Journal Homepage: - www.journalijar.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

RESEARCH ARTICLE

EXTENT OF CODE-SWITCHING OF ENGLISH AND KISWAHILI DURING ENGLISH LESSONS IN PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN ELDORET WEST SUB-COUNTY, KENYA

Mutai Susan, J. Rono, Dr. Audrey Matere and Dr. Julia Situma
Department of Curriculum Instruction and Media, School of Education and Human Resource Development Kisii University, Kenya.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………....

Manuscript Info	Abstract

………………………….   ………………………………………………………………

English is a language of international communication; hence it has special place in educational systems of most countries in the world. In Kenya, English is a language of instruction as well as examinable subject in Kenyan schools. In addition, Kiswahili is a national language which is used by both learners and teachers leading to code-switching. The purpose of the paper was to establish the extent of code-switching in English and Kiswahili during English lessons in public primary schools. The study adopted descriptive survey design and mixed methods approach. The target population was 243 teachers of English, 64 grade three teachers and 2176 learners in primary schools in Eldoret West Sub-County, Kenya. The sample size was 33 teachers of English, 8 grade three teachers and 292 learners. Both quantitative and qualitative data was collected through the use of questionnaires, interviews and observation schedule. Piloting of research instruments was conducted in the nearby Wareng Sub County which shares similar characteristics as the study area. Validity was ensured through expert judgment while reliability was tested using Cronbach's alpha coefficient after piloting. The data was analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative techniques. Quantitative data was analysed using descriptive statistics; frequencies and percentages while content analysis was used to analyze qualitative data. The study found out that majority (56.5%) of teachers used code switching most of the time while explaining meaning of words and most (50.4%) of the teachers of English used code switching as a way of explaining grammar in an explicit manner while most (41.2%) of the teachers used code switching to introduce unfamiliar topics to learners during English lessons. The findings will benefit the Government of Kenya in formulating language policies for schools. The study will also be of significance to teachers of English in coming up with the strategies to boost performance of English.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………....

Introduction:-

English language is considered to be the most vital aspect in the provision of high-quality education. Many emerging countries, according to Benson (2016), are categorized by both personal and societal multilingualism, yet they still continue to allowing a single foreign dialect to be dominant in their education systems. According to

Corresponding Author:- Mutai Susan
Address:- Department of Curriculum Instruction and Media, School of Education and Human Resource Development Kisii University, Kenya.

Ndlovu (2019), a student's ability to participate is determined by their linguistic skills in four areas: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. In the words of Skutnabb-Kangas (2018), instruction in a language that students do not usually speak is referred to as "submersion" since it is akin to holding learners under water without teaching them how to swim. The debate is whether monolingual, bilingual, or multilingual education is more successful in the classroom. Code Switching has proven to be an effective instruction and learning approach in schools that employ a second language as a means of teaching in many cases when learners fail to communicate through the medium of instruction (Ogechi, 2019; Zabrodskaja, 2015).

Code-switching is defined by Karpava, Ringblom and Zabrodskaja, (2018) as the utilization of two or more languages in the same conversation, usually within the same conversational turn, or even within the same sentence of that turn. Code switching can take numerous forms, including changing sentences, phrases from both languages, and switching in the middle of a long story (Shafi, Kazmi, & Asif, 2020). Inter-sentential and intra-sentential code switching are two forms of code switching identified by Kasperczyk (2015). Inter-sentential code switching occurs at sentence boundaries and is mostly used by fluent bilingual speakers, whereas intra-sentential code switching occurs in the middle of a sentence with no interruptions, hesitations, or pauses indicating a change, and the speaker is usually unconscious of the change.

Code-switching is no longer seen as a random occurrence, but as a highly planned action (Enama, 2015). Linguists, psychologists, and academicians have all shown to be interested in the topic. As a result, code-switching has largely been studied in a variety of socio-cultural situations, particularly in English as First Language (EFL) and English as Second Language (ESL) environments. In situations such as instructor-initiated events or teacher-learner interactions, the bulk of code-switching occurrences indicate sophisticated language usage and serve a range of educational objectives (Enama, 2015).

