

Functions of Code Switching in the English Language Teaching Classroom Discourse: Perspectives of Lecturers and Students

Farhana Tabassum (Corresponding Author)

Senior Lecturer of English

University Institute of Medical Lab Technology (UIMLT), Faculty of Allied Health Sciences (FAHS), the University of Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan

Hina Rafique

Assistant Professor of English, Govt.P.G. College (W) Satellite Town. Gujranwala

Nazia Akram

Lecturer of English

University Institute of Radiological Sciences & Medical Imaging Technology (UIRSMIT), Faculty of Allied Health Sciences (FAHS), the University of Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan

Muhammad Asim Khan

Headmaster, Govt. High School 50/D, Tehsil Depalpur District Okara.

ABSTRACT: *In the bilingual classrooms of higher education institutions of Pakistan, instructors and learners of English language tend to apply two or more than two languages alternatively and competently for diverse reasons and multiple functions. The study aimed at exploring the functions of code switching between English to Urdu languages, employed by English instructors and students in the English Language Teaching (ELT) classrooms' discourse. In the present quantitative study, survey research method was brought into play. Simple Random Sampling was used. The study unearthed the fact that majority of students alter language code to overcome their incompetence in English language, whereas instructors utilized code switching strategy to deal with students' language incompetence and to explicate concept that does not have an equivalent match in English language. The study recommended formulating explicit policies for the proportionate switch between Urdu and English languages at all diverse levels of education in the higher institutions.*

KEYWORDS: classroom discourse, code switching, ELT classrooms, bilingual classrooms, English language teaching.

INTRODUCTION

Pakistan is considered as the third world country worldwide where English has gained the status of official language and it has become part and parcel of all the fields of learning found in almost all the educational, technical, and business domains of Pakistan. Like other underdeveloped countries, in Pakistan too, it is viewed as the gateway to national and international progress. Over the last number of years, extensive and ubiquitous use of English language and the world eminent slogan 'Education for All' has augmented the value of English language in the cosmopolite world and has added a universalistic dimension to the teaching-learning of English in Pakistan. Currently, English is being taught as mandatory subject from grade one to graduation level. In as much as, perpetual elevation in the status of English, more attention has started been given to teaching English language and the use of English language as a tool of instruction for teaching diversified disciplines at various levels in Pakistan (Gulzar A, 2010, p. 26).

Notwithstanding, currently, English is being employed for teaching divergent subjects especially in private schools and colleges, but in innumerable higher education institutions in Pakistan are still thought out as bilingual. Accordingly, bilingualism is quite in vogue and recurring phenomenon of the classroom discourse in the present teaching and learning context where not only students but also instructors both are exploiting Urdu and English languages for facilitating teaching as well as learning. Hamers and Blanc (2000) expounded that bilingualism is the faculty of an individual to employ two or more than two languages alternatively and skillfully (Salla, 2010, p. 04). In Pakistan, code switching is a predominantly recognized phenomenon. Majority of the teachers, instructors and student switch language from English to Urdu or any other native language for various reasons and to achieve diverse functions. Manifold education policies have been formulated to uplift the standard of education, but the policies pertaining to code switching phenomenon, that is, how much, where and when the native language or Urdu language should be used, still need to be developed. Aforementioned, bewildered situation is conjointly ubiquitous in the ELT classroom discourse in various public and private universities of Lahore, Pakistan, where instructors of English language and the students do code switching from Urdu to English or English to Urdu, unrelentingly for numerous reasons and

functions regardless to any yardstick presented to them by higher education and higher administration of their institutions.

In this regard, various researches have been carried out on divergent contexts and prospects of code-switching strategy and for that reason it can be asserted that code switching phenomenon has multifarious implications that differ in disparate contexts. The studies on the functional basis on the code-switching phenomenon more especially alternation between English to Urdu language in higher education institutions of Lahore, Pakistan, is inadequate. Hence, the present baffled circumstances prompt the researchers to explore the reasons and functions of code-switching strategy either exploited by students or instructors in the bilingual discourse of ELT classrooms of higher institutions of Lahore, Pakistan.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF RESEARCH

Pertinent theories such as Classroom Discourse, Bilingualism and Second Language Acquisition, contributed in forming the theoretical framework of the research. Furthermore, the above-mentioned theories were integrated with the thesis of the research for the better comprehension of their pedagogical implications in the bilingual context of ELT classrooms in the higher institutions of Lahore.

