Code-switching in EFL Classroom Settings: A Review from Teachers' and Students' Outlook

Iwan Fauzi

Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia

Contact:	Iwan Fauzi	✉	i_fauzi@edu.upr.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The use of code-switching in English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) classrooms has considerably occupied serious discussions. Most language researchers consider whether to use only the target language exclusively or to use it alongside the first language in foreign language classrooms. This paper reviews 15 empirical studies investigating the code-switching in the different EFL classroom settings and culture regarded English as second and foreign languages. There are three main things that this paper wants to seek for the answer from those studies viewed from teachers' and students' outlook; those are the perception, the function, and the strategy to generate learning success from the code-switching. The results show that code-switching provides the chance for the lower proficiency level of English learners to feel secure in expressing what they want to speak, but not for those who belong to high proficiency level ones. Besides, code-switching tends to function as classroom management, but the over-functioning of code-switching in the EFL classroom can only hinder learners from receiving comprehensible input of English. Of all, the most important highlight from this paper is that the more the mother tongue is used the worse the success of learning English.

Introduction

Over the past two decades, the study of code-switching has attracted a lot of attention from academics. Switching between different languages, or even different varieties or registers of the same language, is an increasingly common linguistic phenomenon. It has also been used more frequently orally rather than in writing (Gardner-Chloros, 2009). There has been an increase of academic curiosity about bilingual speech phenomena, particularly code-switching (Auer, 2013). For this reason, studies on bilingualism naturally concentrate heavily on this aspect of the phenomenon.

Code-switching is commonly indicated as "a speech style in which fluent (i.e., simultaneous) bilinguals move in and out of two (or more) languages" (MacSwan, 2014). Code-switching, as defined by Clyne (2011), occurs when a speaker (or writer) shifts between several languages or dialects. When one person in a conversation employs one language and the other responds in another, a linguistic shift is taking place. Some linguists argued that code-switching phenomenon shows a person who is deficient in a certain language

competence. However, it was found that code-switching is a common way for bilingual people to talk to each other, but it takes a lot of bilingual skill to do well (Muysken, 2000).

Then, to switch Meisel (1994) confirms the term code-switching by emphasizing the speaker's pragmatic and grammatical proficiency. He also affirmed that code-switching shows the speaker's capacity to choose a language based on the interlocutor, situation, topic, and more. Code-switching, he argued, is an expression of the speaker's language ability within an interactional sequence in a way that follows sociolinguistic rules and does not violate certain grammatical constraints. For instances, there can be seen when the two languages (e.g.: English and Indonesian) are identical in grammatical construction such as subject-verb-complement or subject-verb-object where from both languages there is no violation on the parts of construction switched since they are equivalent to one another.

There have been many in-depth arguments about the pros and cons of code-switching in second and foreign language schools, as well as whether or not the target language should be used exclusively. Early scholars argue that code-switching should be prohibited in second language classes since it can impede learning. This stands on the premise that students may rely too heavily on their teachers' code-switching (Chaudron, 1989; Ellis, 1984; Fillmore, 1985). In new second-language linguistic situations, code-switching may reduce second-language learners' desire to learn and their ability to predict and to infer. Code-switching may lead to confusion, error fossilization, and internalization in learners. Frequent usage of code-switching could affect how learners express themselves in the second language later on (Martin-Jones, 2000).

For language educators, such as Burenhult and Flyman (1999), Cook (2001), Levine (2003), and Sert (2005) believe that sometimes it is easier to explain something in the first language. For this reason, code-switching saves time and makes it easier for learners to understand. Due to their perception that the second language is not difficult to learn, learners found that code-switching was a motivating factor in learning it (Greggio & Gil, 2007; Levine, 2003).

