

The Impact of Code Switching and Code Mixing on Learning of English Language in Lower Secondary School level: A Case Study of Selected Schools in Rubavu District, Rwanda

Alphonse Nteziyaremye¹

Alphonse Ndizeye²

Alphonsine Nzabakirana³

Raphaël Benimana⁴

Patience Mugisha⁵

¹ntezalphonse1981@gmail.com

²alphandi80@gmail.com

³alphonsinenzaba@gmail.com

⁴raphaelbenimana55@gmail.com

⁵patienmugisha@gmail.com

¹<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-3081-7982>

¹Rwanda Polytechnic/Karongi College, ²Rwanda Coding Academy, ^{3,4,5}University of Technology and Arts of Byumba, Rwanda

ABSTRACT

English is the most widely spoken language in the world, making it essential for effective global communication. This is why individuals who aspire to thrive in today's global society must possess proficiency in English. This study focuses on how the use of code switching (CS) and code mixing (CM) affect the learning of the English language in G. S. Bisizi and G. S. Gikombe of Rubavu District in Rwanda. The study was conducted with the aim to: (1) identify reasons for code switching and code mixing in lower secondary schools; (2) assess the impact of CS and CM on students' performance in learning English; and (3) establish strategies to adopt in order to avoid CS and CM in English language classrooms. It was conducted based on the matrix language frame and sequential theories. A descriptive research design was used. The researchers employed a mixed method for data collection, analysis, and presentation. Its total population is comprised of 726 individuals, including 716 students, 6 teachers, and 4 school leaders from both schools. The sample size is 85 respondents (75 students, 6 teachers, and 4 school leaders) got by use of simple random sampling (students) and purposive sampling techniques (teachers and school leaders). During the collection of primary data, questionnaires, interview guides, and observation checklists were used as convenient tools, while documentation was used in collecting secondary data. The findings indicated that the lack of vocabulary, emphasizing a particular topic while teaching and learning English, and the intention to clarify the speech content are the major reasons for using CS and CM. They also reveal that CS and CM contribute to students' failure in learning English, as both create a lack of their confidence in speaking, limit students' practice in speaking English, retard their ability to master English, and lead to a low understanding and mastery of English. In addition, the study revealed that teachers are the main source for CS and CM in their classes. Finally, this research recommends that school leaders and English language teachers should reinstate a policy of speaking English in the school premises and make an effective follow-up to ensure students do not violate it. Teachers should also act as role models in their language classes by avoiding CS and CM, whereas the decision makers in education should initiate a short-term professional program and special ways to avoid CS among teachers to help students effectively learn English language.

Keywords: Code Mixing, Code Switching, English Language, Learning, Lower Secondary Level

I. INTRODUCTION

English is the world's most widely spoken language, used for effective communication and global interactions. Individuals seeking to succeed in today's global society need to be able to speak English (Fang, 2017; Ondracek, 2011). All levels of educational institutions around the world use English as the language of instruction, making it necessary for academic success. Many multinational companies require their employees to be proficient in English in order to communicate and collaborate across borders (Putra, 2021).

One cannot overstate the significance of the English language in today's society. English serves as a valuable asset for academic, professional, and cultural purposes, providing endless opportunities and enhancing both personal and professional life. With the widespread use of English as a lingua franca in business, education, and international communication, bilingual and multilingual speakers are increasingly engaging in code switching as a normal part of their language practice (Ningrum & Harida, 2021).

According to Ezeh et al. (2022, p.1), "The primary goal of language teaching is to afford learners' proficiency in communicating in the target language, self-development, as well as intercultural understanding of languages in the learning process." Code switching, influenced by situational factors and speaker motivation, has become a common phenomenon in the classroom. Code switching is a reality among students who navigate between languages based on the context and their needs. Understanding code switch and its impact on language use has become essential for educators and learners in English language societies around the world. To effectively navigate the diverse linguistic landscape of today's globalized society, it is important to acknowledge and explore the usefulness and complexity of code switch (Ningrum & Harida, 2021).

In Canada, a bilingual country, the use of the first language (L1) or code-switching (CS) in classrooms supports those who are less proficient in the second language and fosters a positive learning atmosphere. The practices benefit second language acquisition by facilitating communication in the classroom despite limited French skills and creating an environment that reduces emotional barriers to learning the second language (Ningrum & Harida, 2021).

Rezvani and Rasekh (2011) found that code switching and code mixing in Iranian elementary English as a foreign language (EFL) group yielded results similar to those found elsewhere. They stated that the necessary changes can improve the teacher-student relationship, improve teaching performance, help learners understand, and lead to a good teacher-student relationship, especially for beginners. The research conducted in four high schools showed that using the native language (L1) to facilitate English comprehension has a positive impact on learning.

According to Suryawati (2013), in Indonesia, where English is taught as a second language, teachers frequently change the language in the classroom, mostly for teaching purposes. However, personal circumstances and situations can also cause language changes. When communicating, both teachers and students can choose to speak in a single language or mixed languages.

Cook (2001) cites several references to argue that historically, South Africa has often frowned upon rule-changing framing in education and among the public. This misconception stems from the concern that code switching may undermine the quality of the language involved or reflect deficiencies in language skills. Monolinguals and those belonging to dominant cultures and age groups have a negative impact on exchange, especially in terms of comprehension, attractiveness, and originality of writing. On the other hand, Setati et al. (2002) discussed the situation in KwaZulu-Natal, where teachers argued for the prohibition of code switching and mixing, while Van der Walt et al. (2001) noted the practice of code switching and mixing in secondary schools in Gauteng. It is a case of code switching and mixing, despite the principal's objections to the contrary. These examples illustrate the general reluctance to embrace change and integration in South Africa, particularly in English language teaching.

However, in Tanzania, the use of English is common in some situations, especially when communicating with non-native English speakers. Primary schools and secondary schools must teach this course. Recent research shows a decline in the English language proficiency of Tanzanian students, leading to the use of digital and mixed methods in language learning (Qorro, 2002). The transition between Swahili and English creates difficulties for students because of change and mixing. A study by Marwa (2014) in the same context found that conversion from Swahili to English affected language performance. To solve this problem, middle school teachers code-switch as they teach to aid comprehension (Fuss & Iddy, 2024). This was not intended to facilitate learning and could be attributed to both teachers and students' limited English knowledge.

Language transfer (CS) and integration (CS) practices can influence students' learning in Rwanda, where secondary schools teach English as a second language (L2). Although Kinyarwanda is the official language, the fact that English is compulsory at school causes a mixture of the two languages used in English teaching. This will have a positive and negative impact on the learning process and outcomes of English language teaching in secondary education (Niyomugabo, 2015).

More than 90% of Rwandans speak Kinyarwanda, an important language of their own, and only 8% speak French. The shift to English as the language of choice is clear; around 2% of the population now speaks it. English. Education also reflects this change (Niyomugabo, 2015). Similar to other neighboring African countries, the indigenous people of Rwanda spoke Kinyarwanda both before and after the colonial period. Rwanda is a mixture of Rwandan and other languages taught during colonial times and considered "foreign languages," such as French, English, and Swahili. As a result, Rwanda has evolved into a multicultural country where people use different languages for internal and external communication. This linguistic diversity facilitates cultural interactions and connections at home and abroad (LeClerc, 2008; Munyaneksha, 2004).

