

Code-switching Versus Target-language-only for Saudi EFL Students

Mazeegha A. Al Tale'

Department of English
Faculty of Languages and Translation
King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia

Faten Abdullrahman AlQahtani

Department of English
Faculty of Languages and Translation
King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia
Corresponding Author: faali@kku.edu.sa

Received: 3/13//2022

Accepted: 5/25/2022

Published: 6/24/2022

Abstract:

Selecting the medium of instruction to teach the target language in EFL classrooms has been controversial for several years. This study explores the impact of code-switching versus target-language-only teaching strategies on beginner students' learning and affective sustenance of EFL reading comprehension based on their perceptions. It also explores whether there are significant differences between the participants' perceptions of these two teaching strategies' possible impact on their learning and affective sustenance. Moreover, it examines whether they prefer their teachers to use code-switching or target-language-only instruction in the classroom and the reasons for their preferences. A questionnaire and follow-up interviews were used to collect the data from 52 female Saudi college participants. The results indicate that the participants had positive perceptions about the impact of CS on their learning and affective sustenance in the EFL reading classes as opposed to negative perceptions about TL-only instruction. The results also show significant differences between their perceptions of TL-only instruction and code-switching, indicating that they prefer code-switching to TL-only instruction in their EFL reading classes. The study recommends that code-switching is used as a facilitating instructional strategy for EFL beginners to give them affective support and make the input more comprehensible.

Keywords: affective sustenance, code-switching, EFL instruction, reading comprehension, Saudi EFL students, target-language-only

Cite as: Al Tale', M. A., & AlQahtani, F. A. (2022). Code-switching Versus Target-language-only for Saudi EFL Students. *Arab World English Journal*, 13 (2) 437-450.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no2.30>

Introduction

Learning a foreign language in a classroom setting occurs through a communication/interaction process between non-native speakers and the teacher who teaches them a foreign language. During this communication process, the learners may reach different proficiency levels of the Target Language (TL). To solve the potential problem of a low level of English language proficiency, teachers may code-switch to the learners' native language to help them understand the meaning and structures of the target language to save time and lead to more effective learning (Cook, 2001).

This shift is called Code-Switching (CS); it alternates between the native and target languages. As Maftoon and Amjadiparvar (2018) indicate, this alternation is considered predetermined result of mastering different language varieties and has always been seen in multilingual communities. However, whether or not the students' native language should be used to teach a foreign language has been controversial for several years.

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

Researchers who have advocated alternating use of the first and target languages indicate that the teachers perform various useful functions in the classroom that facilitate language learning (e.g. Collier & Thomas, 2017). Language instructors who favour bilingual instruction through CS believe it is a valuable and effective tool that fosters beginner-level learning. For example, some researchers argued in favour of CS over monolingual instruction for the sake of course-content clarity, indicating that students are more attentive and less confused when teachers instruct them through CS (e.g. Al-Enezi, 2018). Others have developed instructional approaches in this regard, such as translanguaging, multilingual teaching, and plurilingual education (e.g. Piccardo, 2013).

Reading comprehension plays a critical role in the acquisition and learning of any foreign language, and it is considered the scaffolding for the remaining language skills. It helps language learners to construct, contextualise, and comprehend any received information in the target language. EFL teachers tend to employ different instructional strategies to teach reading and facilitate reading comprehension in language classrooms. One of the critical factors that directly affect reading comprehension is the number of known words in a reading text. When all the words in a text are unknown to the reader, comprehension cannot take place. In the case of EFL learners, the CS strategy discussed above might be useful in this regard, especially for beginners. EFL learning is also affected by emotional factors (Mehmood, 2018; Rahim & Chun, 2017). This study examines how female EFL college reading comprehension beginners perceive the effects of CS versus TL-only instruction on their learning and affective sustenance in the classroom. It also aims

at examining their preferences for CS or TL-only instruction used by their teachers and the reasons behind their preferences.

