

Exploring Teachers' and Students' Perspectives About Code-Switching as an Instructional Strategy in Business Communication Classes

Mashooque Ali Mirjat¹ and Stephen John²

<https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2024.13.4.84>

Abstract

English is recognized as a global communication medium in business, technology, and education. In Pakistan, both Urdu (L1) and English (L2) are used as mediums of instruction, with English predominantly used in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Students from diverse linguistic backgrounds are enrolled in HEIs' business communication courses, where they often encounter challenges in learning. Though code-switching is increasingly utilized as an instructional strategy in English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts, its use as a pedagogical tool in business communication courses in HEIs has yet to be fully recognized. This study aims to explore the perspectives of faculty members and students about code-switching as an instructional strategy in business communication courses. A quantitative approach was employed, utilizing a structured questionnaire to collect data from faculty ($n = 14$) and students ($n = 271$) at a private-sector university in Karachi. Data analysis was conducted through SPSS. The study reveals that faculty and students hold positive views on using code-switching in business communication courses. However, the study indicates substantial differences in perspectives and varying degrees of agreement or disagreement. Students overwhelmingly support using first language (L1) in the classroom, with 75.6% advocating for it, compared to only 57.2% of faculty. This disparity highlights a potential gap in understanding the benefits that students associate with L1 usage. The study suggests that incorporating code-switching as an instructional strategy can contribute to an inclusive classroom environment, enhancing communication and learning in diverse linguistic settings.

Keywords: Code-Switching, Instructional Strategy, English as a Second Language (ESL), Communication and Learning, Pedagogical Strategy.

Introduction

English is widely used in business, technology, and education worldwide and is the universal communication language (Crystal, 2003). Students from various linguistic backgrounds enroll in business communication courses at higher education institutions in Pakistan. In Pakistan, techniques such as Audio-lingual Instruction, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Grammar Translation Method (GTM) are employed to teach English as a second language. Exploring efficient teaching techniques is essential for business communication courses. Code-switching, or switching between two or more languages or dialects during a conversation or educational setting, has also drawn much attention in second-language learning in Pakistan. According to the earliest definition of code-switching, it is the juxtaposition within the same

¹PhD Scholar, Department of Education, Sindh Madressatul Islam University, Karachi.

Corresponding Author Email: mashooque.ali@iobm.edu.pk

²Associate Professor, Department of Education, Sindh Madressatul Islam University, Karachi



speech, exchange of passages belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems" (Gumperz, 1982). Code-switching can be a vital tool for filling in comprehension gaps and improving the learning process in ESL learning, especially when non-native speakers are present. Pakistan stands out as a unique social phenomenon in terms of linguistic expressions. Urdu is the nation's official language, and the language of instruction in higher education institutions is English. People living in multilingual societies often switch between languages during a single conversation to achieve communication goals. Pakistan's education system comprises both private and public sector institutions. In private institutions, English serves as the medium of instruction, with the national language taught as a compulsory subject (Panhwar, 2018).

In contrast, public sector institutions use Urdu or regional languages as the medium of instruction, while English is mandatory until grade 10. However, there is a significant transition from the mother tongue to English as the medium of instruction in higher education institutions within the public sector (Panhwar, 2018). Simultaneously, these higher educational institutions teach English as a Second Language or Foreign Language. Switching between languages is common in such a multilingual teaching context (Panhwar, 2018).

Code-switching is employed to learn English in the ESL context. Still, it has yet to be recognized as an instructional strategy in higher education institutes that teach communication courses. According to Holmes 2008, Business programs must promote an inclusive environment because code-switching affects inclusion and employee interactions in multicultural workplaces. Mahootian (2006) suggests that by incorporating this knowledge into business education, students can better prepare for linguistically diverse real-world scenarios and the demands of global business contexts.

The research study intends to answer the questions as follows:

- a) What are Faculty members' perceptions of using code-switching as an instructional strategy in Business Communication classes?
- b) What are students' perspectives on using code-switching as an instructional strategy in Business Communication classes?
- c) What are the perceived uses of code-switching as an instructional strategy in Business Communication classes?