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Rwanda's education policy makes the second language (English) the medium of instruction in schools, with all teaching being done in this language at different times depending on Rwandan history. Since 2008, the Government of Rwanda has made the English language a primary medium of instruction in all state schools, from primary schools to

higher learning institutions, and implemented the decision since the 2009 academic year (Ndizeye & Tabaro, 2023; Sibomana, 2014). Although English is the main language of education, Kinyarwanda is still very popular, and students do not have enough practice in English. They often mix English and Rwandan, leading to code switching and mixing when teaching English (Toribio, 2004).

In line with the above context, by the time they complete the lower secondary school curriculum, Rwandan lower secondary school graduates are expected to have developed the ability to effectively and confidently communicate in various daily situations. This includes mastering grammar, pronunciation, stress, and intonation to ensure clear and accurate speech, as well as expressing emotions, sharing information, and recounting personal experiences (Brock-Utne, 2007). Introducing CS and CM in class can be a helpful technique to aid in the teaching and learning of English at a basic level, especially for students in multilingual environments. However, various research shows that relying too much on the first language can hinder the progress of English language learners.

Lastly, as there has also been little attention given to code switching and code mixing in English language classes in Rwandan lower secondary school context, the researchers were motivated to conduct the current study to investigate the impact of CS and CM between English and Kinyarwanda languages on the acquisition of English Language (EL) in lower secondary schools in Rwanda. To be realistic, the study focused on G. S. Bisizi and G. S. Gikombe of the Nyakiliba sector, Rubavu District.

1.2 Research Objectives

The main purpose of this study is to determine the impact of code switching and code mixing on learning of English language subject in lower secondary schools in G. S Bisizi and G. S Gikombe of Nyakiliba sector, Rubavu District. Its specific objectives are the following:

- (i) To find out the reasons for code switching and code mixing in learning English language in lower level of in G. S Bisizi and G. S Gikombe;
- (ii) To assess the impact of code switching and code mixing towards students' learning of English language in G. S Bisizi and G. S Gikombe;
- (iii) To establish strategies to be adopted in learning of English language in order to avoid code switching and code mixing in lower secondary level.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

2.1.1 Sequential Model

According to Poplack (1980), he introduced the sequential model as a way to explain how bilinguals use two languages. This model looks at code switching and code mixing as separate things, of which code switching is when you alternate between two languages within one sentence or conversation, whereas code mixing occurs when you insert words or phrases from one language into another. The model utters that CS usually happens at language boundaries, like between clauses or sentences, and has specific meanings in language use and society.

Language codes get switched by multilingual people, and this task involves making choices between tongues. These decisions depend upon the situation, social reasons, and communication goals. Switching languages lets speakers use various language tools to form meaning. Additionally, the sequential model claims that code mixing can occur in a single sentence. Here, parts of speech like nouns, verbs, and adjectives are combined from two or more languages. Such mixing may display the speaker's proficiency, identity links, or associations with particular social groups (Poplack's, 1980).

However, Poplack's (1980) sequential model gives a detailed basis to grasp how bilingual people use language and the detailed methods of CS and CM. It stresses the distinct traits of these phenomena and their individual functions in communication. The model clarifies how speakers who know multiple languages navigate their linguistic repertoires across various settings. Understanding the mechanics behind CS and CM can illuminate language's dynamic essence and the intricate ways individuals navigate multilingual interactions.

2.1.2 The Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model

The Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model of structural constraints on code switching by Carol Myers-Scotton (1993 [a]) was developed as a way to account for CS patterns in bilingual discourse. The model states that

individual bilingual speakers possess a range of linguistic systems, which are activated according to contextual factors. Switching codes is influenced by MLF (Myers-Scotton, 2002). Matrix language frames, embedded language frames, and the congruence principle form the components of the MLF model. Dominant in nature is the matrix language frame, which governs code switching behavior. In this context, embedded frame languages represent subordinated systems that get activated simultaneously with code-switching occurring. Code switching patterns' naturalness depends on how well aligned the matrix language frame is with the embedded language frames (Myers-Scotton, 2002).

Code switching in the MLF model is viewed as a communicative strategy through which bilingual speakers negotiate social and language identities, manage power relations, and convey complex meanings that may not be easily conveyed in one language (Myers-Scotton, 2005). By shifting between languages within the confines of the matrix language frame, bilingual speakers could strategically combine linguistic resources from different languages to achieve their communication goals.

One significant contribution of the MLF model is its focus on integrating CS into the overall linguistic structure of a bilingual speaker. In contrast to other theories of code switching that may consider language change as an arbitrary or chaotic occurrence; it suggests instead that CS is a systematic and rule-governed process molded by a bilingual speaker's underlying competence (Myers-Scotton, 1993 [b]).

MLF model critics have raised worries about its relevance to all instances of code switching by bilinguals. For instance, some scholars claim that the model leaves out variations in code switching patterns in different bilingual communities (Poplack, 1980). Moreover, critiques have been leveled against the model's ambition to simplify complex interactions between various languages in bilingual speech using a hierarchical binary framework of language frames. Despite these criticisms, the MLF model still remains a useful theoretical framework for understanding code switching in bilingual discourse. It offers an organized and comprehensive description of the intricate processes underlying language-switching behavior through its emphasis on structural integration of code switching within a bilingual speaker's linguistic system (Myers-Scotton, 2010).

The MLF model has actual uses for teachers and language rules. By knowing how the matrix language frame works in multilingual speech, educators can develop better ways to help bilingual learners get fluent. Myers-Scotton (2010) says that understanding the MLF model can help teachers plan lessons that support students using words from different languages in class and transferring knowledge between them. The MLF model also helps us learn about language contact and language change in multilingual communities.

Hence, both sequential and matrix language frame models are considered very crucial and relevant to this study as far as both code switching and code mixing are concerned. This means that both models are the guiding theories based on while conducting this research.

2.2 Empirical Review

According to Ningrum and Harida (2021, 2), "There are two kinds of code generally applied in bilingual or multilingual society namely code mixing and code switching." Code is essentially a language variety or dialect used in communication. Code switching and mixing are foundational concepts of bilingualism, which involve the use of two languages by an individual. Students and teachers employ code switching and code mixing in and outside the classroom for clarification and ease of communication. The language of instruction greatly facilitates the acquisition of learning experiences (Ezeh et al., 2022).

The spoken language process called "code switching" is defined as the use of two or more languages in a conversation, often distinguished by language awareness. The exchange of two codes (words or language) between people who share these codes is referred to as code switching (Holmes, 2001). Code switching also refers to the phenomenon of bilingual or multilingual speakers switching between their native language and another language (Moodley, 2013; Ningrum & Harida, 2021).

"Code switching is used in sociolinguistics to refer the language shifting which is the tendency of bilingual to switch their language from one language to the other while speaking to another bilingual" (Ningrum & Harida, 2021). Code mixing, on the other hand, refers to the act of differentiating a language, language, or style of speech to fit the listener's environment. Teachers often use this practice to effectively convey their content when faced with difficult or ambiguous concepts that are difficult to teach without switching to students' language (Ningrum & Harida, 2021). Code switching occurs when a person switches between two languages or dialects when communicating with others (Toribio, 2004). On the other hand, the term "code mixing" describes the situation when a speaker uses two or more languages or words interchangeably in a sentence or speech. It may occur for various reasons, such as language differences, presentation and social differences (Muysken, 2000).

