

CODE-SWITCHING: AN EMERGENT LANGUAGE POLICY & ATTITUDES OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS AND LEARNERS

Afsheen Kashifa

Department of English Language Teaching ELT NUML, Islamabad, Pakistan (currently pursuing Ph.D.in English Linguistics, NUML, Islamabad)
akashifa@numl.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Code-switching is the practice flashing between two or more languages in conversation. The tenacity of the present research is to explore the opinions of English language instructors and learners about the practice of code-switching during English language classes at the university level. For this purpose, Mixed-research approach was employed, and data was collected from 200 English language instructors and students through designed questionnaire and interview schedule at English department in National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad. Speech accommodation theory by Howard Giles and Markedness Model by Carol Myers Scotton were used as a theoretical framework. Symbol L1 was used for native language and L2 for foreign language. The results showed that cultural and social understanding is possible if concepts are taught and learnt in an understandable way. The learning and teaching of L2 also becomes easier when it is taught and learnt by using a language which brings ease to the learners. It was concluded that code-switching is not a threat to L2 rather an add-on which polishes the language skills of the learners and reduces the burden of teaching and learning as well.

Keywords: Code-Switching, Language, Code-Mixing, Instructors, Learners, Attitudes

INTRODUCTION

Learning a new language is not a simple task. It takes courage to step out of the comforts of your mother tongue and learn something entirely new. English is an international and most learned language of the world. For native speakers, it's relatively easy to understand the concepts and to get a full grasp over them. On the other hand, for non-native speakers, learning English is fairly a big challenge. They have to overcome the challenge and to get ease that comes with their mother tongue. To make sure that learners get over their primary language, a learning environment must be ensured that is agreeable and flexible for both students and teachers. Code-switching is a method that may be used to enhance understanding among learners. Numan, Carter, and Sert (2001) define this term as "a phenomenon of switching from one language to another in the same discourse" (p. 275). Sert further defines the concept and application of it in language teaching discourses produced by the teachers and students (2005).

This paper primarily investigates the concept of code-switching from a language instructors and learner's point of view. Many linguists are of the view that this method should not be considered a hindrance and can be used in heterogeneous English classrooms. Cook (1989:1991) explains the very idea as a teaching method practiced in second language learning for the development of the learners with the help of language samples (Cook, 1989:1991).

This article investigates the situations and purposes of practicing the teaching method by English professors in their classes.

Research Question

This research stressed on the question, under what situations code-switching is practiced by English teachers and what are their impacts upon students during English language class?

Research Objectives

This research has the following objectives.

1. To determine a general opinion among English tutors about the practice of code-switching in the classroom.
2. The amount of understanding and comprehension among pupils when their primary language is practiced as the medium of instruction.

Significance of the Research

The current research has linguistic significance in helping the students who speak different languages and learn the new language. The English language teachers switch the code considering it an efficient way for students to grasp the concepts of an entirely foreign language. This research also contributes in acknowledging a teacher's capability to teach the target language, effectively.

Statement of the Problem

English is hailed as an official language in Pakistan like the countries of the whole world. People are encouraged to learn English to efficiently communicate in their respective fields. It is especially hard for those who had completed their early education in institutions where Urdu is used as the primary language. To break this language barrier at later stages of education, code-switching seems to be a promising methodology.

The use of L1 (native language) while teaching L2 (foreign language) has always been a topic of debate among linguists. Haliwell and Jones (1991) argue that in the absence of one's primary language, a new language could be learned effectively. This raises the question of understanding a totally new idea on the learner's part without having any prior knowledge of the concept in question. On the other hand, notable figures like Atkinson (1987) support the usage of L1 while teaching L2. He claims that using a person's familiar language proves to be a fruitful learning tool. Additionally, code-switching may save a teacher's time and energy since it can help the students understand better as supported by Clanflone (2009).