Significance of the Study

It is essential to comprehend the efficacy of code-switching as an instructional strategy in Business Communication classes for several reasons, including:

- a) A unique understanding of how code-switching affects the teaching and learning dynamics in Business Communication courses can be obtained by investigating how faculty and students view the practice. This knowledge is critical for evaluating how healthy code-switching bridges linguistic gaps and aids in understanding intricate business concepts.
- b) The research will make a valuable contribution to applied linguistics and education by offering empirical data on the application of code-switching in specialized instructional settings. By focusing on business communication, the research will contribute to the body of knowledge already available on instructional strategies for ESL learners.

Literature Review

Code-switching has been a central topic of linguistic study for many years, and many academicians have defined code-switching differently. One of the earliest and most frequently cited definitions of the term by Gumperz (1982) states that code-switching is the juxtaposition of passages of speech within the same speech exchange belonging to two dissimilar grammatical systems/subsystems. Cook (1991) strongly believes that applying code-switching

would not damage the grammatical structures of spoken languages. Further elaborating, Baker (2006) defined code-switching as any switch occurring during a conversation regardless of the word sentence or speech block level.

Auer (2013) offers a modern viewpoint. According to Auer, code-switching is sporadically using two or more languages or dialects during a single conversation or interaction contingent upon the situation and the linguistic repertoire of the participants. This contemporary perspective emphasizes how code-switching is dynamic and context-dependent.

Poplack (1982) divided code-switching into three grammatical categories; first, there is a method of switching **tags** by inserting an interjection such as a tag into the sentence (you know, I mean or right) in a phrase. Given the low likelihood of breaking grammatical rules, tag-switching is comparatively easy and does not call for a high level of proficiency in both languages. Secondly, inter-sentential switching occurs at the end of sentences or phrases. Compared to tag-switching, it necessitates greater syntactic complexity in both languages because it involves switching between sentences. Thirdly, there is **Intra-Sentential Switching**; this type of language switching occurs inside a single clause or sentence. Because of the increased likelihood of breaking syntactic rules, it is regarded as the most complex form of code-switching.

Scholars have classified codeswitching according to its functions as well, Hymes (1962) provided five essential roles of code-switching, including (i) Expressive Function, (ii) Directive Function, (c) Metalinguistic Function, (iv) Poetic Function and (v) Referential Function. Later, Baker (2006) developed this understanding by putting forth thirteen overlapping goals for code-switching.

Studies reveal that code-switching differs significantly in functions and frequency based on English language users' proficiency levels. Higher proficiency learners generally use code-switching as a comparative tool between languages. In comparison, lower proficiency learners frequently use it as a bridge to understand the target language better. Code-switching is a common strategy for lower proficiency groups to fill in vocabulary and comprehension gaps. According to Bouangeunes (2009), research, students could overcome vocabulary limitations and frequently gave more precise explanations of concepts when they translated into their first language (L1). Likewise, Ahmad and Jusoff (2009) found a positive relationship between students' understanding of the subject matter and the degree of code-switching by teachers, indicating that code-switching improves learning opportunities for students with lower proficiency levels.

According to Deuchar's (2021) study, learners with lower proficiency levels gain from code-switching because it makes language acquisition and comprehension easier, whereas learners with higher proficiency levels use it more sparingly and frequently for subtle comparisons. Likewise, Wei (2021) discovered that proficient students occasionally utilize deliberate code-switching to reinforce their comprehension of intricate linguistic frameworks.

Code-switching can be especially pertinent in business communication courses taught at IOBM, where ESL students study business-oriented coursework. In business communication classes, code-switching can help explain industry-specific terminology and complex concepts, according to research by

The usefulness of code-switching as a teaching strategy has been empirically demonstrated in several studies, which include:

Enabling Comprehension: Turnbull (2001) discovered that code-switching, in which teachers use students' native languages to clarify challenging instructions and academic content, aids in the explanation of complex concepts. Through improved comprehension of the subject matter, this method lessens cognitive overload in students. According to Lee (2024), code-switching

in ESL classes improved comprehension and engagement by providing a language the students were familiar with.

