Count	0	0	4	3	1	8
		% within Gender of respondents	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	2	10	16	22	12	62
		% within Gender of respondents	3.2%	16.1%	25.8%	35.5%	19.4%	100.0%

Table 4: Cross-Tabulation of Gender with Expected Counts of Speaking English
Key: SDA = Strongly Disagree, DA= Disagree, N= Neutral A= Agree, SA= Strongly Agree

In Table 4 above, 20.4% male and 12.5% female have shown that they have the ardent desire & enjoy speaking English language.

4.1.4.1. About Code-switching (CS)

Gender of Respondents * Good English Teachers Explain in My L ₁ Cross-Tabulation								
			Good English teachers explain in my L ₁					Total
			SDA	DA	N	A	SA	
Gender of respondents	Male	Count	3	8	11	18	14	54
		% within Gender of respondents	5.6%	14.8%	20.4%	33.3%	25.9%	100.0%
	Female	Count	1	1	0	5	1	8
		% within Gender of respondents	12.5%	12.5%	0.0%	62.5%	12.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	4	9	11	23	15	62
		% within Gender of respondents	6.5%	14.5%	17.7%	37.1%	24.2%	100.0%

Table 5: Cross-Tabulation of Gender with English Language Explanation in My L₁
Key: SDA = Strongly Disagree, DA= Disagree, N= Neutral A= Agree, SA= Strongly Agree

Without doubt, the data in Table 5 confirm that male, 33 % and female, 62.5 % have expressed 'good teachers' code-switch or explain the lesson in students' L₁. This is something interesting outcome on the issue. The conclusion is therefore students have a great tendency or inclination of the students towards code-switching when the outcome focuses on fluency and accuracy. As can be inferred from teachers' data, there are practical dilemmas or reluctance. The result perhaps emanates from the sense of teacher knowledge availed through researches. Moreover, the existing dichotomous theoretical views have their impacts on teachers.

4.1.5. Correlation Data

Correlations			
		Gender of respondents	English should be taught through code-switching
Gender of respondents	Pearson Correlation	1	-.246**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.054
	N	62	62
English should be taught through code-switching	Pearson Correlation	-.246	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.054	
	N	62	62

Table 6: Correlation Data
** Correlation Is Significant at the 0.05

The correlation is used to obtain the relationship between GENDER (independent variable) and STUDENTS' BELIEF (the dependent variable) about CS. As it is indicated in the Table 7 the Pearson correlation between gender of students and their assumption or belief about CS is ($r = -0.246$, i.e., -2.45). So, this shows the existence of a weak & negative

(but significant to the context) relationship between the variables. This result is an important figure to notice. Accordingly, the null hypothesis is rejected and gender of students is a factor for teachers to recognize during instruction.

Teachers' Belief on Students' Lack of Vocabulary					
		f	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Valid	Neutral	1	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Agree	4	66.7	66.7	83.3
	Strongly agree	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

Table 7: Teachers' Belief

Table 4. presents the percentages of teachers' belief in lack of vocabulary. In regards to this, 66.7% of them agree and 16.7% strongly agree though the problem needs further investigation. If this can be the source, it is a one step towards the problem since very little is known in this particular setting. Thus, the outcome is not a conclusive finding until it is reaffirmed by another research in the area.

4.2. Discussions

So far, at the early beginning of this study, it is recalled that the saying goes for "If education goes wrong...." Hence, the attention of the study revolves around CS which is merely emanates from myths or false impressions portrayed in the mind of students. In connection to English language learning, sofar, the existing literary views raised issues relevant to the following views: linguistic right & English-only. Many years back (i.e. ten years ago) researchers like Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain (2009) and others indicated the extreme version does not sound theoretical to multilingual classroom context. Therefore, CS is natural and inevitable; nevertheless, the way teachers and students see it is different.

In the eyes of FL/ESL teachers, extreme CS is a test of patience. Students show little progress and inversely proportional to their schooling lifespan. As can be seen from the students' data, false illusions or myths, male, 31.5% and female, 25% agree on the issue of teachers CS; moreover, male, 14.8 % and female, 12.5% strongly agree in the expense their understanding the lesson. This shows that students' perception perpetuating the problem. Teachers in their interview have expressed the potentiality of the problem.

Teachers play crucial roles within the knowledge of language awareness (i.e., the awareness to erode students' myths, beliefs, assumptions, or attitudes underlying in FL/SL education). Though it seems too late, therefore, the place is whereby they can practically help their students. Whatever belief students had they will help them fend off it. This has been further confirmed by the data. Closed-ended questionnaire data show teachers need of harnessing language pedagogy; however, students come to think of CS with old myths that have been established since lower grade levels.