The paper emphasizes on the use of native language from an English teacher's point of view. Teachers not only help their pupils in learning English but create an enabling environment for themselves as well. Bista (2010) states that "An important teaching skill is the ability to transfer knowledge to students in a clear and efficient manner, and so code-switching can be a useful tool in the classroom for both teachers and students" (p.1).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Language; Some Preliminary Concerns

In simplest words, language is the medium through which we communicate with others. Throughout history, different scholars and linguists have tried to define language since it cannot be singularly stated. According to Donald (2021) to express the ideas, emotions, thoughts, desires, and feelings, the mod of language is used by human beings. Chomsky (2002) says that language is considered the inherent capability of the native speakers to understand and form grammatical sentences. These grammatical sentences form the basis of different cultural backgrounds, hence, different languages. Finocchiaro (1983) states that the system of arbitrary, vocal symbols is language that permits people in a given culture or other people who have learned the system of that culture, to communicate or to interact. Thus, language is bound by the masses who are familiar with it within a community. This also means that there may be more than one dialect that roots within a community.

Brown (2000) explains learning as "Acquiring knowledge and skills and having them readily available from memory so you can make sense of future problems and opportunities" (p. 12). This could be the closest definition of learning when language is the subject. Learning involves adding new information to one's already built memory while acquiring some entirely new elements. Learning a new language demands fluency in speech, writing, listening, and in some cases, character recognition too. The process of learning a new language is especially difficult when the native tongue is of a completely distinct nature and there are no or very few similarities. Thus, the native language helps the students to learn English in an impressive manner. The use of codes of a familiar language for the teaching of a foreign language leads to a new way of teaching called code-switching.

Code-Switching

Multilingual communities devise different strategies to have easy communication among their people and communities. Code-switching is also one such example. In a country like Pakistan, the national language is Urdu and English enjoys the status of being official, there exists a plethora of local languages. These local dialects vary from one place to other and they greatly hinder the learning process. To reduce this barrier, code-switching seems like a promising solution. No doubt, the mainstream literature about the teaching of English language supports instructions in monolingual and in some institutions, the English-only-policy is being practiced but in real, there are institutions where the use of L1 is a norm.

Milroy & Muysken state that method under discussion is “an alternative use by bilinguals of two or more languages in the same conversation” (1995, p.7). Code-switching is not a thing of new. It has been widely in use among the masses for different purposes. It has been often seen that individuals feel more comfortable among people with whom they share a common language. Aranoff and Miller (2003) explain the point as a communicative option available to a bilingual member of a speech community which is similar to switching between styles or dialects is an option for the monolingual speakers. According to Clyne (2000) code-switching takes place “when a bilingual introduces a completely unassimilated word from another language into his speech” (p.40). In addition to, Mayer (2001) argues “It is the selection of forms from an embedded variety (or varieties) in utterances of a matrix variety by bilinguals or multilingual during the same conversation” (p. 3).

Although the very teaching method, in general, seems harmful, there has always been a never-ending debate about the benefits of its usage. While some linguists are of the view that code-switching negatively affects a person’s learning, there are many who support it as well. Baker proclaims, “if a child does not have a social, motivational, educational or personal problem, do not immediately focus on bilingualism as the first cause” (2005, p.76). Moreover, negative perspectives on code changing keep on giving instructors, executives, and even guardians a reason for concern. Abad (2005) describes the concerns of the parents about the language development of the children. This may be the case considering that a person’s native language may act as an obstacle in the learning process. On the other hand, Metila (2016) considers the practice of the very method as a helping tool to improve class participation and better performance by the pupils in a relaxed classroom atmosphere. Thus, the technique is utilized to assemble great connections among individuals from a bilingual environment. Metila (2016) focuses on the contextual demand for the practice of code-switching as an appropriate and most acceptable way of learning. Through this way, instructor puts emphasis on the foreign language content by substituting to the native language of the apprentices. This may also guarantee further clarification of the concept at hand. In research, Metila interviewed the teachers to show that they had substituted the language of instruction with the local variety to make pupils to understand the content. Clearly, there is no one answer to this debate since it varies according to the situation.