Some important key terms and concepts related to code-switching, such as the term and concept, the nature of code-switching and its use in bilingual classroom contexts, and its functions in EFL classroom setting will be highlighted in literature review. Most language researchers refer to speakers of two or more languages as "bilingual" and "multilingual" respectively (McArthur as cited in Shay, 2015). In his view, the term "bilingual" refers to those who are fluent in more than one language, while the term "bilingualism" refers to the ability to speak two languages or the colloquial usage of more than one language regularly (Fabbro, 1999). Yet, the term "bilingual" is often used interchangeably with "multilingual," because the latter implies knowledge of more than two languages. Taking for example, most people in Indonesia are multilingual albeit at least they are bilingual. Since they are bilingual, they have ability to speak more than one language; at least their mother tongue and national language (Indonesian). To be multilingual, people can speak many more regional languages instead of foreign languages. Therefore, Indonesian people are very susceptible to code switching their speech.

Since code-switching is an unseparated part from the bilingual context, patterns of code-switching are also constrained by bilingual ability. According to Poplack (1980) highly proficient bilinguals prefer complicated intra-sentential code-switches and are more consistent, while less proficient bilinguals tend to restrict switching to openly changeable constituents (for instances, tag items such as "I mean" or "you know"); and it makes them less able to manage how they switch (Lipski, 2014).

The scholarly literature provides various types of code-switching, but the most well-known are inter-sentential and intra-sentential code-switching, in which the former occurs during a conversation from sentence to sentence and the latter occurs within a sentence. According to Poplack (1980), inter-sentential switches do not generally require grammatical competence in both languages, while intra-sentential switches show higher levels of competence in the two grammars involved. Since a bilingual teacher is aware of the language of the students, the classroom is a setting that potentially uses code-switching as well. Therefore, code-switching can also be found as part of an actual teaching method which shares the same reasons and communicative functions in the natural discourse. Some cases of code switching cannot be avoided by English teachers at times they are teaching the target language to their students. In Indonesia, for instance, students will never hesitate to switch their English utterances into Indonesian language while learning the target language albeit their English teacher does not allow to do so. This phenomenon, from the student side, is mostly due to lack of vocabulary of English. In the meantime, why teachers of English tend to be permissive with this case, it is to maximize the communicative interaction in the classroom among students, or even between student and teacher.

In the second language or foreign language classroom settings, therefore, code-switching phenomenon has attracted the attention of many applied linguists. In terms of teacher's code-switching, teachers switching their languages, either consciously or not, necessarily serve some basic functions which may be beneficial in language learning environments. These functions, according to Burenhult and Flyman (1999), are listed as "linguistic insecurity, topic switch, affective functions, socializing functions, and repetitive functions" (p. 3). Linguistic insecurity is the difficulty for teachers to explain matters relating to new concepts. For this reason, teachers code-switch the foreign language instruction into students' native language to secure the transfer of knowledge. In the topic switch, the teacher changes the way he or she talks based on what is being talked about. Mostly this occurs when a teacher is teaching grammar. He or she will switch to the students' native language when talking about certain grammar topics that are being taught at that moment.

The phenomenon also carries affective functions that serve for expression of emotions. Still refers to Burenhult and Flyman (1999), the teacher employs code-switching to foster close relationships and a sense of unity among students. In this view, code-switching's contribution to fostering a positive linguistic climate in the classroom might be considered. Then, socializing functions, that is when teachers turn to the students' first language to signal friendship and solidarity. This is often directed to people with a lower proficiency in foreign language instruction. Most data on Burenhult and Flyman (1999) showed that in accommodating this function of code-switching the teacher tries to show solidarity towards the students by expressing understanding of their problems by speaking in their mother tongue.

Furthermore, the last function of code-switching used by teachers in classroom settings is its repetitive function. In this case, the teacher uses code-switching in order to transfer the necessary knowledge for the students for clarity. However, the propensity for students to repeat instructions in their own language may result in some unwanted student behaviors. If a learner knows that a native language translation will come after the foreign language instruction, they may become disinterested in listening to the previous instruction. As a result, the student will be disadvantaged academically because of the limited exposure to foreign language speech.