Cognitive Development of Students: According to Auerbach (1993), code-switching can facilitate academic content accessibility, which in turn can aid in the development of cognitive abilities. Teachers can facilitate the integration of new knowledge into students' preexisting cognitive frameworks by introducing concepts in the student's native tongues. This supports Vygotsky's theory that language **lowers anxiety and increases participation**. Lewis Jones and Baker (2013) showed that code-switching can reduce students' anxiety levels and boost their self-assurance when participating. When teachers begin teaching in their students' native tongues, a more welcoming atmosphere is created, promoting student engagement and willingness to take risks with language use.

Methodology

The study was conducted using a quantitative approach. The survey participants are undergraduate students and faculty members of the Institute of Business Management (IoBM), Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan. The data were collected through a questionnaire. The questionnaire was administered to (N=14) faculty members and (N=271) undergraduate students using random sampling. The number of male students was (N=123) and female (N=94). The data was quantified through SPSS by mean, standard deviation and % of the responses from the questionnaire. This questionnaire aims to gather quantitative information about respondents' perspectives regarding code-switching, including perceived effectiveness, benefits, and challenges (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Quantitative data will offer quantifiable insights into how teaching strategies and student learning outcomes in Business Communication classes are affected by code-switching.

The question items included in the first part of the questionnaire are adapted from questionnaires used for students by Jingxia (2010) and Weng (2012). They investigated students' and teachers' opinions regarding using the Chinese language in EFL classrooms. The question items regarding functions of code-switching have been adopted from Hymes's (1962) framework.

The participants were asked to rate each question on a five-point Likert scale with the options presented in sequence as "Strongly Disagree" =1, "Disagree" =2, "Neutral" =3, "Agree" =4 and "Strongly Agree" =5. The questions were formulated into statements, as illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1: Statements

1. Students should be allowed to use L1 in Business Communication Courses
2. Students like it when their teachers use L1 in Business Communication Courses
3. I think it is necessary to use L1 in the classroom.
4. Students will benefit more if their teachers use L1 in Business Communication Courses
5. It is useful when teachers switch to L1 in order to explain complex concepts.
6. It is useful when teachers switch to L1 in order to pass instructions
7. Students should be allowed to use L1 in group activities in Business Communication Courses.
8. Teacher and students can use L1 to check for comprehension in Business Communication Courses
9. The English only classroom makes students feel exhausted.
10. The use of L1 in Business Communication Courses s increases students' motivation in learning.

11. How much do you think it is necessary for your students to use L1 in the following situations?
- 11.1 No similar words in English
- 11.2 To fill the gap in speaking
- 11.3 Easier to speak in own language
- 11.4 To avoid misunderstanding

Data Analysis

Below are tables to give statement wise analysis of faculty members' perspectives about code switching

Table 2: Statement No 1: Students should be allowed to use L1 in Business Communication courses

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	1	7.1	3.64
D	3	21.4	
UD	2	14.3	
A	2	14.3	
SA	6	42.9	
Sum	14	100.0	

Questionnaire statement wise responses of faculty members have been analyzed through Statistical techniques, wherein frequencies, percentage, and mean have been applied for analysis of faculty members' perceptions and the results are presented accordingly.

Table 2 highlights that 57.2% faculty members agreed that students should be allowed to use L1 in Business Communication classes, however 28.5% don't agree with this proposition and a very less number 14.3% remained neutral. The mean value for first statement remained 3.64, showing higher level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 3: Statement No 2: Students like it when teachers use L1 in Business Communication courses

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	1	7.1	3.9
D	1	7.1	
UD	-	0	
A	8	57.1	
SA	4	28.6	
Sum	14	100.0	

Table 3 highlights that 85.7% faculty members agreed that their students really like while teachers use L1 in Business Communication classes, however 14.3% didn't agree with this proposition. The mean value for second statement remained 3.9, showing higher level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 4: Statement No 3. It is necessary to use L1 in Business Communication courses

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	0	0.0	3.71
D	3	21.4	
UD	2	14.3	
A	5	35.7	
SA	4	28.6	
Sum	14	100.0	

Table 4 highlights that 64.3% faculty members agreed that it is necessary to use L1 in Business Communication classes, however 21.4% didn't agree with this proposition and a 14.3% faculty remained undecided. The mean value for third statement remained 3.71, showing higher level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 5: Statement No 4. Students will benefit more if their teachers use L1 in Business Communication Courses