Qing (2010) suggested that code-switching in the language classroom is not necessarily a hindrance or a deficit in language acquisition, but it may be a beneficial approach in classroom engagement if the goal is to make meaning apparent and efficiently convey knowledge to pupils. Code switching is considered to be a common practice in bilingual classrooms world over. As Martin-Jones, as cited in Alenezi, (2016) pointed out, widespread research has been conducted on the utilization of code switching in the classroom as a contextualization reminder. Such contextualization cues range from lexical, phonological and syntactic adoptions to various kinds of code switching and style shifting, which involves substituting a word in another language. Furthermore, Lewis, Jones, and Baker (2012) discovered that the main reason for code switching in Hong Kong schools was that there was no direct translation of words between English and Cantonese. Additionally, Man and Lu (2006) in their study found out that teachers in Hong Kong schools used code switching as a way of relieving tension and injecting humour into conversations with students.

Amekor (2009) investigated the usage of code-switching in the classroom at a few schools in the Volta Region of Ghana's Keta Municipal and Akatsi Districts. The goal of the study was to look into language use patterns in classes where English was the default code, as well as the motivations behind any code choices in those courses. While presenting the evidence from recorded information and questionnaire surveys, the author pointed out that all the classrooms were characterized by persistent utilization of code-switching practices. students' command of English was insufficient to use it as the main medium of instruction. However, it is not simply students that lack a good command of the English language.

Moodley (2014) also investigated code-switching behavior among isiZulu (Zulu) native language pupils in South African junior secondary schools. Given the quantity of diverse African languages spoken, these students' classrooms were multilingual. The findings revealed that Code Switching (CS) was a common occurrence in English language classroom group work. However, students in Group 1 (all Zulu-English bilinguals) utilized CS more frequently than students in Group 2 (all English monolinguals). The usage of CS also aided in the development of vocabulary and the comprehension of difficult subjects. CS was also more frequently used by the learners to manage the group and influence the behavior of their fellow students.

According to a study in Thailand by Promnath and Tayjasa (2016), the study reported that code-switching was good to for students' enhancement of knowledge. The study also noted that code-switching during class instruction saved a lot of time and made students to feel more competent and at ease during the learning process. When compared to utilizing exclusively English, code-switching allows students with weaker performance to follow teachings more

easily. Learners were less stressed owing to the fact that they were not worried on what to say during the English language learning since they code switched Thai if they had no clue on what to say in English. Additionally, it emerged that switching to Thai assisted with classroom management and the incorporation of morality and ethics.

Simasiku (2015) noted that in English medium classes, the use of mother tongue was not only for classroom administration, but also for language analysis, presenting grammatical rules, discussing cross-cultural concerns, offering directions or prompts, clarifying faults, and assessing for comprehension. The researcher acknowledged code-switching as a resource that aids learners in understanding and comprehending their lectures, hence improving their exam results. It is also a tool for increasing student participation in the classroom, which is a requirement for academic success and cognitive growth.

In connection to situational elements like context and social ties, as well as speaker motivations, code switching is a common behavior among bilingual and multilingual speakers (Wolfram & Schilling, 2015). As a result, code switching is becoming a more common occurrence in English-speaking societies around the world, as well as in the classroom. The issue of code switching as found out in a study by Misati and Lwangale (2020) is aimed at aiding learners to understand the concepts being taught. However, in using code switching to teach English speaking skills is likely to jeopardize the learner's effort and interest in learning the English language. The teachers' use of code switching in teaching of speaking skills could be attributed to what Baraza (2004) terms as lack of harmony in training and practice of teachers of English in Kenya.

In Kenya a study by Misati and Lwangale (2020) found out that code switching is aimed at aiding learners to understand the concepts being taught. However, in using code switching to teach English speaking skills is likely to jeopardize the learner's effort and interest in learning the English language. In terms of phonetic, syntactic, lexical mistake levels and prosodic, Akumu (2015) discovered that code switching had more effects on students' spoken performance more than their written performance.

