

# Code-switching Versus Target-language-only for English as a Foreign Language: Saudi Students' Perceptions

Mazeegha A. Al Tale<sup>1</sup> & Faten A. Alqahtani<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> English Department, Faculty of Languages and Translation, King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Mazeegha A. Al Tale, English Language Department, Faculty of Languages and Translation, King Khalid University, P.O. Box: 960, Abha, Asir, Postal Code: 61421, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Received: July 26, 2020

Accepted: August 6, 2020

Online Published: August 7, 2020

doi: 10.5539/elt.v13n9p18

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n9p18>

## Abstract

Selecting the medium of instruction to teach English as a Foreign Language (EFL) has been a controversial issue for several years. This article explores the impact of code-switching (CS) versus target-language-only (TL-only) teaching strategies on the learning and affective sustenance of EFL reading comprehension beginner students based on their perceptions. It also investigates whether there is a significant difference between the participants' perceptions of these two teaching strategies' possible impact on their learning and affective sustenance. Fifty-two female Saudi college students participated in the study. A questionnaire and follow-up interviews were used to collect the data. The results indicate that the participants had positive perceptions about the impact of CS on their learning and affective sustenance in the EFL reading classes as opposed to negative perceptions about TL-only instruction. The results also show that there is a significant difference between their perceptions of TL-only instruction and CS, indicating that they prefer CS to TL-only instruction in their EFL reading classes. We recommend that reading comprehension teachers for beginners utilize CS as a facilitating instructional strategy for EFL beginners to give them affective support and make the input more comprehensible.

**Keywords:** affective sustenance, code-switching, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction, reading comprehension, Saudi Arabia, target-language-only

## 1. Introduction

Learning a foreign language in a classroom setting takes place through a communication/interaction process between the students, who speak a prior native language, and the teacher, who teaches them a language that is not their own. During this communication process, the learners may reach different proficiency levels of the target language (TL). To solve the potential problem of a low level of English language proficiency in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, teachers may shift to the learners' native language to help them understand the meaning and structures of the target language to save time and lead to more effective learning (Cook, 2001).

This shift is called code-switching (CS), which is the alternation between the native language and the target language. As Maftoon and Amjadiparvar (2018) indicate, this alternation is "an unavoidable consequence of communication between different language varieties and has long been observed in multilingual communities" (p. 108). However, whether the students' native language should be used to teach a foreign language has been a controversial topic for several years.

Some applied linguists advocate the use of target-language-only (TL-only) instruction in EFL classrooms. Inspired by Krashen's comprehensible input hypothesis (Krashen, 1982), which calls for the exposure of EFL learners to comprehensible TL input, they consider this strategy an optimal one for ensuring the EFL/ESL learners' acquisition of the foreign/second language (Hall & Cook, 2012). They emphasize that it offers more exposure to the target language, primarily when the TL is taught in first language (L1) contexts (Cameron, 2001) and facilitates learning for beginners (Glisan & Donato, 2017). However, Kroll, Dussias, Bogulski, and Valdes-Kroff (2012) indicate that the TL-only instruction ignores the scientific fact that a previously learned language is present in the learners' minds, even when the focus is on the TL.

Researchers who have advocated alternating use of the first and target languages indicate that, by such alternation, the teachers perform various useful functions in the classroom that facilitate language learning (Bhatti, Shamsudin, & Said, 2018; Collier & Thomas, 2017; Mahdi & Al-Malki, 2019; Rabab'ah & Al-Yasin,

2017). Some researchers concluded that language instructors who favor bilingual instruction in the form of CS believe it to be a valuable and effective tool that fosters learning at beginner levels (Ahmed & Jusoff, 2009; Horasan, 2014; Sert, 2005). Al-Enezi (2018) argued in favor of CS over monolingual instruction for the sake of course-content clarity. His findings reveal that students are more attentive and less confused when teachers instruct them through CS. Some researchers have developed instructional approaches in this regard, such as translanguaging, multilingual teaching, and plurilingual education (Chumak-Horbatsch, 2012; García, 2009; Piccardo, 2013).

Reading comprehension plays a critical role in the acquisition and learning of any foreign language, and it is considered the scaffolding for the remaining language skills. It helps language learners to construct, contextualize, and comprehend any received information in the target language. EFL teachers tend to employ different instructional strategies to teach reading and facilitate reading comprehension in language classrooms. One of the critical factors that directly affect reading comprehension is the number of known words in a reading text. When all the words in a text are unknown to the reader, comprehension cannot take place. In the case of EFL learners, the CS strategy discussed above might be useful in this regard, especially for beginners. This study's objective is to investigate female EFL college reading comprehension beginners' perceptions regarding the effects of CS versus TL-only instruction on their learning and affective sustenance in the classroom.