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	1	7.14	3.8
D	2	14.3	
UD	1	7.14	
A	5	35.7	
SA	5	35.7	
Sum	14	100.0	

Table 5 shows that 71.4% faculty members agreed with the statement under question over the use L1 in Business Communication classes, however 21.4% didn't agree with this proposition and a 7.14% faculty remained undecided. The mean value for fourth statement remained 3.8, showing higher level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 6: Statement No 5. It is useful when teachers switch to L1 in order to explain complex concepts

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	0	0	4.14
D	2	14.3	
UD	1	7.14	
A	4	28.6	
SA	7	50.0	
Sum	14	100.0	

Table 6 shows that 78.6% faculty members agreed that use of L1 for explanation of complex concepts during Business Communication classes is of a great help for students. However, 14.3% disagreed with this proposition and 7.14% faculty also remained undecided. The mean value for fifth statement remained 4.14, which shows a very high level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 7: Statement No 6. It is useful when teachers switch to L1 in order to pass instructions

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	1	7.1	3.7
D	2	14.3	
UD	2	14.3	
A	4	28.6	
SA	5	35.7	
Sum	14	100.0	

Table 7 demonstrates that many of the teachers (64.3%) have their point of view in agreement with the statement of the question. While 21.4 % of the teachers have not agreed, however, 14.3% are undecided and mean value is 3.7 which show higher level of acceptance.

Table 8: Statement No 7. Students should be allowed to use L1 in group activities in Business Communication Courses

Option	F	%	\bar{x}
SD	3	21.4	2.7
D	4	28.6	
UD	2	14.3	
A	3	21.4	
SA	2	14.3	
Sum	14	100.0	

Table 8 shows that 35.7% faculty members agreed with the statement under discussion, and 50 % disagreed with this proposition and 14.3% faculty also remained undecided. The mean value for ninth statement remained 2.7, which shows lower level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 9: Statement No 8. Teacher and students can use L1 to check for comprehension in Business Communication Courses

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	2	14.2	3.28
D	3	21.4	
UD	1	7.1	
A	5	35.7	
SA	3	21.4	
Sum	14	100.0	

Table 8 shows that 57.2% faculty members agreed with the statement under discussion, and 35.6% disagreed with this proposition and 7.1% faculty also remained undecided. The mean value for tenth statement remained 3.28, which shows good level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 10: Statement No 9. The English only classroom makes students feel exhausted

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	0	0.0	4.07
D	2	14.3	
UD	0	0.0	
A	7	50.0	
SA	5	35.7	
Sum	14	100.0	

Table 9 shows that 85.7% faculty members agreed with the statement under discussion; and 14.3% disagreed with this proposition. However, no faculty remained undecided. The mean value for 11th statement remained 4.07, which shows a very high level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 11: Statement No 10. The use of L1 in Business Communication Courses increases students' motivation in learning

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	1	7.1	3.8
D	2	14.3	
UD	1	7.1	
A	4	28.6	
SA	6	42.8	
Sum	14	100.0	

Table 11 shows that 71.4% faculty members agreed with the statement under discussion; and 21.4% disagreed with this proposition. However, 7.1% faculty also remained undecided. The mean value for 10 statement remained 3.8, which shows high level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 12: Statement No 11. How much do you think it is necessary for students to use L1 in the following situations?

Function of L1	Options	f	%	\bar{x}
11.1 No similar words in English	SD	2	14.3	3.5
	D	2	14.3	
	N	1	7.1	
	A	5	35.7	
	SA	4	28.6	
	Total	14	100.0	
11.2 To fill the gap in speaking	SD	1	7.1	3.7
	D	1	7.1	
	N	2	14.3	
	A	7	50.0	
	SA	3	21.4	
	Total	14	100.0	
11.3 Easier to speak in own language	SD	4	28.6	2.5
	D	5	35.7	
	N	1	7.1	
	A	2	14.3	

	SA	2	14.3	
	Total	14	100.0	
11.4 To avoid misunderstanding	SD	1	7.1	3.7
	D	1	7.1	
	N	2	14.3	
	A	7	50.0	
	SA	3	21.4	
	Total	14	100.0	

Table 11 depicts teacher's perception results about four uses of L1 by students during instructions. It shows that 64.3%, 71.4% and 71.4% faculty members agreed with the uses of L1 by students mentioned in 11.1, 11.2 and 11.4 statements respectively. However, the use of L1 mentioned in statement 11.3 has not been agreed by majority hence 64.3% disagreed with it. The mean value for 11.1, 11.2 and 11.4 remained 3.5, 3.7 and 3.7 respectively, which shows high level of acceptance for the statements under discussion. However, mean value for 11.3 remained 2.5, which shows very low level of acceptance for the statements under discussion.

