Perceptions of Education Stakeholders on Use of Code-Switching in English Foreign Language Classrooms in Primary Schools in Tanzania

Loti Isaya Kambey
Mkwawa University College of Education
University of Dar es Salaam
Mwajuma Siama Vuzo
School of Education
University of Dar es Salaam

ABSTRACT
Code switching is used as a strategy for teaching of English foreign language in Tanzania public primary school contexts. It is however not officially recognised as one of the strategies for teaching and learning the English subject. Little attention has been given to the use of code switching for teaching and learning English as a foreign language in relation to how it minimises the opportunity to use the target language. The paper is informed by various perspectives on use of code switching in the language teaching and learning classroom. In particular, the paper is pegged on the view that in the foreign language classroom exposure and use of the target language is prime and should be maximised. This paper presents findings from a study that investigated the use of code switching in English language teaching and learning process where a qualitative approach was used. The findings of the study showed code switching negatively affects language proficiency of learners, as it lowers students' ability to master English language, hinders language learning and it contributes to challenges students face during exams. Code switching impedes English language learning and should be avoided so as to develop a tendency for practicing speaking English language during English sessions. It is recommended to persistently teach English through English in the foreign language context to maximise use and the linguistic space for effective learning of the language.

Keywords: Code switching, Foreign Language, Language Teaching and Communicative Competence

INTRODUCTION

The term "code-switching" (CS) is used to describe a variety of language mixing and alternation events, whether they occur throughout a single conversation turn, or sentence utterance (Milroy and Gordon, 2003). Code-switching in the classroom is used to serve linguistic functions and ensure that students understand instructions and content in multiple language learning contexts (Lee, 2016). Code-switching is a common practice in any multilingual society. Multilingualism is the "co-existence of several languages within a society" (Okal, 2014, p. 223). Those proficient in more than one language employ a full range of linguistic skills rather than focusing on just one language (Keller, 2020).

Code-switching is a key research subject in the area of English Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. There are various contradicting perspectives on the use of code-switching. According to Mochacha and Lwangale (2020), it helps learners accomplish a range of purposes, such as improving strategies and techniques to make tasks more understandable. Similarly, Willis (2021) believes that using one's language has a positive and important effect on improving the target language. Literature shows that code-switching in English and Kiswahili is used for teaching and learning in Tanzania mainland instead of English medium of instruction at the secondary level of education in Tanzania (Brock-Utne 2007, Vuzo, 2012, Shartiely 2016). Code switching is used as a pedagogical tool for providing clarification, repetition, and summarizing that facilitate learning where a foreign language is used for teaching and learning.

Furthermore, Lee (2016) views Code switching as where multiple languages are used in the learning process to serve linguistic functions and ensure that students understand instructions and content. When teaching and learning a new language, Moghadam, Samad & Shahraki (2012) demonstrated that the majority of teachers and students code switch in the native language as they pick up new vocabulary in the second language. Likewise, Meutia (2021) highlights that code-switching is a natural phenomenon in EFL classrooms and is used for explaining grammar, managing the class, facilitating comprehension, translating unknown words, clarifying key teaching points, giving instructions, and displaying effective expressions. Ustunel (2016) views Code switching as a natural and important aspect of language teaching and learning, but some teachers and researchers view it as a deficit. It is therefore debatable whether CS enhances or impedes the process of learning a foreign

language. A debate that has existed since the teaching of a foreign language began (Puspawati, 2018).

Besides Nurhamidah et al. (2018) states that code-switching in the EFL classroom is beneficial because it allows teachers to easily transfer content to students, allowing them to interact in the classroom. Such researchers view CS as a valuable linguistic tool (Baker, 2001; Muthusamy et al. 2020; Younas et al. 2020). Modupeola (2013) asserts that CS is seen to be a useful tool in helping English language teaching and learning process, especially at the foundation level (primary level). Shinga and Pillay (2021) argue that in the teaching and learning of a second language, the usage of the learners' native tongue may be essential. Bhatti, Shamsudin, & Said (2018) report that code switching can be used as a teaching approach in order to improve the effectiveness of teaching and learning in English classrooms. Some reports show that CS enhances communication and promotes students' learning (Muthiasari, Lio &Tambunan, 2017; Puspawati, 2018). Nurhamidah (2018) cautions that the use of code switching should be utilised wisely by teachers regarding to its pros and cons emerging from scholars. The fair proportions of code-switching use will give higher chance of learning achievement in EFL classroom. In sum language instructors who favour use of CS believe it is a valuable and effective tool that fosters beginner-level learning (Al Tale & Al Qahtani, 2022). These researchers generally, agree that CS in language teaching enables the efficient content transmission from a teacher to the students. Translanguaging, multilingual teaching, and plurilingual education e.g. (Piccardo, 2013) are instructional approaches developed from such perspectives. These are however not the focus of this paper.