Research Objectives

- I. To scrutinize various reasons for which code-switching phenomenon is being employed in the ELT classrooms in various private and public universities, Lahore, Pakistan
- II. To investigate students' and instructors' perspectives regarding numerous functions of code switching.

Research Questions

- I. What are the reasons for which instructors do code switching in the ELT classrooms?
- II. Why do students alter language from English to Urdu students in the ELT classrooms?

Significance of the Study

The study can claim to have had a significant and conspicuous place in the field of research because it would be useful and advantageous due to its subtle handling of varying pedagogical issues for those who aspire to choose teaching as a profession. The study provides insight into how to use handy tools to make students motivated, and concurrently it tends to make learning environment more interesting for students by restructuring the traditional set up. The study is likely to be productive and gainful for higher education administration in establishing an explicit criterion pertaining the judicious use of Urdu language not only in English language teaching classrooms but also in accordance with the different learning contexts.

LITERATURE REVIEW

From the last two decades, specialists in language have started manifesting a deep concern in the cogent aspects of bilingual discourse and irresistible code-switching strategy. History of code switching exhibited that in the years 1950s and 1960s, code switching was considered to be an insignificant and peripheral matter. Nevertheless, in 1970, influential work of Poplack on the syntactic features of the language, specifically interesting characteristics of bilingual speech, had veered the interest of the language specialists towards exploring syntax, psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic attributes of languages. Resultantly, a unique and distinctive act of code alternation phenomenon evolved into an area of prime significance.

Definition of Code Switching

As stated in the Oxford Dictionary that code switching is an alternate use of two languages or more than two varieties of languages in the same conversation. Gumperz (1982) defined code switching as the development of the code to shape conversational impact. Code switching is actually a strategy which is used by the interlocutor to accomplish specific function or objective (Ong, 2013, p.35). According to Stott (2006) the code switching is a phenomenon where a person changes from language variety to other different language. Hymes (1974) also affirmed that the word code-switching can be characterized as a predisposition for employing two or more than two varieties of languages with a diverse pattern in speech (Ayeomoni, 2006, p. 91).

THE FUNCTION OF CODE SWITCHING IN TEACHING AND LEARNING CONTEXT

In the case study of Lisa Khaerunnisa (2016) on the code-switching strategy of an English Foreign Language instructor among three languages, including English, Indonesia and Javanese in the classrooms. The research was intended to investigate different types and multifarious functions of code-switching process in the teaching and learning context. The data was acquired from the classroom observation and the interviews of teachers. The study manifested that three types of code switching were used for four different functions i.e. for the purpose of clarity, explanation, instruction, and appreciation and for maintaining discipline in the classroom.

Mujiono, Poedjosoedarma, Subroto, & Wiranto (2013) in their research work investigated the types and functions of code switching in the EFL classrooms utilized by instructors of English as foreign language (EFL) while delivering instructions. A qualitative approach was employed to collect data ethnographically via recordings, observations and interviews. The results revealed that the English teachers switched the codes from English, Arabic and Indonesian languages alternatively to instruct linguistic factor of language, for the pronouncement of the speaker, addressee specification, to show affection, to create humor, for clarification, to reinforce request or command, to ask questions, to give suggestion or advice, to bridge the gap of addressees' weak language skills, to make it easier to convey speakers message, and for discourse markers"(p. 53).

Pertaining to functions of teachers' code switching, Seedhouse (2005) in his study explored that teachers initiated code alteration to approach curriculum, manage discipline in the classroom, and to develop interpersonal relations with students (Rathert, 2012). Rose & Dulm (2006) carried out a research appertaining to diverse functions of the code switching used by English and Afrikaan students in the classroom interface of a secondary school in the Western Cape. The classroom interactions were recorded and analyzed within the framework presented by Myers-Scotton's (1993a). The audios discerned that students and teachers altered codes to attain various academic objectives such as, for explanation, verification, elaboration, fun and humor and to realize some societal goals like to establish identity.

