



---

## Code-switching in Language Classrooms: A Comparative Study of University Teachers' Beliefs

**Shaista Shehzadi<sup>1</sup>, Arshad Ali<sup>2</sup> and Ayyaz Mahmood<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Lecturer, Department of English, National University of Modern Languages, Pakistan  
shaista.shehzadi@numl.edu.pk

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, Department of English, National University of Modern Languages, Pakistan  
arali@numl.edu.pk

<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of English, National University of Modern Languages, Pakistan  
aymahmood@numl.edu.pk

### Abstract

The subject of first language (L1) usage or code-switching in relation to L2 (second language) education and learning has been a source of contention in the field of second language acquisition for decades. The assumption that first language (L1) must be used for second language (L2) education and learning has thus been supported by a number of studies, while some other works have provided evidence of the drawbacks of that L1 implementation. As of now, it is widely acknowledged that the idea of "belief" is a key factor influencing second language (L2) education and understanding. The current investigation compares the beliefs of various university teachers and instructors about the use of L1 in language classrooms in two different universities of two main cities, namely The University of Lahore and the National University of Modern Language in Lahore and Multan, respectively. In this research, it has been examined whether or not Multan and Lahore EFL lecturers have similar or divergent views on the use of L1 in their language courses. A questionnaire based on teachers' beliefs was used to collect the data. Twenty EFL teachers from both settings were involved in the study. The research found that the opinions of two EFL teachers regarding the use of L1 for their approach to their subject of classroom management and CS for interpersonal connections were significantly different from one another.

**Keywords:** First language, Second language, Code-switching, Language Education, EFL

### 1. Introduction

Howatt (2004) notes that while some researchers are of the opinion that teaching L2 with the help of L1 can never help students achieve a higher level of regularity, others see L1 as a useful system for teaching current language patterns/expressions or for providing crucial guidelines. It is further persuaded that no L1 interference in education is necessary to achieve the goal of refining students' understanding of L2. Similar to this, Halliwell and Jones (1991) think that L2 instruction should generally be focused on enhancing students' communication skills and they become better at thinking in a foreign language as a result. They found that students do not even require interpretation because they can comprehend the message without being aware of the words' actual meanings or contexts.

Contrarily, few researchers (Harbord, 1992) agree that L1 should not be avoided when teaching L2, and that understanding L1 is necessary if you want to become fluent in L2. Another argument for why learning L1 is essential for learning L2 is that if students haven't learned how to properly use the foreign language, they will not be able to express themselves clearly and will not be able to further develop their ability to reason logically (Harbord, 1992). Considering a different study that looked at the effects of L2 education interpretation, Durce (2013) found that teaching L2 through L1 translation was viewed as particularly effective in some specific situations. Additionally, Elmetwally (2012) notes that using an L1 will aid in



successful schooling when considering the findings of work that was based on the questioning of various students and teachers about their beliefs regarding using Urdu for teaching in Pakistan. In her research, AL.H (2010) examined the viewpoint that teachers and students in Pakistan express regarding incorporating Urdu into English classrooms. Findings from her research showed that educators and students share a positive outlook on incorporating first language (L1) for the teaching of second language (L2). In addition, Mahado (2013), who focused on the viewpoint of EFL educators regarding the use of Creole in language classrooms in Pakistani schools, found that while Urdu-only strategies can help students gain the most valuable exposure to that language, using Creole can give different students the freedom to participate effectively during their learning interactions. In this way, Hansen (2012) found that EFL instructors prefer to use their native tongue since doing so requires adequate planning and preparation for the best way to convey English precisely.

Additionally, instructors of English, especially those who thoroughly research the EFL regions, instructors of more scholarly subjects taught in English, and the students taking these EMI and EFL courses are unable to imagine how, in their practical circumstances, L1 (first language) can be completely avoid. Furthermore, they are unable to understand why it should be avoided when, in reality, doing so makes learning easier and quicker and has no negative effects on or delays the process of learning a particular language.