A contrary perspective is that using code-switching undermines the goal of language teaching, harms students' competency, and indicates laziness during the teaching and learning process (Brown, 2005). It is used by teachers to compensate for their lack of ability in the TL by using their first language (L1) to keep a flow during communication to overcome gaps and flaws in conversations. Teachers' code-switching in the classrooms should be resisted to keep students from becoming reliant on the first language (L1) (Altun, 2019). Dendup (2020) argues that code-switching mostly occurs when one is at the loss of words and it questions one's fluency. Moreover, when code-mixing is so extreme or frequent it can lead to an origin and evolution of a new language known as "Media

Lingua halfway language" which is spoken as the usual everyday language. Therefore, employing code-switching can make the students feel more confident and comfortable during the teaching and learning process but actually, it indicates that their English vocabulary is limited (Kumar et al., 2021). Such scholars argue that code-switching should be prohibited in language classrooms because it substantially impedes language learning (Üstünel, 2016). Code switching limits students practice in speaking English language and therefore does not lead to language competence (Johanes, 2017). It slows down students' English language acquisition (Eliakimu, 2015). Rugemalira (2005, p. 77) argues that CS in the classroom "amounts to translation of what has been said in the target language undermines any motivation for learning the target language as the learners will learn to tune out and wait for the translation in the first language." Whereas Baker (2001, p. 100) believes that CS expresses "a deficit, or a lack of mastery of both languages." Hence code-switching prevents language students from acquiring more useful target language skills (Wijaya, 2020). Code-switching is deemed to negatively influence learners.

Moreover, Mujiono et. al. (2013) argue that code-switching is considered by many to be neither an asset nor a valuable addition as code-switching by individual students is evidence that they are not thinking much in the target language. Regarding the role of code-switching in second or foreign language learning classes, Üstünel (2016) argues that researchers have tended to fall into one of the three camps: firstly, the first language should play an unrestricted and free role; secondly, the first language can be a useful tool, but its role in second language acquisition should be outlined; and thirdly, since it may hinder learning, the first language should not be used in second language classes. Al Tale' & Al Qahtani (2022) emphasize that whether or not the student's native language should be used to teach a foreign language has been controversial for several years.

The perspective informing this study is the communicative approach which emphasizes on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language (TL) (Nunan 1991). In this view failure to use a familiar language to learn a target language in a constructive way only inhibits learning. Hence instead visual aids, appropriate body language and modelling speech according to learners' level of language development should help teach the foreign language (Ustunel, 2016). This perspective

is also informed by the idea of the maximum exposure to the TL. Krashen (1982) holds that the TL should be used most in the classroom in the EFL context as it is the only place where the learners are exposed to the TL. Hence Code-switching limits, the classroom learning time that may not fully be optimised by teachers and learners to learn as much as they possibly can (Jingxia, 2010). Code-switching should be avoided to prevent negative transfer and guarantee the maxims of comprehensible input in addition to meaning negotiation (Hussein, Saed & Haider, 2020). This ensures optimal EFL learning of the foreign/second language by offering more exposure to the target language (Hall & Cook, 2012). Therefore, teachers should make maximum use of the target language in foreign language classrooms (Zainil & Arsyad 2021). Besides Littlewood and Yu (2011) acknowledge that much use of the target language in the EFL classroom correlates significantly with higher students' language output. Students need to have comprehensible input as well as opportunity and encouragement to produce output in the target language. Their linguistic abilities should be stretched to the fullest (Ustunel, 2016).

Most of the studies conducted in Tanzania on use of code switching focused on teaching and learning at the secondary school level and above where English language is used as a medium of instruction for teaching all subjects except language specific subjects (e.g. Kadeghe, 2006; Vuzo, 2012; Eliakimu, 2015; Johanes, 2017). Cook (2008) highlights that language teaching classrooms are different from other classrooms because language is not just about the medium of instruction but also about the content whose purpose in one sense is to provide optimal samples of language for the learner to profit from – the best 'input' to the process of language learning. The focus in a foreign language context is the ability to use the language.

Language Teaching and Learning Context in Tanzania
Tanzania is a multilingual country in the sense that its people speak several languages. Tibategeza (2010) asserts that the country has 150 ethnic languages spoken within its boundaries. Kiswahili is a national language and it is used as a first or second language by most Tanzanians (MoEVT, 2014). The English language is used as a second or third (foreign) language by some Tanzanians. Kiswahili and English languages are the official languages in Tanzania (Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT), 2014). Although English is referred to as a second language in Tanzania, its usage is relatively restricted, making it

more of a foreign language (Sane & Sebonde, 2014). English language is mostly used in school contexts.