Statement Wise Analysis of Students' perspectives about Code switching

Questionnaire statement wise responses of students regarding code switching in business communication courses have also been analyzed through Statistical techniques, wherein frequencies, percentage, and mean were applied and the results are presented accordingly.

Table 13: Statement No 1

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	11	5.4	4.0
D	33	16.1	
UD	6	2.9	
A	50	24.4	
SA	105	51.2	
Sum	205	100.0	

Table 13 highlights that 75.6% students agreed that students should be allowed to use L1 in Business Communication classes, however 21.5% didn't agree with this proposition and a very less number 2.9% remained neutral. The mean value for first statement remained 4 showing high level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 14: Statement No 2

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	7	3.4	4.27
D	9	4.4	
UD	0	0	
A	93	45.4	
SA	96	46.8	
Sum	205	100.0	

Table 14 highlights that 92.2% students agreed that they like it when their teachers use L1 in Business Communication classes, however 7.8% didn't agree with this proposition. The mean

value for second statement remained 4.27, showing very high level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	10	4.9	3.67
D	42	20.5	
UD	1	0.48	
A	103	50.24	
SA	49	23.9	
Sum	205	100.0	

Table 15 highlights that 74.1% students agreed that it is necessary to use L1 should be used in in Business Communication classes, however 235.4% didn't agree with this proposition and 0.48% students remained undecided. The mean value for third statement remained 3.67, showing higher level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	9	4.4	3.8
D	29	14.1	
UD	10	4.9	
A	101	49.3	
SA	56	27.3	
Sum	205	100.0	

Table 16 shows that 76.6% students believe in affirmation about the statement in question, however 18.54% didn't agree with this proposition and 4.9% students remained undecided. The mean value for fourth statement remained 3.8, showing higher level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	4	1.95	4.2
D	20	9.75	
UD	0	0	
A	87	42.4	
SA	94	45.9	
Sum	205	100.0	

Table 17 shows that 88.3% students agreed with the statement under question. However, 11.7% disagreed with this proposition. The mean value for fifth statement remained 4.2, which shows a very high level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 18: Statement No 6

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	4	2.0	3.8
D	40	19.5	
UD	17	8.3	
A	75	36.6	
SA	69	33.7	
Sum	205	100.0	

Table 18 shows that 70.24% students agreed with the statement under discussion, and 21.5% disagreed with this proposition and 8.3% students also remained undecided. The mean value for eight statement remained 3.76, which shows a high level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 19: Statement No 7

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	9	4.4	4.02
D	22	10.7	
UD	4	2.0	
A	89	43.4	
SA	81	39.5	
Sum	205	100.0	

Table 19 shows that 82.9% students agreed with the statement under discussion, and 15.1% disagreed with this proposition and 2% students also remained undecided. The mean value for ninth statement remained 4.02, which shows high level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 20: Statement No 8

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	6	2.9	3.91
D	22	10.7	
UD	10	4.9	
A	113	55.1	
SA	54	26.3	
Sum	205	100.0	

Table 21 shows that 81.4% students agreed with the statement under discussion, and 13.6% disagreed with this proposition and 4.94% students remained undecided. The mean value for tenth statement remained 3.91, which shows high level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 21: Statement No 9

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	2	1.0	4.4
D	7	3.4	
UD	3	1.46	
A	87	42.4	
SA	106	51.7	
Sum	205	100.0	

Table 21 shows that 94% students agreed with the statement under discussion; and 4.4% disagreed with this proposition. However, 1.46% faculty also remained undecided. The mean value for eleventh statement remained 4.4, which shows higher level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 22: Statement No 10

Option	f	%	\bar{x}
SD	7	3.4	4.07
D	19	9.3	
UD	7	3.4	
A	91	44.4	
SA	81	39.5	
Sum	205	100.0	

Table 22 shows that 83.9% students agreed with the statement under discussion; and 12.7% disagreed with this proposition. However, 3.4% students also remained undecided. The mean value for 10th statement remained 4.07, which shows high level of acceptance for the statement under discussion.