Regarding their perspectives on the use of L1, there is little difference between instructors of English major learners and instructors of non-English major learners (Song, 2009). Additionally, this study shows that L1 may also be unavoidable in L2 classrooms, even if students have no trouble understanding what is being said. Thompson (2006) emphasises the importance of investigating learner and instructor convictions in order to change existing convictions that contradict the language securing hypothesis and to support convictions that will frequently lead to more prominent learning and possible language acquiring. According to the findings of Yao's (2011) review, the majority of learners are not energised by their instructors and, as a result, require more consolation.

Uysal and Bardakci (2014) discovered in their research that instructors do not accept that new advancements can be used in their classroom settings, and as a result, most educators focused their working works on demonstrating a more conventional expressed logical technique for language structure because of variables like time constraints, crowded classes, low learner inspiration, commotion and classroom board issues, reading material, focal assistance, social apprehension, and social apprehension. Another idea brought up by Nuttall (1982) states, for language instructors, there is a lot of work to do. For example, they could utilize proper texts and exercises that emphasise students' consideration of the actual text. In this research, we are attempting to track down the distinctions and similitudes in the conviction of educators towards involving L1 in classrooms between EFL university instructors in Lahore and Multan to discover, what are the explanations for utilizing L1 after extensive stretch and wide way of thinking behind the methodologies in instructing the English language in EFL classrooms.

### 1.1. Research Questions

1. What are the beliefs of Lahore university teachers toward the use of L1 in English language classes?
2. What are Multan University teachers' beliefs toward using L1 in English classes?
3. Do English as foreign language teachers at Lahore and Multan universities differ in their beliefs toward using L1 in the language classroom?



## 2. Literature Review

Several scholars and scientists have worked on language, particularly code switching. The first work we will look at is by Valdes-Fallis (1978), who claims that code-mixing or switching is the agreement of two different codes performed by the move. Simply put, it is the combination of two different words or phrases.

According to Gumperz (1982), collocation refers to the combining of two different linguistic frameworks or systems. Three different types of code-mixing and code-switching will predominate: First, tag switching 2) Inter- or intra-sentential 3) at the word or expression level. Code-switching is a common occurrence in language classrooms. Nowadays, students have mixed feelings about the instructors switching or mixing their codes in the classrooms. According to S. Krashen (1982), openness to understandable details is crucial for successful language acquisition.

Code-mixing, which occurs unintentionally by the teacher during class, is regarded as a special methodology to help students understand some challenging ideas by giving them a solid foundation and lowering their anxiety in the classroom setting. The use of code-switching enables the less able students to participate in class discussions and helps them understand some complex ideas. It has been noted that code-mixing has been extremely helpful in reducing the class's weaker students' agitation, anxiety, silence, and hesitation.

There are many uses for code switching. The concepts and knowledge being taught, the reading material, and student comprehensions are all communicated using code-switching. Additionally, it enhances the classroom environment and helps create strong relationships between the teacher and the students. Statistics show that 64% of students credit their high test scores to teachers who frequently use the code-mixing technique, which they believe helps in their understanding of the material and higher test scores (Alenezi, 2010).

## 3. Research Methodology

The data for this study was collected from two different university teachers in two different cities, namely EFL teachers at The University of Lahore and EFL teachers at NUML, Multan. The researchers gathered data by emailing a questionnaire to ten EFL teachers from both universities. The researcher used convenient sampling to collect data from ten EFL teachers at each university.

## 4. Data Analysis

To answer the main research questions and determine whether Lahore university English teachers and Multan university English teachers have comparable or variable convictions about using their first language (L1), Urdu, in English language classrooms, data was entered into SPSS version 16. T-tests were also used to compare the results of two different groups. Table 1 displays the mean, standard deviation, and standard error mean for each type of poll for two different groups.

**Table 1** *Group Statistics*

	Nationality	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
<b>Teacher's personal</b>	Lahore	12.6000	2.06219	.46112
	Multan	13.8000	4.9481 5	1.10644
<b>Subject access</b>	Lahore	21.8500	2.79614	.62524



	Multan	15.2500	5.11834	1.14449
<b>Classroom management</b>	Lahore	21.1500	3.32890	.74436
	Multan	14.1500	4.79336	1.07183
<b>CS for interpersonal relations</b>	Lahore	22.0500	3.26827	.73081
	Multan	14.6000	5.60451	1.25321

The T-test Table is used to determine whether two groups from Lahore and Multan have similar or opposing views on using L1 in language learning classrooms. Looking at this table, we can see that two groups from Lahore and Multan are participating. It demonstrates how similar or dissimilar these two groups are in terms of their commitment to involving the L1 in language classrooms.