English is a language of worldwide communication and thus occupies a unique position in most countries' educational systems. English is an examinable topic as well as a language of teaching in Kenyan schools. English is the language of instruction in primary schools from standard four onwards, and a teaching subject at pre-school level. Apart from making learners to be linguistically diverse, it also has some economic returns in the job market (Kimemia, 2002). Performance of English in the national examination in primary schools in Eldoret west Sub-County is wanting; in 2015: English was the subject with the highest decline, from a mean score of 3.90 in 2014 to a mean score of 3.42 in 2015, and 3.63 in 2016 (Ministry of Education, 2016). KNEC examination reports from 2013 to 2015 have captured the growing concerns of the candidates' poor performance in English functional skills and imaginative composition writing (KNEC report, 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016).

Akumu, (2014) conducted a study on effect of code switching on learners' oral and written discourse in English in selected secondary schools in Nyatike District, Migori County, Kenya. The results of the study established that code-switching influenced performance in English in composition writing. Furthermore, Nthinga, (2003), conducted a study on forms and roles of code switching in pre-primary classroom discourse in selected schools in Kasarani Division, Nairobi. The study found out that code switching was commonly used for classroom management. However, this study was undertaken in a pre-school setup but the current study was undertaken in upper primary school. The reviewed literature indicates that, few researches have been undertaken in Kenya on extent of code-switchingEnglish and Kiswahili during English lessons in public primary schools in Eldoret west Sub-County, Kenya

Literature:-
In a bilingual setting, switching from one particular dialect to the another is usual. As a result, CS is a globally recognized language trait. Gulzar (2010), for example, investigates the frequency of CS among Pakistani instructors and acknowledges how widespread the practice is in the country. In the past, it was thought that having an open mind about CS would lead to teachers using it excessively. Language interaction was attempted to be avoided in South Africa. Slabbert and Finlayson (2002) point to South Africa's aim to safeguard linguistic purity by dividing communities into racially ethnic divisions. Setswana, a language that was devalued in favor of English as a language of teaching and learning (LoLT) in Botswana, unavoidably resurfaces in classrooms when teachers switch codes for pedagogic or didactic reasons, according to Mokgwathi and Webb (2013). Despite the official attitude that Setswana must only be taught, the language's use as a LoLT has not diminished.

According to Kamisah and Misyana (2011), speakers participate in CS for a number of reasons, including discourse-related or participant-related ones. Kamisah&Misyana (2011) found that CS performs a variety of roles in content-based lectures, including indicating subject shift, providing and clarifying explanations, enacting social connections, and mitigating messages. According to Kamisah and Misyana (2011), the effect of science and technology in education is a significant element influencing CS behavior in the classroom.

One of the parameters evaluated in a Tanzanian research conducted by Malekela (2004) was the usage of CS. According to the research, CS was prevalent in schools at all levels of education, among instructors and pupils, and ranged from English to Kiswahili (the mother tongue of most Tanzanians). According to Malekela (2004), CS is not only a problem at the secondary school level; it is also done at the university level, as long as both the instructors and the students are Tanzanians. The previous study was done in Tanzanian secondary schools, whereas the present study was undertaken in Kenyan elementary schools.

Nthinga (2003) looked at the functions of code switching in pre-primary classroom discourse. Her work was concerned with how CS aids the teaching process. It focused on pre-primary classroom discourse in Kasarani division, Nairobi. She found from the research that CS was a normal practice out of necessity so that a teacher would be understood, and that Kenya is a multilingual society and CS is an upshot of the same. The study also revealed that English and other languages can co-exist. The current study differs from the study by Nthinga (2003), in the current study seeks to assess the use of code switching in primary schools. Secondly, this study was conducted among the rural school learners.