In the education sector of Tanzania, mainly English and Kiswahili languages are used. The languages are learnt as compulsory subjects at primary and secondary level education. English Language Subject teaching begins in Standard III in public schools (TIE 2015). English language syllabus shows that English subject has a maximum of 7 periods per week. Language teaching is where grammar, vocabulary, and the written and oral forms of a language constitute a specific curriculum for the acquisition of a language other than the mother tongue (Vuzo, 2019). If correctly done, communicative competence is promoted.

There are weaknesses in language competencies which are largely attributed to poor teaching and learning infrastructure and poor teaching methods and minimal use of appropriate use of language in ordinary surroundings. This has led to lack of ability to use the English language for both teachers and students at the different levels of education (MoEVT 2014, p. 13). Moreover, results from NECTA (2021, 2022) show that the performance of students in English is poor. A majority of the students fail hence the need to look into the teaching of the subject in regard to the extent to which code-switching contributes to this situation.

This paper focuses on the use of code-switching in teaching English foreign language which is the only subject at the primary level not taught in Kiswahili medium of instruction. The basic premise is using code-switching does not provide an optimal sample and best input in the English foreign language classroom which is barely the main encounter and source of language available for learners. Exposure to and opportunities for target language interaction in the case of a foreign language are restricted to the classroom and it is not spoken in the society (Moeller & Catalano 2015). Additionally, Holmarsdottir (2004) asserts that in foreign language learning the teacher plays a major role with little or no peer learning. The teacher provides exposure to the language and opportunities for learning through classroom activities. Teachers' use of target language (TL) is the prime source of comprehensible input but it also facilitates meaningful interaction during the instructional process determining the success (or otherwise) of classroom L2 learning (Kim & Elder, 2008). In order to enhance English foreign language learning the target language should be used consistently in the teaching and learning

context. The range of language experiences that children get in their foreign language lessons is likely to influence how the new language develops. Therefore, this paper provides some insight in this respect in regard to English foreign language teaching in primary schools in Tanzania from grades III–VII.

English Language Teaching in Public Primary Schools in Tanzania
In Tanzania, primary-level English language teaching and learning are aimed at preparing students to accomplish activities involving the use of all four language skills (MoEST, 2016). Additionally, according to MoEST (2016), the process will produce a student who is able to communicate by using both written and oral English. English is a crucial subject to teach and acquire in primary school because: it is used in Tanzania alongside Kiswahili as an official language. It is also the most common business language and it provides access to learning about other cultures and expanding one's knowledge. The current objectives of teaching and learning English language in primary school in Tanzania are:

a) To enable the pupils to express themselves appropriately in a given situation;
b) To develop the pupils' basic skills in listening (lip reading, for the deaf) speaking, reading and writing (writing into Braille for the blind) through English language;
c) To acquire and use vocabulary through the four language skills;
d) To enable pupils to acquire and apply correct English grammar; and
e) To provide the pupils with a sound base for higher education and further personal advancement through English language use (MoEST, 2016, p. viii).

In order to meet the above stated objectives, the teaching and learning of English language is supposed to be efficient and accurate.

In order to improve the teaching and learning of English language in Tanzania, and so as to help students communicate effectively with English speakers both inside and outside of the country the government released the communicative competence-based English curriculum in 2005 (Sane & Sebonde, 2014). One of the tenets of competence-based language teaching according to Richards and Rodgers (2014) is the emphasis on the use of the target language by correctly assembling

language components so as to construct communicative competence of the learners when teaching and learning a language. John, Vuzo & Mkumbo (2020) show that there are some challenges related to implementing competence-based language teaching (CBLT) such as inadequate time allocated for teaching English subject through Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach; inadequate teaching and learning facilities such as CDs, Videos, textbooks for authentic communication; crowded classes and poor teaching and learning environments.

Despite the government's initiative to improve English language teaching and learning process by introducing competence-based syllabus, where it is expected that teachers will use the target language (English) for communication, there is unofficial use of Kiswahili in teaching and learning of English contrary to what is expected. The use of code switching as a learning strategy is a common phenomenon in Tanzania in nearly all levels of education in all subjects including English (Mtallo, 2015). Although code-switching practice is common, neither the education policy (MoEVT, 2014) nor the current CBLT approach (Richards and Rodgers, 2014) adopted in Tanzania support entirely the use of code-switching when teaching and learning a language. The aim of the study infoming the paper was to establish the negative factors associated with code switching, especially in facilitating the learning of English as a foreign language. This paper was therefore guided by the following research questions:

- How do education stakeholders perceive the use of Code switching in the English language teaching and learning process?
- What are the implications of using Code switching in the English language teaching and learning process?