Literature Review

Researchers are increasingly interested in understanding the perceptions of teachers and learners regarding CS versus TL-only instruction. For the Saudi K-12 stage, Al-Nofaie's (2010) study showed the positive attitudes of both teachers and students toward using Arabic, students' L1, as a clarification tool in English classes. Although the teachers preferred using the native language for specific functions, they were reluctant to use it or allow students to use it. Also, Al-Shammari (2011) examined the purpose of L1 use at two technical colleges in Saudi Arabia. It also examined Saudi teachers' and students' attitudes toward the L1 role in the EFL classroom. The results showed that L1 is used for clarification purposes. The study concluded that L1 judicious use in EFL classrooms is beneficial for language learning processes, increasing learners' comprehension of new vocabulary and complex concepts. Gulzar and Al-Asmari (2014) investigated students' and teachers' awareness of CS dynamics at Saudi Taif University English Language Center. They found that although both Saudi EFL teachers and students share similar, relatively positive attitudes toward the use of CS, they have different views on the effectiveness of different functions of CS. Furthermore, they also have considerable differences in their awareness of CS and the idiosyncratic customs of CS in Saudi EFL university classrooms.

Additionally, Al-Mohaimed and Almurshed (2018) investigated Saudi EFL female preparatory-year college students' attitudes and perceptions toward L1 use in English classrooms. The results show that while beginner students hold positive perceptions of CS in English classes, advanced students have a negative attitude toward it. Al-Enezi (2018) also examined Saudi Arabian medical students' attitudes toward CS to Arabic in their classrooms. The results of the study revealed positive attitudes toward CS over TL-only instruction. Although most of them are aware of the benefits of using TL-Only instruction, they viewed CS as more preferred for understanding the course content. Moreover, they contended the idea that CS might lead to confusion in the classroom and showed increased respect for teachers who use CS. The study called EFL teaching and learning leaders to incorporate CS positives in EFL classrooms.

One year later, Mahdi and Al-Malki (2019) examined Saudi EFL learners' attitudes toward using in EFL classrooms. They also explored CS functions for teachers. The results showed negative perceptions about CS. However, the results revealed that the teachers used CS to aid low-level learners and streamline various language activities. Magundayao and Rosario (2019) also examined the views of 41 students and five teachers on CS in ESL classrooms in the Philippines. The results revealed that teachers preferred it since it helps them in classroom management, curriculum access, and building interpersonal relations with the students. The students also had positive attitudes toward CS, considering it an effective teaching strategy to simplify complex concepts and enhance interaction. Moreover, Narayan (2019) examined the role of CS to L1 (Fiji Hindi) in Fijian ESL classes and whether it enhances classroom interaction. The results revealed that CS is a promising strategy for language learning. The study called for enlightening ESL teachers about the benefits of CS.

Aoyama (2020) recently investigated Japanese high school students' use of CS to L1 during their communicative ESL activities and their attitudes toward such use. He used a survey and

classroom observation. The results revealed that all the participants partially used CS during communicative activities. The results also showed they used it for five speech functions (adding information, providing feedback, asking for help, giving equivalences, and explaining using metalanguage). The study called EFL Japanese high school teachers to benefit from CS in their classrooms to accompany communicative teaching strategies. More recently, Tubayqi and Al Tale' (2021) examined the attitudes of Saudi female EFL beginners at Jazan University and their two teachers toward CS to Arabic in EFL grammar classes and the reasons for using and avoiding CS. The study also presented some of the CS functions in EFL grammar classes. The study revealed that despite having positive attitudes toward MT in EFL classes, students and teachers are also aware of the adverse effects of its overuse. In addition, the results revealed that teachers and students use MT to perform a variety of tasks in the classroom that facilitate teaching and learning.

Rationale and Research Questions

As seen in the literature above, although several studies have explored the attitudes and perceptions of learners about CS in Arab and non-Arab EFL classes, most of them have concentrated on the attitudes of teachers and students toward CS and its functions. This study adds to the previous literature by deeply investigating the impact of both CS versus TL-only instruction on female reading comprehension beginners' learning and affective sustenance in the classroom. It compares their perceptions of the impact of CS versus TL-only instruction on their learning and affective sustenance in the classroom, attempting to present useful insights about the impact of CS versus TL-only instruction on learning and psychological states of reading comprehension beginners.