There has been growing interest in the investigation of the perceptions of teachers and learners regarding CS versus TL-only instruction. For K-12 learners, Al-Nofaie (2010) investigated Saudi teachers' and students' attitudes in an intermediate female school in Jeddah toward using Arabic as a facilitating tool in English classes. The results show that the participants held positive attitudes toward that use in the EFL classrooms. The results also reveal that, although the teachers preferred using the native language for specific functions, they were reluctant to use it or allow students to use it.

Similarly, in Iran, Sa'd and Qadermazi (2015) investigated Iranian elementary EFL learners' and teachers' views on the use of L1. The findings reveal that, while most participants hold positive attitudes toward the judicious use of L1, a few prefer TL-only instruction. Bilgin (2016) studied the EFL student teachers' beliefs of their classroom CS used at a private school in Turkey. The study concluded that student teachers' use of CS could be an indicator of how they define themselves professionally, their beliefs and identity, and their rapport with supervisors. The researcher recommended the inclusion of CS as a topic in student-teacher education and supervisor training.

For CS in college-level EFL classrooms, Ahmed and Jusoff (2009) explored the perceptions of EFL communication course beginners in Malaysia concerning their teachers' use of CS and its effect on their affective support, learning success, and use of CS for future learning. The results show that beginners perceive CS as a positive strategy due to its useful functions. The researchers concluded that CS is an effective instructional strategy for those with low English proficiency. In 2011, Al-Shammari also investigated the attitudes of pre-intermediate college teachers and students in Madinah toward L1 use in the classroom. The results show that the majority of teachers and students have positive attitudes toward that use. They believe that L1 use is beneficial in explaining new vocabulary and difficult concepts.

Gulzar and Al-Asmari (2014) compared the attitudes of 100 faculty members and 100 students from Taif University English Language Center with regard to several CS exchanges. The results indicate that both teachers and learners share similar, relatively positive attitudes toward the use of CS, but vary in their views on the effectiveness of different functions of CS. The findings also indicate considerable differences in their awareness of CS and the idiosyncratic customs of CS in Saudi EFL university classrooms.

In Kuwait, Al-Rabah, Wu, Alotaibi, and Aldaihani (2016) explored the affective, sociolinguistic, and psycholinguistic factors that led to CS and EFL college teachers' attitudes. Although the teachers code-switched because of affective, sociolinguistic, and psycholinguistic factors, they generally held negative attitudes toward this strategy. The researchers recommended that language teacher education programs equip EFL graduates with suitable teaching methods and classroom practices to use L1 appropriately in EFL classrooms.

Al-Mohaimed and Almurshed (2018) investigated Saudi EFL female preparatory-year college students' attitudes and perceptions toward L1 use in English classrooms. The results show that, while elementary and intermediate students hold positive perceptions of CS in English classes, advanced students have a negative attitude toward it. In the same year, Ahmed, Radzuan, and Hussain (2018) investigated the perspectives of EFL higher education teachers and students on the use of Arabic in EFL classrooms. They found that both teachers and students hold positive attitudes toward CS. They recommended planned, occasional, and judicious use of L1 while teaching adult EFL learners. Nawawi (2018) highlighted the superiority of using Pedagogical Translation

Strategy, which is a translation between English and students' first language when teaching. He stated that the Pedagogical Translation Strategy is an essential instructional strategy for reading comprehension for the Management Study Program in the Faculty of Economics, and he recommended adopting this technique in EFL/ESL teaching.

More recently, Mahdi and Al-Malki (2019) studied Saudi EFL learners' perceptions of using CS in the classroom. They also analyzed CS's functions used by the teachers through a questionnaire that contained both open- and close-ended questions. The findings revealed negative perceptions about CS. They also revealed that EFL teachers use CS for several functions, such as helping low-level learners and streamlining different language activities. Maguddayao and Rosario (2019) also explored the views of 41 Grade 10 students and 5 teachers in the Philippines toward the practice and use of CS in ESL classrooms. The results revealed that teachers preferred CS since it helps them in classroom management, curriculum access, and building interpersonal relations with the students. The results also showed the students' positive attitude toward CS as an effective instructional strategy to clarify complex concepts and classroom interaction.

Although several studies have explored the attitudes and perceptions of learners about CS in Saudi EFL classes, none of them have compared college reading comprehension beginners' perceptions of CS versus TL-only instruction with respect to their learning and affective sustenance in the classroom. Hence, the present study is an attempt to add to the literature on CS versus TL-only instruction. The researchers hope that this paper will give EFL teachers useful insights into CS versus TL-only in their classrooms.

## 2. Research Questions

Based on the concepts of CS and TL-only instruction, the researchers' teaching experiences, and the related literature, this study addresses Saudi EFL learners' perceptions of the impact of CS versus TL-only instruction on their learning of reading and their affective sustenance in the classroom.