Table 23: Statement No 11

Function of L1	Options	f	%	\bar{x}
11.1 No similar words in English	SD	5	2.4	3.8
	D	38	18.5	
	N	17	8.3	
	A	75	36.6	
	SA	70	34.1	
	Total	205	100.0	
11.2 To fill the gap in speaking	SD	8	3.9	3.5
	D	48	23.4	
	N	25	12.2	
	A	72	35.1	
	SA	52	25.4	
	Total	205	100.0	
11.3 Easier to speak in own language	SD	9	4.4	4.04
	D	16	7.8	
	N	10	4.9	
	A	93	45.4	
	SA	77	37.6	
	Total	205	100.0	

	Total	205	100.0	
11.4 To avoid misunderstanding	SD	7	3.4	4
	D	21	10.2	
	N	14	6.8	
	A	87	42.4	
	SA	76	37.1	
	Total	205	100.0	

Table 23 depicts student's perception results about four uses of L1 by students during instructions. It shows that 70.73%, 60.5%, 83% and 79.5 students agreed with the uses of L1 by students mentioned in 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4 statements respectively. The mean value for 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4 remained 3.8, 3.5, 4.04 and 4 respectively, which shows high level of acceptance for the statements under discussion.

Findings

Faculty members' Perspectives

- 57.2% faculty members agreed that students should be allowed to use L1 in Business Communication classes, however 28.5% didn't agree with it (table 2).
- 85.7% faculty members agreed that their students really like while teachers use L1 in Business Communication classes, however 14.3% didn't agree with it (table 3).
- 64.3% faculty members agreed that it is L1 should be used in Business Communication classes, however 21.4% didn't agree with it (table 4).
- 71.4% faculty members are of the view that if they use first language in Business Communication classes it may prove beneficial for their students, however 21.4% didn't agree with it (table 5).
- 78.6% faculty members agreed that while explanation of complex concepts by teachers, during Business Communication classes use of L1 it of great help for students. However, 14.3% disagreed with it (table 6).
- 64.3% faculty members agreed the utility of code switching for passing instructions, while 21.4% disagreed with it (table 7).
- Only 35.7% faculty members agreed and 50% disagreed with the statement regarding use of L1 by students during their group activities (table 8).
- 57.2% faculty members agreed and 35.6% disagreed the statement regarding the usage of codeswitching for comprehension checking both by faculty as well as students (table 9).
- 85.7% faculty members firmly believed that usage of only targeted language i.e. English in the class results in exhaustion of students; and 14.3% disagreed with this proposition (table 10).
- 71.4% faculty members agreed upon usage of L1 for motivation students in their learning while 21.4% disagreed with it (table 11).
- Results show that 64.3%, 71.4% and 71.4% faculty members agreed with the uses of L1 by students when don't find similar word in English, want to fill gaps in speaking and to avoid misunderstanding. However, the use of L1 just for the sake of easiness in speaking in L1 has not been agreed by 64.3% faculty members (table 12).

Students' Perspectives

- 75.6% students agreed that students should be allowed to use L1 in Business Communication classes, however 21.5% didn't agree with it (table 13).

- 92.2% students agreed that they like it when their teachers use L1 in Business Communication classes, however 7.8% didn't agree with it (table 14).
- 74.1% students agreed that it is necessary to use L1 should be used in in Business Communication classes, however 25.4% didn't agree with it (table 15).
- 76.6% students believed that communication in first language in class by their teachers will be helpful for them, however 18.5% didn't agree with it (table 16).
- 88.3% students agreed that while explanation of complex concepts by teachers, during business Communication classes use of L1 it of great help for students. However, 11.7% disagreed with it (table 17).
- 70.24% students believed that faculty may use codeswitching when required to pass instructions, while 21.5% disagreed with it (table 18).
- 82.9% students agreed and only 15.1% students disagreed with the statement regarding permission of using first language by students during their group activities in the class (table 19).
- 81.4% students agreed and 13.6 % students disagreed that teacher and students can use L1 to review their comprehension (table 20).
- 94% students are of the view that if only second language is being used for instructions it creates fatigue in the classroom and 4.4% disagreed with it (table 21).
- 83.4% students agreed that motivation in the learning process in business communication classes can also be achieved by using L1, while 12.7% disagreed with it (table 22).
- Results show that 70.73%, 60.5%, 83% and 79.5% students agreed with the uses of L1 by students when they don't find similar word in English, want to fill gaps in speaking, because it is easier to speak in L1 and to avoid misunderstanding, respectively (table 23).