2.2.1 Reasons for Code Switching and Code Mixing in Teaching and Learning

Holmes (2013) identified six factors that can lead to code switching and code mixing in conversations. These include the use of multiple languages for rhetorical reason, differences in status and formality, the topic being discussed, quoting other statements or proverbs, a lack of vocabulary, and the involvement of other participants in the conversation.

One manner to reflect on consideration on code switching is as a shift in meaning that occurs whilst speakers circulate among or more languages. Variations in language carry social meanings just like metaphors carry complex meanings. As referred to via Holmes (2013), code switching is a device used by speakers to demonstrate the connection between the exceptional linguistic codes present in a community. Whilst engaging in code switching and code mixing, audio system apprehends their connection to a specific network and the relationship between the languages getting used. People who code transfer and code mix are generally folks who are familiar with both languages or are a part of the network that makes use of them.

Secondly, difference in status between the speakers in a discussion also leads to code switching. This means that the formality of the conversational setting encourages code switching to occur throughout an exchange. The speakers' employment of various forms of linguistic variation demonstrates the distinctiveness of this position. The urge to demonstrate one's social standing causes speakers to choose to employ a higher-status language rather than a lower-status one (Holmes, 2013).

Thirdly switching frequently demonstrates an alternation in a different dimension, such as the varied interactions among certain speakers due to their formality and status relationships. Higher linguistic prestige is typically employed in business, administration, education and formal communication. Conversely, the lower one is frequently employed to express the speaker's emotion throughout the exchange or to demonstrate unity or humor. For instance, conversations between a doctor and his patient are often conducted in a formal language, but conversations between two friends who do not display a social class divide occasionally take place in an informal language (Holmes, 2013).

In addition, code switching occurs during speech due to differences in the speakers' linguistic states. Changes in the level of formality within the conversation also contribute to the occurrence of code switching. Speakers utilize different languages to convey distinctions in their relationships. Typically, speakers opt for a more formal language rather than a more informal language to convey their relationships. Code switching can be manifested in various ways, such as altering the form of interaction based on the speakers' level of formality and status. The most commonly used languages are prevalent in professional, governmental, educational, and social settings. Conversely, less formal language is often utilized to express the speaker's emotions or convey sympathy or humor. For example, healthcare professionals generally employ formal language when communicating with their patients, while friends without significant societal differences may use informal language among themselves (Baker, 2006).

Moreover, when speakers switch between languages, they do so in order to convey their cultural identity and relay the intended meaning accurately. For instance, a Chinese speaker may switch from English to Mandarin Chinese when expressing Chinese proverbs. Code switching also occurs when a speaker rephrases what another person has said. Individuals often assess the truthfulness of the words they utter. The main objective of the speaker is to effectively communicate their message (Hoffman, 1991).

Furthermore, when an idea or item cannot be adequately described in the language that is generally used in society, code-switching leads to lexical borrowing from other languages. During a discussion, speakers frequently drop in words from a different language at random. The speakers' mother language plays a significant part in this conduct. This is a result of the speakers' increased propensity to converse in their mother tongue rather than in another language. As a result, individuals frequently revert to their mother tongue when conversing in a second language (Malik, 1994).

Conversely, speakers' proficiency in a second language also leads them to change their code, particularly when discussing specific topics linked to the second language in their native tongue. Their proficiency in the second language prompts them to communicate using it. For example, the conversations among the Chinese students studying in the United States are notable because they are exposed to English language usage in many of the topics they are learning. Then, during conversations inside their Chinese group, such English terms are incorporated into the Chinese language (Holmes, 2013).

Lastly, code switching is used to express group identity, inter-ethnic friendship, and a sense of solidarity with others. Speakers often exchange numbers depending on the relationship. Code switching may occur when social conditions change. An example of this is when a new speaker joins the conversation. Therefore, the emergence of code switching in conversation may be related to the presence of other speakers. Speakers vary the numbers they use from one language to another to express the relationship between members of a creative community. Code switching often

occurs quickly and briefly for social interactions, such as when a speaker communicates with another speaker to indicate that they are of the same race (Holmes, 2013).

2.2.2 Impact of Code Switching and Code Mixing Towards Students' Learning of English Language

According to different research findings, code switching and code mixing affect either positively or negatively the teaching and learning of English language. On one side, according to Alidou (2009)'s research findings, the motive at the back of college students' underperformance is not connected to their innate cognitive abilities but alternatively their insufficient mastery of English because of the lack of enough language of practice. A disadvantage associated with the utilization of CS in class is that scholars frequently perform poorly in tests as it is mostly considered to be an unreliable approach of teaching and assessment (Brock-Utne, 2004).

Additionally, the incorporation of both code switching and code mixing in the teaching of English can hinder students' language acquisition. Shifting among languages poses demanding situations for college kids, inclusive of in their mom tongue of Kiswahili, as noted through Mlay (2010). This fashion persists as college students develop to higher academic levels, which include excessive school, college, and university. Studies have shown that novices come across difficulties in correctly communicating in English no matter their grasp of the difficulty rely. Proficiency in English is critical for students to excel in countrywide examinations, whole their research, and pursue similarly schooling (Martirosyan et al., 2015).

Brock-Utne (2007) stated that it is evident from his research that code switching is linked to a poor understanding of the English language. Most students had trouble understanding proper English grammar, mispronounced words, and a lack of confidence while speaking the language. They did not grasp anything until the teacher translated or changed the language to Kiswahili.

However, Botswana is a multilingual African country where at least 25 languages are spoken, and English is the most widely used language in many fields such as education, government, law, technology, business and economy. The classroom often has flexible and integrated mathematics exercises where teachers use different words to help students better understand concepts. Multilingual teachers can be flexible when teaching to ensure better understanding among students. This change in language use, referred to as "code switching", is a common teaching practice in Botswana (Batibo, 2006). Likewise, in Nigeria, it has been found useful to include changes in secondary education at the initial stage. This is because it captures the student's emotions, but this should gradually diminish as their speaking skills improve. Considering the diversity of languages in Nigeria, teachers are advised to use different methods when studying flexibility as a strategy in teaching and learning (Modupeola, 2013).

2.2.3 Strategies to Cope with CS and CM in English Language Class

According to Cleghorn and Rollnick (2002) research, there are numerous techniques to prevent code switching while studying English. These were that professors should not use code switching while instructing in English, that scholars who reply to questions in elegance should be encouraged, and that students must make a robust attempt to repair mistakes that they make when speaking. Other strategies consist of the use of scholar-targeted strategies to increase participation in speaking English, using Individual Education Programs, restricting college students to speaking English both inside and outside of the classroom, motivation (Dilnoza, 2021) and using simple language by ways of explaining more whilst college students remain silent after asking questions.

Another tactic to save you code switching and code mixing in English language acquisition changed into located to be giving scholars access to the language they require. According to Nation (2003), the teacher would possibly have requested the scholars what they could need to say approximately someone and will have even given them a heads-up on a way to inquire about someone's appears and persona before assigning them to "inform one's preferred relative to his/her group." The teacher needs to also permit the learners to look at adjectives associated with look and persona. They then write their feedback after completing the speaking workout.