METHODOLOGY
A study that explored stakeholders' perceptions on the use of Code switching between English and Kiswahili languages was conducted in Bagamoyo Tanzania where Kiswahili is a predominant language. Four schools (coded as School A - D) were purposively chosen from Bagamoyo town. The study used a qualitative approach specifically case study design. Qualitative research "seeks to understand and interpret human and social behaviour as it is lived by participants naturally in a particular social setting" (Ary et. al. 2014, p. 447). This approach allowed

the researchers to listen to the participants about their perspectives and interpretations on the use of CS in English language teaching and learning. The use of case study design in this study was useful in examining a group of subjects selected from public primary schools in Bagamoyo district. Guided by the perspective of Creswell (2014), the naturally occurring data in the participants' setting were collected through face-to-face semi-structured interviews and classroom observations and thematically analysed by inductively building general themes and making interpretations of the meaning of the data. The researchers applied three general sets of aims in thematic analysis as presented by Gibson & Brown (2009) which were the examination of commonalities, the examination of differences and the examination of relationships.

The study had a sample of 20 participants: 4 Ward Educational Officers, 4 heads of English language departments, and 12 English language teachers who were interviewed. Codes were used to represent these participants. WEOs are coded as "WEO 1 – 4". Teachers were coded as "T" (thus T 1 – 3) in each school.

Table 1: Composition of sample

S/N	Categories of Participants	Number of Respondents
1	Ward Educational Officers (WEOs)	4
2	Head of English Departments (HoDs)	4
3	English language teachers	12
	TOTAL	**20**

Four WEOs were purposively selected in this study because they are the ones responsible for ensuring teaching and learning is effectively done in the respective ward localities. Purposive sampling was used to choose four heads of English language departments from four schools used in the study. In selecting teachers, purposive random sampling was used. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), purposeful random sampling adds credibility to a purposeful selected sample. The researchers randomly selected three English language teachers in each of the four schools. Since English language teachers were more than three teachers who were required per school, the researchers prepared small papers with numbers as per the total number of teachers available. Teachers who got paper number one, two and three were included in the study.

Face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted with four WEOs, four heads of English language departments and twelve English language teachers. In addition, classroom observations were done with four teachers -one teacher in each of the four schools used in the study.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
The patterns of Code Switching in the Classroom
The findings from classroom observations showed how Code switching was manifested in English language teaching and learning process in public primary schools. The following is a sample excerpt of the classroom observations.

Excerpt 1 - Classroom observation from School A
[In School "A" the researchers observed classroom teaching and learning process. The excerpt below is a lesson about countable and non-countable nouns].

Key: T = Teacher; S = Student; SS = Students; ( ) = Translated text; [ ] = Observer's comments; 1, 2, 3, … = The exchanges of teacher and students have been assigned continuous numbers.
  1. T: Good morning class
  2. SS: Good morning Madam
  3. T: How are you?
  4. SS: We are fine thanking you Madam. How are you too?
  5. T: I'm fine, sit down!
  6. SS: Thank you Madam.
  7. T: [Pointing at one student] Wewe, futa ubao! *(You, clean the blackboard)*
  8. T: Today, we continue with our lesson about countable and uncountable nouns
  9. T: Who can mention countable nouns?
  10. SS: [Silent]
  11. T: I said mention countable nouns!
  12. SS: [Silent]
  13. T: Majina yanayohesabika ni yapi? (*What are countable nouns?*)
  14. SS: [*Randomly*] mangoes, trees, houses [*Many responses continued*]
  15. T: Ok! Ok! Why do we use 'many' in pencils?

16. S: Kwa sababu penseli zinahesabika (*Because pencils are countable*)
17. T: Sawa zinahesaika: answer in English.
         (*ok it is countable*)
18. S: [Silent]
19. T: Anyway! Hivi days ni nini kwa Kiswahili? (*What is 'days' in Kiswahili?*)
20. SS: Siku (*days*)
21. T: Hivyo we can count days, sivyo? (*So we can count days, isn't?*)
22. SS: Ndiyo (*yes*)
23. T: Can you count milk?
24. SS: [Silent]
25. T: Mnaweza kuhesabu maziwa? (*Can you count milk?*)
26. SS: Hapana (*No*)
27. T: So, this is uncountable thing, ok!
28. SS: Yes
29. T: I want reason: kwanini tunatumia 'any' na sio 'some' kwenye mangoes?   (*Why do we use 'any' and not 'some' in mangoes?*)
30. S: Because mango is countable.
31. T: Mwenzenu anasema kwa sababu embe linahesabika, je ni kweli?
         (*Your fellow has said because mango is countable, is itcorrect?*)
32. SS: Ndio *(Yes)*
33. T: Kumbukeni nimewaambia nini kuhusu 'any' na 'some'.
         (*Remember what I have told you about any and some*)
34. T: Why do we use 'some' sugar?
35. T: Kwanini tunatumia some? (*Why do we use some?*)
36. S: Kwa sababu sukari haihesabiki (*Because sugar is not countable*).
37. T: Now I give you some questions and every one of you should do, sawa? *(ok?)*
38. SS: Sawa *(Ok)*
39. T: [T wrote the questions on the blackboard and started passing by to mark the assignment from the students and thereafter winded up the lesson].