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

The specific research questions are as follows:

- 1 What are the perceptions of female Saudi EFL reading comprehension beginners at King Khalid University about the impact of CS versus TL-only instruction on their learning and their affective sustenance in their reading comprehension course?
- 2 What are the differences between beginners' perceptions of CS versus TL-only instruction in their learning and affective sustenance in their reading comprehension course?
- 3 What are the beginners' preferences of CS versus TL-only instruction in their reading classes and why?

Method

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

Participants

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

Research Instruments

The researchers used two main tools to collect the data. The first tool was a questionnaire (see Appendix A). The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part obtained the participants' demographic information while the second consisted of 11 items arranged in a Likert scale ranging from one ('most unlike this') to nine ('most like this'). This Likert scale has a mean score of 0.89 with an equal interval length of a low score of 1.67–3.63; an average score of 3.67–6.33; and a high score of 6.33–9. (see Table one).

Table 1. *Likert scale levels*

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

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

Research Procedures

The researchers gave the questionnaire to three colleagues from the same department— one associate professor and two assistant professors. One of the researchers distributed the questionnaire during the stage of the course. It was written both in Arabic and in English to ensure that participants did not face difficulty in understanding the items. The respondents had 15 minutes

to fill in the questionnaires in class. The researchers also invited the students for any clarification. In the same context, the researchers conducted semi-structured interviews with ten participants to get a more accurate account of the students' perceptions. Each interview lasted between five and 10 minutes. Then, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences programme, version 23, was used to conduct descriptive statistics of the questionnaire responses and inferential statistics comparison tests (a paired t-test) to compare the participants' perceptions of the two instructional strategies. The researchers also used Microsoft Excel to draw the figures of the obtained results.

Results

CS versus TL-only Instruction and Learners' Learning

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

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

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

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

The participants perceived CS to be effective and TL-only to be ineffective, as shown in Table 2. The paired-samples t-test shows a significant difference between perceptions ($t = 6.8, p = .000 = 51$). They view CS as an effective way to clarify difficult concepts. The paired-samples t-test indicates a significant difference between the two perceptions ($t = 4.6, p = .000 = 51$).

In addition, while they believed CS to have a positive effect on learning new vocabulary, their opinion of TL-only instruction as having the same effect was low. The paired-samples t-test indicates that there is a significant difference between the two perceptions ($t = 4.6, p = .000 = 51$). Furthermore, while they perceived that CS had a positive impact on learning reading skills, they perceived that TL-only instruction had an equally positive effect. A paired-sample t-test, however, shows that there is a significant difference between the two perceptions ($t = 1.8, p = .085 = 51$).

Code-switching and Learners' Affective Sustenance

The results show that the participants considered CS a strategy that gave them confidence, support, enjoyment, satisfaction, and comfort. It made them less stressed during lectures. Table three shows these results.

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

				Paired Differences

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

Notes: (L)=low level of preference; (M)=moderate level of preference; (H) =high level of preference

As shown in Table 3, the students perceived CS as having a positive impact on their confidence than TL-only does. The paired-samples t-test indicates that there is a significant difference between the two perceptions ($t = 7.9$, $p = .000 = 51$). The participants also perceived CS as positively supporting them in the classroom, while TL-only instruction was not as effective. The paired-samples t-test demonstrates that the difference between the two perceptions is significant ($t = 4.1$, $p = .000 = 51$).

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

They perceived CS as positively affecting their comfort during lectures. According to the paired-samples t-test, the difference between the two perceptions is significant ($t = 5.0$, $p = .000 = 51$). Their perception of the impact of CS on their feeling of being less stressed was high, but their perception of the impact of TL-only instruction was low. In the paired-samples t-test, the difference between the two perceptions is significant ($t = 6.5$, $p = .000 = 51$).

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

Interviews

Ten of the participants underwent interviews. Five of them were from the CS class and five were from the TL-only class. The first interview question was whether they would prefer the teacher to code-switch or teach them through TL-only instruction. The second question was to give reasons for their preferences.

Most of the interviewees reported that their teachers should use the CS strategy in reading classes. Only a few of them reported that they should use TL-only instruction. The following table shows this result.