According to Khassawneh (2011), the best way to prevent code switching and code mixing in English language instruction is to have students work with numerous companions. He contends that assigning students to work with the equal partner on each venture reduces their inventiveness and makes them extra reticent to speak. However, following the commentary in the English schoolroom, he found that something a scholar had stated in his or her reaction had also brought on him to remember this tactic. One student expresses, for instance, inside the chat with the others: "I like speaking to my pair, but I'm concerned I might not have the ability to talk with anybody else in English!" These principles gave upward push to the approach of assigning college students to numerous companions. In his research, he also paired the scholars the usage of a few nouns and synonyms for a reading comprehension, take a look at a challenge to be finished in pairs. Every student decided on a sheet of paper with a phrase written on it, searched for the classmate who knew the synonym and collaborated with him or her. Once the undertaking changed into completed, each scholar wrote his/her own evaluation (Khassawneh, 2011).

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Study Area and Research Design

3.1.1 Study Area

The current study was conducted in two schools namely Groupe Scolaire Bisizi and Groupe Scolaire Gikombe known as G. S Bisizi and G. S Gikombe in this study. Both schools are located in Nyankiliba sector of Rubavu district, Western Province of Rwanda. G. S Bisizi and G. S Gikombe share the same state of being 9YBE schools.

3.1.2 Research Design

This research is descriptive as it applies a mixed method, combining both quantitative and qualitative methods (Mukama & Nkusi, 2019; Ronen, 2020) as convenient approaches that to allow the researchers to effectively collect and analyze its data. The study is described in-depth on the impact of code switching and code mixing on learning of English language subject with different methods such as collecting different types of data by interviewing them, observation and interaction through the subject.

3.2 Population and Sampling

726 individuals is the total target population of this research. During this study, the researcher applied a simple random sampling technique for selecting the students and purposive sampling technique to select the teachers and school leaders (Noor et al., 2022). By applying the aforementioned techniques, the selected sample size of this study was 85 participants composed of 75 students, 6 teachers of English and 4 school leaders, all from both schools. The table below contains the details.

Table 1
Sample Size

Category of respondents	School	Target population			Sample size			Percentage
		Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	
Students	G. S Bisizi	112	126	238	11	13	24	28.2
	G. S Gikombe	221	257	478	23	28	51	60
	Total 1	333	383	716	34	41	75	88.2
Teachers	G. S Bisizi	1	2	3	1	2	3	3.5
	G. S Gikombe	3	0	3	3	0	3	3.5
	Total 2	4	2	6	4	2	6	7
School leaders	G. S Bisizi	1	1	2	1	1	2	2.4
	G. S Gikombe	1	1	2	1	1	2	2.4
	Total 3	2	2	4	2	2	4	4.8
General Total		339	387	726	40	45	85	100

To sum up, according to the above table 1, the population of the study was composed of all 726 individuals including 716 students (333 males and 383 females), 6 teachers (4 males and 2 females), 4 school leaders (2 males and 2 females). The selected sample size from the above population is 85 participants categorized into 75 students (35 males and 40 females), 6 teachers of English (4 males and 2 females) and 4 school leaders (2 males and 2 females) from G. S Bisizi and G. S Gikombe.

3.3 Data Collection Tools

For collecting the primary data among the respondents, questionnaires and interview guides were used together with the classroom observations while documentation was used to collect secondary data of this research.

3.4 Data Analysis and Presentation

After data collecting, the researchers used an Excel sheet to analyze them. The analyzed data were presented quantitatively in tables showing frequencies and percentages followed by clear descriptions below them. The qualitative data were analyzed presented by grouping the related themes.

IV. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

4.1 Response Rate

According to the results from table 2, the 85 sampled respondents were interviewed or given questionnaires. Therefore, all the selected participants responded at the rate of 100%.

Table 2

The Rate of Responses

Response rate	Frequency	Percentage
Replied	85	100
Not replied	0	0
Total	85	100

4.2 Reasons for CS and CM in Learning English Language in Lower Secondary School Level

As it was among the specific objectives, the researchers asked the respondents different questions leading to the identification of the reasons for CS and CM in teaching and learning English language. All the three categories of respondents shared the same views there is a use of CS and CM in English language classes. To be specific on the reasons for CS and CM in learning English language in lower secondary school level, the researchers have dug deep by the means of the opinions of the students and the teachers, as well as those of school leaders. To arrive at the required reasons, firstly, the researchers asked the respondents to highlight if there is a use of code switching and how often it is used while teaching and learning English language. All the opinions and views of the respondents were presented using tables. The findings are clearly summarized in the table 3, 4 and 5.

Firstly, the students were asked to identify the probable reasons that push teachers and students to code switch and code mix during their activities of teaching learning of English language. The table below gives the details of their answers.

Table 3:

The students' views about why they use their mother tongue in teaching learning English

Reason	Frequency	Percentage
It is easy to explain in mother tongue (Kinyarwanda)	65	86.7
Lack of register (lack of vocabulary/lack of facility)	73	97.3
To clarify difficult concepts/to emphasize a point	69	92
Lack of competence in English language	64	85

The findings in the table 3 above show that a big number of student respondents agreed that the lack of register (lack of vocabulary/lack of facility) is the major reason of code mixing as 73 out of 75 (97.3%) of students confirmed. It is followed by the fact of clarifying difficult concepts or to emphasize certain points while teaching and learning English as 92% of students said. Then, 86.5% of the students argued that it is easier to explain complex concepts in their mother tongue. Additionally, 85.3% expressed their insufficient proficiency in the English language, which they attributed to their background.

On the other side, teachers of both schools were asked to identify the reasons using code switching and code mixing in learning and teaching English language. The table below gives the details of their answers.

Table 4

Teachers' Views on the Reasons of Using Code Switching and Code Mixing

Reason	Frequency	Percentage
Talking about a particular topic	3	50
Quoting Somebody Else	4	66.7
Intention of clarifying the speech content	5	83.3
Lack of register (lack of vocabulary/lack of facility)	6	100
To emphasize a point	6	100
For rhetoric/pragmatics reasons	3	50
For the differences of status and formalities	3	50

In the above table 4, the biggest number of respondents agreed that lack of register (lack of vocabulary/lack of facility) and the fact of emphasizing a point while teaching and learning English are the most important reasons of code switching as 6 out of 6 (100%) of teachers confirmed. The next is the intention of clarifying the speech content, as affirmed by 83.3% of teachers. Then, 66.6% of teachers said that quoting somebody else or other statements or proverbs is also one of the reasons of code switching in teaching and learning English. So far, talking about a particular topic while teaching English language, rhetorical or pragmatic reasons and the difference of status and level of formality were mentioned by teachers as other important reasons of CS and CM.

Table 5*School Leaders' Views on the Reasons of Using Code Switching and Code Mixing*

Reason	Frequency	Percentage
Talking about a particular topic	2	50
Quoting Somebody Else	2	50
Intention of clarifying the speech content	2	50
Lack of register (lack of vocabulary/lack of facility)	3	75
To emphasize a point	3	75
For rhetoric/pragmatics reasons	2	50
For the differences of status and formalities	2	50

In the table 5, a big number of teacher respondents agreed that lack of register (lack of vocabulary/lack of facility) and a need to emphasize a point while teaching and learning English are the most important reasons of code switching as 3 out of 4 (75%) of school leaders confirmed. Then, talking about a particular topic while teaching English language and to emphasize a crucial point was presented as the next key reasons of CS and CM. The rest four mentioned reasons for CS and CM in English language classes are the intention of clarifying the speech content, quoting somebody else, talking about a particular topic, rhetoric/pragmatics reasons and the differences of status and formalities as 50% of school leaders highlighted.