The specific research questions are as follows:

1. What are the perceptions of female Saudi EFL reading comprehension beginners at King Khalid University (KKU) about the impact of CS versus TL-only instruction on their learning and their affective sustenance in their reading comprehension course?
2. Are there significant differences between female Saudi EFL reading comprehension beginners' perceptions of CS versus TL-only instruction in their learning and affective sustenance in their reading comprehension course?

## 3. Methodology

This study employed a mixed-method research design to give an in-depth report of the participants' perceptions of CS versus TL-only instruction as teaching strategies and the effect of those two strategies on their learning and affective sustenance in the classroom.

### 3.1 Participants

The context of this study was a Saudi university female campus during the first academic semester of 2019-2020. It employs data obtained from 52 female Saudi EFL Level One reading comprehension students. Access to male students was not possible since they were taught by male teachers in a separate campus because of cultural constraints. The participants of this study were students in the English department, which offers a bachelor's degree in the English Language. Their ages ranged from 18 to 20 years old. They were taught by one of the researchers during that semester. They were representative of all Level One reading comprehension students during the semester. The participants were studying listening, speaking, reading, and writing English language skills. The researchers chose this specific level because they were novices at studying reading comprehension Level One, for which the prescribed book was the Well Read 1 Student Book: Skills and Strategies for Reading Student Guide series (Pasternak & Wrangell, 2007). Some of their teachers were bilingual, and others were native speakers of English who did not speak Arabic.

### 3.2 Materials

The researchers used two main tools to collect the data of this study. The first tool was a questionnaire designed to obtain the participants' perceptions of the effects of teachers' CS versus TL-only instruction on their affective sustenance in the classroom and their learning in a reading comprehension class (see Appendix A). Some items in the questionnaire are from Ahmed and Jusoff's (2009) questionnaire on CS. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part obtained the participants' demographic information. The second part consisted of 11 items arranged in a Likert scale ranging from 1 ("most unlike this") to 9 ("most like this"). The mean score according to this Likert scale has an equal interval length (0.89) with three levels: low level for the mean score in the interval

(1–3.67), moderate level for the mean score in the interval (3.67–6.33), and high level for the mean score in the interval (6.33–9) (see Table 1).

Table 1. Likert scale levels

Scale	Interval length	Lower	Upper	Level
1	0.89	[ 1.00	1.89]	Low (L)
2	0.89	[ 1.89	2.78]	
3	0.89	[ 2.78	3.67]	
4	0.89	[ 3.67	4.56]	Moderate (M)
5	0.89	[ 4.56	5.44]	
6	0.89	[ 5.44	6.33]	High (H)
7	0.89	[ 6.33	7.22]	
8	0.89	[ 7.22	8.11]	
9	0.89	[ 8.11	9.00]	

In addition to the questionnaire, interviews with 10 students were conducted to obtain an in-depth understanding of whether their teacher should use CS or TL-only in teaching them a reading comprehension course and why (see Appendix B). The 10 students were chosen from two classes taught by the same researcher. The researcher is bilingual and spent four weeks teaching one of the classes using CS and the other class using TL-only. A consent form was given to the 10 randomly selected students (See Appendix B).

### 3.3 Procedures

The researchers gave the questionnaire to three colleagues from the same department—two assistant professors and one associate professor to review it for validity. One of the researchers distributed the questionnaire. It was written both in Arabic and in English to ensure that participants did not face difficulty in understanding the items. The respondents had 15 minutes to fill in the questionnaires in class. The researchers also invited the students to ask for any clarification. In the same context, the researchers conducted semi-structured interviews with 10 participants to get a more accurate account of the students' perceptions. Each interview lasted between 5 and 10 minutes. Then, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program, version 23, was used to conduct descriptive statistics of the questionnaire responses and to conduct inferential statistics comparison tests (a paired t-test) to compare the participants' perceptions of the two instructional strategies. The researchers also used Microsoft Excel to draw the figures of the obtained results.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 CS versus TL-only Instruction and Learners' Learning

The results show that while the participants perceived CS as a strategy helping them to understand the course, learn difficult concepts and new vocabulary, and learn reading skills more effectively, they do not consider TL-only instruction as being equally effective (Table 2).

Table 2. Mean scores of learners' perceptions of CS versus TL-only impact on learning

Learning	Paired Differences					Sig. (2-tailed)
	CS	TL-only	MD	SD	t	
	M (Level)	M (Level)				
Understanding the course	7.02 (H)	3.00 (L)	4.04	4.3	6.8	.000
Learning difficult concepts	6.56 (H)	3.4 (L)	3.1	4.9	4.6	.000
Learning new vocabulary	6.62 (H)	3.4 (L)	3.2	5.1	4.6	.000
Learning reading skills more effectively	5.63 (M)	4.4 (M)	1.3	5.2	1.8	.085

Note. (L) = low level of preference; (M) = moderate level of preference; (H) = high level of preference

As shown in Table 2, while the participants' perception of CS as being helpful in understanding the course was high, they perceived TL-only as ineffective. The paired-samples t-test shows that the difference between the two perceptions is significant ( $t = 6.8, p = .000 = 51$ ). While their perception of CS as being effective in making difficult concepts easy to understand was high, their perception of TL-only instruction as being equally useful was low. The paired-samples t-test shows that the difference between the two perceptions is significant ( $t = 4.6, p = .000 = 51$ ).