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

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

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

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

Discussion

Regarding the first part of the first research question about the perceptions of the participants about the impact of CS versus TL-only instruction on their learning, the results revealed that generally, most participants believe that CS in class makes it easy for them to understand the course and learn difficult concepts and new vocabulary. These findings support Al-Shammari's (2011) conclusion that college beginners see CS as helpful in understanding new vocabulary and difficult concepts. They are similar to the previous studies that consider CS a beneficial tool in accelerating learners' language learning process, particularly for beginners, to whom most of the skills are new (Aoyama;2020; Maguddayao & Rosario, 2019; Mahdi & Al-Malki, 2019; Narayan, 2019; Modupeola, 2013).

As for the second part of the first research question about the perceptions of the participants about the impact of CS versus TL-only instruction on their affective sustenance in their reading comprehension course, most respondents see CS as a strategy that gives them more confidence and support in EFL language classrooms. CS helps them enjoy the lecture and makes them satisfied, comfortable, less stressed, and feel less lost during the lecture. This finding supports Aoyama's claim (2020), which was in favor of CS to support the adoption of varying communicative teaching strategies. As a result, students can have ample opportunities to be engaged with communicative activities and produce the target language confidently.

Regarding the third research question about the beginners' preferences of CS versus TL-only instruction in their reading classes the reasons for their preferences, most participants prefer their teacher's CS over TL-only instruction to teach them reading skills. They reported that they are beginners and need the input to be more comprehensible to them. This finding goes with those findings of previous literature reporting positive attitudes toward CS to the learners' native language in EFL classrooms (Tubayqi & Al Tale, 2021; Maguddayao & Rosario, 2019). This reasoning supports Krashen's (1982) comprehensible input hypothesis, in which he states that the TL input should be only one level above the learners' current level (+1) to be comprehensible to them. They also think that CS makes their language learning process more accessible with fewer psychological barriers, supporting Meyer's (2008) conclusion that 'the primary role of the students' L1 in the language classroom is lowering affective filters' (p. 147). It is natural and rational that using the mother tongue in a new learning environment gives positive affective support to beginners.

Conclusion

As seen in the above sections, EFL reading comprehension beginners' perceptions of CS as a teaching strategy is immensely positive compared with their perceptions of the TL-only instruction, which is highly negative. These findings indicate their need, as beginners, for a CS strategy to give them affective support in the classroom and help them understand the target language's new vocabulary and difficult concepts. Such findings will contribute to the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) and be of use for language institutions decision makers who may consider adopting new regulations and policies in favour of CS as a clarification tool for language instruction.

Implications, Limitations, and Recommendations

The findings of the study have practical implications for teaching EFL/ESL reading comprehension. Based on these results, EFL teachers might code-switch to EFL beginners' native language to create a more encouraging learning environment and make the input that students receive more understandable so that they can internalize it quickly. However, teachers should remind the beginner students that this strategy is just to help them understand the new vocabulary and difficult concepts. They must concentrate on the target language, using the teachers' CS only to understand the target language. This study also recommends that EFL teachers be aware of their students' perceptions of CS and code-switch when appropriate. The present study has some limitations that should be addressed in future research. First, the study was conducted on two beginner classes of a reading comprehension course. To support or reject the study's findings, researchers can further investigate the students' perceptions of CS versus TL-only as an

instructional strategy for teaching listening, writing, and speaking skills to beginners. The second limitation is that the study dealt with only female beginners. To complement the findings of this study, researchers can research male Saudi EFL students. A third limitation is obtaining the perceptions of students only. Thus, further researchers can also study both students and teachers' perceptions of CS versus TL-only instruction in Saudi EFL beginner classrooms. A fourth limitation is that the study was conducted on EFL beginners only. Further researchers can compare between beginners' and advanced learners' perceptions of CS versus TL-only instruction. With more research on CS versus TL-only instruction for teaching beginners, some theoretical conclusions about CS and EFL teaching will arise.