Still regarding the function, teachers and students indeed do not share the same functions in code-switching. Though code-switching among students may occur subconsciously, it undoubtedly offers certain functions, whether they are beneficial or not. Eldridge (1996) names student's functions as: equivalence, floor-holding, reiteration, and conflict control. To switch code by the equivalence function, the student makes use of the native equivalent of a certain lexical item in the target language and code-switches to the native language. This function may be clearly defined by students' deficiency in uttering words or phrases that they do not know how to say those equivalences in the target language. In terms of the floor-holding, the students fill in the gaps with their mother tongue to eliminate communication silences during an interaction in the target language. In this case, students cannot recall the appropriate target language structure, so they switch the code to the native in order to hold the floor and not to lose fluency in a long pause.

Moreover, the other consideration of students' code-switching, according to Eldridge (1996), is reiteration. This is a situation where "messages are reinforced, emphasized, or clarified when the message has already been transmitted in one code, but not understood". In this situation, students will often resort to code-switching to show their teacher that they understand the meaning of the utterance, either because they are unsure whether they have conveyed the whole meaning in the target language or because they feel it is more appropriate to do so. The last function of students' code-switching is conflict control. This is a strategy used by the students to avoid a misunderstanding and a potential conflicted language by transferring the intended meaning in the native language whenever there is a lack of some culturally equivalent lexis of the target language.

All of the functions aforementioned are positive towards code-switching in the EFL classrooms. However, there are also negative effects from too much using two languages back-and-forth in the situation of teaching and learning at school. Cook (2001) warns that there is a possibility that code-switching may not always be effective, especially in language classes that are different in nature, because the use of code-switching could negatively affect students who do not share the same mother tongue while those who do so are actually being benefited. In addition, Atkinson (1987) warns against using the mother tongue excessively in language instruction since it allows students to translate the most language tasks into L1. Then, Nation (2003) also cautions against utilizing the mother tongue in EFL classes since it limits input and decreases L2 practice opportunities. By paying attention to the consequences of using code-switching in the EFL classroom, more or less the phenomenon of utilizing two languages interchangeably in the foreign language context can have a negative impact on the progress of EFL learning.

Method

This research used a qualitative research method with a library research approach. Library research, according to Zed (2008), is the research limits its activities only to the study of literature references to answer problems. There were three problems to be answered using this library research: (1) learners' & teachers' perception towards code-switching in EFL classroom settings; (2) the effectiveness of code-switching undergoes its functions in facilitating English learning; and (3) the difference between using code-switching strategy and "English only" in the classroom toward learning success. By employing a library research approach, the researcher mainly entailed the selection of research articles from which the information about code-switching in the EFL classroom setting was explored and gathered.

The sources of data were research papers to be reviewed sourced from ScienceDirect, Web of Science (WoS) and ERIC databases. Those research articles were sorted based on the inclusion criteria for this research which at least represented answering research questions proposed. In selecting the articles, researcher first used Google Scholar search terms with specified filters for data candidatures as follows:

1) The term "Code-switching in EFL classroom setting" was the first filter for searching.

2) Then, the terms "ScienceDirect" "WoS" and "ERIC" were used for the second filter.

3) In the third filter, the researcher checked every article based on research questions whether they were in line or answering at least one of the fulfilling research questions of this paper.

4) Other inclusion criteria for procedures of data collection also used the following requirements:

5) Research articles selected were published by reputable journals and preferably indexed by Scopus in the last ten years.

6) The scope of findings and discussion must focus on code-switching in EFL or ESL classroom settings.

7) Primary findings of research articles selected must answer research questions of this paper.

In terms of data analysis, a content analysis was used to analyze selected research articles from the data collected. In specific, this paper firstly reviewed findings of articles in relation to learners' and teachers' perceptions on the use of first language in second or foreign language classrooms. Secondly, it also analyzed research articles that supported the functions of code-switching in bilingual classrooms which ascertained their significant contribution to the development of students' target language. Then, this paper ends up with the pedagogical implications of code-switching by seeking the effect of using first language (L1) and second (L2) or foreign language (FL) interchangeably towards students' learning achievement in the target language.

Results

There are fifteen selected research articles sourced from the reputable data repositories and various times of research. Nine selected articles are sourced from ERIC data repository, and three respectively taken from Science Direct and WoS. In addition, those research articles are published ranging from 2012 to 2021. Then, the description of the data from the research articles in terms of research method used, instruments, subject levels, and number of subjects engaged by overseas researchers is depicted in the table below.