As shown in table (2), the aftereffects of methods for the primary class, which are teachers' personal, differ from the next three classifications. However, the mean of the second category, subject access, differs between groups.

**Table 2. Independent Sample T-Test**

		Levine's Test for t-test for Equality of Means						
		Equality of Variances		of				
		F	Sig.	Sig. (2 tailed)	Mean Difference	Standard Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper	
<b>Teacher's Personal</b>	Equal variances assumed	4.802	0.000	0.324	-1.20000	1.19869	3.62661	1.22662
	Equal variances not assumed			.326	1.20000-	1.19868	3.66673-	1.26673
<b>Subject access</b>	Equal variances assumed	8.440	.006	.000	6.60000	1.30414	3.95990	9.24010
	Equal variances not assumed			.000	6.60000	1.30414	3.93435	9.26565
<b>Classroom management</b>	Equal variances assumed	2.438	.127	.000	7.00000	1.30495	4.35827	9.64173
	Equal variances not assumed			.000	7.00000	1.30495	4.34764	9.65236
<b>CS for interpersonal relations</b>	Equal variances assumed	9.328	.004	.000	7.45000	1.45073	4.51316	10.38684
	Equal variances not assumed			.000	7.45000	1.45073	4.48959	10.41041

The results of this test simply show that the method of understanding two distinct groups from two distinct cities is fundamentally very unique. However, there is no significant difference between the two groups with the main classification that addresses the inquiries from 1 to 5. All things considered, we can argue that the interest taking instructors are all EFL educators who are educating in two cities with particularly similar Urdu statuses; however, their conviction for using first language (L1) is varied, which addresses the main research questions.



## 5. Discussion

Twenty English teachers from Lahore University and Multan University were interviewed. The researchers asked them a variety of questions, including their thoughts on the teaching profession and, in particular, the use of L1 in English classrooms.

The researchers conducted an opinion poll to assess teachers' attitude toward using (L1) in the classroom and to learn how they handle code-switching and code-mixing. This poll consisted of four sections and nearly twenty items. Perspectives of teachers to involve the first language (L1) in EFL classrooms were examined under 4 sub-headings: attitudes of teachers towards those teachers who use L1 in their classroom (Q1-Q5); attitude of teachers towards using L1 in making students understand the subject material (Q6-Q10); attitudes of teachers towards using L1 in classroom, management (Q11-Q15); and Attitudes of teachers towards using L1 in their interpersonal relations (Q16-Q20). The results from SPSS are displayed in Table number 3.

**Table 3** *Percentage of the Questionnaire Responses of each Participating Group*

N	Questions	Nationality	Agree %	Not sure %	Disagree %
1	If the instructor uses the (L1)/ first language in the classroom, then he/she can communicate more properly.	Lahore	35	25	40
		Multan	50	25	25
2	Problems in comprehension may occur if the instructor uses the first language in the classroom.	Lahore	15	15	70
		Multan	30	25	55
3	It is believed that language is contaminated if the instructor uses the first language in the classroom.	Lahore	15	15	70
		<b>Multan</b>	45	05	60
4	Instructors who use first languages in classroom are limited to Urdu.	Lahore	35	15	50
		Multan	35	20	45
5	Instructors who use first languages in classrooms are experts in English.	Lahore	25	40	35
		Multan	10	40	50
6	If the instructor is applying the first language in classroom then he/she can do so on every topic in the classroom.	Lahore	75	15	10
		Multan	20	35	45
7	Grammatical points and lexical items in the text can be explained in a better way if the instructor uses the first language in the classroom.	Lahore	90	0	10
		Multan	55	20	25
8	Cultural topics of course can be explained in a much better way if the instructor uses the first language in the classroom.	Lahore	100	0	0
		<b>Multan</b>	55	15	30
9	It becomes much easier for the teacher to explain the cultural topics if he/she try to explain them with help of the first language.	Lahore	90	5	5
		<b>Multan</b>	35	45	10
10	The content of the lesson is delivered in a more easy way if the instructor try to explain it with the help of the first language	Lahore	100	0	0
		Multan	50	20	30
11	Instructors can give more clear instructions to the students if he/she uses the first language.	Lahore	85	0	15
		<b>Multan</b>	65	15	20
12	The use of the first language is a better and easier way of maintaining discipline in the classroom.	Lahore	80	10	10
		<b>Multan</b>	30	25	45
13	Teachers can easily engage the student's attention in the classroom if he/she uses the first language.	Lahore	95	5	0
		Multan	35	30	35