Myths, as has been aforementioned, obscure students' language proficiency. Thus, it is essential to dispel a range of myths that negatively position them to CS (for example, English teachers must explain what they teach in L₁). However, teachers should operate with laid down language teaching principles so that they demythologize such illusions or false impressions. Students also need to be genuinely curious to wipe off the tenacious myths developed in the longevity of time.

Unstructured interview significantly show that conversational CS takes place within ranges of interest. Teachers' dilemma is embedded in the dichotomous views of empirical evidences that exist in language pedagogy. No doubt for the knowledge and understanding therein; however, implementations a big concern. For instance, students should be optimistic and use the language with their colleagues. Thus, if there are no compelling necessities students should go for CS in the FL/SL classrooms; nevertheless, the worrying situation is CS prevails for indeterminate time. As has been explained, therefore, the EFL/ESL instructional system needs teacher's expansive and explorative nature to sort out constraints. To recap, mother tongue is a symbol of one's identity. It helps in FL/SL learning; on this account, teachers then shouldn't exhaust their patience at a time of CS.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Conclusions

This study examined the way EFL/ESL instruction is being run in connection with code-switching. In spite of the objectives of the instruction, English language is mostly affected by learners' previously established beliefs (i.e., simple myths) but impact their EFL/ESL learning. EFL/ESL teachers understand the complete removal doesn't seem likely in the multi/pluri-lingual settings. As the issue has been hotly debated in researches, it needs teachers' careful handling to demythologize conceived notions.

To recap, there is no quick, easy and timely way out of the problem. But seeking a new way to the common ground is rather far better. Booth, Colombo, & Williams (2003) warned the common sense notion of common ground itself. For some it is a general misunderstanding; therefore, it influences the works of some researchers. Among the alternatives there is sufficient common ground – maintaining the equilibrium of accuracy and fluency, as well as input and output. As Ur (2009) puts it, language proficiency in terms of accuracy and fluency means the balance of understanding, receiving and producing the language accurately. For deeper understanding, the study calls for more research in the area. In due course, therefore, the study establishes the following recommendations.

5.2. Recommendations

Having what has been stated in mind, thus, the study will recommend the following: Teachers & the English Language and Literature Department (ELLD).

The teacher should:

- Be unambiguous on how to handle conversational CS;
- Help students deconstruct misconceptions;
- Use English language during instruction in every way possible;
- Work in team with other English teachers across the colleges;
- Inspect & record predicaments or undesirable events of behavior;
- Scaffold the students until they build confidence. Research in (applied) linguistics is interested in scaffolding (e.g., Candlin & Mercer, 2001; Field, 2005).
- Think linguistic diversity as a resource. (e.g., "It may be beneficial to treat diversity as resource rather than think of eliminating it by taking any direct action", Kumaravadivelu, 2006, p.197).
- Refrain from rejections. Admonishing students who use their mother tongue during pair, group or whole class presentations is hurting;
- Understand the linguistic coexistence since students are from every corner of the country;
- Use conciliatory mechanisms to bridge the gap between theory and practice;
- The English Language and Literature Department (ELLD) should:
- Establish clubs that work on the English language;
- Provide accreditations to club members who have shown good performance;
- Offer leaflets and advice to the needy students;

5.3. Implications of the Study

The implications of this study are compelling enough to make changes for implementations. Thus, if students had to bring intended changes, they should learn English by heart. Teachers also need to work hard to bring the desired behavioral changes. For instance, students' lack of vocabulary is a major impediment to keep interactions. Consequently, they gravitate to code-switch. The solution to such a problem seems obvious; indeed, multilingual students need to bridge the gap their vocabulary knowledge. Moreover, EFL/ESL teachers should find common grounds where the controversial issues exist i.e., linguistic right vis-à-vis proficiency enrichment.