Table 1. Description of articles based on research method used

Methods	Instruments	Subject (N)	Level	Article authors
Quantitative	*Questionnaire*	Students (299)	University	Ahmad & Jusoff (2009)
		Teachers (20) & students (37)	University	Chowdhury (2013)
		Students (45)	University	Nordin et al. (2013)
		Teachers (54)	High school	Romli & Aziz (2015)
	Observation	Teachers (16)	University	Adder & Bagui (2020)
	Observation, questionnaire, interview	Teachers (2)	University	Ibrahim et al. (2013)
		Teachers (4) & students (43)	University	Horasan (2014)
Qualitative	*Observation*	Teachers (4)	University	Aisha et al. (2018)
	Interview	Teachers (4)	University	Narasuman et al. (2019)
		Teachers (3)	High school	Yiltanlilar & Caganaga (2015)
	Observation, interview	Teachers (4)	University	Bensen & Cavuşoğlu (2013)
		Teachers (6) & students (24)	University	Adriosh & Razı (2019)
	Questionnaire, observation	Teachers (12)	High school	Simasiku et al. (2015)
Mixed method	*Questionnaire, interview*	Teachers (20) & students (286)	University	Paker & Karaağaç (2015)
	Observation, questionnaire, interview	Students (20)	University	Hawa et al. (2021)

Table 1 shows that there are seven and six studies using quantitative and qualitative methods respectively, and other two studies used mixed methods. Most studies utilized a single instrument (questionnaire, observation, or interview) to obtain their data, and there were three studies using two instruments (observation-interview, questionnaire-observation, or questionnaire-interview) for gaining the data. Yet, there were two studies that used three instruments at once each of observation, questionnaire, and interview. In addition, all studies had sample representation from the university and high school levels. Then, the respondents have also been characterized by students and teachers. From the variation of research

methods used, data collection techniques, and respondents taken, it is assured that the data obtained for this current study can be representative for reviewing the phenomena of code-switching in EFL classroom settings. Then, the breakdown of the data in terms of answering questions for this current study is shown in the table below.

Table 2. Summary of research articles answering to current research questions

Research questions (RQ) to be answered	Research articles (by authors)
1. RQ-1	Ahmad & Jusoff (2009), Chowdhury (2013), Hawa et al. (2021), Ibrahim et al. (2013), Nordin et al. (2013), Narasuman et al. (2019), Yiltanlilar & Caganaga (2015), Horasan (2014), Paker & Karaağac (2015), Adriosh & Razi (2019)
2. RQ-2	Aisha et al. (2018), Hawa et al. (2021), Ibrahim et al. (2013), Nordin et al. (2013), Yiltanlilar & Caganaga (2015), Horasan (2014), Romli & Aziz (2015), Adder & Bagui (2020), Adriosh & Razi (2019)
3. RQ-3	Ahmad & Jusoff (2009), Aisha et al. (2018), Simasiku et al. (2015), Nordin et al. (2013), Narasuman et al. (2019), Bensen & Cavuşoğlu (2013), Adder and Bagui (2020)

As depicted by table 2, all research articles have filled all slots of research questions proposed by this current study. To be specific, one research article may fill more than one research question, even a study by Nordin et al. (2013) and Simasiku et al. (2015) can cover three research questions at once, but the other two studies by Simasiku et al. (2015) and Romli and Aziz (2015) are only able to answer one research question to this current study. Meanwhile, the others remain interchangeably covering two research questions to be answered by the current study. Therefore, those 15 articles used by this study have sufficiently assured that findings from those research articles are able to answer objectively the problems proposed in this study.

Discussion

To discuss the result from the data found, first this study discusses the data based on research questions propositioned respectively. Then, the discussion is summarized at once by providing theoretical bases to support the findings reviewed.