During the class observations, the researchers noted at G. S Gikombe that the lesson was taking place in English language, but two of three classes in the school, the teacher used English language from the beginning of the lesson to the end of the lesson. Unlikely, most of the students were able to follow what was spoken by their teacher. On the other hand, at G. S Bisizi the researchers noted that teachers used English language then changed to their mother tongue (Kinyarwanda language). Once the teacher asked questions, students remain silent while others murmured among themselves. Then, after switching to Kinyarwanda language, assuming that the students did not understand the language rather than elaborating more or rephrasing the questions in the English language for them to understand questions asked in the English language, they could answer effectively. In the one class at G. S Bisizi, the researchers observed that the teacher used English and Kinyarwanda language because she was accustomed to the situation and not that students did not understand what was spoken. Therefore, the researchers observed that that most teachers switched and mixed between English and Kinyarwanda language to make students understand the meaning of English words or sentences.

4.3 Impact of Code Switching and Code Mixing Towards Students' Learning of English Language

The objective number two of the study explores the impact of CS and CM towards the students' learning of English language. The students, teachers and school leaders were asked about what they see as impact of CS and CM on the students' learning of English language. All their opinions from the respondents are summarized below. On one side, the students were asked to share their view on how code switching and code mixing impact on students' mastery of English language. Their responses were compiled in the following table.

Table 6*Students' views on the impact of CS & CM on students' learning of English language*

Impact	Rate	Percentage
Fail to perform well in examinations	73	97.3
Difficult for learners to master English language	65	86.6
Failure to understand the English language	70	93.3
Failed to understand how words are pronounced	67	89.3
Lack of confidence when speaking the English language	69	92
Errors in making English sentences	63	84
Poor command to make students in speaking English language	61	81.3

For the findings summarized in the table 6, the respondents stated that the use of both languages contribute on students' failure in mastering English language because students fail to perform well in examinations in English language as expressed by the percentage of 97.3% of students. The findings also show that students failure to understand the English language as expressed by the percentage of 93.3%. In addition, the percentage of 92% affirmed that code switching leads to lack of confidence when speaking the English language. Furthermore, 89.3% of the students said that that code switching causes students to fail to understand how words are pronounced. Then, 86.6% of the students agreed that due to code switching it is difficult for learners to master English language. So far, 84% of the students said that there are errors in making English sentences as the result of using code switching frequently. Lastly, 81.3% of the students said that there is poor command to make students in speaking English language.

In the interviews, teachers were asked to give their views whether the use of CS and CM influence students learning of English language and 4 (66.7). Also in the interview with the school leaders they gave their views that the use of code switching and code mixing influence negatively the students language learning failure to speak English language at the rate of 75% (3 out of 4). Their views centered on the view that the use of code switching and code mixing diminish the ability of students to leaning English language by hindering students from fully immersing themselves in the language and acquiring the necessary vocabulary, grammar skills, and/or master English speaking skills. They also added that the CS and CM lead to confusion and inconsistency in language use, making it difficult for students to develop proficiency in English.

Therefore, during the class observations, the researchers found out that the code switching and code mixing contribute to students' failure in learning English language (Odhiambo, 2021) as some teachers and students could code switch and code mix to Kinyarwanda during the observed English language class activities. In the same way, that leads to students failure to think critically in the target language (English), students lack of confidence in speaking the English language, as well as the poor performance in examinations of English language and other subject taught in that language.

4.4 Strategies to be adopted in Teaching And Learning of English Language in order to avoid Code Switching and Code Mixing in Lower Secondary Level

As aforementioned, the objective number three of the study was to establish strategies to be adopted in learning of English language in order to avoid code switching and code mixing in lower secondary level. With the same purpose, all participants were requested to provide their opinions about the strategies/ways that can be used to avoid code switching in learning English language. The students' answers were summarized in the following table.

Table 7

Students' Views about Strategies that can be used to avoid Code Switching in Learning English Language

Strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Motivation to students who speak English language in class	70	93.3
Correct students' mistakes through speaking English language	73	97.3
Consistent English language use	74	98.7
Follow English language curriculum	70	93.3
Give students more time to practice English language speaking	69	92
Peer support	63	84
School language support	66	88

The findings in the table above number 7 show that a big number of respondents agreed that there exist various ways to avoid code switching and code mixing in learning and teaching English language. The ways mentioned include but not limited the restriction of students to speak English language inside and outside the class (consistent English language use) as (98.7%) of the students respondents highlighted it, to correct mistakes the students' mistakes through speaking as expressed by 97.3% of the students, following English language curriculum as said by 93.3% of the students, motivating the students who speak English in class (93.3%), giving students more time to practice English language (92%), school language support (88 %) and peer support as said by 84% of the students.

In the same context, teachers were asked to outline some of the ways to avoid CS and CM in learning English language. Their answers are presented in table below.

Table 8*Teachers' Views about Strategies that can be used to avoid Code Switching in Learning English Language*

Strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Motivation to students who speak English language in class	5	83.3
Correct students' mistakes through speaking English language	6	100
Consistent English language use	6	100
Follow English language curriculum	5	83.3
Give students more time to practice English language speaking	5	83.3
Peer support	4	66.7
School language support	5	83.3
Apply student-centered method	5	83.3
Using simple English language	4	66.7
Vocabulary expansion	4	66.7

The finding in the table above show that a big number of teachers respondents agreed that the main ways to avoid code switching and code mixing in learning and teaching English language are: the consistent English language use and the correction of mistakes done by students through speaking as 6 out of 6 (100%) of them revealed. They are followed by motivating the students who speak English, the use of student-centered method to increase student's participation in speaking the English language, following the English language curriculum, giving students more time to practice English language speaking, and the provision of the school language support as said by 83.3% of the teachers. Finally, 66.7% of them shared their view that peer support, use of simple English language and the vocabulary expansion strategies can be applied in order to avoid CS and CM in English language teaching and learning.

During the interviewed conducted, school leaders were also asked about strategies/ways that can be used to avoid code switching in learning English language. They stated that the strategies should include the restriction of students to speak English language inside and outside the class (consistent English language use), correction of the mistakes done by students through speaking, the use of student-centered method as it increases student's participation in speaking the English language as 4 out of 4 (100%) of respondents highlighted. They also proved that follow English curriculum, giving students a lot of time to exercise speaking at the rate of 75%. Lastly, 50 of the school leaders shared the same views that motivating students who speak English in the school premises, providing language support at school, the vocabulary expansion, peer support and the use of simple English language would work better in teaching and learning English language rather than adopting the CS and CM in classes.

4.5 Discussions

This section discusses the above findings by relating them to the existing literature. Firstly, the researchers give the summary of the reasons of code switching and code mixing in the learning English language in the selected schools. Secondly, it discusses the impact of code switching and code mixing towards students' learning of English language. Finally, the strategies to avoid code switching and code mixing in learning English language are discussed.