About the Authors:

Mazeegha Ahmed Al-Tale' is an associate professor of Applied Linguistics at King Khalid University (KKU), Saudi Arabia. Throughout her career, she has taught graduate and postgraduate English language courses, face-to-face and online. In addition, she has published articles in Saudi, Arabic, and international journals. Teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), digital foreign learning, and critical discourse analysis are her research interests. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6355-8816>

Faten Abdullrahman Alqahtani is a lecturer in the department of English at King Khalid University. She received an MA in Applied Linguistics from the University of South Florida. She is currently studying for her Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics at KKU. Expertise and interests include English as a foreign language (EFL), teaching and learning, curriculum and instruction, language testing, and error analysis. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0054-182X>

References

- Al-Enezi, M. (2018). Investigating Saudi Medical Students' Attitudes Towards English-Arabic Code-Switching in Classroom Instruction. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 14/1: 142–160.
- Al-Mohaimed, M. S., & Almurshed, H. M. (2018). Foreign Language Learners' Attitudes And Perceptions of L1 Use in L2 Classroom. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(4), 433–446. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no4.32>
- Al-Nofaie, H. (2010). Attitudes Toward Code-Switching as Facilitating Tool in English Classes. *Journal of Novitiate-Royal*, 4(1), 64–95.
- Al-Shammari, M. M. (2011). The Use of the Mother Tongue in Saudi EFL Classrooms. *Journal of International Education Research (JIER)*, 7(4), 95–102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.19030/jier.v7i4.6055>
- Aoyama, R. (2020). Exploring Japanese High School Students' L1 Use in Translanguaging in the Communicative EFL Classroom. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 23(4), 1–19. Available at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1242655.pdf>
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. P. (2017). Validating the Power of Bilingual Schooling: Thirty-Two Years of Large-Scale, Longitudinal Research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 203–217.
- Cook, V. J. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402–423. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>

- Gulzar, M. A., & Al-Asmari, A. (2014). Code Switching: Awareness Amongst Teachers and Students in Saudi Universities EFL Classrooms. *Higher Education of Social Science*, 6(2), 1–13.
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-Language Use in Language Teaching and Learning'. *Language Teaching*, 45(3), 271–308. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000067>
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Child-Adult Differences in Second Language Acquisition: Series on Issues in Second Language Research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Kroll, J. F., Dussias, P. E., Bogulski, C. A., & Valdes-Kroff, J. (2012). Juggling two languages in one mind: What Bilinguals Tell us about Language Processing and its Consequences for Cognition. In B. Ross (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 56, pp. 229–262). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Maftoon, P., & Amjadiparvar, A. (2018). Teachers' Code-Switching in EFL Classes: Deficiency or Asset? *Journal of Meaning and Sign*, 1(1), 107–127.
- Maguddayao, R., & Rosario, O. (2019). Code Switching of English Language Teachers and Students in an ESL Classroom. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 21(2.3), 102–122.
- Mahdi, A., & Al-Malki, M. S. (2019). Teachers' Perceptions Towards Pedagogical Implications of Code Switching: Saudi EFL Classroom Context in Focus. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 7(3), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0703001>
- Mehmood, T. (2018). Bridging the gap: Change in Class Environment to Help Learners Lower Affective Filters. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(3), 129-144. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no3.9>
- Meyer, H. (2008). The Pedagogical Implications of L1 Use in The L2 Classroom. *Maebashi Kyodai Gakuen College Ronsyu*, 8, 147–159.
- Modupeola, O. R. (2013). Code-Switching as a Teaching Strategy: Implication for English Language Teaching and Learning in a Multilingual Society. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 14(3), 92–94. <https://doi.org/10.9790/1959-1439294>
- Narayan, R. (2019). Code-Switching as a Linguistic Resource in the Fijian ESL Classrooms: Bane or Boon? *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(3), 427. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1003.04>
- Pasternak, M., & Wrangell, E. (2007). *Well Read Skills & Strategies for Reading*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Piccardo, E. (2013). Plurilingualism And Curriculum Design: Toward a Synergic Vision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 600–614. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.110>
- Rahim, A., & Chun, L (2017). Proposing an Affective Literacy Framework for Young Learners of English in Malaysian Rural Areas: Its Key Dimensions And Challenges. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 14(2), 115-144. <https://doi.org/10.32890/mjli2017.14.2.5>
- Tubayqi, K. A., & Al Tale', M. A. (2021). Mother Tongue Use in Beginner EFL Grammar Classes in Saudi Arabia: A Case Study. *Arab World English Journal*, 12 (4) 349 -365. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol12no4.23>