In some of the communicative situations where code-switching takes place, there is a discussion of the matrix, the dominant or target language, and embedded or the L1 which is the cause of originating the switches, has always been made. (Younas,2020)

The concept and use of Code-switching have started in the early twentieth century through the observations made regarding bilingual research projects. Till the first half of the 20th century, code-switching has been taken an unconscious act that follows no logical sequences and patterns, therefore, results in a kind of imperfect second language learning (2000).

Muysken (2000) provided the *categories of code-switching* along with reasons for code-switching. Such as referential code-switching in which speakers make lexical choices from the dominant language.

For example, for the learning of English, learners make use of Urdu language and vice versa. Whereas in directive code-switching, a learner either tries to associate or dissociate from other speakers in a communicative act. The change in tone of a speaker’s tone, it is called phatic code-switching. In addition to this, in metalinguistic code-switching the speakers practice local languages to talk of specific concepts. But Howard Giles (1987) focuses on only two functions of code-switching either to associate or disassociate with the partners in the communication event. Apart from code-switching, there is another method used for the teaching of a foreign language called Code-Mixing.

Code-Mixing

Psycholinguistic studies define code-mixing as "the transition from using linguistic units like words, phrases, and clauses, of one language with those of another within a single sentence" (Sridhar and Sridhar 1980). A language or the system of communication within a community may be referred to as a code. Code-mixing usually occurs at word level which means a word is substituted with another word of a different language (Baker Jones, 2014). Code-mixing is used where the communicators do not have a common language between them. This was common in trade between two parties where they did not know the language of the place.

Code-mixing is often interchangeably used by code-switching. Both terms refer to occurrences composed of two or more unique elements and grammatical systems. Investigations characterizes the

method as a setting or blending of different etymological units of affixes, words, phrases, and clauses from two distinctive linguistic frameworks in one sentence and discourse setting. While code-switching refers to put or blend units of words, phrases and sentences from two distinct programs inside a similar discourse setting. As far as structural distinction between two methods is concerned, the former refers to a situation of adjusting components or the alteration of the codes at inter-sentential level and the later refers to intra-sentential or within a sentence alternation (Bokamba, 1988).

Use of Code-Switching in English Classes

Foreign language classes like English, where Urdu is the first language of students, they learn the second language only in class. That is why students tend to code mix while talking to each other and with the teacher. Sometimes even when talking only in Urdu, the use of words and phrases in English seems so unconscious and common that it is hardly felt. Similarly, teachers also tend to code-mix while teaching concepts. At first, the teachers try to convey concepts in target language i.e., English. Then, they may switch to the native language so as to know how much the students have grasped (Schweers, 1999 as cited in Ahmed, 2009).

The development of English as lingua franca has not only increased the significance of bilingualism, multilingualism and the use of code switching, but also considered it a ‘normal behavior’ (Lin, Ammar, Levin, & Dyer Levin, 2014). In addition to this, the practice of code-switching generates a ‘safe space’ for effective learning as said by Arther (1996). Which is denied those who protect English-only teaching approach which exhibits the practice of colonialism. Therefore, the discussions on code switching distinguish between monolingual and bilingual use of languages for the teaching of English. The former is in favor of using only English whereas the latter supports the use of Urdu for the teaching of English or vice versa. According to Bashir (2015) he problem had been solved by Stern (1992) who considered these two approaches as a continuum where the use of L1 is made possible in a unique and different way.

Though many researchers have criticized the excessive use of code switching at one hand, but they have also supported it on the hand, in particular situations such as stimulating language, judging comprehension, giving instructions, and making the explanations of grammar. (Yi- chun Pan ,2010).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Mix-method research defines the collection and analyses of qualitative and quantitative data simultaneously. According to Cresswell & Plano (2010) such type of data provides better understanding of research problem under investigation. Thus, the qualitative and quantitative data of the present research, have been collected through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, respectively. The questionnaires have been divided into sections containing the demographic information and questions of the research under investigation. The Likert scale instrument has been used having four options ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to disagree’ and distributed among native and non-native instructors of English at the department of English Language Teaching at National University of Modern Languages Islamabad.