Through classroom observations, Macaro (2005) discovered that code-switching by teachers and students in the language classroom can be considered a useful language approach. This would be consistent with Ahmad's (2009) study, which looked at how low-proficiency learners were influenced by teachers' use of code-switching in the language classroom using a questionnaire with 257 participants. Instructors' code-switching in the language classroom is a useful tool for low-proficiency students, and teachers' code-switching is connected to learners' support. According to Xiaoil's (2013) questionnaires and interviews, students are more likely to limit their use of the teaching language if the instructor code-switches often in the classroom. As a result, the current study looked into the degree of code-switching in English and Kiswahili in public primary schools in Kenya's Eldoret west Sub-County, Kenya.

Methodology:-

The study was conducted in Eldoret West Sub-County. The Sub-County is located in Uasin-Gishu County Eldoret west sub-County has two divisions; Soy and Turbo division. Descriptive research design was used in this study. Descriptive research designs, according to Muyembe (2019), are used to collect data by interpreting or giving a questionnaire to a group of people. Descriptive research aims to measure a set of variables in their natural setting (Gravetter&Forzano, 2011). In addition, the study made use of mixed methods approach where both qualitative and quantitative data was collected and analysed. The researcher further used convergent parallel design where quantitative and qualitative approaches were used simultaneously (Ponce &Pagán-Maldonado, 2015). In general, parallel phase studies entail investigating the problem from both quantitative and qualitative perspectives.

The target population was teachers and learners in 64 public primary schools in Eldoret west sub-County. From the records in Eldoret west Sub County, there were 641 teachers and 7,140 learners in all the schools in the sub-county. However, in the current research, the target population was 343 teachers of English in upper primary, 64 teachers of grade three and 2176 class seven pupils since class eight learners were busy preparing for examinations. Grade three teachers were targeted due to the fact that code switching starts at early grades while teachers of English on the other hand understands their pupils well.

The sample size or this study was based on Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size determination formula as cited by Kasomo (2001). The formula is given as:

$$n = \frac{X^2 * N * P(1 - P)}{\left(ME^2 * (N - 1)\right) + (X^2 * P * (1 - P))}$$

Where;

         n=Sample size

X^2=Chi Square for the specified confidence level at 1 degree of freedom= (3.841) from tables

N=Population size

P=Population proportion (.50 in the table)

ME=Desired margin of error (expressed as a proportion=0.05)

For teachers (Teachers of English + Grade 3 teachers = 307)

=3.841x307x0.5 (1-0.5)/ 0.05x0.05 (307-1) +3.841x0.5 (1-0.5)

= 171

For learners

=3.841x2176x0.5 (1-0.5)/ 0.05x0.05 (2176-1) +3.841x0.5 (1-0.5)

= 327

In this study, the researcher selected 20 schools using simple random sampling technique. The schools were selected proportionately based on the division. Purposive sampling was adopted to select the teachers of English teaching the class seven learners. A combination of purposive sampling and simple random sampling was employed in selecting learners to participate in this study. Class seven learners were purposively selected, and simple random sampling was used to select 10% of the learners to participate in the study from the selected schools. In addition, 8 grade three teachers were selected by simple random sampling technique to participate in the study. According to Creswell (2018), randomly selected samples yield study findings that can be extended to larger populations within statistically specified margins of error. Random sampling also entails subject assignment and selection by random, removing systematic bias and limiting the impact of extraneous variables.

Data collection instruments consisted of questionnaires, interview and observation. Research questionnaires were utilized to acquire quantitative data from teachers of English and class seven students. Interviews were used to collect qualitative information from grade three teachers in the sub-county. This method was adopted in order to acquire rich and detailed information about code-switching and how it affects students' English language performance. The data collected from the interview schedule yielded qualitative data which complemented the quantitative data collected using structured questionnaire.

In addition, non-participant observation approach was used to watch participants in their natural environments with the goal of determining whether or not English instructors use code-switching as a teaching tactic in class. This technique was also considered significant in complimenting the data collected from the questionnaires and interviews. The researcher used three (3) observation schedule to observe the teaching of English. In particular, observation was to uncover whether teachers of English used code switching, the situations where code switching was used and the use of code switching by learners.