Mattson and Burenhult (1999) listed numerous functions of teachers' code switching as topic switch, affective functions and repetitive functions. The attention of student is channelized for comprehending new concepts by employing code switching strategy from native/parent tongue to their second language under the heading of switch cases. Serving expression of emotion comes under the heading of affective function. In this phase, code alteration is accustomed by the teachers to confect harmony and better relation with the students, whereas in repetitive phase, the teacher applies code switching for conveying necessary knowledge (Ansar, 2017).

Garcines, Evageline, &H.Alvarez (2017) also explored the purpose and reasons of code alteration between English languages to native language by the instructors of English language teaching. The results revealed that English language is neither easily comprehensible for students nor conveniently grasped by them. Furthermore, most of the teachers also mentioned that their fluency also gets disturbed when they deliver lecture in English thence, they alter code from English language to their native language to make their teaching smooth and malleable.

Secil Horason in his research examined class room discourse regarding the level of code switching, its different patterns at sentential levels, and to explore the perspectives of the teachers and the learners towards code switching. Data was obtained through questionnaires, interviews and observations. The study brought into light that students exercise code switching for fulfilling meta-language functions (to perform grammar and language tasks). Moreover, the study also ascertained that code switching was a significant tool for learners to teach complex concepts and to create jokes, yet it should be negated when the competence level is achieved (Horason, 2014).

Eldridge (1996) established that learners code switch to attain typically four functions in the classroom such as floor holding, conflict control, reiteration and equivalence (Ansar, 2017). Sert (2005) ascertained that instructor alter codes to realize various functions such as to change topic, for displaying emotions and for reiteration/clarification. To change language for topic switch, an instructor builds a connection between the known (L1) and the unknown (target language content), making meaning clear. In code switching for affective functions, code-switching is used by the teacher to build solidarity and intimate relations with students, thereby

creating a helpful language setting in the teaching space. In case of repetition, language alteration is done by the teacher for clarity of meaning but as the students know that the instructor would repeat them in the L1, therefore restrict students to L2 experience.

Sert expounded further that the functions of the code switching that were identified by Eldridge (1996), which are equivalence, floor holding, reiteration, and conflict control. Equivalence is the similarity function whereby the learner makes use of the first language equivalent of a lexical item in the target language, which may be done when the learner lacks required skills to explicate the words that have been asked in the second language. In floor holding, learners fill the stopgaps with the L1, so as to avoid gaps in communication that could be the result of incompetence in the target language. In reiteration, student utilizes code-switching in order to reinforce, emphasize or clarify the messages and may be for the reason that the student has failed to transfer meaning exactly in the target language, or may be done to show the teacher that the learner has understood. Finally, code-switching for conflict control is whereby the student code-switches to avoid misconceptions (Mareva, 2016).

The above-mentioned functions are further elaborated by Sert (2005) that language alteration is a significant tool which influence English language teaching classrooms positively as it contributes in making students acquainted with diverse features of the target language that are unfamiliar to students (Bensen, 2013, p.73). Sert (2004) also found that students use code switching for the functions of equivalence, reiteration, floor holding and conflict control. Equivalence allows students to communicate well without gaps due to inadequacy. Whereas, while communicating, when a learner fails to recall a lexical item and employs that word in the mother tongue to avert superfluous void in conversation. Reiteration guides the students to become capable of their target language. Conflict control is used to hold off the misinterpretation when a learner forgets availing the correct elucidation in conversation (Mujiono, 2013).

An application of code alteration phenomenon not only makes the instructions effective but also enhances student's relationship with their teachers and gives a chance to them to feel confident when their participation is needed or when they have no clarity about a certain point while making use of native or mother language.

Atkinson (1993), with respect to this, argues that it is not only feasible to eliminate L1 from the classrooms at all but it also means to withhold the students from their learning tools (Iqbal, 2011).

Thus, it is concluded from the divergent studies that learners and instructors both apply code-switching in the teaching-learning context for attaining numerous functions. Pertaining to teaching and learning scenario, Reyes (2004) propounded that code switching is used for varied functions in the classrooms such as speech expression (2) coping quote, (3) turn shifting (4) topic and situation alteration, for focusing attention, explanation or persuasion, person's specification, question shift, and as a discourse maker. Another auxiliary function presented by Mattsson and Burenhult (1999) is the fragmented or thorough usage of the native language for the repetition in order to comprehensive information, however, it is intermittently exploited for the revision of the formerly articulated utterances (Fachriyah, 2017, p. 150).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Research Design

Quantitative research approach was employed in the study, which is mostly used to validate the proposed hypothesis or to find out an association among different variables. For that reason, deeply structured methods are used in the study such as questionnaires with close-ended questions, survey, and structured observation. The application of the statistics for the precise measurement of the numeric data is the distinctive characteristic of the quantitative approach (Marczyk, DeMatto, & Festinger, 2005, p. 17). Positivistic Paradigm is philosophical under pinning, which shapes the approach of the present study. The research design of the study is descriptive in which a Survey research method was employed to collect data from the respondents.