Sample and Sampling Technique

The sample of the study is 200 respondents from the department of English language Teaching NUML, Islamabad. The data have been collected by using the Convenient Sampling Technique.

Tools of Data Collection and Data Analysis

The present investigation has been conducted by using both qualitative and quantitative methods. The survey for the investigation has been done through questionnaires consisting of closed-ended questions. The Questionnaire consisted of demographic information about respondents and research based 25 statements established to probe into the phenomenon under consideration. For this study, the teachers and students from the English department at NUML, Islamabad, have been selected as the respondents whose ages fall between 25-60 years. The questions have been asked regarding the use of L1 in explaining and learning different situations and cultural aspects.

Data were collected via a questionnaire as “they are easy to construct, extremely versatile, and uniquely capable of gathering a large amount of information quickly in a form that is readily process able” (Dornyei, 2009, p.1). Moreover, questionnaires provide information in a striking manner because they are efficient in terms of the researchers’ time, effort, and financial resources (Foddy, 1993). The questionnaire responses have been analyzed quantitatively primarily through descriptive statistics, especially in form of frequency distributions and percentages.

Semi-structured interviews have taken place as another instrument for collecting data which is considered a flexible tool as it allows the topic to be emerged during the conversation. Thus, English language lecturers and learners fluent in Urdu and English and some other languages like Punjabi, Saraiki and Sindhi have been interviewed. They have been asked the questions regarding practices of substituting the lexical in English classrooms, the impact of Urdu, attitudes of the pupils, instructors and changes they would like to suggest regarding the use of L1.

Theoretical Framework

The model or theory proposed by Howard Giles (1987) titled 'speech accommodation theory' and Markedness Model by Carol Myers Scotton (1988) have been used as the theoretical framework for the present research. This suggests that the choice of language by the speakers is rational because speakers switch the code to explore the possible language choices to accommodate others with an aspiration to be accommodated by others.

Data Collection and Analysis

According to Leach & Gillham (2008) the two sets of data, i.e., quantitative, and qualitative can be gathered from questionnaires and semi-structured interviews in convenient way. The questionnaire has been self-administered and incorporated background information about both types of respondents, i.e., teachers and students. The questions have been designed to investigate attitudes of instructors and learners regarding the use and impacts of Urdu in English classes.

The semi-structured interview conducted to get students attitudes about code-switching. As Denscombe (2010) proclaims that such an interview is flexible and useful for an in-depth exploration of the respondents' perspectives on an issue. The students of English of the research through random sampling were interviewed and questionnaires have been filled by 200 English language learners and teachers. The teaching faculty selected for this research keeps experience of 7 to 25 years. All respondents are fluent in Urdu and English, and local languages. The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed.

FINDINGS

Questionnaires

The 86% respondents (see appendix 1) said that they do switch the code and foreign teachers said that they do but in some cases like in explaining the cultural aspects and when students demand for the use of L1 in some cases.

The data (appendix 1) show that teachers have flexible attitude towards the use of English in English classrooms, particularly for the teaching of the rules of grammar. Side by side, they favor the use of L1 to some extent in the explanation of cultural and religious concepts which are different across languages and cultures. The teachers of English language do make use of L1 for the teaching of cultural concepts but remain stick to L2 for the teaching of phonetics and phonology, creative and academic skills. They use 30% Urdu in their classes except the foreigners who use Urdu in some situations. The reason for using L1 in English classes is that they have students from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds who have never been to English schools rather have studied English subjects in their regional languages. Therefore, teachers sometimes, use Urdu or L1 to make their students Understand the ideas in L2.

Attitudes of Learners

Students' attitudes towards teachers' use of native language have been measured through the Likert scale (SD, D, N, A, SA). The responses show that 50% pupils disagreed with the statement that they prefer teachers who use Urdu in English classes, but 50% of them have shown their agreement. Similarly, 60% didn't like idea of explaining grammar of English in Urdu but 40% agreed. 70 % respondents agreed that new vocabulary and terms should be explained in Urdu while 50 % have shown their disagreement to the use of Urdu instead English. 30 % agreed that remain more attentive when they are taught in Urdu and 20% were neutral. 50% pupils preferred exam instructions to be in both modes of English and Urdu because they are of the view that they can understand the questions more easily. In addition to this, 50 strongly opposed the idea that they like their fellows if they demand their teachers to speak English in the class. Eventually, these results indicate that the students have positive views about maximizing the use of English by instructors during their lessons but in some conditions, they prefer the use of L1 as well.