4.5.1 The Reasons of Code Switching and Code Mixing in the Learning English Language in the Selected Schools

As it was confirmed by the respondents who often explained that code switch exist when the speakers (teachers and students) the first among the major reasons of CS and/or CM is the lack an appropriate expression or vocabulary in their communication. This normally happens when the speakers miss a particular word needed in the target language in teaching and or learning process. It is also said a result of incompetent in English language, when they do not know some terms in English, and leads them to the CS and or CM during teaching and learning activities. In Holmes (2013) research, he justified that the students do code switch and code mix to interact when they speak to their teachers and audience in the classes because they are unable to find specific words to use. Secondly, talking about a particular topic was found to be another reason. The teachers and school leaders and most of teachers shared their viewpoint that teachers sometimes prefer to talk about a particular topic in Kinyarwanda rather than in English language. In fact, they do this because they feel free, more comfortable and easy to express their emotional feelings in their mother tongue that is their familiar language. On the other side, as the majority of students are not familiar with English, so the teachers mostly switch English with Kinyarwanda language with the intention to satisfy their needs, with the intent to avoid misunderstanding and conflicts. Also in support of this study's finding, the findings of Hoffman (1991) found that speakers sometimes prefer to talk about a particular topic in one language rather than in

another because a speaker feels free, more comfortable and easy to express their emotional feelings in a language that is their everyday language or familiar with it. Thirdly, the views of 83.3% of teachers and 50% of school leaders affirmed that code switching occurs when they have intention of clarifying the speech content. They said that when they discuss between themselves, there occurs lots of CS and/or CMs. It means to make the content run smoothly and can be clearly understood. Code switching takes place many times because the teachers want to emphasize the message that they want to convey (Probyn, 2006). Teachers also said that when they teach grammar and when they give instructions to the students, they mostly code switch to explain the content since they think that it is the best way to make sure that all students get their message as it is. Another factor leading the respondents to code switching and code mixing was said to be the emphasis, which is considered a very significant factor in linguistic study. It means that a majority of the respondents code switched and code mixed to either stress a particular statement or to make a statement clearer for others to understand (Fussy & Iddy, 2024). Similarly, Baker (2006) points out that, CS and CM can be used to emphasize a particular point, to substitute a word in place of an unknown word in the target language. This can also be adopted to express a concept that has no equivalent in the culture of the other language, to reinforce a request, to clarify a point, to express identity and friendship, to ease tension and inject humour into a conversation (Baker, 2006).

Furthermore, the views many teachers and school leaders were that quoting somebody else or other statements such as proverbs is also another reasons of code switching in teaching and learning English. This happens when the teachers quote famous expressions or utterances. Hoffman (1991) noted that the quotations are usually from the public figure or famous people. Those famous expressions or saying can be quoted intact in their original language. Additionally, students, teachers and school leaders revealed that code switching and code mixing are used for rhetoric or pragmatics reasons. The CS and CM are done to enrich the utterance. This code switching and code mixing used to represent rhetorical skills of the speaker. Sometimes the changing of the language used to persuade the listeners in order to make them understand. It makes the utterance categorized as metaphorical code switching (Malik, 1994). This happens as a result of the fluency of the speaker to use both Kinyarwanda and English in daily life, and sometimes the teachers unconsciously and even spontaneously switched between both languages. Lastly, as the views of teachers and school leaders said that CS and CM are used for the differences of status and formalities. This is so as code switching may sometimes occur as a result of the status distinction (Ningrum & Harida, 2021) among the speakers involved in a conversation. Besides that, the formality of conversation circumstance also stimulates the occurrence of CS. Again, the distinction of this status is shown in the use of the different forms of language variety among teachers and students. The use of higher form of a language, which has higher prestige instead of using the lower one by the speakers, is triggered by the desire to show their social status (Mlay, 2010). The respondents also stated that CS and CM are strategies to express group identity because the way people communicate with their group are obviously different from the way they communicate with people from other groups. As it has been mentioned previously, the way of communication of academic people in their disciplinary groupings, are obviously different from other groups. In other words, the way of communication of one community is different from the people who are out of the community.

4.5.2 Impact of Code Switching and Code Mixing towards Students' Learning of English Language

The findings also showed that there exists a significant impact of CS and CM to students' learning of English. The students' failure to understand the English language was expressed by 93.3% of students and a big number of English teachers and school leaders. As the respondents said, code switching and code mixing make it difficult for students to fully grasp the English language as they do not get familiar with the target language (Odhiambo, 2021) because they tend to automatically code mix/or code switch frequently. Brock-Utne and Holmarsdottir (2002) stated that when teachers and students frequently switch between languages, it can create confusion and hinder their ability to understand English effectively. Therefore, students might struggle with vocabulary, grammar and overall comprehension of the target language as they do not concentrate on it. Thus, it is important for students to immerse themselves in English and practice using it consistently to avoid such difficulties.

Also, a wide number of English teachers and all school leaders affirmed that code switching leads to the lack of confidence when speaking the English language. The respondents affirmed that when code switching occurs frequently in the classroom during English language learning, students become dependent on their native language instead of fully engaging with English language. In the same way, Brock-Utne (2007) stated that code switching and code mixing can lead to the lack of confidence in using English language because they can feel more comfortable relying on their native language. It, thus, is important for students to practice English language skills consistently to build their fluency and confidence (Brock-Utne, 2004).

Finally yet importantly, 81.3% of the students and most of English teachers and all school leaders said that there is poor command to make students speaking English language. According to Cleghorn & Rollnick (2002), code

switching sometimes leads to a poor command of speaking English language. They agreed that when students frequently switch between languages, it hinders their ability to develop fluency and proficiency in English language (Brock-Utne, 2004). They may struggle with pronunciation, word choice and overall coherence in their speech. To improve their command of speaking English, it is important for students to practice using English language consistently and engage in activities that promote active communication skills in English language.

4.5.3 Strategies to avoid Code Switching and Code Mixing in Learning English Language

The section gives the summary of the strategies that can be used to avoid code switching in learning English language. As it was expressed by all of the respondents of 98.7% (students), 100% of English teachers and 100% of school leaders are key to avoid code switching. It is clear that teachers should not involve in either code switching or code mixing when teaching the English language. The finding of this study in this point is in agreement with the finding of Cleghorn & Rollnick's (2002) which highlights that professors should not use CS and CM while instructing in English. Instead, teachers restrict students to speak English language inside and outside the class. Therefore, it is always better those teachers encourage students to consistently use English language during their classroom activities. This will, then, help them in creating an immersive English speaking environment and reduce the temptation to mix or switch to native language.

The point of views of 97.3% of the students, 100% of English teachers and 100% of school leaders asserted that should correct mistakes done by students through speaking English language during their classroom activities. Through the discussion with the respondents, the managed affirmed that when the teachers correct mistakes made by their students during speaking activities, it can help them to avoid code switching and / or code mixing in learning English language. The findings on this point are aligned with the one of Cleghorn & Rollnick (2002) who argued that teachers could prevent the use of CS and CM by correcting mistakes done by students through speaking. This can include correcting grammar errors, suggesting alternative vocabulary or providing effective pronunciation guidance. They, then, can do this by creating a supportive and non-judgmental environment as a key to encouraging students to take risks and improve their English language skills without relying on code switching or code mixing.