Sampling and Population

Simple random sampling was employed to obtain data from 200 students who were doing Masters in English Language Teaching (MA ELT) and Post Graduate Diploma in English Language Teaching (PGD- ELT) from The University of Punjab, The University of Management and Technology (UMT), National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Kinnaird College for Women and

Minhaj University, and from 200 lecturers and Assistant Professor of English language, who were teaching ELT classes in the above mentioned universities.

Research Tool

Structured questionnaire, comprised of 12 close-ended questions was developed to explore the functions and reasons of code-switching phenomenon from English to Urdu languages in the ELT classrooms discourse. “In a structured questionnaire, participants respond to prompts by selecting from predetermined answers (e.g., Likert scales, multiple choice responses); these data are typically analyzed quantitatively” (Harris, 2010, p. 01). However, the benefit of this inflexibility in questionnaire is that, it aids researcher to draw a meaningful comparison from answers of the participant across study sites (Mangal, 2013, p. 158).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS Version 21) was used to analyze data. The statistical test used in the study are Relative Frequency distribution to get the overview of the percentage of the respondents regarding each question pertinent to functions of CS and the Pearson chi-square test was used to discern the relationship between the different variables of the questionnaire. P-Value < 0.05 was considered as statistically significant value. The results were demonstrated through the table.

Table 1. Analysis of Functions of Code switching by Students in the ELT Classroom' Discourse

	Variables	Students n (%)	Instructors n (%)	p-value
i.	Equivalence			
	1.Strongly Agreed	90(45.0)	49(24.5)	.000
	2.Agreed	46(23.0)	101(50.5)	
	3.Neutral	27(13.5)	26(13.0)	
	4.Disagreed	27(13.5)	10(5.0)	
	5.Strongly Disagreed	10(5.0)	14(7.0)	
ii.	Reiteration/Repetition			
	1.Strongly Agreed	65(32.5)	70(35.0)	.000
	2.Agreed	60(30.0)	80(40.0)	
	3.Neutral	17(8.5)	30(15.0)	
	4.Disagreed	23(11.5)	13(6.5)	
	5.Strongly Disagreed	35(17.5)	7(3.5)	
iii.	Floor holding			
	1.Strongly Agreed	76(38.0)	42(21.0)	.000
	2.Agreed	58((29.0)	102(51.0)	
	3.Neutral	29(14.5)	16(8.0)	
	4.Disagreed	25(12.5)	27(13.5)	
	5.Strongly Disagreed	12(6.0)	13(6.5)	
iv.	Conflict control			
	1.Strongly Agreed	40(20.0)	59(29.5)	.000
	2.Agreed	101(50.5)	54(27.0)	
	3.Neutral	20(10.0)	22(11.0)	
	4.Disagreed	26(13.0)	34(17.0)	
	5.Strongly Disagreed	13(6.5)	9(4.5)	
v.	Language incompetence			
	1.Strongly Agreed	67(33.5)	106(53.0)	.000
	2.Agreed	62(31.0)	45(22.5)	
	3.Neutral	30(15.0)	11(5.5)	
	4.Disagreed	26(13.0)	31(14.5)	
	5.Strongly Disagreed	15(7.5)	7(3.5)	

Equivalence

Table 1 shows that 90 students (45.0%) and 49 instructors(24.5%) strongly agreed, 46 students (23.0%) and 101 instructors (50.5%) agreed, 27 students (13.5%) and 26 instructors(13.0%) were neutral while 27 students (13.55) and 10 (5.0%) instructors disagreed whereas 10 students (5.0%) and 14 instructors (7.0%) strongly disagreed that learners utilized code switching strategy from English to Urdu for emphasis purpose i.e. Sert (2005) also confirmed that students use native counterpart of certain words in target language in order to overcome his/her deficiency in the target language. A significant association was found among students and instructors about this function (p-value = 000).