Attitudes of Students (Sample)

47% students disagreed that they prefer their teachers to ask questions in Urdu during lessons (37% though agreed). Also, 39% disagreed that they prefer to use Urdu when talking with their classmates, while 32% agreed. These responses do not suggest that students have negative attitudes towards use of Urdu during English lessons, but the disagreeing points are greater than the agreeing statements.

Interviews

The data have been gathered through semi-structured interviews via Google meet. The foreign and Pakistani English language learners have been interviewed. All of them teach and study at NUML, Islamabad. The common themes in the data which have been collected from the students and teachers of English department NUML have been described here.

Use of L1 by Teachers and students 2. Conditional Use of L1 or Use of Urdu

In the interview, only foreign English teachers said that they adopt an English-only approach. Whereas other instructors prefer English-only approach desirable, but sometimes it is unavoidable to make use of L1 because students have never been in any English environment during their academic career. Therefore, code-switching is an apt method of teaching L2.

Reasons for Using L1

During the interview, trainers have also identified quite a few reasons in favor of Urdu. For example, students feel shy while talking in English because of low confidence and use Urdu. Thus, the teachers have to accommodate their use of L1 to boost their confidence. Some other teachers said that they sometimes switch to Urdu to explain certain concepts which are different between these two languages, particularly, the use of vocabulary. While some other explained that sometimes religious and cultural differences become the reason for using Urdu in classes. Another reason for using Urdu in English classes pointed out by instructors is that an English-only approach puts pressure on pupils and hinders their participation. Thus, substituting lexical helps the students to be relaxed and participate in-class activities.

The respondents also claimed that their English teachers at their schools have taught them the subjects of English not only in Urdu but also in their regional languages. Therefore, they understand things more easily if Urdu is used at some levels. Eventually, the data showed that teachers (except the foreigners) do make use of Urdu in their classes for explaining particular concepts. In addition, instructors admitted that students also use Urdu during English classes though they discouraged as well.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study shows that respondents have expressed positive attitudes towards maximizing English by themselves, but they have also identified situations where they feel that using L1 is a great source of comprehension. For example, they express ideas in Urdu which they could not express in English. Moreover, Urdu is helpful in teaching of vocabulary. The participants aspire to speak English but due to less exposure to the English environment and low confidence, they use L1 or Urdu. These findings suggest the maximized use of English and minimized use of L1 or Urdu to become proficient speakers of English. L1 can be used as a tool for boosting up the confidence of the students in some situations without denying the role of L2 in English classrooms.

In the light of the arguments and data, the use of L1 for the teaching & learning of L2, a chicken and egg issue which does not lead to any conclusive conclusions. According to Hall & Cook (2012), L1 can be used as a resource which can support the learning L2. Thus, use of L1 doesn't dominate rather used for productive results. The data have also proved that the Code-switching is desirable and fruitful for the teaching of diverse cultural and religious concepts. For better communication skills, understanding plays a vital role which is possible through the use of L1 in diversified classrooms like English classrooms at NUML.

CONCLUSION

The present study conclusively suggests that a more moderate approach is desirable in this multilingual and multicultural world for more positive outcomes. Thus, the use of L1 would not maximize and surpass the use of L2 in English classes but a support in certain situations. Moreover, better cultural and social understanding is possible if concepts are taught and learnt in an understandable way. The learning and teaching of L2 also becomes easier when it is taught and learnt by using a language which brings

ease to the learners. Thus, code-switching is not a threat to L2 rather an add-on which polishes the language skills of the learners and reduces the burden of teaching and learning as well.