Basing on classroom observations data from the four schools, two basic patterns of use of Code switching in English classrooms have been identified through classroom observations which are (a) Code switching in a translation form and (b) Code switching for checking vocabulary equivalents from English to Kiswahili. Generally, the excerpts show use of utterances of words, sentences and repeated drills practised by the class often as discrete items, that bear little or no resemblance to possible sequences in normal discourse. There is also more use of the familiar language compared to the target language.

Perceptions of Code Switching as an English Language Teaching Strategy

WEOs in this study concurred that Code switching between English and Kiswahili is a manifestation of teacher's incompetency in English language and is a bad practice. Generally, there was no formula in relation to the use of Kiswahili and English. Some teachers used more Kiswahili than English while others used more English while code switching. This lack of consistency affects the kind of language input. Findings further showed that teachers code switch because students fail to understand in English. This was asserted by WEO 1:

> Code switching is not good. The problem is the base; all subjects are taught in Kiswahili except English language subject only that has few periods per week.

Likewise, WEO 2 stated that:

> Code switching use in the classroom represents the incompetence of the teachers in English language. Teachers should use English language all the time when teaching English subject. Students' failure to understand something should not be an excuse for the teacher to code switch.

All 4 heads of English language departments (HoDs) stated that the use of Code switching between English and Kiswahili in English language teaching and learning process is not a good practice. The HoD of School A stated the following:

> I do not like to use code switching because if you want to put a strong base of English to the students, it is better to use English only. When you code switch the student may not put much emphasis on English knowing that the teacher will explain in Kiswahili.

The HoDs put much emphasis on the use of English language when learning English language. This is clearly shown by the following quotation:

> I myself have negative perceptions towards the use of code switching. Code switching is not a good thing. It is better for an English language teacher to use simple English language rather than code switching in Kiswahili. (HoD School B)

At least 10 of the teachers interviewed perceived negatively the use of code switching in English language teaching and learning process. Some of their responses were as follows:

> As a teacher I do not like to use code switching because if you want to have a strong base of English to the students, it is better to use English only rather than code switching. (T 2 School A)

> Teaching English by using Kiswahili is not good. It is just because of the environment i.e. the use of mother tongue interferes the smooth process of learning English. This situation of code switching is just due to lack of enough teaching and learning facilities like teaching aids. (T 1 School C)

> It is not good but we have to start building a base from the beginning to avoid using code switching. This will be done when we develop different programmes which will encourage students to use English like 'English speaking day' (T 3 School D)

Although the stakeholders disliked the practice, teachers' responses showed that they use it to help learners understand due to lack of enough teaching and learning facilities like teaching aids. Despite the unfavourable general view of code switching, the findings show that English language teachers employ it for a variety of purposes; the major being fostering students' understanding as it has also been reported by earlier studies (Modupeola, 2013; Muthiasari, Lio &Tambunan, 2017; Puspawati, 2018). This illustrates that teachers and their administrators dislike CS practice; however, they are forced by classroom circumstances to use it despite their understanding of the fact that the use of CS is not formally accepted by neither the policy (MoEVT, 2014) nor current communicative language teaching approaches (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

Code Switching in English Language Teaching and Learning Process
The main reasons noted for code switching were the socializing role of the teacher, the need to translate, elaborate by repetition and both

teachers' and students' English language incompetence and insecurity. Generally, the findings came up with three major ways on how CS affects English language teaching and learning process: (1) Code switching lowers students' ability to master English language; (2) Code switching hinders language learning and (3) Code switching brings problems to students during examinations' time.

Participants asserted that code switching has negative outcomes on students' English language proficiency as it does not promote use of English language and in so doing students do not get much opportunity to attain the expected level of English proficiency which contributes to some not being able to answer examination questions in English. For instance, WEO 1 asserted that:

> Code switching impedes the process of teaching and learning English because it fails to prepare a child for his/her future i.e. secondary level where English is almost everything. In a greater percent it lowers student's ability towards mastery of English language.