Clarification/Reiteration

According to Reyes (2004), Sert (2005), Rita (2012) and Ansar (2017) students alter codes in order to reinforce, emphasize, or clarify their messages which they have previously transmitted in the target language. The analysis of the functions of code switching presented in the Table 1 exhibits that 65 students (32.5%) and 70 lectures (35.0%) strongly agreed to this function. 60 students (30.0%) and 80 instructors (40.0%) agreed while 17 students (8.5%) and 30 instructors (15.0%) did not answer. 23 students (11.5%) and 13 instructors (6.5%) disagreed to the statement whereas 35 students (17.5%) and 7 instructors (3.5%) strongly disagreed that students use code switching for reiteration. A significant association was found in the perspectives of students and instructors regarding code switching for the function of reiteration in ELT classrooms (p-value=.000).

Floor Holding

The results indicate that 76 students (38.0%) and 42 instructors (21.0%) strongly agreed. 58 students (29.0%) and 102 instructors (51.0%) agreed to the statement whereas 29 students (14.5%) and 16 instructors (8.0%) were neutral while 25 students (12.5%) and 27 instructors (13.5%) disagreed and 12 students (6.0%) and 13 instructors (6.5%) strongly disagreed that students use code switching floor holding. A significant association was found in the views of students and instructors floor holding (p-value =.000). Mujiono, (2013) and (Rita, 2012) also confirmed that students do code switching to avoid breakdowns while conversation longer turns in communication.

Conflict Control

Sert (2005) and Shay (2015) maintained that students exploit code switching phenomenon in order to avoid a misunderstanding. Table 1 illustrates that 40 students (20.0%) and 59 instructors (29.5%) strongly disagreed to the statement. 101 students (50.5%) and 54 instructors (27.0%) disagreed whereas 20 students (10.0%) and 22 instructors (11.0%) were neutral while 26 students (13.0%) and 34 instructors (17.0%) disagreed and 13 students (6.5%) and 9 lecturers (4.5%) strongly disagreed that students alter languages to attain the purpose of conflict control or to avoid misconception. A significant association was found among prospects of the students and instructors regarding code switching for the function of conflict control in ELT classrooms ($p\text{-value}=.000$).

Language Incompetence

The analysis of this function exhibits that 67 students (33.5%) and 106 instructors (53.0%) strongly agreed. 62 students (31.0%) and 45 instructors (22.5%) agreed to the statement whereas 30 students (15.0%) and 11 instructors (5.5%) remained undecided. 26 students (13.0%) and 31 instructors (14.5%) disagreed while 15 students (7.5%) and 7 instructors (3.5%) strongly disagreed that students employ CS to overcome their language incompetence. A significant association was found in the perspectives of students and instructors that students use CS to overcome their language incompetence ($p\text{-value}=.000$).

Table 2. Analysis of Functions of Code switching by Instructors in the ELT Classrooms' Discourse

S.no	variables	Students n (%)	Instructors n (%)	p-value
i.	Revision			
	1.Strongly Agreed	57(28.5)	67(33.5)	.000
	2.Agreed	97(48.5)	50(25.0)	
	3.Neutral	23(11.5)	37(18.5)	
	4.Disagreed	14(7.0)	32(16.0)	
	5.Strongly Disagreed	9(4.5)	14(7.0)	
i.	Grammar Instruction			
	1.Strongly Agreed	57(28.5)	66(33.0)	.000
	2.Agreed	61(30.5)	75(37.5)	