REFERENCES

- Abad, L. S. (2005). Code-switching in the classroom: A clash of two languages. *LEAPS: Miriam College Faculty Research Journal*, 25(1), 1-1.
- Abbas, F., Aslam, S., & Khan, R. A. M. (2011). *Code-mixing as a communicative strategy among the university level students in Pakistan*.
- Ahmad, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' Code-Switching in Classroom Instructions for Low English Proficient Learners. *English language teaching*, 2(2), 49-55.
- Arthur, J. (1996). Code switching and collusion: Classroom interaction in Botswana primary schools. *Linguistics and education*, 8(1), 17-33.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource? *ELT journal*, 41(4), 241-247.
- Bashir, A., & Naveed, A. (2015). The functions of code switching in ESL classroom discourse. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 6, 1-4.
- Baker, C. (2014). A Parents' and Teachers' Guide to Bilingualism. Multilingual Matters.
- Bista, K. (2010). Factors of Code-switching among Bilingual English Students in the University Classroom: A Survey. *Online Submission*, 9(29), 1-19.
- Bokamba, E. G. (1988). Code-mixing, language variation, and linguistic theory:: Evidence from bantu languages. *Lingua*, 76(1), 21-62.
- Brown, H. D. (2002). English language teaching in the "post-method" era: Toward better diagnosis, treatment, and assessment. *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*, 9, 18.
- Chomsky, N., & Noam, C. (2002). *On nature and language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cianflone, E., & Coppolino, R. (2011). An interdisciplinary module to teach English and Business Organization in a university-level vocational course. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 4(1).
- Clyne, M. (2000). Constraints on code-switching: How universal are they. *The bilingualism reader*, 257-280.
- Cook, V. (2002). *Language teaching methodology and the L2 user perspective*, Vivian cook. Portraits of the L2 user, 1, 325.
- Creswell, J. W., Klassen, A. C., Plano Clark, V. L., & Smith, K. C. (2011). Best practices for mixed methods research in the health sciences. Bethesda (Maryland): *National Institutes of Health*, 2013, 541-545.
- Denscombe, M. (2010). Questionnaires. *The good research guide: For small-scale social research projects*, 373.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Routledge.
- Finocchiaro, M., & Sako, S. (1983). *Foreign Language Testing: A Practical Approach*. Regents Publishing Company, Inc., 2 Park Ave., New York, NY 10016.
- Foddy, M., & Crundall, I. (1993). A field study of social comparison processes in ability evaluation. *British journal of social psychology*, 32(4), 287-305.
- Giles, H., Mulac, A., Bradac, J. J., & Johnson, P. (1987). Speech accommodation theory: The first decade and beyond. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 10(1), 13-48.
- Halliwell, S., & Jones, B. (1991). *On Target: Teaching in the Target Language*. Pathfinder 5. A CILT Series for Language Teachers.
- Lin, C. C., Ammar, W., Levin, L., & Dyer, C. (2014, October). The cmu submission for the shared task on language identification in code-switched data. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Computational Approaches to Code Switching* (pp. 80-86).
- Leach, M. J., & Gillham, D. (2008). Evaluation of the Evidence-Based practice Attitude and utilization Survey for complementary and alternative medicine practitioners. *Journal of evaluation in clinical practice*, 14(5), 792-798.
- McDonald, E. (2012). Aristotle, Saussure, Kress on speech and writing: Language as paradigm for the semiotic?. *Language & Communication*, 32(3), 205-215.

- Mayer, J. F. (2001). *Code-switching in Samoan: t-style and k-style*. University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Metila, R. A., Pradilla, L. A. S., & Williams, A. B. (2016). The challenge of implementing mother tongue education in linguistically diverse contexts: The case of the Philippines. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 25(5), 781-789.
- Milroy, J. (1995). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken, P., & Muysken, P. C. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (Ed.). (1998). *Codes and consequences: Choosing linguistic varieties*. Oxford University Press.
- Sert, O. (2005). *The Functions of Code-Switching in ELT Classrooms*. Online Submission, 11(8).
- Sridhar, S. N., & Sridhar, K. K. (1980). The syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual code mixing. *Canadian Journal of Psychology/Revue canadienne de psychologie*, 34(4), 407.
- Younas, M., Afzaal, M., Noor, U., Khalid, S., & Naqvi, S. (2020). Code-switching in ESL Teaching at University Level in Pakistan. *English Language Teaching*, 13(8), 63-73.