The findings show that in code switching usually Kiswahili is the matrix language (main language) and English the embedded code (the language that holds the lesser role), in activities and tasks in lessons to fill in this gap in English language proficiency that is lacking. Hence there is minimal use of English language that is the target language. Code switching where there are low levels of English language proficiency experienced by most teachers as well as students accentuates negative aspects associated with code mixing. It is therefore an unsystematic result of not knowing one of the languages involved very well and is a form of linguistic decay (Appel & Muysken 1995). Code switching hinders successful learning of English foreign language as it reduces exposure to the language that relies heavily on the classroom context to learn it, learners in this context rely on code switching and do not focus on language accuracy but on commitment of errors without noticing (Jingxia, 2010). In the long run learners fail to learn the target language by limiting communication skills in the target language. This implies that communicative competence {knowing how to use language for different purposes and functions, knowing how to vary communication according to setting and participants (formal/ information; written/spoken); knowing how to produce and understand different types of texts (e.g narratives, reports, interviews, conversations) and knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one's own language

knowledge through use of different communication strategies} in other words (grammatical competence, socio-linguistic competence, discourse competence, strategic competence and actional competence) (Hymes, 1971) are not being attained in many public schools (Sane & Sebonde, 2014).

The influence of Code Switching on Language Learning

The use of code switching prevents students from being creative and working hard to learn English language. One teacher stated:

> The use of code switching impedes English language teaching and learning process and is not allowed because it makes students to relax and just wait for the teacher's translation. (T 2, SCH C)

Code switching makes students lazy in trying hard to understand meanings derived from their classroom teaching and learning process because they know the teacher will code switch and explain in Kiswahili language (See excerpt 1 lines 19-36). A student therefore relaxes and depends on the teacher's elaborations in Kiswahili and does not learn English language effectively. This verifies findings from other studies that CS impedes learning. See excerpt 1 lines 9-14 where students are silent and only respond after elaborations have been provided. Rugemalira (2005) demonstrates that using too much CS deters students from becoming motivated to study the target language since they train themselves to tune out and wait for the elaborations to be given in the familiar language. Hence code-switching should be avoided and the target language should be used consistently instead. In other words, the linguistic space to use the language should be optimised to promote attainment of language competence and proficiency. This indicates that the intended and target language competencies stated by TIE (2015) are therefore not attained as planned.

Implications of Code Switching on Assessment

The findings revealed that students who learn English language through code switching between English and Kiswahili face difficulties when it comes to examination writing. One of the HoDs asserted:

> Code switching does not help the child, especially in writing assignments and examinations. You give information in Kiswahili but the examination is done in English. In this case, code switching helps to understand but at the time of writing it does not help. (HoD, School A)

The problem is due to the logic that students rely much on Kiswahili information and hence become unable to conceptualise concepts in the target language which is English. It was further revealed that CS may bring problems during assignments and examinations which are done in English only. Code switching in this regard lowers students' ability to master English language, hinders language learning and brings problems to students during examinations' time. Students who are taught through CS fail to be self-independent in answering questions in English as required. The rationale behind this claim is that while CS is informally applied between English and Kiswahili when teaching and learning English, only English is necessary when completing assignments and in examinations. Basically, although using CS seems imperative to enable understanding of English but it exacerbates the situation of failing to learn to use the target language as it does not encourage its use.

Generally, findings from previous studies show that code switching in Tanzanian classrooms is done in a haphazard manner, which may be pedagogically counter-productive (Rubagumya 2003, Vuzo 2012). This contributes to students and teachers being inclined to build on the language they are most competent in with little input going to the other language, as exemplified in this study. The chance to learn English in this way is restricted and limited by code switching. The students and teachers therefore remain poor in English. Instead the teaching of English should be rooted directly on the realities of the students' environment.

In relation to Krashen's (1982) comprehensible input hypothesis students are supposed to be immersed in a comprehensible language environment. The use of code switching denies students with enough target language practice and hinders the development of language proficiency. This verifies what Temesgen and Hailu (2022) assert that CS should be avoided in environments where learning a second or foreign language is taking place since it limits students' access to L2 input.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Although code switching pedagogy may be effective when planned and applied properly, maximizing L2 input remains a primary goal of EFL classrooms. The communicative approach informing the paper emphasizes that CS has negative implications towards English language teaching and learning process and therefore it should be avoided, minimised and reduced to promote the tendency for practicing English

language skills during English sessions. English foreign language should be taught through English in order to optimise the use of the target language in the teaching and learning classroom. Language is a central aspect for communication and hence language teaching should be promoted to acquire requisite skills necessary for the future of students and for sustainable language education needed for education and development. Communicating effectively is key for the 21st century. Hence English foreign language teachers should focus on providing students with correct and appropriate exposure to the English foreign language. Despite other challenges highlighted of implementing competence based English language teaching students should be provided with more opportunity and time for learning the English foreign language in the classroom so as to facilitate attainment of the required language competencies.

REFERENCES

Al Tale, M. & Al Qahtani, F. (2022). Code-switching Versus Target-language-only for Saudi EFL Students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, *13*(2), 437-450.
https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no2.30

Altun, S. (2019). The Interaction of Code switching and EFL Teachers' Perceptions on their Teacher Identity Development. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 10*(1), 163-176. https://doi.org//10.7575/aiac.alls. v.10n.1p.163

Appel, R. & Muysken, P. (1995). *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Edward Arnold.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. K., & Walker, D. A. (2014). *Introduction to Research in Education* (9th ed.). Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.

Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (3rd ed.). London, England: Biddles.

Bhatti, A., Shamsudin, S., & Said, S. B. (2018). Code switching: A useful Foreign Language Teaching Tool in EFL classrooms. *English Language Teaching, 11*(6), 93–101.
http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n6p93

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*(1), 487–498.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2006.10.004

Brown, K. (2005). *The Encyclopedia of Language Linguistics* (Vol. 1). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Cook, V. (2008). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London, UK: Hodder Education.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approach* (4th ed.). London: SAGE Publications.

Dendup, P. (2020). Code switching in the Classroom: The Perspectives of Bhutanese Teachers. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, *1*(3), 47-57. doi: 10.5842/49-0-663

Eliakimu, J. (2015). *An Assessment of the Perceptions of Teachers and Students towards Code Switching in o-level Secondary School Teaching and Learning in Mbozi district, Tanzania* [Unpublished M. A. Education Dissertation]. University of Dar es Salaam.

Gibson, W. J., & Brown, A. (2009). *Working with qualitative data*. London: SAGE Publications.

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

Holmarsdottir, H. (2004). In Search of an appropriate theory. In B. Brock-Utne, Z. Desai, & M. Qorro (Eds.), *Researching the Language of Instruction in Tanzania and South Africa*. Cape Town: African Minds.

Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer.

Hussein, R., Saed, H. & Haider, A. (2020). *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 19*(2), 60-78. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.19.2.5

Hymes, D. H. (1971). *On Communicative Competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvannia Press.

Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' Code Switching to the L1 in EFL classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 3, 10–23. https://doi.org/10.2174/1874913501003010010

Johanes, J. (2017). *The Influence of Code Switching and Code Mixing on Learning English Language in Secondary Schools: The case of Rombo District* [Unpublished M. A. linguistics thesis]. Open University of Tanzania.

Kadeghe, M. (2006). Code-switching in Tanzanian Classrooms: Asset or Liability? *Papers in Education and Development, Vol.26.*

Keller, M. L. (2020). *Code-switching: Unifying Contemporary and Historical Perspectives*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kim, S. & Elder, C. (2008). Language Use in Foreign Language Classrooms: Practices and Perceptions of Two Native Speaker Teachers in New Zealand, *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *21*(22), 167–185. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07908310802287574

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Kumar, T., Nukapangu, V. & Hassan, A. (2021). Effectiveness of Code switching in Language Classroom in India at Primary Level: A Case of L2 Teachers' Perspectives. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, Vol. 11* (4), *379-385*. https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.11.04.37Lee, H. L. J. (2016). Code switching in the Teaching of English as a Second Language to Secondary School Students. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research, 6*(1), 1–45.

Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First Language and Target Language in the Foreign Classroom. *Language Teaching*, Vol. *44*(1), 64–77. *https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809990310*

Meutia, R. (2021). Teachers' Code Switching in Indonesian EFL Classrooms. *Asian Journal of Research in Education and Social Sciences, 3*(3), 213–227. https://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ajress

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Milroy, L., & Gordon, M. (2003). *Sociolinguistics Method and Interpretation.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Mochacha, F. M., & Lwangale, D. W. (2020). The influence of Code switching on mastery of English-speaking Skills in Secondary Schools in Kwanza Sub-County, Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya. Journal of Educational Research, *5*(2), 76-88.

Modupeola, O. R. (2013). Code-switching as a Teaching Strategy: Implication for English language Teaching and Learning in a Multilingual Society. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 14*(3), 92–94. DOI:10.9790/1959-1439294

Moeller, A.J. & Catalano, T. (2015). Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences, 2,* 327–333. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.92082-8

MoEST. (2016). *English Language Syllabus for Basic Education Standard III – VI*. Dar es Salaam: MoEST.

MoEVT. (2014). *Education and Training Policy*. Dar es Salaam: MoEVT.

Moghadam, S.H., Samad, A.A., & Shahraki, E.R., (2012). Code switching as a Medium of Instruction in an EFL classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(11), 2219–2225. DOI: 10.4304/tpls.2.11.2219-2225Mtallo, G. R. (2015). Teaching and learning in Tanzania: Blessing or Curse? A practical review of Phan le Ha's teaching English as an international language. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(17), 118–123. DOI:10.13140/RG.2.1.1420.9128

Mujiono, M., Poedjosoedarmo, S., Subroto, E., & Wiratno, T. (2013). Code switching in English as Foreign Language Instruction practiced by the English Lecturers at Universities. *International Journal of Linguistics, 5*(2), 45–65. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i2.3561

Muthiasari, G., Lio, A., Tambunan, T. (2017). Code-switching in English Language Teaching-Learning Process. *Journal of Language Education and Educational Technology, 2*(2), 1–16. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.33772/jleet.v2i2.6694

Muthusamy, P., Muniandy, R., Kandasamy, S., Hussin, O., Subramaniam, M. & Farashaiyan, A. (2020). Factors of Code-switching among Bilingual International Students in Malaysia. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *9*(4), 332–338. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n4p332

NECTA. (2021). *Candidates' Item Response Analysis Report for the Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE) 2021*: *English language*. Dar es Salaam: NECTA.