	3.Neutral	29(14.5)	43(21.5)	
	4.Disagreed	36(18.0)	13(6.5)	
	5.Strongly Disagreed	17(8.5)	3(1.5)	
i.	Checking Understanding			
	1.Strongly Agreed	46(23.0)	73(36.5)	.000
	2.Agreed	95(47.5)	60(30.0)	
	3.Neutral	22(11.0)	36(18.0)	
	4.Disagreed	18(9.0)	23(11.0)	
	5.Strongly Disagreed	19(9.5)	8(4.0)	
7.	Ease of expression			
	1.Strongly Agreed	69(34.5)	80(40.0)	.001
	2.Agreed	52(26.5)	55(27.5)	
	3.Neutral	11(5.5)	26(13.0)	
	4.Disagreed	28(14.0)	23(11.5)	
	5.Strongly Disagreed	40(20.0)	16(8.0)	
7.	Class management			
	1.Strongly Agreed	60(30.0)	80(40.0)	.000
	2.Agreed	55(27.5)	73(36.5)	
	3.Neutral	34(17.0)	25(12.5)	
	4.Disagreed	37(18.5)	12(6.0)	
	5.Strongly Disagreed	14(7.0)	10(5.0)	
i.	To balance addressee's language incompetence			
	1.Strongly Agreed	45(22.0)	70(35.0)	.000
	2.Agreed	46(23.0)	71(35.5)	
	3.Neutral	37(18.5)	30(15.0)	
	4.Disagreed	51(25.5)	22(11.0)	
	5.Strongly Disagreed	21(10.5)	7(3.5)	
i.	To overcome their linguistic incompetence			
	1.Strongly Agreed	29(14.5)	24(12.0)	.001
	2.Agreed	23(11.5)	37(18.5)	
	3.Neutral	16(8.0)	38(19.0)	
	4.Disagreed	97(48.5)	64(32.0)	
	5.Strongly Disagreed	35(17.5)	36(18.0)	

Revision

The results presented in the Table 1 show that 57 students (28.5%) and 67 instructors (33.5%) strongly agreed, 97 students (48.5%) and 50 instructors (25.0%) agreed while 23 students (11.5%) and 37 instructors (18.5%) were neutral, 14 students (7.0%) and 32 instructors (16.0%) disagreed, 9 students (4.5%) and 14 instructors (7.0%) strongly disagreed that instructors change language to revise the taught concepts. A significant association was found in the perceptions of students and instructors regarding teachers' CS for the purpose of revision in ELT classrooms ($p\text{-value}=0.000$). Ansar and Auliya (2017) argued that teachers change language for repetitive function as well as to impart knowledge to students. In this regard, Mattsson and Burenhult (1999, p. 9) also affirmed that teachers frequently use code switching for the repetition of the formerly articulated sentences (Fachriyah, 2017).

Grammar Instruction

The results presented in the table manifest that 57 students (28.5%) and 66 instructors (33.0%) strongly agreed to the statement. 61 students (30.5%) and 75 instructors (37.5%) agreed while 29 students (14.5%) and 43 instructors (21.5%) were neutral, 36 students (18.0%) and 13 instructors (6.5%) disagreed and 17 students (8.5%) and 3 instructors (1.5%) strongly disagreed that teachers use code switching for delivering instructions of grammar in the ELT classrooms. There is a significant association between the outlooks of students and instructors regarding instructors' language alteration for grammar instruction in ELT classrooms ($p\text{-value}=0.000$). Instructors do code switch from target language to mother tongue while delivering grammar instruction (Shay, 2015). Malik (2015) also stated that such type code switch signifies that teachers deem necessary to employ first language as a handy tool for expounding grammar of the foreign language.

For Checking Understanding of Students

The data obtained from the findings of the study reveal that 46 students (23.0%) and 73 instructors (36.5%) strongly agreed. 95 students (47.5%) and 60 instructors agreed whereas 22 students (11.5%) and 36 instructors (18.0%) were neutral, 18 students (9.0%) and 23 instructors (11.0%) disagreed to the statement while 40 students (20.0%) and 16 instructors (8.0%) strongly disagreed that teachers switch codes from English to Urdu for testing knowledge and understanding of their

students. A significant association was found in the view points of the learners and instructors regarding instructors' code alteration for checking comprehension of the students of the taught concepts ($p\text{-value}=0.000$). Garcines, Evangeline, & H.Alvarez, (2017) also stated as English is less used to be understood and teacher employ language change strategy for assessing comprehension of the learners.