6. References

- i. Alberto, P. & C. Troutman, A. (2009). *Applied Behaviour Analysis for Teachers*. London: Pearson Prentice hall
- ii. Andrews, S. (2007). *Teacher Language Awareness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press Booth, W., Colombo, G. & Williams, J. (2003). *The Craft of Research*. Chicago & London: THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
- iii. Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. San Francisco: Longman.
- iv. Candlin, Ch. & Mercer, N. (2001). *English Language teaching in its Social Context*. London: Open University.
- v. Carter, R. & Nunan, D. (2001). *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- vi. DePalma, R. (2010). *Language use in the Two-way Classroom: Lessons from a Spanish-*
- vii. *English Bilingual Kindergarten*. Bristol. Multilingual Matters
- viii. E. Bullock, B. & Jacqueline, A. (2009). *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- ix. F. Cantone, K. (2007). *Code-Switching in Bilingual Children: Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- x. Fecho, B. (2004). *Isthis English? Race, Language and Culture in the Classroom*. New York and London: Teachers College Press
- xi. Gromman, D. (2003). *Language awareness*. Ausria. Graz University Haager, D., K. Klingner, J. & C. Aceves, T. (2010). *How to Teach English Language Learners:*
- xii. *Effective Strategies from Outstanding Educators*. San Francisco: JOSSEY-BASS Harmer, J. (1987). *Teaching and Learning Grammar*. London: Longman.
- xiii. _____. (1999). *How to Teach English: An Introduction to Practice of English Language*
- xiv. *Teaching*: London: Longman.
- xv. _____. (2003) 'Popular Culture, Methods and Context'. *ELT Journal*, 57/3: 288–94.
- xvi. Hawks, P. (2001). *Making distinctions: A discussion of the mother tongue in the foreign language classroom*. *Hwa Kang Journal of TEFL*, 7, 47–55.
- xvii. J. Shin, S. (2013). *Bilingualism in Schools and Society: Language, Identity and Policy*. New
- xviii. York and London: Routledge.
- xix. Kalaja, P., Maria, A. & Barcelos, F. (2006). *Beliefs about SLA: New Research Approaches*. New York: Springer
- xx. Keith, G. (2002). *Appraising Research in Second Language Learning: A practical approach to critical analysis of quantitative research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- xxi. Knapp, K. & Antos, G. (2009). *Handbooks of Applied Linguistics: Communication Competence, Language and Communication Problems Practical Solutions*. New York: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.

- xxii. Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding Language Teaching: From Method to Postmethod*. New Jersey: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES.
- xxiii. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- xxiv. Lucas, T. (2011). *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms*. New York and London: Routledge.
- xxv. Marlina, R. & Ashish, R. (2014). *The Pedagogy of English as an International Language: Perspectives from Scholars, Teachers, and Students*. London: Springer
- xxvi. M.Swales & B. Feak (1993). *Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills*. Michigan: University of Michigan.
- xxvii. N. Berlin, L. (2005). *Contextualizing College ESL Classroom Praxis: A Participatory Approach to Effective Instruction*. New York and London: Routledge.
- xxviii. Nation, P. & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language Curriculum Design*. New York. Routledge.
- xxix. Patricia, O. & Collins, J. (2003). *The Greenwood Dictionary of Education: Forwarded by Catherine Snow*. London: Greenwood Publishing Group
- xxx. Penston, T. (2005). *A Concise Grammar for English Language Teachers*. Ireland. TP Publications
- xxxi. Phillipson, R. (1991). *Foreign/second Language Pedagogy Research*. Clevedon: MULTILINGUAL MATTERS LTD
- xxxii. Pilar, M. (2007). *Investigating Tasks in Formal Language Learning: the authors of individual chapters*. Canada: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- xxxiii. Ramsden, P. (2002). *Learning to teach in higher education*. London & New York: Routledge.
- xxxiv. Raschka, C., Sercombe, P., & Huang, C.-L. (2009). *Conflicts and tensions in codeswitching in a Taiwanese EFL classroom. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12(2), 157–171.*
- xxxv. Richards, J.C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- xxxvii. Richards, J.C. & Lockhart, Ch. (2007). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- xxxix. Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- xl. Richards, J.C, Schmidt, R., Kendrick, H. & Kim, Y. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Pearson Education.
- xli. Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- xl. Sercombe, P. & Tupas, R. (2014). *Language, Education and Nation-building: Assimilation and Shift in South Asia*. Macmillan. Palgrave
- xl. Stern, H.H. (1991). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- xliv. Tovakoli, H. (2012). *A Dictionary of Language Acquisition: A comprehensive Overview of key terms in First and Second Language Acquisition*. Tehran: RHANAMA PRESS
- xl. Tomlinson, S. (2008). *Race and Education: Policy and Politics in Britain*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- xlvi. Trappes-Lomax, H. & Ferguson, G. (2002). *Language in Language Teacher Education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- xlvii. Tsou, W. & Kao, Sh. (2017). *English as a Medium of Instruction in Higher Education: Implementation and Classroom Practices in Taiwan*. Singapore: Springer
- xl. Turnbull, M. & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2009). *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*. Bristol: MULTILINGUAL MATTERS
- Ur, P. (2009). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- i. Ustünel, E. (2016). *EFL Classroom Code-Switching*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- ii. V. Taylor, Sh. & M. Sobel, D. (2011). *Culturally Responsive Pedagogy: Teaching Like Us Students' Lives Matter*. London: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.