Learners' and teachers' perception towards code–switching in EFL classroom setting

In EFL classes, there is a fairly high amount of code-switching which has the general effect of making students more likely to use L1 in class very often. Analyzing some data from the research articles reviewed, the perceptions of learners and teachers towards code-switching are very diverse. Generally, the learners perceive that code-switching has helped them understand difficult concepts faced in their learning. Ahmad and Jusoff (2009), for instance, investigated 299 university students in Malaysia where 72.4 percent of those surveyed said that code-switching has made it easier for them to comprehend new words, 71.6 percent of

respondents thought code-switching had helped them comprehend any difficult ideas in the lesson, whereas nearly 69 percent of those surveyed thought that teacher's code-switching had made it easier for them to comprehend the grammar they were learning. Furthermore, about 67.3 percent of the respondents considered they could complete every assignment given by their teachers when they code-switched.

The similar learners' perceptions are also found in Horasan (2014). In his study, he looked into 43 university students and found that they believed lack of vocabulary knowledge is the primary cause of their code-switching use. They also believed that using code-switching in this way is advantageous and enhances their L2 survival conversation skill. From the study, students asserted that even when they use their native language as part of their communication strategy, code-switching allows them to maintain the conversation. This is also similar to Chowdhury's (2013) study that students considered code-switching as being more accepting and positive because they believe it to be a simpler and more beneficial way to learn a foreign language like English.

If it is observed from the teacher's perceptions, some studies regarded that code-switching plays a significant role in succeeding EFL learning albeit teachers' reluctance to regard it as a positive occurrence (Chowdhury, 2013; Ibrahim et al., 2013; Nordin et al., 2013). To be moderate, the language switch is tolerable if the aim of using it is to manage the classroom or get students' focus instead of assisting students' understanding or to draw their attention (Horasan, 2014). The more contrast is the study reported by Hawa et al. (2021) where 50 percent of respondents indicated as lower-level students acknowledged that the use of their native language improved their ability to learn English because it increased their motivation to engage and get involved in the learning process. This tells that code-switching is more welcomed by the one who has low-level proficiency of English, but not otherwise.

However, there are few studies that oppose code-switching and consider it as an obstacle to the progress of English learning as a foreign language. Adriosh and Razı (2019), for instance, argued that the students will miss out on greater exposure to EFL in the classroom due to the reliance on L1. In their study where Arabic which was the first language of respondents was not preferred to be used rather than English for classroom communication. From the teachers' perception that they believed to advance in students' language abilities, they must practice the language. Students regarded this as a chance to practice the English language since it is not frequently used outside of the classroom. Furthermore, Narasuman et al. (2019) in their study interviewing university teachers reported that code-switching has its own disadvantages. It can influence students' learning negatively because it does not provide them with much needed practice and exposure to the target language. This argument is also confirmed by Hawa et al. (2021) where from the interview made to university students in Indonesia that almost 50 percent did not agree with code-switching in EFL classroom. They chose to use English entirely during the learning process. This is due to the fact that the use of L1 may reduce their motivation, make them lazy to communicate in the target language, and attract them to be fearful of making mistakes when doing practice in speaking English.

In contrast, the positive perception towards code-switching in ELT classrooms considerably cannot be denied if we regard that it is much needed from the perspective of language proficiency level of the learners. As noted from studies aforementioned, the lower the learners' level the more they rely on the mother tongue. For the lower English proficiency, code-switching is the secure choice to start when the learners have difficulty expressing what they want to say. This affirms what Schweers Jr (1999) states that using the L1 as the starting point gives students a secured feeling and validates their personal experiences, and enables

them to express themselves. Then, the learner is prepared to take chances and explore with English. Or, more precisely the use of L1 in FL or L2 context is in line with Thornbury (2005) that asserts code-switching can make the expression goes to a direct route to a word's meaning. However, the overuse of code-switching is not recommended to the FL or L2 classroom because, according to Atkinson (1987) it will translate most English words and phrases into L1. As a result, it decreases the practice opportunities and the amount of input (Nation, 2003).

Functions of code–switching in facilitating English learning

In relation to its functions, teachers and students have certain purposes to switch from English as FL or L2 to their native language. From the observation made by Hawa et al. (2021) to twenty university-students of Indonesian learners of English revealed that during the learning process, the L1 was primarily used to clarify the instructions being given. The mother tongue use in English class is unavoidable for increased effectiveness and output. Students code-switched to their mother tongue are to clarify or to correct errors among them while speaking. When one student made a mistake, another attempted to fix it by speaking in his or her native language in a spontaneous way.