Appendices

Appendix A: Students' Questionnaire

Dear learners,

This questionnaire is designed to obtain information about your perceptions of the teachers' CS versus TL-only instruction in reading comprehension class. There are no correct or incorrect answers. The received responses will be highly confidential and used only for research purposes. Answer all questions as accurately as possible.

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

Part 1: Demographic information (Required):

Name and ID Age:Level:

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

Item No	A	B
1	My teacher's code-switching to Arabic encourages me gives and me more confidence to participate in class.	My teacher's using only the target language (English) gives me more confidence to participate in class.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
2	My teacher's code-switching to Arabic in class makes it easy for me to learn difficult concepts.	My teacher's using only the target language (English) makes it easy for me to learn difficult concepts.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
3	My teacher's code-switching to Arabic in class makes it easy for me to understand the course.	My teacher's using only the target language (English) in class makes it easy for me to understand the course.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
4	My teacher's code-switching to Arabic in class helps me understand new vocabulary.	My teacher's using only the target language (English) in class helps me understand new vocabulary.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	

5	My teacher's code-switching to Arabic in class is supportive to me.	My teacher's using only the target language (English) in class is supportive to me.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
6	My teacher's code-switching to Arabic in class helps me enjoy the lecture.	My teacher's using only the target language (English) in class helps me enjoy the lecture.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
7	My teacher's code-switching to Arabic in class makes me feel satisfied during the lecture.	My teacher's using only the target language (English) in class makes me feel satisfied during the lecture.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
8	My teacher's code-switching to Arabic in class makes me feel comfortable during the lecture.	My teacher's using only the target language (English) in class makes me feel comfortable during the lecture.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
9	My teacher's code-switching to Arabic in class helps me feel less stressed.	My teacher's using only the target language (English) in class helps me feel less stressed.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
10	My teacher's code-switching to Arabic in class makes me feel less lost during the lesson.	My teacher's using only the target language (English) in class helps me feel less lost during the lesson.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
11	My teacher's code-switching to Arabic in class makes me learn reading skills more effectively.	My teacher's using only the target language (English) in class makes me learn reading skills more effectively.
	Most like this _____ Most like this 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	

Appendix B: Interview guide

1. In Reading Comprehension classes, do you think your teacher should code-switch to Arabic? Why?
2. Should your teacher use only the target language to teach you Reading Comprehension? Why?

Appendix C: Consent Form for interviewees

Dear participants,

Please complete and sign the form below if you are ready to participate. In addition, please initial the boxes below to confirm that you agree with each statement:

	Please Initial box:
I am aware that my participation in this interview is voluntary, and I may withdraw at any time without facing any negative consequences. Further, if I do not want to answer any question, I may leave it.	<input style="width: 50px; height: 30px; border: 1px solid black;" type="checkbox"/>
I understand that any responses that I provide are strictly confidential. I understand that my name will not appear on any of the research materials, and I will not be identified in any reports resulting from the research.	<input style="width: 50px; height: 30px; border: 1px solid black;" type="checkbox"/>
I consent to the recording of this interview. It is understood that the audio recording of this interview will only be used for analysis and that extracts from the interview, from which I will not be personally identified, may be used in any conference presentation, report, or journal article developed through the research. I understand that no other use of the recording will be made without my written consent, and that no one outside of the research team will be allowed to view the original recording.	<input style="width: 50px; height: 30px; border: 1px solid black;" type="checkbox"/>
I agree that my anonymised data will be kept for future research purposes, such as publications related to this study after it has been completed.	<input style="width: 50px; height: 30px; border: 1px solid black;" type="checkbox"/>
I agree to participate in this interview.	<input style="width: 50px; height: 30px; border: 1px solid black;" type="checkbox"/>

Name of participant Date _____
Signature

Principal Investigator Date _____
Signature