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Codeswitching—the case of switching between two languages during the course of a conversation—has sparked much interest in the field of second language acquisition in general and in foreign language instruction, in particular. Much debate has centered on the reasons for, and the utility of, codeswitching in foreign language instruction. This thesis explores the issue by conducting a survey among students enrolled in foreign language classes at a Midwestern American university. The aim of the thesis was to assess the students’ perceptions of and attitude toward codeswitching by both students and teachers in foreign language classes and to determine whether there were certain factors that influenced these perceptions and attitudes. The results show that language anxiety and perceived language competence play a significant role in impacting students’ perceptions of and attitude toward codeswitching in the foreign language classroom.

Motivation to learn the language did not impact many of the dependent variables. The results are presented and discussed, as are avenues for future research.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Codeswitching, defined by Myers-Scotton (1993a) as “the use of two or more languages in the same conversation, usually within the same conversational turn, or even within the same sentence of that turn,” has been the subject of much study for a long time and in different areas. For example, one field of investigation focuses on the use of code switching in the words of bilingual or multilingual speakers in their everyday conversations (Myers-Scotton, 1993a). Many studies have paid attention to the experience of children who engage in code switching with peers, parents, or even with strangers. Other studies address the experiences of adults and discuss the different languages in which codeswitching takes place (see, for example, Edwards and Dewaele 2007; Lawson 2000; Macaro 2001; Sarkar and Winer 2006).

Codeswitching is even being explored in marketing and advertising. These studies mostly focus on the experiences of the Hispanic community in the United States and advertising that changes between English and Spanish, targeting this group of consumers (see, for example, Bishop and Peterson, 2010; Luna and Peracchio, 2005). It has been argued that, among bilingual Hispanics, codeswitching might foster increased attention to
Subject of intense debate, code-switching in the foreign language classroom has engendered its share of research. This issue has attracted supporters and detractors. Those who support its use suggest that learning a foreign language is facilitated if students can speak without fear of forgetting words in the foreign language and codeswitching can creative a supportive classroom environment (Butzkamm, 1998; Castellotti & Moore, 1997; McMillan & Rivers, 2011) They also point to the various pedagogical uses of codeswitching such as facilitating student comprehension; helping students build their vocabulary; manage classroom activities; and even to build solidarity with students (Bateman, 2008; Qing, 2010; Ustunel, 2004; Yang, 2004). By contrast, opponents advocate a strict "diet" of the foreign language for learners of a foreign language. They generally think that use of the native language in the foreign language classroom can be counter-productive, in that it does not foster acquisition of the foreign language (Cook, 2001; Duff & Polio, 1990; Polio & Duff, 1994; also see McMillan & Rivers, 2011 for a recent discussion).

The following extract, which touches indirectly on the issue of codeswitching, was taken from the website of an American university, Illinois State University, which has a Study Abroad program in France and which asks for feedback from students regarding their experiences in the program.

Extract: “How were your semester classes and teachers?

The classes were very informative, non-threatening, and low stress. The professors genuinely want you to do your absolute best. Probably the greatest part of CIDEF is that
the professor cannot simply switch back into English if the students do not understand because not everyone in the class is a native English speaker. I had to make mistakes in French and hear the explanation in French, which expanded my vocabulary and helped me think in French.” (Source: http://www.llc.ilstu.edu/studyabroad/angers.shtml, Study Abroad student opinion)

In it, the student, in recounting her experience, makes reference to one of the realities in foreign language instruction in classrooms in the United States: codeswitching, that is, the switching to English from the language being taught and back to the language being taught. As seen through the eyes of this respondent to the University’s request for feedback, codeswitching was limited when she was in a second language context in France and she had positive impressions of being taught entirely in French and being forced to think in French.

When I became aware of this feedback, I reflected on my own experiences as a learner of a second language, French, and the experiences both in the context of a second language environment (learning French in France) and a foreign language context (learning French in the United States or Jamaica). I wondered at the extent to which my experiences in the second language context mirrored those of the respondent and came away feeling that our experiences were similar. Regarding codeswitching, there is usually limited scope for this in a second language classroom\(^1\), as there is not usually a common language among the learners. Students in such classes often come from different countries where native languages are also different. I was also forced to think about my

\(^1\) A second language classroom is one in which a target language (e.g., French) is being taught to non-native speakers (speakers of English) in a context in which the target language is the dominant language (in France). A foreign language classroom is one in which a language (e.g., French) is being taught to non-native speakers (speakers of American English) in a context where the native language of the learners is the dominant language (in the USA).
experiences in learning French in a foreign language context (such as in the United States or Jamaica). I wondered what the experiences of the respondent in the above extract in a foreign language context were like, and whether she expected codeswitching to take place. In addition, what is her response, as well as the response of other students learning a foreign language, to codeswitching?