Besides, while they perceived CS as having a positive impact on learning new vocabulary, their perception about TL-only instruction as having an equal impact was low. The paired-samples t-test shows that the difference between the two perceptions is significant ( $t = 4.6, p = .000 = 51$ ). Moreover, while their perception of the positive impact of CS on learning reading skills was at a medium level, their perception of TL-only instruction having an equal impact on learning reading skills was also at a medium level. However, the paired-samples t-test shows that the difference between the two perceptions is significant ( $t = 1.8, p = .085 = 51$ ).

#### 4.2 Code-switching and Learners' Affective Sustenance

The results show that the participants considered CS to be a strategy that gave them confidence, support, enjoyment, satisfaction, and comfort. They also considered it a strategy that made them less stressed and feel less lost during lectures. On the other hand, they did not perceive TL-only instruction as being equally useful. Table 3 shows these results.

Table 3. Mean scores of learners' perceptions of CS versus TL-only impact on learners' affective sustenance during lectures

Affective Sustenance	Paired Differences		MD	SD	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
	CS	TL-only				
Confidence	7.1 (H)	2.9 (L)	4.2	3.8	7.9	.000
Support	6.4 (H)	3.7 (L)	2.7	4.7	4.1	.000
Enjoyment	6.1 (M)	3.9 (M)	2.2	4.8	3.3	.002
Satisfaction	6.3 (H)	3.7 (M)	2.7	4.8	3.9	.000
Comfort	6.8 (H)	3.2 (L)	3.5	5.1	5.0	.000
Less stress	7.0 (H)	3.0 (L)	4.0	4.5	6.5	.000
Feeling less lost	6.9 (H)	3.1 (L)	3.8	4.5	6.1	.000

Note. (L) = low level of preference; (M) = moderate level of preference; (H) = high level of preference

As shown in Table 3, while the participants perceived CS as having a positive impact on their confidence, their perception of the impact of TL-only on that affective feeling was low. The paired-samples t-test shows that the difference between the two perceptions is significant ( $t = 7.9, p = .000 = 51$ ). Further, the participants perceived CS as positively supporting them in the classroom, whereas they perceived TL-only instruction as not equally effective. The paired-samples t-test shows that the difference between the two perceptions is significant ( $t = 4.1, p = .000 = 51$ ).

Additionally, students had a medium level of perception that CS had a positive impact on their enjoyment during lectures, and a medium level of perception of the same impact of TL-only instruction on that feeling of enjoyment. The paired-samples t-test shows that the difference between the two perceptions is significant ( $t = 3.3, p = .002 = 51$ ). Moreover, they had a high level of perception of CS having a positive impact on their satisfaction during lectures, whereas their perception of the TL-only instruction having the same impact was at a medium level. The paired-samples t-test shows that the difference between the two perceptions is significant ( $t = 3.9, p = .000 = 51$ ).

While they highly perceived CS as positively impacting their comfort during lectures, they did not perceive TL-only instruction as being equally useful. The paired-samples t-test shows that the difference between the two perceptions is significant ( $t = 5.0, p = .000 = 51$ ). While their perception of CS positively impacting their feeling of being less stressed was high, their perception of the impact of TL-only instruction on that feeling was low. The paired-samples t-test shows that the difference between the two perceptions is significant ( $t = 6.5, p = .000 = 51$ ).

Moreover, while their perception of CS as positively impacting their feeling of being less lost was high, their perception of the TL-only instruction as being equally useful was low. The paired-samples t-test shows that the difference between the two perceptions is significant ( $t = 6.1, p = .000 = 51$ ).

#### 4.3 Interviews

One of the researchers conducted interviews with ten of the participants. Five of them were from the CS class and five were from the TL-only class. The first interview question was whether they would prefer the teacher to code-switch or teach them through TL-only instruction. The second question was to give reasons for their preferences. Most of the interviewees reported that their teachers should use the CS strategy in reading classes. Only a few of them reported that they should use TL-only instruction. The following table shows this result.

Table 4. Mean scores of the responses to the interview questions

Interviewees	N	With CS		With TL-only	
		No.	Percent	No.	Percent
CS class	5	4	40	1	10
TL-only class	5	4	40	1	10
Total	10	8	80	2	20

As shown in Table 4 above, the majority of the students (80%) favored being taught through CS, while only a few (20%) felt they needed to be taught only in the target language. Those interviewees who preferred CS think that it is a helpful strategy for them since they are beginners and do not have adequate language competency to comprehend the target language easily. They also reported that CS makes their language learning process smoother, with less psychological barriers. They added that a reading comprehension course needs the teacher's CS, since it depends on comprehension, and, for them as beginners, it takes time to comprehend any received information in the target language, especially unfamiliar words. One of the interviewed students had studied the same course before with a teacher who did not code-switch. She reported that now, being with a bilingual teacher who did code-switch, it was easier for her to understand the course.