From the teacher's side, moreover, Ibrahim et al. (2013) noticed the different functions of code-switching performed by two university-teachers of Malay they observed and interviewed. Seven functions of code-switching found are to reiterate or repeat a message, to qualify a previously mentioned statement, to express sentence fillers, to indicate the difference between fact and opinion, to emphasize direct quotations or reported speech, to mention specific instances, and to express specific feature of Islamic English (since Malay is typically Moslem).

Meanwhile, Aisha et al. (2018) observed four university-teachers in Pakistan using code switching in the speaking classrooms. From the observation, they found two main functions of code-switching used by Pakistani students (switching from English to Urdu), namely methodological and social functions. The methodological functions such as translation, clarification of complex ideas, and other forms of communication strategy between teachers and students are all language-related code-switching functions performed by teachers to teach the target language. Then, the social function involves dealing with the emotional aspect of the students' personalities, disciplining them, and providing them with instructions about classroom activities.

However, some studies revealing the other functions of code-switching that teachers provide to learners of English are primarily to help them comprehend the meaning of unfamiliar vocabulary, to provide instruction, and to enable the description and explanation of difficult concepts or ideas (Adder & Bagui, 2020; Hawa et al., 2021; Nordin et al., 2013; Romli & Aziz, 2015; Yiltanlilar & Caganaga, 2015). For those all functions, code-switching is used to facilitate the flow of classroom teaching for language learners and to improve their comprehension of L2 or FL words that they need to clarify.

In addition, the thing that is not less important in relation to the function of code-switching by English teachers is for classroom management (Horasan, 2014; Narasuman et al., 2019; Romli & Aziz, 2015; Yiltanlilar & Caganaga, 2015). To be more specific, as stated by Yiltanlilar and Caganaga (2015) the way of Turkish teachers of English managing classroom through code-switching is by bringing up the concept of humor in the language class such as using small chunks of words from L1 with English words to make a fun and positive classroom atmosphere. Nonetheless, all classroom observations and interviews conducted from studies

aforementioned are explicitly in line with Burenhult and Flyman (1999) that mentioned functions of code-switching used by teachers in EFL classrooms as linguistic insecurity, topic switch, affective functions, socializing functions, and repetitive functions. Meanwhile, other functions such as methodological and social functions implicitly correspond to Eldridge (1996) naming these functions, which are mostly used by students, as equivalence, floor-holding, reiteration, and conflict control.

The difference between using code-switching strategy and "English-only" in the classroom toward learning success

Learning success in English reflects the learners' ability to use English effectively as a result of successful completion of tasks or activities designed by teachers. In relation to using code-switching strategy whether it gave positive effect to succeed language learning under such classroom circumstance, some studies argued with their respective findings. Ahmad and Jusoff (2009), for instance, with its quantitative data to find the correlation between teachers' code-switching and students' success in their learning with a value of $r = 0.62$ revealed a significant relationship between both, showing students' satisfaction with their English learning. However, this quantitative data does not fit 100 percent guarantee code-switching can really improve students' proficiency. From the questionnaire' answers obtained, about 50 percent of students regarded that English class had to be "English Only" which required teachers to communicate in English, so they did not think that using a code-switching strategy would help them become more proficient.

In terms of the proficiency level of English that the learners have, code-switching is also the best choice to trigger learners who are not proficient enough in English to talk more (Aisha et al., 2018; Narasuman et al., 2019). This is positive for teachers to switch as observed by Aisha et al. (2018) in the speaking classrooms of the Pakistani context where teachers code-switching to Urdu showed a notable relationship between their teaching input via code-switching and students' learning success.