Table 24: A comparative analysis of the findings

Statements	Faculty Members' Perspective	Students' Perspective
Statement 1	57.2% Agree, 28.5% Disagree	75.6% agree, 21.5% disagree
Statement 2	85.7% agree, 14.3% disagree	92.2% agree, 7.8% disagree
Statement 3	64.3% agree, 21.4% disagree	74.1% agree, 25.4% disagree
Statement 4	71.4% agree, 21.4% disagree	76.6% agree, 18.5% disagree
Statement 5	78.6% agree, 14.3% disagree	88.3% agree, 11.7% disagree
Statement 6	64.3% agree, 21.4% disagree	70.2% agree, 21.5% disagree
Statement 7	35.7% agree, 50% disagree	82.9% agree, 15.1% disagree
Statement 8	57.2% agree 35.6% disagree	81.4% agree, 13.6% disagree
Statement 9	85.7% agree, 14.3% disagree	94% agree, 4.4% disagree
Statement 10	71.4.3% agree, 21.4% disagree	83.4% agree, 12.7% disagree

Discussion

The main purpose of the study was to explore perspectives of faculty members as well as students about code switching specifically in Business Communication courses in a Higher education institution setting. Thus, with the help of a questionnaire, the researcher collected quantitative data from faculty as well as students to know their perspectives about the use of code switching as an instructional strategy in Business communication courses. It has been derived from the perspectives of faculty and students that their perception about the use of code switching in Business communication classes is positive. However, we may find a degree of

difference through statistical results in the degree of agreement or disagreement in the perspectives of faculty and students about certain aspects including awareness and functions of code switching.

It has been found that faculty's attitudes towards code switching as an instructional strategy in business communication courses was encouraging and positive in general. The faculty showed agreement for the use of code switching as an instructional strategy in higher education institutes specifically, for business communication courses. Faculty members were also of the view that even code switching could be allowed for specific functions but they emphasized that students should not be allowed to use L1 during their group tasks in business communication classes.

The research findings from the students' questionnaire were equally comparable with the findings from faculty members, the results revealed higher degree of agreement by students about the uses of code switching in business communication courses. Furthermore, study reveals that students' perspective about code switching in business communication classes has higher mean and acceptance level. Students believed that code switching for the purpose of explaining complex terminology and concepts in business communication not only increase their comprehension level but it also results in motivation for learning.

Overall, there is a notable agreement between faculty and students on the importance of code-switching. However, the findings indicate substantial differences in their perspectives:

Support for L1 Usage: Students overwhelmingly support the use of their first language (L1) in the classroom, with 75.6% advocating for it, compared to only 57.2% of faculty. This disparity highlights a potential gap in understanding the benefits that students associate with L1 usage.

Key Areas of Disagreement: Specifically, students express a stronger preference for using L1 for group activities and checking comprehension, with percentages significantly higher than those of faculty. This suggests that students may feel more comfortable and engaged when they can utilize their native language.

- *Benefits of Code-Switching:* Both groups recognize the advantages of code-switching, particularly in explaining complex concepts. For instance, 78.6% of faculty and 85.5% of students agree on the necessity of L1 for this purpose. This consensus indicates that code-switching can facilitate better understanding and retention of complex material.
- *Areas of Concern:* Despite the benefits, there are areas of concern regarding the perceptions of L1's usefulness:
- *Skepticism from Faculty:* Faculty members exhibit some doubt about the overall effectiveness of L1 in teaching, which contrasts with students' views that see it as a valuable resource. This difference may stem from varying pedagogical beliefs or experiences in the classroom.
- *Exhaustion from English-Only Instruction:* Both groups acknowledge the fatigue associated with exclusive English instruction, with 85.7% of faculty and 94% of students feeling this way. This shared sentiment underscores the need for a more balanced approach to language use in the classroom.