Ease of Expression

The results presented in the Table 1 show that 69 students (34.5%) and 80 instructors (40.0%) strongly agreed to the statement. 52 students (26.5%) and 55 instructors (27.5%) agreed whereas 11 students (5.5%) and 26 instructors (13.0%) remained undecided. 28 students (14.0%) and 23 instructors (11.5%) disagreed. 40 students (20.0%) and 16 instructors (8.0%) strongly disagreed that teachers altered codes for an ease of expression. A significant association was found in the perceptions of students and instructors regarding instructors' code alteration for an ease of expression in ELT classrooms ($p\text{-value}=0.001$). While clarifying this function of code switching for ease of expression, Aichuns (n.d.) explicates that instructor alter codes from foreign language to mother tongue to facilitate their expression when "English word or expression finds its equivalent in several Chinese terms or when its Chinese equivalent is not easy to retrieve"(Gulzar, 2010).

For Classroom Management

The results presented in the table explore that 60 students (30.0%) and 80 instructors (40.0%) strongly agreed. 55 students (27.5%) and 73 instructors (36.5%) agreed whereas 34 students (17.0%) and 25 instructors (12.5%) were neutral. 37 students (18.5%) and 12 instructors (6.5%) disagreed and 14 students (7.0%) and 10 instructors (5.0%) strongly disagreed that instructors altered code for class management in ELT classrooms. A significant association was found in views of the students and instructors regarding instructors' language shift to manage classrooms during English language teaching and learning process ($p\text{-value}=0.000$). Cahyani (2018), Uys (2010), and Radzilani (2014) also confirmed in their studies that teacher use code switching for the class management.

To Balance Addressee's Language Incompetence

Table 1 show that 45 students (22.0%) and 70 instructors (35.0%) strongly agreed. 46 students (23.0%) and 71 instructors (35.5%) agreed whereas 37 students (18.5%) and 30 instructors (15.0%) were neutral. 51 students (25.5%) and 22

instructors (11.0%) disagreed and 21 students (10.5%) and 7 instructors (3.5%) strongly disagreed that teachers use code from English to Urdu to balance addressee's language competence. A significant association was found in the outlooks of students and instructors and majority of them agreed that teachers code switch to bridge the learners' language incompetence in ELT classrooms (p -value=.000). Mujiono, Poedjosoedarmo, Subroto, & Wiratno (2013) also found in their studies that English instructors switched between English to Indonesian language in order to come up to the level of students Indonesian language skills.

To Overcome Their Linguistic Incompetence

The results manifest that 29 students (14.5%) and 25 instructors (12.0%) strongly agreed to the statement. 23 students (11.5%) and 37 instructors (18.5%) agreed while 16 students (8.0%) and 38 instructors (19.0%) were neutral. 97 students (48.5%) and 64 instructors (32.0%) disagreed, whereas 35 students (17.5%) and 36 instructors (18.0%) strongly disagreed that English teachers utilizes code switching strategy to overcome their linguistic incompetence. A significant association was found in the perspectives of the students and instructors regarding instructors' code alteration for overcoming their linguistic incompetence in ELT classrooms (p -value=.001). Mujiono, Poedjosoedarma, Subroto, and Wiranto (2013) in their studies also explored that teachers sometimes had to face complication for elaborating information that did not have an equivalent match in English language.

Implication to Research and Practice

The findings of the study would lead the Higher Education Commission to frame language policies for an adequate application of Urdu language in accordance with the prerequisite of various programmers in higher institutions. The study also recommends students to lead themselves towards self-directed learning of English language through extensive and intensive reading and listening to British Broadcasting Corporation specifically. Instructors are also directed to take part in the self-access training courses to polish up their English language competence that would eventually result in the provision of expert language instructors in future. Sagacious use of CS shall be permitted in the ELT classrooms in order to facilitate teaching and learning process. An explicit language policy for all the courses offered by Higher Education Institutions to teach divergent courses of English subject such as English Language Teaching (ELT, Functional English, Communication Skills, English literature, and Linguistics, Teaching English as a

Foreign Language (TEFL) etc., shall be outlined to save instructors and students both from current bewildered situation. Twenty minutes of every lecture shall be reserved for divergent speaking activities (class discussion, role plays, presentations, information gap activities, jigsaw activities), so that students can practice speaking English to ameliorate their English communication skills.

CONCLUSION

The findings from the questionnaires of the students and instructors explored the fact that both instructors and students switch codes from English to Urdu to fulfill variety of function in English language teaching classrooms. Majority of student's employ code switching for the purpose of reiteration, equivalence, floor holding, and conflict control. Whereas, instructors employ code switching strategy for topic shift, repetition of basic concepts, checking understanding of learners, to manage their classes, to facilitate their expression, to bridge the gap of the student's language competence and sometimes to overcome their own weak English language skills. Consequently, owing to incompetence in English language skills of the English instructors, students confront obstacles in their ways to become autonomous learners, and the insufficient exposure to English language bereaved learners from global listening.