In contrast, Bensen and Cavuşoğlu (2013) observed and interviewed four university-teachers of Turkish where those teachers considered that high level students shouldn't be taught using code-switching because they can comprehend using English as the target language in a straightforward manner. This study also proved from the observation that switching back and forth would not help students in the future, especially for their skills of speaking and listening. By such a language situation in an EFL classroom, the students will be led to a lack in English communication. This finding is also confirmed by the observation made by Simasiku et al. (2015) to twelve high-school Namibian teachers of English where code-switching would lead to poor English proficiency, poor expression and poor command of the English language learners both spoken and written.

Additionally, Adder and Bagui (2020) also did not deny the same thing in their research by observing sixteen Algerian teachers of English at the university level. They found overusing Algerian Arabic in the classroom may have detrimental effects on students' English proficiency or academic performance, such as causing them to become lazy or reliant on translation and, of course, making it more difficult for them to learn vocabulary. By avoiding the use of code-switching, learners will get the opportunity to interact with the language they learn in the classroom. Though code-switching is inevitably to control the class for the reason of classroom management, its overuse would harm the progress of students in learning English as a foreign language with much dependance on learners' mother tongue.

From all observations, questionnaire answers, and interviews made in relation to the extent of code-switching facilitating learning success; it can be drawn an explicit argument from Schweers Jr (1999) that learning success requires successful provision of comprehensible input to ensure learners understand the intended content. Therefore, according to Skiba (1997) and Cook (2001) that a comprehensible input cannot always be guaranteed in an English-only classroom. Hence, the teacher's use of code-switching should be viewed as a type of teaching strategy in order to achieve the intended transfer of meaning from the target language.

Conclusion

This desk-study research paper obviously arrives at three conclusions. Firstly, the perception towards code-switching in the EFL classroom setting, in fact, is to provide the chance for the lower proficiency level of English learners to feel secure in expressing what they want to speak. However, for the high proficiency level of English learners who code-switches is not recommended to be used in the classroom since in the future it will become a habit for learners at this level who always depend on the vocabulary of L1 in every class interaction.

Secondly, in terms of its function code-switching is important to be used in EFL classroom settings for reasons of classroom management, and also methodological functions such as to understand the meaning of unfamiliar words, to facilitate the explanation and clarification of difficult terms or concepts of the instructional materials. Yet, the over-functioning of code-switching in the EFL classroom can only hinder learners from receiving comprehensible input of English. In the case of EFL classroom communication interaction, as much as possible it should be avoided.

Thirdly, teachers must be able to control the use of code-switching in the classroom. The more the mother tongue is used the worse the success of learning English. Its parameter simply relies on how EFL learners minimize themselves to use the mother tongue in the English contexts. Therefore, the success of English learning is dependable on the reliance of English use within the classroom interactions without being interfered by L1 words.

From those conclusions there must have been a pedagogical implication through the practice of code-switching in the EFL classroom. It goes without saying that code-switching enables efficient idea transfer from a teacher to students and vice versa so that it is regarded to be essential for the development of language skills. Also, it maintains communication between teacher and students inside the classroom, and it is mostly used for classroom management. However, the thing which is equally important too is that the use of L1 should not be exaggerated because the more the students are exposed to the target language, the better they will learn it.

References

Adder, F. Z., & Bagui, H. (2020). English - Algerian Arabic code-switching in EFL classroom: Case of EFL teachers and students in the department of English at Tlemcen university, Algeria. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, *11*(4), 144–162. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no4.10

Adriosh, M., & Razı, Ö. (2019). Teacher's code switching in EFL undergraduate classrooms in Libya: Functions and perceptions. *SAGE Open*, *9*(2), 215824401984621. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019846214

Ahmad, 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/https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1082375

Aisha, B., Shamsudin, S., & Said, S. B. M. (2018). Code-switching: A useful foreign language teaching tool in EFL classrooms. *English Language Teaching*, *11*(6), 93. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n6p93

Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, *41*(4), 241–247. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/41.4.241

Auer, P. (2013). *Introduction: Bilingual conversation revisited. Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (P. Auer). Routledge.