14	The teacher can easily make the students sit quite in the classroom if they use the first language in the class.	Lahore	85	5	10
		Multan	25	30	45
15	Teachers can handle the students and give directions to them in a more easy way if they use the first language in the classroom.	Lahore	75	20	5
		Multan	10	25	65
16	To encourage the student more, the instructor can use the first language in the class.	Lahore	90	10	0
		Multan	30	10	60
17	Using the first language in the classroom is a good and better way of applauding the students.	Lahore	85	5	10
		Multan	40	10	50
18	The use of the first language in the classroom is another way of brightening up the atmosphere of the classroom.	Lahore	100	0	0
		Multan	55	25	20
19	If the teacher uses the first language in the classroom then he/she can more easily give remarks on student's response in the classroom	Lahore	90	0	30
		Multan	35	20	45
	Instructors who use their first language in classroom can debate with learners more finely (reduce distance).	Lahore	95	0	5
		Multan	60	15	25

### Segment one: Teachers attitudes towards those who use L1 in their classrooms

Primary question deals with the teacher's perception towards those teachers who use L1 in their classrooms. Table 3 shows that 25% Lahore university teachers were not sure that using L1 in classrooms can communicate their thoughts freely and evidently. Moreover, 20-25 per cent of instructors disagreed with this point. The next inquiry concerns the instructor's attitude to see whether the instructor's utilization of L1 brings on any sort of trouble in getting what the instructor is conveying or not. In total 30-40% Lahori teachers disagree or empathetically disagree. Almost 5-10% of the teachers agree with this point and 10% of Lahori teachers and 20% of Multani instructors agreed yet 15% of Lahori and 25% of Multani instructors are neutral. Thus, it is accepted that involving first language (L1) for two settings can assist instructors with better explanation of the topic. With the responses to the assertion of, "Instructors who utilize the first language in classrooms can more readily teach the learners". Lahori instructors likewise would in general agree with the statement. The outcome shows that 80% of Lahori instructors also agreed. While 30% of university instructors in Multan agreed with this assertion.

### Segment two: Teachers Attitudes to use first language (L1) in connection to understanding subject material

This segment attempts to research teachers' perspectives on whether involving L1 in the classrooms will assist learners to understand the topic or not. If we talk about the past, we come to know that there was no huge contrast between the conviction of university instructors of Lahore and Multan in involving first Language L1 in classrooms. Table number 3 shows the startling after-effects of inquiry six. 15% of Multan educators differ with the opinion of Lahori teachers. It is found that 75% of the Lahore educators agreed and strongly agreed on this point and 35% of Multani and 15% of the Lahori also agreed that by using L1 students understand the topic more clearly.

### Segment three: Attitudes to using first language (L1) in connection to classrooms management

The researchers learned from this study that instructors who use L1 in the classroom can more easily explain the task. The outcome exhibits that 85% of Lahori instructors and 65% of



Multani instructors agreed that using L1 helps them to manage classrooms while just 15% of Lahori and 20% of Multani instructors disagreed, and 15% of Multan instructors were neutral. It is accepted that involving L1 for classroom management can assist instructors to give a better explanation of classroom task. With the response to the assertion of, "Instructors who utilize the first language in the classrooms can more readily teach the learners". Lahori instructors likewise would in general agree with the statement. The outcome shows that 80% of Lahori educators agreed while the 30% of university instructors in Multan agreed with this assertion and 25% of the instructors of Multan and 10% University instructors in Lahore were neutral.