Before the main investigation, a pilot study was done in the adjacent Wareng Sub County, which has comparable features to the study region. The results of the pilot research were discussed with the supervisors so that the instrument could be adjusted as needed. The main goal of the pilot was to see how reliable and valid the instruments were. To determine the validity of the research instruments, expert judgment was used to evaluate the research tools to assess the content and face validity of the instrument. Their opinions were used to make the necessary adjustments to the instruments.The dependability of the research tools was tested using Cronbach's alpha. A co-efficiency of 0.72 was attained in the study demonstrating that the instruments for data collection were reliable.

The collected information was analyzed through the use of both qualitative and quantitative techniques. The data from the questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively using descriptive statistics; frequencies and percentages with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS version 22). Data from the interviews and observation schedules were analyzed qualitatively using is content analysis. To offer in–depth explanations of the findings and validation, the quantitative analysis was augmented by qualitative descriptions that explored and expanded on the quantitative findings. Tables and figures were used to present the data that had been analyzed.

The researcher adhered to all the norms and regulations that are laid down for an individual to carry out a scholarly research work in Kenya. Before undertaking fieldwork, a research permit was sought from relevant authorities including the National Council of Science, Technology and Innovations (NACOSTI) and the County Director of Education. Throughout the study, privacy, confidentiality, and openness in data gathering were maintained. The researcher's sensitivity to human dignity, informed consent from the participants, privacy and confidentiality on

information supplied, anonymity to safeguard the respondents' identities, and informed consent from the participants were the major ethical issues of concern (Luey, 2005). Prior to participation in the study, the researcher obtained the respondents' consent.

Results:-

The aim of this study was to establish the extent of code-switching in English and Kiswahili during English lessons in public primary schools in Eldoret west Sub-County. As a way of achieving this, the study participants were first asked to rate their degree of agreement on a four-point Likert scale items in the questionnaire as never, hardly, often and most of the time. The outcomes of their replies were tallied and are shown in Table 1.

Table 1:- Teachers' Responses on Extent of Code-Switching During English Lessons.

Statement	Never		Hardly		Often		Most of the time	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
I use code switching when explaining meanings of words	9	6.9	6	4.6	42	32.1	74	56.5
I use code switching when explaining difficult concept	12	9.2	10	7.6	33	25.2	75	57.3
I use code switching to explain grammar explicitly	15	11.5	9	6.9	41	31.3	66	50.4
I use code switching to assess students' comprehension of the subject	24	18.3	11	8.4	39	29.8	57	43.5
I use code switching to introduce unfamiliar topics	10	7.6	23	17.6	44	33.6	54	41.2
I use code switching to give personal remarks to learners	9	6.9	30	22.9	49	37.4	43	32.8
I use code switching when greeting and interacting with learners	4	3.1	18	13.7	51	38.9	58	44.3
I use code switching for class management	10	7.6	19	14.5	35	26.7	67	51.1

Results from Table 1 points out that 74(56.5%) teachers reported that they use code use code switching when explaining meanings of words most of the time, 42(32.1%) teachers agreed that use code switching when explaining meanings of words often in class and 9(6.9%) teachers acknowledged that they never use code switching when explaining meanings of words while only 6(4.6%) teachers reported that they hardly use code switching when explaining meanings of words. The study found out from the responses that a majority (56.5%) of teachers use code switching most of the time while explaining meaning of words to learners during English lessons. This is consistent with the finding of Hussein, Saed and Haider (2020) who noted that learners repeat the message they are taught in first language in this case Kiswahili to make sure that its meaning is conveyed in second language which in this case is English smoothly and clearly. Thus, code switching is mostly used by teachers mostly in class as a means of ensuring that students understand the meaning of the words used in English.