I. APPENDIX

Table: Attitudes of Instructors to L1

	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Use of Urdu enables you to express ideas that you cannot explain in English	0	5	4	4	2
2. Use of Urdu makes the communication between teacher and student more effective	0	2	5	6	2
3. Use of Urdu leaves a stronger impression in student's mind	0	5	2	4	4
4. Use of Urdu makes the topic of discussion more interesting for student	0	5	3	4	3
5. Use of Urdu ensures better understanding among students	0	10	2	1	3
6. My students encourage me to use Urdu when they are unable to understand something in English	0	6	3	4	2
7. Use of Urdu helps the students in memorizing the key points	0	4	3	6	2
8. Repeating my questions in Urdu after asking in English makes my students understand the question well	0	6	3	4	2
9. Students feel more comfortable if the instructions are given to them in Urdu	0	5	1	7	2
10. New concepts of English should be explained in Urdu	0	7	1	4	3
11. Rules of grammar should be explained in Urdu	0	2	1	6	6
12. I feel more confident if I use Urdu along with English while teaching	0	2	2	7	3

13. I encourage using Urdu in classroom when asked a question from students	0	6	2	5	2
14. Use of Urdu while teaching shows my lack of English knowledge in front of my students	0	6	3	3	3
15. I feel less creative if I use Urdu in English classes	0	6	2	5	2
16. I often use words from Urdu while teaching in English	0	6	0	7	2
17. I often start a sentence in English and switch to Urdu	2	5	2	4	2
18. I feel more comfortable while having a general conversation with my students in Urdu	0	4	2	8	1
19. I support my fellow colleagues to use for better understanding of students	0	7	2	3	3
20. Using Urdu in an English language class is an effective methodology	0	6	2	5	2

II. APPENDIX

Code-Switching; an Emergent Language Policy & Attitudes of English Language Instructors and Learners

Name: _____ Gender: _____
 Status: _____ Qualification: _____
 Institution: _____

Q1. Which subject do you mostly teach?

Q2. What is your mother language?

Q3. How long have you been in teaching profession?

- ~ 2 years • ~ 5 years • ~ 7 years
- More than 10 years

Q4. What percentages of your interactions with your students are?

In English _____ %

In Urdu _____ %

Q5. Use of Urdu enables you to express ideas that you cannot explain in English

- a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral
- d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q6. Use of Urdu makes the communication between teacher and student more effective

- a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral
- d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q7. Use of Urdu leaves a stronger impression in student's mind

- a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral
- d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q8. Use of Urdu makes the topic of discussion more interesting for students

- a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral
- d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q9. Use of Urdu ensures better understanding among students

- a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q10. My students encourage me to use Urdu when they are unable to understand something in English

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q11. Use of Urdu helps the students in memorizing the key points

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q12. Repeating my questions in Urdu after asking in English makes my students understand the question well

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q13. Students feel more comfortable if the instructions are given to them in Urdu

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q14. New concepts of English should be explained in Urdu

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q15. Rules of grammar should be explained in Urdu

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q16. I feel more confident if I use Urdu along with English while teaching

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q17. I encourage using Urdu in classroom when asked a question from students

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q18. Use of Urdu while teaching shows my lack of English knowledge in front of my students

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q19. I feel less creative if I use Urdu in English classes

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q20. I often use words from Urdu while teaching in English

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q21. I often switch to English while talking in Urdu in general

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q22. I often start a sentence in English and switch to Urdu

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q23. I feel more comfortable while having a general conversation with my students in Urdu

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q24. I support my fellow colleagues to use Urdu while teaching for better understanding of students

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree

Q25. Using Urdu in an English language class is an effective methodology

a) Strongly Agree b) Agree c) Neutral

d) Disagree e) Strongly Disagree