These ruminations planted the seeds of interest in seeking to explore the issue of codeswitching in foreign language classrooms. Do students have experiences with codeswitching in their foreign language classes? Who engages in it? On what occasions do they engage in it? What are students’ perceptions of theirs and others’ codeswitching? Are there individual factors that influence students’ attitudes toward and perceptions of codeswitching?

Despite the current research on the topic of codeswitching, a gap in our knowledge exists, as there is little research on the attitudes of students of foreign languages to the use of codeswitching by their classmates and their teachers, and, importantly, how these attitudes are affected by various personal and psychological factors. This thesis focuses on this subject, in particular the impact that different personality factors have on foreign language students’ perceptions of attitudes toward codeswitching in the foreign language classroom. In this project, personal and psychological factors include motivation of students in learning the foreign language; students’ perceptions of their competence in the foreign language being studied; and anxiety surrounding the use of the foreign language.

The aim of this thesis was to explore such questions as: Are students who are highly motivated to learn a foreign language less favorable towards codeswitching than
students who are less motivated to learn the foreign language? If students’ perception of their competence in the foreign language being studied is high, does that render them less favorable toward codeswitching? Does anxiety surrounding use of a foreign language lead to differing attitudes toward codeswitching?

The main purpose of this study is to, initially, make a contribution to the discourse on code switching, in general, and code switching in the foreign language classroom in particular. More specifically, a primary goal is to make recommendations for teachers of foreign languages, based on the results of analysis of the effects of personal factors and psychological attitudes toward code-switching. For example, if the results show that students who have a high level of anxiety in the use of a foreign language prefer to codeswitch, a possible recommendation would address ways to promote relaxation in the course and develop practices that facilitate this relaxed atmosphere, where they feel free to make errors in the foreign language.

In the case of the perception of student competence in the foreign language, if the results allow us to make distinctions between those who have a favorable perception of their competence and those with an unfavorable perception, this information will become useful for teachers who could then develop programs that would build students' confidence in their competence, thereby contributing positively to student experience in foreign language courses. So the contribution of this study is both theoretic and practical.

In Chapter 1, I conduct a general discussion of codeswitching and a review of the literature on code-switching in general. In Chapter 2, I touch on switching in language courses, in particular, and review that literature. In Chapter 3, I advance the theoretical

---

2 Throughout this thesis, perceived competence refers to students’ subjective views of their ability in the foreign language.
framework, where I develop some hypotheses based on a discussion of the personal and psychological factors being explored in this thesis: student motivation to learn the foreign language, perception of language competence, and anxiety using the foreign language. Chapter 4 focuses on the methodological issues, which involves a discussion of the design and execution of a survey to collect data from students enrolled in foreign language courses at the University of Toledo, regardless of language or level. Chapter 5 provides the results and a discussion of these results, and in Chapter 6, I note study limitations and discuss future research avenues.
Chapter 2

Codeswitching: A general discussion

In the course of the history of research on codeswitching, a number of definitions of the phenomenon have been proposed. Gumperz (1982) sees codeswitching as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (p. 59). Auer (1984) defines codeswitching as “the alternating use of more than one language” (p. 1). Heller (1988) proposes that codeswitching is “the use of more than one language in the course of a single communicative episode” (p. 1). In a similar vein, Myers-Scotton (1993a) sees codeswitching as “the use of two or more languages in the same conversation, usually within the same conversational turn, or even within the same sentence of that turn” (p. vii).

Myers-Scotton (1993b), in developing the Matrix Language Framework (MLF) of codeswitching, makes a distinction between two general types: intersentential and intrasentential. According to her, intersentential codeswitching occurs when an interlocutor switches from one language to the other between sentences; so, an entire sentence, or entire sentences, may be generated before there is a switch back to the other
language. In the case of intrasentential codeswitching, it occurs within a sentence or sentence fragment. The following two examples illustrate this distinction:

Example 1 (intersentential): *Des rappeurs ont incité les jeunes à s'inscrire sur les listes électorales et "être acteur" de leur futur. They want young people to go out and vote. Pour Samir, jeune homme dans la salle, ça marchera bien dans les quartiers.*

Example 2 (intrasentential): *Des rappeurs ont incité les jeunes à s'inscrire sur les listes électorales et take charge of their future.*