Further, 75(57.3%) respondents acknowledged that teachers of English used code switching most of the time when explaining difficult concepts during the teaching process, 33(25.2%) teachers reported that they used code switching often when explaining difficult concept and 12(9.2%) teachers reported that they never used code switching when explaining difficult concept while only 10(7.6%) teachers acknowledged that they hardly used code switching when explaining difficult concept. The study findings showed that code switching was used most of the time by teachers when explaining difficult concepts to learners during the teaching of English. This finding is in line with those of Paramesvaran and Jia, (2018) who noted that code switching in classrooms is normally used by students and teachers when trying to explain various concepts which are considered hard for weak learners to grasp.

In addition, 66(50.4%) teachers of English stated that they used code switching most of the time in the explanation of grammar in an explicit way, 41(31.3%) teachers acknowledged that the often use code switching to explain grammar explicitly and 15(11.5%) respondents reported that the never use code switching to explain grammar explicitly while 9(6.9%) teachers hardly used code switching to explain grammar explicitly. From the teachers' replies, it appeared that most (50.4%) of the teachers of English in primary schools in Eldoret West subcounty most of the time used code switching as a way of explaining grammar in an explicit manner. This is consistent with the survey findings conducted by Tariq, Bilal, Abbas, and Mahmood (2013) which established that code-switching was

mostly used by teachers for grammar explanation. Moreover, studies by Kumar and Narendra (2012) found out that that most of the code-switching occurrences were manifested during grammar instructions.

Moreover, 57(43.5%) teachers most of the time used code switching to assess learners' comprehension of the subject, 39(29.8%) teachers reported that they often used code switching to assess students; comprehension of the subject and 24(18.3%) teachers acknowledged that they never used code switching to assess students' comprehension of the subject while 11(8.4%) of the teachers hardly used code switching to assess comprehension of the subject. The research discoveries implied that most (43.5%) of the teachers in primary schools in Eldoret west subcounty most of the time used code switching to assess students' comprehension of the subject. In Poland code switching is mostly utilised by instructors to assess comprehension in English classes as noted by Hait (2014) which was found to be similar to the current study findings.

Further, 54(41.2%) respondents used code switching most of the time while introducing unfamiliar topics to students, 44(33.6%) teachers often used code switching to introduce unfamiliar topics and 23(17.6%) teachers hardly used code switching to introduce unfamiliar topics while 10(7.6%) teachers never used code switching to introduce unfamiliar topics. It seems therefore that most (41.2%) of the teachers used code switching to introduce unfamiliar topics to learners during English lessons. Thus, helping students to understand the topics clearly. Code switching has been shown to ease communication between teachers and students particularly during the introduction of subjects or units that seem to be difficult to learners (Yao, 2011).

In addition, 49(37.4%) teachers often used code switching to give personal remarks to learners, 43(32.8%) teachers most of the time used code switching to give personal advice to learners and 30(22.9%) teachers hardly used code switching of Swahili and English to give personal remarks to learners while 9(6.9%) teachers never used code switching to give personal remarks to learners. It thus emerged that most (37.4%) of the teachers often used code switching while giving personal remarks to learners. This was found to support earlier findings of Cashman (2005) who reported that Spanish teachers usually code-switched Spanish and English while giving personal remarks to their students.

Further, 58(44.3%) teachers reported that they use code switching most of the time when greeting and interacting with learners, 51(38.9%) teachers acknowledged that they often use code switching when greeting and interacting with learners and 18(13.7%) teachers reported that they hardly use code switching when greeting and interacting with learners while only 4(3.1%) teachers acknowledged that they never used code switching when greeting and interacting with learners. The responses showed that most of the teachers used code switching most of the time when greeting and interacting with learners. This shows that code switching of Kiswahili and English is usually used for interaction among teachers and learners. This concurs with the findings of Hait (2014) who did a study on functions of code switching in secondary schools and found out that when communicating with one another, most students and teachers move between their native and target languages.