Another significant finding worth discussion is that whenever an English language teaching instructor switch code from English to Urdu it does not reflect his/her language incompetence or inefficiency. They often do code alteration deliberately for an ease of expression and to make their students stress free. The main concern of the instructor is their students and it is their responsibilities to make their students comprehend the taught concepts. English is not their first language and many students face difficulties in understanding lectures that are delivered throughout in English. Resultantly, many instructors switch to Urdu language to grease the wheels of teaching and learning process.

Future Research

The study was an effort to discover the functions of the codeswitching phenomenon in Pakistani Bilingual ELT classrooms where students and lecturers intentionally or unintentionally employ codeswitching strategy to achieve diverse functions.

Functions of codeswitching (from Urdu to English and vice-versa) can be further investigated in the variety of contexts such as honors program in different disciplines at higher institutions through survey research methods.

Furthermore, the utility of the codeswitching phenomenon can also be scrutinized by taking direct observations of the lecturers and students in their context to explore diversified functions and reasons.

References

- F. A. Ansar, and F. Auliya (2017). Code Switching and Code Mixing in Teaching-Learning Process. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris* Vol, 10, 29-45.
- H. Cahyani (2018). Teachers' code-switching in bilingual classrooms: exploring pedagogical and sociocultural functions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* Vol, 21, 465-479
[https:// doi.org/ 10.1080/13670050.2016.1189509](https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1189509)
- E. Fachriyah (2017). Functions of Codeswitching in an English Language Classrooms. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 148-156.
- D. V. Garcines, D. Evangeline, and D. H. Alvarez (2017). Code-Switching: Boon or Bane? *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences* Vol. 4 Issue 8, 1-10.
- M. A. Gulzar (2010). Code-switching: Awareness about Its Utility in Bilingual Classrooms. *Bulletin of Education and Research* Vol, 32, 23-44.
- S. A. Hait (2014). *The Functions of Code Switching Used by Secondary*. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320597672> Function of Code Switching Used by Secondary Students in English_ Classes
- S. Horason (2014). Code-switching in EFL classrooms and the perceptions of the students and teachers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 31-45.
- L. Iqbal (2011). Linguistic Features of Code Switching: A Study of Urdu/English Bilingual Teachers Classroom Interactions. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* Vol. 1 No. 14, 188-193.
- L. Khaerunnisa (2016). An EFL Teacher's Code Switching in a Young Learners' Classroom. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics* Vol. 1 No. 1, 2016, 13-26.
- G. Marczyk, D. DeMatto, and D. Festinger (2005). *Essentials of Research Design and Methodology*. John Wiley & Sons.

- R. Mareva (2016). Teachers' code-switching in English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction: Perceptions of selected secondary school learners in Zimbabwe. *IRA-International Journal of Management & Social Sciences*, 107-129.
- S. Moradkhani (2012). The Typology of EFL Teachers' Codeswitching: A Validation Study. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 106-126.
- Mujiono, S. Poedjosoedarma, E. Subroto, and T. Wiranto (2013). Code Switching in English as Foreign Language Instruction Practiced by the English Instructors at Universities *International Journal of Linguistics Vol. 5 No. 2*, 46-63.
- T. E. Radzilani (2014). The function and frequency of teachers' code switching in two bilingual primary schools in the Vhembe District of Limpopo Province.
- S. Rathert (2012). Functions of Teacher and Students Code-Switching in an EFL classroom and Pedagogical Focus: Observations and Implications. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 7-18.
- A. Rita (2012). Code switching in student-student interaction; functions and reasons. *Revista de Estudos Linguísticos da Univerdade do Porto - Vol. 7*, 177-195.
- S. Rose, and O. V. Dulm (2006). Functions of Code Switching in Multilingual Classrooms. *A Journal of Language Learning*.
- O. Sert (2005). The Functions of Code Switching in ELT Classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal Vol. XI, No. 8*.
- O. Shay (2015). To switch or not to switch: Code-switching in a multilingual country. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 462 – 469.