The few interviewees (20%) who reported that they prefer TL-only instruction think that they are language learners and that it is essential to be taught only in the target language. When the teacher speaks only in the TL, they think that she will give the learners an excellent opportunity to listen to and learn the TL, and provide learners with the necessity of learning the language. They added that it is for the good for the students that the teacher spoke in the TL, and that they will learn it faster and start thinking in that language. The interviewees added that it is their responsibility as language learners to make efforts to translate and learn the TL. They believe that the teacher should use only the TL in the classroom, considering her to be a source for that language.

#### 5. Discussion and Conclusion

There is a significant difference between female Saudi EFL reading comprehension beginners' perceptions of CS versus TL-only instruction in favor of the former. Regarding the effects of CS to Arabic on their learning, the results reveal that generally, the majority of participants believe that CS in class makes it easy for them to understand the course and to learn difficult concepts and new vocabulary. These findings are in line with Al-Shammari's (2011) conclusion that college beginners see CS as helpful in understanding new vocabulary and difficult concepts. They are similar to the previous studies that consider CS to be a beneficial tool in accelerating learners' language learning process, particularly for beginners, to whom most of the skills are new (Modupeola, 2013). Modupeola (2013) concludes that CS in EFL classrooms would help language learners to start from the "known to the unknown" (p. 93). Cook (2001) also indicates that teachers can utilize learners' native language when teaching new vocabulary. Furthermore, McMillan and Rivers (2011) state that the use of the native language in the classrooms can enhance L2 learning. Finally, Zhao and Macaro (2014) recommend that CS, compared to TL-only instruction, might lead to better vocabulary learning.

Regarding the effects of CS to Arabic on their affective sustenance, most respondents see CS as a strategy that gives them more confidence and support in EFL language classrooms; CS helps them enjoy the lecture and makes them satisfied, comfortable, less stressed, and feel less lost during the lecture. The interview results also indicate that the vast majority of the interviewed participants prefer their teacher's CS over TL-only instruction to teach them reading skills. They reported that they are beginners and need the input to be more comprehensible to them. This reasoning supports Krashen's (1982) comprehensible input hypothesis, in which he states that the TL input should be only one level above the learners' current level (+1) to be comprehensible to them. They also think that CS makes their language learning process more accessible with fewer psychological barriers, supporting Meyer's

(2008) conclusion that "the primary role of the students' L1 in the language classroom is lowering affective filters" (p. 147). Their positive perception of the teacher's CS supports Bensen and Çavusoglu's (2013) conclusion that language learners prefer the teacher's CS for instructional reasons. It is natural and rational that using the mother tongue in a new learning environment gives positive affective support to beginners.

As seen in the above sections, EFL reading comprehension beginners' perceptions of CS as a teaching strategy is immensely positive compared with their perceptions of the TL-only instruction, which is highly negative. These findings indicate their need, as beginners, of a CS strategy to give them affective support in the classroom, and to serve as a torch that guides them to the unknown meanings of the target language's new vocabulary and difficult concepts, thus making it more comprehensible to them.

## 6. Implications, Limitations, and Recommendations

The findings of the study have practical implications for teaching EFL/ESL reading comprehension. Based on these results, EFL teachers might code-switch to EFL beginners' native language to create a more supportive learning environment and make the input that students receive more comprehensible so that they can internalize it quickly. However, teachers should remind the beginner students that this strategy is just to help them understand the new vocabulary and difficult concepts, and that they must concentrate on the target language, using the teachers' CS only to understand the target language. This paper also recommends that EFL teachers should be aware of their students' perceptions of code-switching and code-switch when appropriate. Wang (2017) indicates that teachers' use of CS should be lowered to the minimum to focus on target language learning.

The present study has some limitations that should be addressed in future research. First, the study was conducted on two beginner classes of a reading comprehension course. To support or reject the findings of the study, researchers can further investigate the students' perceptions of CS versus TL-only as an instructional strategy for teaching listening, writing, and speaking skills to beginners. The second limitation is that the study dealt with only female beginners. To complement the findings of this study, researchers can research male Saudi EFL students. A third limitation is obtaining the perceptions of students only. Thus, further researchers can also study the perceptions of both students and teachers on CS versus TL-only instruction in Saudi EFL beginner classrooms. A fourth limitation is that the study was conducted on EFL beginners only. Further researchers can compare between beginners' and advanced learners' perceptions of CS versus TL-only instruction. With more research on CS versus TL-only instruction for teaching beginners, some theoretical conclusions about CS and EFL teaching will arise.