Similarly, 67(51.1%) teachers acknowledged that they use code switching most of the time for class management, 35(26.7%) teachers reported that they often use code switching for classroom management and 19(14.5%) teachers were of the view that they hardly used code switching for classroom management while 10(7.6%) teachers reported that they never used code switching for classroom management. From the responses, it emerged that most (51.1%) teachers were most of the time using code switching of Kiswahili and English for classroom management. This study findings were similar to those of Simasiku et al., (2015) who reported in their study in Zambia that teachers used code switching of mother tongue and English mostly for classroom management.

On interviewing class three teachers, it emerged that most of the teachers were using code switching of Kiswahili mostly for interaction with learners and classroom management particularly greetings and when they want a specific student to answer some questions. Interviews conducted with grade three teachers showed that most of the teachers used code switching while they were greeting learners, or when explaining a difficult concept to learners.

One of the teachers interviewed had this to say;
"Code switching is something inevitable in class particularly when addressing specific needs of a particular learner or when trying to pass a message to learners. I always use Kiswahili particularly when greeting learners or trying to understand challenges learners are undergoing…..."

This shows that Kiswahili is sometimes used as a medium of instruction during the teaching of English.

Observations made in the four classes showed that in most cases, teachers tried to use only English but they found themselves using Kiswahili. On the other hand, grade three learners mostly used Kiswahili in their conversations with their teachers.

Conclusion and Recommendation of the Study:-
The study concluded that code switching is mostly used by teachers in class as a way of making sure that students understand the meaning of the words used in English, explain grammar explicitly, to introduce unfamiliar topics and for classroom management.The study recommends that code switching of English and Kiswahili in primary schools is inevitable and thus needs to be encouraged since it encourages learning of English and other subjects.

References:-
1. Ahmad, B. H., &Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' Code-Switching in Classroom Instructions for Low English Proficient Learners. English Language Teaching, 2(2), 49-55.
2. Akumu, E. O (2015). Influence of Code Switching on Students' Oral and Written Discourse in English in Selected Schools in Nyatike District, Migori County, Kenya. Unpublished thesis, Kenyatta University
3. Alenezi, M. (2016). Gender and students' attitude toward code-switching: A correlational study with reference to Saudi Arabian medical students at Northern Border University. International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies, 4(3), 154-166.
4. Amekor, K. C., (2009). Codeswitching as a Medium of Instruction in Selected Schools in the Volta Region.M.Phil Thesis. English Department, University of Ghana.
5. Benson, S. D. (2016). Task-based language teaching: An empirical study of task transfer.Language Teaching Research, 20(3), 341-365.
6. Cashman, H. R. (2005). Identities at play: language preference and group membership in bilingual talk in interaction. Journal of Pragmatics, 37, 301- 316
7. Creswell, J. W. (2016). Reflections on the MMIRA the future of mixed methods task force report. Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 10(3) 215–219
8. Enama, P. R. B. (2015). The impact of English-only and bilingual approaches to EFL instruction on low-achieving bilinguals in Cameroon: An empirical study. Journal of Language Teaching Research, 7(1), 19-30.
9. Gulzar, M. A. (2010). Code-switching: Awareness about its utility in bilingual classrooms. Bulletin of Education & Research, 32, 23-44.
10. Hait, S. A. (2014). The Functions of Code Switching Used by Secondary Students in English Classes. MA Thesis is Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master of Arts Degree in English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of English Language and Literature, Middle East University, June 2014. GRIN Verlag.
11. Hussein, R. F., Saed, H. A., & Haider, A. S. (2020). Teachers and students code-switching: The inevitable evil in EFL classrooms. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 19(2), 60-78.
12. K.N.E.C. (2009). Examination Report. Nairobi: Kenya National Examinations Council.
13. Kamisah, A., &Misyana, S. H. (2011). Code-switching and code-mixing of English and Bahasa Malaysia in content-based classrooms: Frequency and attitudes. The Linguistics Journal, 5(1), 220–247, UniversitiTeknologi Mara Pahang.
14. Kumar, N. S., & Narendra, M. (2012). A Study of Code Switching in Relation to ESL. Language in India, 12(4), 65-71.
15. Lewis, G., Jones, B. & Baker, C., (2012). Trans-languaging: Developing its conceptualization and contextualization. Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice. 18(7). 655-670.
16. Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 Classroom: A Communication and Learning Strategy. Non-Native Language Teachers Educational Lingustic, 5, 63- 84.
17. Malekela, A.G., (2004). Secondary school students' views on the medium of instruction in Tanzania, a Paper presented at LOITASA workshop, 26–28 January, 2004, Arusha: Tanzania..
18. Misati, M. A &Lwangale, D W (2020). Influence of code switching on mastery of English-speaking skills in secondary schools in Kwanza Sub-County Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya. Journal of Educational Research, 5 (2), 76 -88.