As far as Rwanda shifted from Knowledge Based Curriculum (KBC) to Competency-Based Curriculum (CBC) (Nteziyaremye et al., 2024), the viewpoint of 97.3% of the students, 100% of English teachers and 100% of school leaders' the use of student-centered method to increase student's participation in speaking the English language can help in avoiding code switching in English language learning. As the respondents emphasized, by focusing on the needs and interests of individual students, teachers can create a supportive and engaging learning environment. This can include interactive activities, discussions and projects that encourage students to express their ideas in English and when students feel empowered and motivated to use it. In that context, students are less likely to rely on code switching as a crutch. Their full involvement in the lesson activities promotes active participation and fosters a deeper understanding of English language. The findings in this particular point go hand in hand with the findings of Cleghorn & Rollnick (2002) which revealed the use of student-centred method in a language classroom increases student's participation in speaking the English language.

Moreover, 93.3% of the students, 83.3% of English teachers and 75% of school leaders mentioned the use of use and following of English language curriculum as a way that can definably help in avoiding CS and CM in learning English language. As the designed English program or curriculum provides structured lessons and activities that focus of building proficiency in English language, Rwanda Education Board ([REB], 2015) emphasizes the effective use of the curriculum, which encourages active participation and provide ample opportunities for practice. This is in agreement with the findings of Cleghorn and Rollnick (2002) who stated an English program or curriculum can help students develop a strong command of the language and reduce the need for code switching.

For the point of views of 93.3% of the students, 66.7% of English teachers and 50% of school leaders, motivating students who speak English in class help in avoiding code switching when learning English language. In the discussion with the respondents, it was found that when students receive positive reinforcement and recognition for their efforts, it boots their confidence and encourages them to actively participate (Dilnoza, 2021) in English speaking activities. They continued saying that by creating a supportive and encouraging classroom environment, teachers can motivate students to express themselves in English, reducing the reliance on code switching. Thus, it is all about creating a safe space where students feel valued and empowered to use English language. In the same vein, Probyn (2006) suggested that class motivation for students who answer questions in class increase the participations of students in English language classroom.

Furthermore, as it is sorted from the table above, the number of 92% of the students, 83.3% of English teachers and 75% of school leaders suggested that teachers should give students a lot of exercise to practice English language in all four skills of any language that is listening, speaking, reading and writing which can really help in avoiding code switching. All of them agreed up on that when teachers provide ample opportunities for practice,

students get more comfortable using English in various contexts. Moreover, Nation (2003) in his study leveled that by engaging in exercises that focus on the above stated different language skills students can develop their English proficiency and reduce the need for code switching and code mixing. As the proverb also goes, practice makes perfect. Similarly, Baker (2006), in his study, substantiated that students should be exposed to the English language for long periods of time in order to become more fluent and master the English language, which facilitate using well-formed expressions without the use of code switching and code mixing. Such activities may include group discussions, oral presentations, debates and role-plays. Thus, by providing the meaningful opportunities to the students for English more practice, they will always feel more motivated to use English language consistently.

It was also indicated by 88% of the students, 83.3% of English teachers and 50% of school leaders that teachers should provide language support and resources to help the students to understand and express themselves in English language as a way of avoiding code switching and mixing in English lessons. As said by some respondents this can include vocabulary lists, grammar explanations and examples to help the students to communicate their thoughts and ideas in English language more confidently. In the same way, Khassawneh (2011) highlighted that teachers should have the ability to support students in building English vocabulary items and grammatical structure. Hence, it is suggested that teachers should be limited from using their mother tongue in order to enable students to better master the English language.

Moreover, as it was also asserted that teachers should focus on building students' vocabulary repertoire in English language, this view was said was given to highlight that teachers their students with a range of words and phrases to help them express themselves more effectively in English language without relying on code switching. This is in the same view with Khassawneh (2011) who noted that the usage of synonyms for a reading comprehension expand the student's vocabulary.

In addition, as long as the 84% of the students, 66.7% of teachers and 50% of school leaders declared that using peer support can surely help in avoiding code switching and/or code mixing, it was due to the fact that when teachers foster a supportive classroom environment where students can help and encourage each other to use English language, they end up teaching and learning by themselves without relying on their teachers. This, however, is in line with Khassawneh (2011) research finding. One of his findings contends that assigning students to work with the equal partner on each venture reduces their inventiveness and makes them extra reticent to speak. It was said also that pairing students of different levels with different English language backgrounds, can provide opportunities for English practice and reduce the need for code switching. Thus, that is because when the learners stay alone, they are able to discuss and teach each other with limited fear to make mistakes than when they are in front of their teachers.

In drawing things to a close, basing on 81.3% of the students and 66.7% of the teachers confirmed that the use of simple language can help in prevent CS and CM in teaching and learning English language. From this point of view, we may learn that when teachers use simple, clear and straightforward language, they help students understand and communicate in English more effectively. We can further state that complex and unfamiliar language sometimes lead to confusion and the temptation to switch to another language. Cleghorn and Rollnick (2002) also found that by keeping the language simple and accessible, teachers can create a supportive learning environment that encourages students to use English language without relying on code switching or code mixing.

V. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

This study investigated the impact of code switching and code mixing in the learning of English language in lower secondary schools in the selected schools of Rubavu district. It concludes that CS and CM generally influence students' failure to learn the English language. This is to mean that code switching leads to lack of confidence to learners when speaking the English language, the limited number of students practice speaking English language that resulted into students' inability in answering examinations in English language, retarded ability of students to master and understand the English language. Additionally, the study found that teachers have been the key to CS and CM because they were the ones who could have lowered the situation.

Furthermore, strategies to avoid code switching and code mixing such as the teachers who should not be engaged in neither code switching nor code mixing for their students to emulate; and giving students a lot of exercise were discussed. The use of simple language, using and sticking to the English language curriculum, restricting students from using other languages except English language in the school premises are also suggested to help students succeed in learning the English language effectively by avoiding the CS and CM.

5.2 Recommendations

With regard to the study's findings, different stakeholders have been recommended so as to help in improving English language in secondary schools and avoid code switching and code mixing in English learning. As the research revealed disadvantages of using CS and CM in teaching and learning English language the students are urged to always exercise themselves in speaking English language everywhere they are as it is a medium of instructions at all levels of Education in Rwanda. They should try to develop a culture of using only English during all lessons, and not only in English subject. Students should also join English clubs that could enable them to practice English-speaking skills.

On the other hand, the teachers of English language in secondary schools should be the role models in their classes by avoiding code switching and/or code mixing as students always tends to imitate them. All English teachers should also reinstate school policy of speaking English in the schools' premises and make a follow up to ensure their students do not violate it.

Thirdly, in order to enhance the effective teaching of English language and avoid code switching and/or code mixing, the school leaders should encourage story reading and writing programme at their schools. If applied, this exercise will help students to develop and master English language, as it will help them learn easily new vocabulary.

The decision makers in Rwandan Education should initiate a short-term professional programme and special ways reserved for teachers of English language in lower secondary school level in order to reduce code switching in their teaching. As a result, the students' success to learn and master English language will be improved as well as the improvement of the language competence to both teachers and students.

The future researchers are encouraged to conduct the researches on "The Comparative studies between private and public schools in terms of code switching and code mixing in Rwandan context.", and/or "The contribution of English clubs to the learning of English language in Rwandan schools."