## References

- Ahmed, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' code-switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 49–55. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n2p49>
- Ahmed, I., Radzuan, N. R. M., & Hussain, M. S. (2018). Use of first language in the classroom: Non-native EFL teachers' beliefs in teaching English to adult learners in bilingual context. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no2.13>
- Al-Enezi, M. (2018). Investigating Saudi medical students' attitudes towards English-Arabic code-switching in classroom instruction. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 14(1), 142–160.
- Al-Mohaimed, M. S., & Almurshed, H. M. (2018). Foreign language learners' attitudes and perceptions of L1 use in L2 classroom. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(4), 433–446. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no4.32>
- Al-Nofaie, H. (2010). Attitudes toward code-switching as facilitating tool in English classes. *Journal of Novitiate-Royal*, 4(1), 64–95.
- Al-Rabah, S., Wu, S. H., Alotaibi, A. M., & Aldaihani, H. A. (2016). English teachers' use of learners' L1 (Arabic) in college classrooms in Kuwait. *English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n1p1>
- Al-Shammari, M. M. (2011). The use of the mother tongue in Saudi EFL classrooms. *Journal of International Education Research*, 7(4), 95–102. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jier.v7i4.6055>
- Bensen, H., & Çavusoglu, Ç. (2013). Reasons for the teachers' uses of code-switching in adult EFL classrooms/Yetiskinlere Yönelik İngilizce Sınıflarında Öğretmenlerin Dil Degisimi Kullanimlarinin Sebepleri. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(2), 69.
- Bhatti, A., Shamsudin, S., & Said, S. B. (2018). Code-Switching: A useful foreign language teaching tool in EFL classrooms. *English Language Teaching*, 11(6), 93. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n6p93>

- Bilgin, S. S. (2016). Code switching in English language teaching (ELT) teaching practice in Turkey: Student teacher practices, beliefs and identity. *Educational Research and Reviews, 11*(8), 686–702.
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733109>
- Chumak-Horbatsch, R. (2012). *Linguistically appropriate practice: A guide for working with young immigrant children*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. P. (2017). Validating the power of bilingual schooling: Thirty-two years of large-scale, longitudinal research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 37*, 203–217. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190517000034>
- Cook, V. J. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(3), 402–423. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Glisan, E. W., & Donato, R. (2017). *Enacting the Work of Language Instruction: High-Leverage Teaching Practices*. Alexandria, VA: ACTFL.
- Gulzar, M. A., & Al-Asmari, A. (2014). Code switching: Awareness amongst teachers and students in Saudi universities EFL classrooms. *Higher Education of Social Science, 6*(2), 1–13.
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching, 45*, 271–308. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000067>
- Horasan, S. (2014). Code-switching in EFL classrooms and the perceptions of the students and teachers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 10*, 31–45.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Child-adult differences in second language acquisition: Series on issues in second language research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Kroll, J. F., Dussias, P. E., Bogulski, C. A., & Valdes-Kroff, J. (2012). Juggling two languages in one mind: What bilinguals tell us about language processing and its consequences for cognition. In B. Ross (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 56, pp. 229–262). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-394393-4.00007-8>
- Maftoon, P., & Amjadiparvar, A. (2018). Teachers' code-switching in EFL classes: Deficiency or asset? *Journal of Meaning and Sign, 1*(1), 107–127.
- Maguddayao, R., & Rosario, O. (2019). Code switching of English language teachers and students in an ESL classroom. *The Asian EFL Journal, 21*(2.3), 102–122.
- Mahdi, A., & Al-Malki, M. S. (2019). Teachers' perceptions towards pedagogical implications of code switching: Saudi EFL classroom context in focus. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 7*(3), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0703001>
- McMillan, B. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2011). The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes toward “English only.” *System, 39*(2), 251–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.011>
- Meyer, H. (2008). The pedagogical implications of L1 use in the L2 classroom. *Maebashi Kyodai Gakuen College Ronshu, 8*, 147–159.
- Modupeola, O. R. (2013). Code-Switching as a teaching strategy: Implication for English language teaching and learning in a multilingual society. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 14*(3), 92–94. <https://doi.org/10.9790/1959-1439294>
- Nawawi, N. (2018). Improving students' reading comprehension through pedagogical translation strategy (An action research to students of faculty of economics Universitas Mataram). *The Asian EFL Journal, 20*(10), 176–191.
- Pasternak, M., & Wrangell, E. (2007). *Well-read skills & strategies for reading*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Piccardo, E. (2013). Plurilingualism and curriculum design: Toward a synergic vision. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(3), 600–614. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.110>
- Rabab'ah, G., & Al-Yasin, N. F. (2017). English-Arabic code switching in Jordanian EFL teachers' discourse. *Dirasat Human and Social Sciences, 43*(2), 313–328. <https://doi.org/10.35516/0103-044-004-019>