NECTA. (2022). *Candidates' Item Response Analysis Report for the Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE) 2022*: *English language*. Dar es Salaam: NECTA.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. New York: Pergamon.

Nurhamidah, N. (2018). Code switching: To what extent it benefits in EFL classroom? *2ⁿᵈ English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLIC) Proceedings*, 2, 69–75.

Nurhamidah, N., Fauziati, E., & Supriyadi, S. (2018). Code switching in EFL classroom: Is it good or bad? *Journal of English Education*, *3*(2), 78–88. https://doi.org/10.31327/jee.v3i2.861

Okal, B. O. (2014). Benefits of Multilingualism in Education. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *2*(3), 223–229. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2014.020304

Piccardo, E. (2013). Plurilingualism and Curriculum Design: Toward a Synergic Vision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 600–614. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.110

John, P., Vuzo, M. & Mkumbo, K. (2020). Contextual and Pedagogical Challenges Facing English Language Teachers in using Communicative Language Teaching Approach in Tanzanian Primary Schools. *Papers in Education and Development, 38*(2), 108-136. https://journals.udsm.ac.tz/index.php/ped/article/view/4338

Puspawati, I. (2018). Teachers' use of Code switching in EFL Classroom and its Functions. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching & Learning, 3*(1), 42–51. https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.3128

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.Rubagumya, Casmir (2003). English Medium Primary Schools in Tanzania: a New 'Linguistic Market' in Education? In: Brock-Utne, B., Desai, Z., & Qorro, M., (eds.). *Language of Instruction in Tanzania and South Africa (LOITASA).* Dar es Salaam: E & D Limited, pp149-169.

Rugemalira, J. M. (2005). Theoretical and Practical Challenges in a Tanzanian English Medium Primary School. *Africa & Asia, 5*(1), 66–84.

Sane, E., & Sebonde, R. Y. (2014). Suitability of Communicative Approach in teaching English Language in Tanzania Secondary Schools. *Arts Social Sciences Journal, 5*(2), 1–6.

Shartiely, N. E. (2016). Code switching in University Classroom Interaction: A case study of the University of Dar es Salaam. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, *Vol. 49,. 215-231*. doi: 10.5842/49-0-663

Shinga, S., & Pillay, A. (2021). Why do Teachers Code-switch when teaching English as a Second Language? *South African Journal of Education*, *41*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v41ns1a1934

Tanzania Institute of Education (TIE). (2015). *English Language Syllabus for Primary Education: Kiswahili Medium Schools.* Dar es Salaam: Ministry of Education, Science and Technology.

Temesgen, A. & Hailu, E. (2022). Teachers' Code switching in EFL classrooms: Functions and motivations. *Cogent Education, 9*(2124039), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2124039

Tibategeza, E. R. (2010). Implementation of Bilingual Education in Tanzania: The Realities in the Schools. *Nordic Journal of African Studies, 19*(4), 227–249. https://njas.fi/njas/article/view/196/187

Ustunel, E. (2016). *EFL Classroom Code switching*. London: Palgrave: Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-55844-2

Vuzo, M. (2012). Stakeholders' Opinions on the use of Code switching / Code mixing as coping Strategies and its Implications for Teaching and Learning in Tanzanian secondary schools. *Huria: Journal of the Open University of Tanzania*, *11*, 127–144. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/huria/article/view/86066

Vuzo, M. (2019). Implementation of Sustainable Language Education in the Tanzanian context: A critical Review. *African Education Indices*, *11*(1), 1–21.

Wijaya, K., Mety, M. & Bram, B. (2020). English Education Master's Program Students' Perceptions on the use of Code switching in EFL Classroom Context. *Journal of English Teaching*, *6*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v6i1.1336

Willis, J. (2021). *A framework for Task-based learning*. Intrinsic Books Ltd.

Younas, M., Afzaal, M., Noor, U., Khalid, S. & Naqvi, S. (2020). Code switching in ESL eaching at University Level in Pakistan. *English Language Teaching*, *13*(8), 63–73. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n8p63

Zainil, Y., & Arsyad, S. (2021). Teachers' Perception of their Code-switching Practices in English as a Foreign Language Classes: The Results of Stimulated Recall Interview and Conversation Analysis. *SAGE Open*, *11*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211013802