Conclusion

The main objective of this study was to explore the perspectives of Faculty and students about code switching as an instructional strategy in business communication classes at a higher education institute. On the bases of findings from the data collected from faculty members and students, it may be concluded that code switching as an instructional strategy even in higher education institutes, for teaching of business communication courses, plays an important role for the improved understanding, comprehension and creating inclusive classroom culture. In light of the findings of this study both faculty members and students showed positive acceptance for the use of code switching in higher educational institute setting for business

communication courses. Hence it is recommended that code switching may be employed as an instructional strategy for the teaching of business communication courses in higher education institutes. Moreover, the study reflects that English only classroom or teaching and responses only in English throughout the class results in exhausted class. As the class being combination of students with different learning capabilities and their belonging from diverse social and cultural backgrounds, use of code switching will bring balance in the learning process of these diverse learners. Thus, it is recommended that for the achievement of inclusive classroom environment and culture codeswitching may be used as an instructional strategy in higher education institutes.

It is also recommended that further research on the topic may be conducted to strengthen the findings and drive conclusive results by selecting more than one higher educational institutions offering business communication course.

References

- Ahmad, B.H., & Jusoff, K. (2009) Teachers' Code-Switching in Classroom Instructions for Low English Proficient Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2, 49. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n2p49>
- Auerbach, E.R. (1993). Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 9-32.
- Baker, C. (2006) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 4th ed. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.
- Bouangeune, (2009). Using L1 in Teaching Vocabulary to Low Proficiency Level Students: A Case of First Year Students, Department English, Faculty of Letters, National University *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2 -DOI - 10.5539/elt. v2n3p186
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des Langues vivantes*, 57(3), 402- 423. DOI:[10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402](https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402)
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. London: Sage publications.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK, NY: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486999>
- Deuchar, M. (2021). *The Role of the Input in the Acquisition of Code Switching. - Multilingualism across the Lifespan*. by Routledge
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. NY: Cambridge University Press <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611834>
- Hymes, D.H. (1962). *The Ethnography of Speaking*. In T. Gladwin & W. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and Human Behavior*. Washington, DC: Anthropological society of Washington.
- Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' code-switching to the L1 in EFL classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 10-23. DOI: [10.2174/1874913501003010010](https://doi.org/10.2174/1874913501003010010)
- Lee, J. S. (2024). The Role of Code-Switching in Multilingual Classrooms: Teacher Perspectives and Student Outcomes. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 23(1), 45-62.
- Li Wei. (2021). TESOL Educators can contribute to the fight-back against racial discrimination and hatred: A personal view from Britain. *Tesol Journal*, 12(3), September 2021, e618. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.618> ; <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/tesj.618>

- Lewis, W. G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2013). 100 bilingual lessons: Distributing two languages in classrooms. In: C. Abello-Contesse, P. M. Chandler, M. D. LópezJiménez, & R. Chacón-Beltrán (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education in the 21st century* (pp. 107–135). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Martinez, R. A. (2024). "Bilingualism and Code-Switching: Implications for Teaching Practices." *Language and Education*, 38(2), 134-150.
- Panhwar, Farida Yasmin Ali Nawaz (2018). *Multilingualism in Sindh, Pakistan: the functions of code-switching used by educated, multilingual Sindhi women and the factors driving its use*. University of Sussex. Thesis. <https://hdl.handle.net/10779/uos.23459879.v1>
- Rahimi, A., & Jafari, Z. (2011). Iranian students' attitudes towards the facilitative and debilitating role of code-switching; Types and moments of code-switching EFL classrooms. *The Buckingham Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 4, 15- 28.
- Ruben K. (2024). Language and Identity: Code-Switching Practices among Multilingual Communities. *European Journal of Linguistics* ISSN: 2957-4641 (online) 3(3), pp 40 – 53, 2024.
- Turnbull, M. (2001) There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but... *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(4), 531-540.
- Weng, P. (2012). Code-switching as a strategy use in an EFL classroom in Taiwan. *US-China Foreign Language*, 10(10), 1669-1675.
<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:145798395>