- Sa'd, S. H. T., & Qadermazi, Z. (2015). L1 use in EFL classes with English-only policy: Insights from triangulated data. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 5(2), 159–175.
- Sert, O. (2005). The functions in code-switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11(8), 1–6.
- Wang, X. (2017). Comparative study on instructors' and students' code-switching in an EFL class. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 13(8), 44–53. <https://doi.org/10.3968/9934>
- Zhao, T. & Macaro, E. (2014). What works better for the learning of concrete and abstract words: Teachers' L1 use or L2-only explanations? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26(1), 75–98. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12080>
- Ahmed, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' code-switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 49–55. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n2p49>
- Ahmed, I., Radzuan, N. R. M., & Hussain, M. S. (2018). Use of first language in the classroom: Non-native EFL teachers' beliefs in teaching English to adult learners in bilingual context. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no2.13>
- Al-Enezi, M. (2018). Investigating Saudi medical students' attitudes towards English-Arabic code-switching in classroom instruction. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 14(1), 142–160.
- Al-Mohaimed, M. S., & Almurshed, H. M. (2018). Foreign language learners' attitudes and perceptions of L1 use in L2 classroom. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(4), 433–446. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no4.32>
- Al-Nofaie, H. (2010). Attitudes toward code-switching as facilitating tool in English classes. *Journal of Novitiate-Royal*, 4(1), 64–95.
- Al-Rabah, S., Wu, S. H., Alotaibi, A. M., & Aldaihani, H. A. (2016). English teachers' use of learners' L1 (Arabic) in college classrooms in Kuwait. *English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n1p1>
- Al-Shammari, M. M. (2011). The use of the mother tongue in Saudi EFL classrooms. *Journal of International Education Research*, 7(4), 95–102. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jier.v7i4.6055>
- Bensen, H., & Çavusoglu, Ç. (2013). Reasons for the teachers' uses of code-switching in adult EFL classrooms/Yetiskinlere Yönelik İngilizce Sınıflarında Öğretmenlerin Dil Degisimi Kullanimlerinin Sebepieri. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(2), 69.
- Bhatti, A., Shamsudin, S., & Said, S. B. (2018). Code-Switching: A useful foreign language teaching tool in EFL classrooms. *English Language Teaching*, 11(6), 93. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n6p93>
- Bilgin, S. S. (2016). Code switching in English language teaching (ELT) teaching practice in Turkey: Student teacher practices, beliefs and identity. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(8), 686–702.
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733109>
- Chumak-Horbatsch, R. (2012). *Linguistically appropriate practice: A guide for working with young immigrant children*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. P. (2017). Validating the power of bilingual schooling: Thirty-two years of large-scale, longitudinal research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 203–217. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190517000034>
- Cook, V. J. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402–423. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Glisan, E. W., & Donato, R. (2017). *Enacting the Work of Language Instruction: High-Leverage Teaching Practices*. Alexandria, VA: ACTFL.
- Gulzar, M. A., & Al-Asmari, A. (2014). Code switching: Awareness amongst teachers and students in Saudi universities EFL classrooms. *Higher Education of Social Science*, 6(2), 1–13.
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 45, 271–308. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000067>
- Horasan, S. (2014). Code-switching in EFL classrooms and the perceptions of the students and teachers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10, 31–45.

- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Child-adult differences in second language acquisition: Series on issues in second language research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Kroll, J. F., Dussias, P. E., Bogulski, C. A., & Valdes-Kroff, J. (2012). Juggling two languages in one mind: What bilinguals tell us about language processing and its consequences for cognition. In B. Ross (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 56, pp. 229–262). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-394393-4.00007-8>
- Maftoon, P., & Amjadiparvar, A. (2018). Teachers' code-switching in EFL classes: Deficiency or asset? *Journal of Meaning and Sign*, 1(1), 107–127.
- Maguddayao, R., & Rosario, O. (2019). Code switching of English language teachers and students in an ESL classroom. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 21(2.3), 102–122.
- Mahdi, A., & Al-Malki, M. S. (2019). Teachers' perceptions towards pedagogical implications of code switching: Saudi EFL classroom context in focus. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 7(3), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0703001>
- McMillan, B. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2011). The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes toward “English only.” *System*, 39(2), 251–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.011>
- Meyer, H. (2008). The pedagogical implications of L1 use in the L2 classroom. *Maebashi Kyodai Gakuen College Ronsyu*, 8, 147–159.
- Modupeola, O. R. (2013). Code-Switching as a teaching strategy: Implication for English language teaching and learning in a multilingual society. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 14(3), 92–94. <https://doi.org/10.9790/1959-1439294>
- Nawawi, N. (2018). Improving students' reading comprehension through pedagogical translation strategy (An action research to students of faculty of economics Universitas Mataram). *The Asian EFL Journal*, 20(10), 176–191.
- Pasternak, M., & Wrangell, E. (2007). *Well-read skills & strategies for reading*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Piccardo, E. (2013). Plurilingualism and curriculum design: Toward a synergic vision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 600–614. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.110>
- Rabab'ah, G., & Al-Yasin, N. F. (2017). English-Arabic code switching in Jordanian EFL teachers' discourse. *Dirasat Human and Social Sciences*, 43(2), 313–328. <https://doi.org/10.35516/0103-044-004-019>
- Sa'd, S. H. T., & Qadermazi, Z. (2015). L1 use in EFL classes with English-only policy: Insights from triangulated data. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 5(2), 159–175.
- Sert, O. (2005). The functions in code-switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11(8), 1–6.
- Wang, X. (2017). Comparative study on instructors' and students' code-switching in an EFL class. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 13(8), 44–53. <https://doi.org/10.3968/9934>
- Zhao, T. & Macaro, E. (2014). What works better for the learning of concrete and abstract words: Teachers' L1 use or L2-only explanations? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26(1), 75–98. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12080>