Bensen, H., & Cavuşoğlu, C. (2013). Reasons for the teachers' uses of code-switching in adult EFL classrooms. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi Sayı*, *20*(2), 69–82. https://www.hayefjournal.org/Content/files/sayilar/63/69.pdf

Burenhult, N., & Flyman, M. A. (1999). *Code-switching in second language teaching of French*. http://www.ling.lu.se/disseminations/pdf/47/Flyman_Burenhult.pdf

Chaudron, C. (1989). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Chowdhury, N. (2013). Classroom code switching of English language teachers at tertiary level: A Bangladeshi perspective. *Stamford Journal of English*, *7*, 40–61. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3329/sje.v7i0.14462

Clyne, M. (2011). *Bilingualism, code-switching and aging. A myth of attrition and a tale of collaboration. Modeling bilingualism: From structure to chaos–in honor of Kees de Bot* (S. M. Schm). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*(3), 402–423. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal*, *50*(4), 303–311. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.4.303

Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Pergamon Press Inc.

Fabbro, F. (1999). *The neurolinguistics of bilingualism: An introduction*. Psychology Press.

Fillmore, W. L. (1985). *When does teacher talk work as input? Input in second language acquisition* (S. Gass &). Newbury House.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.

Greggio, S., & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and learner's use of code-switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: A qualitative study. *Linguagem & Ensino*, *10*(2), 371–393. http://www.educadores.diaadia.pr.gov.br/arquivos/File/2010/artigos_teses/Ingles/greegio.pdf

Hawa, S., Suryani, S., Susiani, R., Dauyah, E., & Majid, A. H. (2021). University students' perception toward the use of the mother tongue in the EFL classrooms. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *8*(3), 1094–1110. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i3.19870

Horasan, S. (2014). Code-switching in EFL classrooms and the perceptions of the students and teachers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *10*(1), 31–45. https://doi.org/https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jlls/issue/9938/122924

Ibrahim, E. H. E., Shah, M. I. A., & Armia, N. T. (2013). Code-switching in English as a foreign language classroom: Teachers' attitudes. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(7), 139–150. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n7p139

Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*(3), 343–364. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00194

Lipski, J. M. (2014). Spanish-English code-switching among low-fluency bilinguals: Towards an expanded typology. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, *8*(1), 23–55. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1558/sols.v8i1.23

MacSwan, J. (2014). *Programs and proposals in codeswitching research: Unconstraining theories of bilingual language mixing* (J. MacSwan). MIT press.

Martin-Jones, M. (2000). Bilingual classroom interaction: A review of recent research. *Language Teaching*, *33*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800015123

Meisel, J. M. (1994). Code-switching in young bilingual children. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *16*(4), 413–439. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100013449

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press.

Narasuman, S., Wali, A. Z., & Sadry, Z. (2019). The functions of code-switching in EFL classrooms. *Social and Management Research Journal (SMRJ)*, *16*(2), 137–152. https://doi.org/https://ir.uitm.edu.my/id/eprint/28226/

Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, *1*, 35–39.

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

Paker, T., & Karaağaç, Ö. (2015). The use and functions of mother tongue in EFL classes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *199*, 111–119. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.494

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en espanol: toward a typology of code-switching 1. *Linguistics*, *18*, 7–8. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581

Romli, N. H., & Aziz, M. S. A. (2015). The use of bahasa Melayu in the English language classroom by 'non-optionist' English teachers. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *172*, 770–777. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.431

Schweers Jr, W. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, *37*(2), 6–9.

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code-switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *11*(8). https://doi.org/http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching

Shay, O. (2015). To switch or not to switch: Code-switching in a multilingual country. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *209*, 462–469. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.253

Simasiku, L., Kasanda, C., & Smit, T. (2015). Can code switching enhance learners' academic achievement? *English Language Teaching*, *8*(2). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n2p70

Skiba, R. (1997). Code switching as a countenance of language interference. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *3*(10), 1–6. https://doi.org/http://iteslj.org/Articles/Skiba-CodeSwitching

Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Pearson Education Limited.

Yiltanlilar, A., & Caganaga, C. K. (2015). The perceptions of EFL teachers on the impact of the usage of code-switching in EFL classroom management. *OALib*, *02*(11), 1–11. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1101961

Zed, M. (2008). *Metode penelitian kepustakaan*. Yayasan Obor Indonesia.