REFERENCES

- Alidou, H. (2009). The language of instruction debate in African classrooms: Do children benefit from the continued use of indigenous languages alongside the official language? *International Review of Education*, 55(5-6), 629-650.
- Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Columbia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Batibo, H. M. (2006). The language situation in Botswana. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 99-101). Elsevier: Oxford.
- Brock-Utne, B. (2004). English as the language of instruction or destruction: How do teachers and students cope? In B. Brock-Utne, Z. Desai, & M. Qorro (Eds.), *Researching the Language of Instruction in Tanzania and South Africa*. Cape Town: Africa Minds.
- Brock-Utne, B. (2007). Learning through a familiar language versus learning through a foreign language: A look into some secondary school classrooms in Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27, 487-498.
- Brock-Utne, B., & Holmarsdottir, H. (2002). *Language policies and practices in Africa: Some preliminary results from a research project in Tanzania and South Africa*. Dar es Salaam: E&D Publishers.
- Cleghorn, A., & Rollnick, S. (2002). Avoiding code switching in learning English: Focus on language. *Journal of Language Teaching*, 7(2), 153-168.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Dilnoza, U. (2021). The influence of affective factors in language learning. *Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT*, 6, 27-31.
- Ezeh, N. G., Umeh, I. A., & Anyanwu, E. C. (2022). Code switching and code mixing in teaching and learning of English as a second language: Building on knowledge. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 15(9), 106-113.
- Fang, F. G. (2017). English as a lingua franca: Implications for pedagogy and assessment. *TEFLIN Journal*, 28(1), 57-70.
- Fussy, D. S., & Iddy, H. (2024). Harnessing the potential of translanguaging in Tanzanian secondary education. *Qualitative Research Journal*. Accessed from ResearchGate
- Hoffman, C. (1991). *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. London: Longman.
- Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Longman.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Longman.

- Khassawneh, S. F. (2011). The attitudes of students towards using Arabic in EFL classrooms at Yarmouk University in Jordan. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 21(4), 592-602.
- LeClerc, J. (2008). Rwanda. L'aménagement linguistique dans le monde [Language policy around the world]. Résor de la Langue Française au Québec (TLFQ), Université Laval, Québec, Canada.
- Malik, L. (1994). *Sociolinguistics: A Study of Codeswitching*. New Delhi: Anmol.
- Martirosyan, N. M., Hwang, E., & Wanjohi, R. (2015). Impact of English proficiency on academic performance of international students. *Journal of International Students*, 5(1), 60-71.
- Marwa, N. W. (2014). Tanzania's language of instruction policy dilemma: Is there a solution? *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(23), 1262-1268.
- Mlay, N. (2010). *The influence of the language of instruction on students' academic performance in secondary schools* (A Thesis of MA of Philosophy. University of Oslo Spring).
- Modupeola, J. (2013). Code switching as a teaching strategy: Implications for language teaching and learning in a multilingual society.
- Moodley, S. (2013). Code-switching as a discourse tool in bilingual education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(2), 212-227.
- Mukama, E., & Nkusi, L. (2019). *Ubushakashatsi mu Bumenyi Nyamuntu n'Imibanire y'Abantu*. African Minds, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Munyankesha, P. (2004). Les défis du plurilinguisme officiel au Rwanda: Analyse sociolinguistique. Université de Western Ontario (Thèse de Doctorat, Ontario, Canada).
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Dueling Languages*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Social motivations for code-switching: Evidence from Africa. Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2005). Surface code-switching and the matrix language frame model. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9(2), 181-201.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2010). The Matrix Language Frame model: Development, theory, and application. In T. Bhatia & W. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism* (pp. 228-249). John Wiley & Sons.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2015). Matrix Language Frame model: A response to Backus' criticisms. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 19(3), 331-337.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2018). The Matrix Language Frame model: A view from language management. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 253, 121-138.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2020). The Matrix Language Frame model: A perspective on bilingual language development. *Journal of Child Language*, 47(2), 332-345.
- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 1-8.
- Ndizeye, A., & Tabaro, C. (2023). Attitudes towards English Medium of Instruction in Engineering Courses in Rwanda Polytechnic. *Journal of Research in Higher Education*, 7(1), 40-70.
- Ndizeye, A., & Tabaro, C. (2023). Attitudes towards English medium of instruction in engineering courses in Rwanda Polytechnic. *Journal of Research in Higher Education*, 7(1), 40-70. <https://doi.org/10.24193/JRHE.2023.1.3>
- Ningrum, A. C. K., & Harida, R. (2021). Code switching in teaching narrative for junior high school. *Saliency Journal*, 1(1), 44-51.
- Niyomugabo, C. (2015). Kinyarwanda language in education across times: Myth or reality. *Journal of Educational Research and Review*, 3(6), 86-95.
- Noor, S., Tajik, O., & Golzar, J. (2022). Simple random sampling. *International Journal of Education and Linguistics Studies*, 1, 78-82. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijels.2022.162982>
- Nteziyaremye, A., Ndizeye, A., & Murenzi, J. D. (2024). Implementation of Competence-Based Curriculum for Kinyarwanda Subject at IPRC Karongi Technical Secondary School, Rwanda. *African Journal of Empirical Research*, 5(2), 438-452. <https://doi.org/10.51867/ajernet.5.2.37>
- Odhiambo, J. E. (2021). How code mixing and code switching affect the study of English language. *International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences*, 8(4), 23-27.
- Ondracek, J. (2011). *Problems in communication caused by mistakes in the pronunciation of English by Czechs* (Doctoral Dissertation, Masaryk University. Retrieved from Masaryk University).
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18(7-8), 581-618.



- Probyn, M. (2006). Language and the struggle to learn: The intersection of classroom realities, language policy and neo-colonial and globalization discourse in South Africa schools. In A. Lin & P. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonization, Globalization: Language-In-Education Policy and Practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Putra, D. A. (2021). The advantage of understanding English and native languages in English learning: A preliminary study of English language learning at University of Djuanda. *TEFLIN Journal*, 32(1), 84-100.
- Qorro, M. (2002). Language of instruction not determinant in quality education. *The Guardian*, Wednesday, 29 May 2002. Accessed from IPP Media
- Rezvani, E., & Rasekh, A. E. (2011). Code-switching in Iranian elementary EFL classrooms: An exploratory investigation. *English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 18-30. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n1p18>
- Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 1, 151-162.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford University Press.
- Setati, M., Adler, J., Reed, Y., & Bapoo, A. (2002). Incomplete journeys: Code-switching and other language practices in mathematics, science, and English language classrooms in South Africa. *Language and Education*, 16(2), 128-149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780208666824>
- Sibomana, E. (2014). The acquisition of English as a second language in Rwanda: Challenges and promises. *Rwandan Journal of Education*, 2(2), 19-30.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). Linguistic diversity, endangerment, and the right to mother-tongue education. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language Policy in Schools: A Resource for Teachers and Administrators*. Routledge.
- Smith, C., & Gidney, S. (2022). Language use in bilingual education. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 43(1), 87-104.
- Suryawati, N. (2013). An Analysis of Code switching Occurred in A Puppet Show. *D J Anglicist*, 2(1), 41-51.
- Toribio, A. J. (2004). Convergence as an optimization strategy in bilingual speech: Evidence from code-switching. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 7(2), 165-173.
- Tsuchiya, K., & Sakurai, T. (2023). The role of code switching in language learning: Evidence from Japanese students. *Asian Journal of Education*, 39(2), 215-229.
- Wang, Y., & Duran, C. (2021). The impact of bilingual education on academic achievement in China. *International Journal of Bilingual Education*, 21(3), 243-261.
- Zhang, J., & Zhang, L. (2020). Code-switching and language policy in Chinese bilingual classrooms. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 43(4), 365-381.