19. Mogwathi, T & Webb, V. (2013). The educational effects of code switching in the classroom benefits and setbacks: A case of selected senior secondary schools in Botswana, Language Matters. Studies in the language of Africa 44 (3): 108-125.

20. Moodley, V. (2014). Introduction to language methodology. Cape Town: Oxford University Press, Southern Africa.

21. Muyembe A, B (2019). Basics of Research Design: A Guide to selecting appropriate research design. International Journal of Contemporary Applied Researches 6, (5), 76 -89.

22. Ndlovu, P. E. (2019). Challenges when writing English: a case study of Grade 8 Second Language learners in a rural school in KwaZulu-Natal. Doctoral dissertation.

23. Nthinga, M.P. (2003). Patterns and Functions of Code Switching in Pre-Primary Classroom Discourse in Selected Schools at Kasarani Division. Nairobi. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Kenyatta University.

24. Ogechi, N. O. (2002). Trilingual Code Switching in Kenya-evidence from Ekegusii, Kiswahili, English and Sheng (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hamburg: Universitat Hamburg.

25. Paramesravan, M.D., & Lim, J.W. (2018). Code-switching practices in a Malaysian multilingual primary classroom from teacher and student perspectives. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8(2), 254-264.

26. Ponce, O. A., &Pagán-Maldonado, N. (2015). Mixed methods research in education: Capturing the complexity of the profession. International Journal of Educational Excellence, 1(1), 111-135.

27. Promnath, K. &Tayjasa, A. (2016). English-Thai Code-Switching of Teachers in ESP Classes. PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand, 51, 97–126.

28. Qing, X. (2010). To Switch or Not to Switch: Examine the Code-switching Practices of Teachers of Non-English Majors. Canadian Social Science, 6(4), 109-113.

29. Shafi, S., Kazmi, S. H., & Asif, R. (2020). Benefits of code-switching in language learning classroom at University of Education Lahore. International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences, 7(1), 227-234.

30. Simasiku, L. (2015). Can Code Switching Enhance Learners' Academic Achievement? English Language Teaching, 8(2), 70–77.

31. Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2018). Language rights and revitalization. The Routledge handbook of language revitalization. New York, NY: Routledge.

32. Slabbert, S. & Finlayson, R. (2002). Code-switching in South African townships. In Mesthrie, R. 2002. Language in South Africa. 235-257. New York: Cambridge University Press.

33. Tariq, A., Bilal, H., Abbas, N., & Mahmood, A. (2013). Functions of code-switching in bilingual classrooms. Research on Humanities Social Sciences, 3(14), 29-34.

34. Wolfram, W., & Schilling, N. (2015).American English: dialects and variation. John Wiley & Sons.

35. Wong, K.-L., Ong, S.-F., &Kuek, T.-Y. (2012). Constructing a Survey Questionnaire to Collect Data on Service Quality of Business Academics. European Journal of Social Sciences 29(2), 209-221.

36. Xiaoil, C. (2013). Research on Chinese Colleague English Teachers' Classroom Code- switching: Beliefs and Attitudes. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4, 77-1284.

37. Yao, M. (2011). On attitudes to teachers' code-switching in EFL classes. World journal of English language, 1(1), 19-28.

38. Zabrodskaja, A. (2015). What is my country to me? Identity construction by Russian-speakers in the Baltic countries. Sociolinguistic Studies, 9, 217—241.