#### **Segment four: Attitudes to using the first language (L1) in connection to interpersonal relations**

We found in this research that instructors who code-switch from English to first language (L1) can more easily empower the learners. The outcome of this research tells us that 90% of Lahori instructors agreed while, just 60% of Multan university educators disagreed and 10 per cent were not sure about this. This connects well to the way that in Lahore University conversely with Multan Universities in EFL classroom instructors accept that it is important to support learners when they are trying a new language. In the last inquiry, "instructors utilize the first language in the classroom can more readily haggle with the learners (lessen distance)" while 95% of the examples from the Lahore agreed and strongly agreed 05% of Multan members agreed and strongly agreed and 25% communicated disagreement.

### **6. Conclusion**

It has been observed that if we include first language (L1) in the language classroom, it remains a hot topic in the domain of L2 (Second language) education and schooling. The current study was conducted to investigate the differences and similarities of EFL instructors teaching English to university level students in Lahore and Multan. The findings revealed a significant difference in the attitudes of two groups. Various types of T-tests were used to obtain the required results. Furthermore, data is analyzed in SPSS to gain a better understanding of the contrasts. In general, we can argue that EFL instructors' conviction in incorporating first language (L1) into classrooms differs in two distinct concentrated settings. As a result, in the context of EFL and ESL, using L1 in the classroom should not be studied and generalized.



### References

- Adnan, M. A. M., Mohamad, S., Yusoff, M. A., & Ghazali, Z. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards the use of the first language in Arabic classroom. *International Refereed Research Journal*, 5(2), 20-28.
- Afzal, S. (2013). Using the first language in an English classroom as a way of scaffolding for both the students and teachers to learn and teach English. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 4(7), 1846-1854.
- Al, H. (2010). The attitudes of teachers and students towards using Arabic in EFL classrooms in Saudi public schools-a case study. *Novitas-Royal*, 4(1).
- Amin, M. M., & Saadatmanesh, S. (2018). Discovering the effectiveness of direct versus indirect corrective feedback on EFL learners' writings: A case of an Iranian context. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*.
- Amin, M. Y. M. (2017). Communication strategies and gender differences; A case study. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies (IJHCS) ISSN 2356-5926*, 4(3), 226-238.
- Amin, M. Y. M. (2017). English language teaching methods and reforms in English curriculum in Iraq; an overview. *Journal of the University of Human Development*, 3(3), 578-583.
- Amin, M. Y. M. (2018). The effectiveness of "Training course for English teachers in Iraqi Kurdistan" and improving teachers' confidence. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL*, 5(1).
- Amin, M. Y. M., & Mohammadkarimi, E. (2019). ELT students' attitudes toward the effectiveness of the anti-plagiarism software, Turnitin. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 3(5), 63-75.
- Druce, P. M. (2015). Attitudes to the Use of L1 and Translation in Second language Teaching and Learning (Part 2). *Journal of Second Language Teaching & Research*, 4(1), 154-175.
- Elmetwally, E. E. (2012). *Students' and teachers' attitudes toward the use of learners' mother tongue in English language classrooms in UAE public high schools* (Doctoral dissertation, The British University in Dubai (BUiD)).
- Halliwell, S., & Jones, B. (1991). *On Target: Teaching in the Target Language. Pathfinder 5. A CILT Series for Language Teachers*.
- Howatt, A. P. R. with HG Widdowson (2004) A history of English language teaching.
- Khoshnaw, S. I. H. (2014). *An Investigation into the Use of L1 in EFL Classes in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq* (Master's thesis, Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU)-Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi (DAÜ)).
- Krashen, S. (1981). Second language acquisition. *Second Language Learning*, 3(7), 19-39.
- Mahadeo, S. K. (2013). The L1 in L2 Learning: Mauritian Teachers' Beliefs and Attitudes. In *The European Conference on Language Learning, University of Mauritian, Mauritian*.



@ 2022 by the author. Licensee University of Chitral, Journal of Linguistics & Literature, Pakistan. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).