**Appendix A**

Dear learners,

This questionnaire is designed to obtain information about your perceptions of the teachers’ CS versus TL-only instruction in reading comprehension class. There are no correct or wrong answers. Your answers will be highly confidential and used only for research purposes. Please answer all questions as accurately as you can.

Code-switching refers to the alternate use of the first language and the target language. In your case, to code-switch from English to Arabic. TL-only instruction refers to the use of only the English language in the classroom.

Part 1: Demographic information (Required):

Name and ID ..... Age: .....Level: .....

Part 2: Answer the following questions by simply giving a tick where appropriate.

Item No	A	B
1	Code-switching to Arabic by my teacher encourages me gives me more confidence to participate in class.	Using only the target language (English) by my teacher gives me more confidence to participate in class.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
2	Code-switching to Arabic by my teacher in class makes it easy for me to learn difficult concepts.	Using only the target language (English) makes it easy for me to learn difficult concepts.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
3	Code-switching to Arabic by my teacher in class makes it easy for me to understand the course.	Using only the target language (English) by my teacher in class makes it easy for me to understand the course.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
4	Code-switching to Arabic by my teacher in class helps me understand new vocabulary.	Using only the target language (English) by my teacher in class helps me understand new vocabulary.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
5	Code-switching to Arabic by my teacher in class is supportive to me.	Using only the target language (English) by my teacher in class is supportive to me.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
6	Code-switching to Arabic by my teacher in class helps me enjoy the lecture.	Using only the target language (English) by my teacher in class helps me enjoy the lecture.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
7	Code-switching to Arabic by my teacher in class makes me feel satisfied during the lecture.	Using only the target language (English) by my teacher in class makes me feel satisfied during the lecture.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
8	Code-switching to Arabic by my teacher in class makes me feel comfortable during the lecture.	Using only the target language (English) by my teacher in class makes me feel comfortable during the lecture.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
9	Code-switching to Arabic by my teacher in class helps me feel less stressed.	Using only the target language (English) by my teacher in class helps me feel less stressed.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	

10	Code-switching to Arabic by my teacher in class makes me feel less lost during the lesson.	Using only the target language (English) by my teacher in class helps me feel less lost during the lesson.
	Most like this _____ Most like this _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
11	Code-switching to Arabic by my teacher in class makes me learn the reading skills more effectively.	Using only the target language (English) by my teacher in class makes me learn the reading skills more effectively.
	Most like this _____ Most like this _____ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	

**Appendix B**

A. Interview guide:

1. Do you think that your teacher should code-switch to Arabic during Reading Comprehension lectures? Why?
2. Do you think that your teacher should use only the target language in teaching you Reading Comprehension course? Why?

B. Consent form:

**Consent Form for Interviews:**

**A comparative study of TL-only instruction vs. Code Switching Instruction**

If you are happy to participate then please complete and sign the form below. Please initial the boxes below to confirm that you agree with each statement:

*Please Initial box:*

I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason and without bearing any negative consequences. In addition, if I do not wish to answer any particular question or questions, I am free to leave it.

I understand that my responses will be kept strictly confidential. I understand that my name will not be linked with the research materials, and will not be identified or identifiable in the report or reports that result from the research.

I agree for this interview to be tape-recorded. I understand that the audio recording made of this interview will be used only for analysis, and that extracts from the interview, from which I would not be personally identified, may be used in any conference presentation, report or journal article developed as a result of the research. I understand that no other use will be made of the recording without my written permission, and that no one outside the research team will be allowed access to the original recording.

I agree that my anonymised data will be kept for future research purposes such as publications related to this study after the completion of the study.

I agree to take part in this interview.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of participant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Principal Investigator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

**Copyrights**

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).