Whatever its definition, codeswitching has generated a lot of debate and research as linguists seek to understand such things as its motivations and structure (see, for example, Heller, 1988; Myers-Scotton 1993a). The research stream reveals that this phenomenon has been studied in very diverse contexts. Woolard (1988), for example, conducted an analysis of performances by a comedian operating in Catalan and Castilian in Spain and concluded that codeswitching was a way of conveying a social message, that is, that “the two languages and thus the language communities can co-exist and interact peacefully” (p. 73). This is against the cultural tensions that exist in this region, Catalonia, where the state language is Castilian, and where the large population of Castilian speakers is primarily monolingual, compared to the Catalan-speaking natives, who tend to be more bilingual. In addition, tensions centered on the need to protect Catalan from extinction. Hence, groups such as politicians have at times played upon these divisions in promoting their agendas. According to Woolard (1988): “Moreover, refusals on the part of public figures to speak Catalan in some cases and Castilian in others created occasional uproars” (p. 55).
Myers-Scotton (1993a) studied the social motivations for codeswitching in Africa, with a particular focus on English-Swahili codeswitching in Kenya. She concluded that codeswitching was an index of rights and obligations as perceived by the interlocutors in a conversation in a given cultural milieu. In the Kenya case, this is a multilingual context, where some 30 or more ethnic groups use their own languages for interactions. English is the language of instruction at school, while Swahili is a medium for interactions with peers and probably siblings. She argues, for example, that codeswitching is an index of speakers’ perceptions of themselves (for example, their status in relation to the other interlocutor/s); a way to project a particular persona or relation with others; a way of affording speakers to not commit to a single identity; and to show solidarity.

There has also been research aimed at understanding the structure of speech in codeswitching (see, for example, Muysken, 2000). For example, drawing on previous efforts to develop a typology of codeswitching speech, Deuchar, Muysken, & Wang (2007) aimed to develop very precise criteria that could be used in the classification of codeswitching speech. In addition, they sought to test these criteria using available codeswitching data. The three data sets on which they tested their classification scheme included Welsh-English bilingual data; Tsou-Mandarin Chinese data; and Taiwanese-Mandarin Chinese data. They argued that a number of attempts had been made previously to classify codeswitching data, and these had utilized such factors as the proportion of the two languages spoken; the directionality of the codeswitching; the nature of the constituents that are switched, such as noun phrases or verb phrases, as well as the various types of multiword switches; and the number of loan words or single word
switches. However, one of the shortcomings of the stream of research, they argued, is the fact that many researchers had failed to adequately define what constitutes a switch.

The authors paid particular attention to a study and classification that was conducted by Muysken (2000), who contended that there were “three main codeswitching patterns found in bilingual speech communities: insertion, alternation and congruent lexicalization” (p. 303). In the case of insertion, one of the two languages in the bilingual discourse determines how constituents from the second language are inserted in the discourse; in alternation, the two languages occur alternately, each retaining its structure; and in congruent lexicalization, the two languages share a common structure and constituents are inserted at random. Muysken also contended that there are four major diagnostic features that were prevalent in codeswitching: constituency; element switched; switch site; and properties of the switch. The authors then attempted to classify their data, mentioned earlier, using the Muyskenian framework. They concluded from this effort that “no data set can be exclusively categorized by one of Muysken’s (2000) three CS patterns” (p. 335).

Regarding the matter of codeswitching in bidialectal and bilingual communities, Swann (2000) makes reference to research on how social occasions may impact the nature of codeswitching in which bilingual speakers engage. She mentions the use of Ranamal (“associated with home, family, and friends, and more generally with locally based activities and relationships”; p. 165) and Bokmal (“associated with formal education and with ‘official transactions, religion, and the mass media’”; p. 165) in Norway. So, speakers switch between the two dialects depending on whether they were
talking about official or unofficial matters; thus, CS was being used “to convey certain social meanings” (p. 165).

In the case of codeswitching and speaker style, Swann reported on studies that looked at black British speakers whose parents had migrated from the Caribbean. In one study the researchers focused on the participants’ use of Patois/Creole/British Black English (used interchangeably by the author) in different situations and with interviewers of different races. The results showed that Patois was used least frequently in the interviews with white interviewers, and was used most often in informal situations where no researcher was present. The researcher concluded, based on other results, that the use of Patois was based on the speakers’ attitudes toward “mainstream white society” as well as their level of integration into the black community.

Sarkar & Winer (2006) focused on rappers in Quebec, Canada, and on codeswitching in their performances. This study represented one of the first efforts to address the issue of language use in rap songs by Quebec rappers. These rappers, according to the authors of this study, were members of the Bill 101 generation, given their ages, and they shared French as a common language owing to schooling. The reference to Bill 101 is a reference to a language policy law that was passed in Quebec in 1977 that recognized French as the sole official language of the province. Thus, the authors were interested in assessing the extent to which lyrics in Quebec rap music might signal the failure, or folly, of this policy. The authors painted a picture of the linguistic diversity of the Montreal in which these rappers operated, and the rappers themselves also reflected this diversity. The authors contended that, sometimes in their performances, these rappers codeswitched among three or four languages with a great degree of ease.
and rapidity, even though they might not speak all the languages fluently. They cite, for example, the lyrics of one rapper Chub-E: “Fake Wu-Tang memba, method, me’me pas” (African-American Vernacular English-English-French) and those of MC Dramatik: “Et blow yo, quand le syste’me est loco t’entends les sire’nes des popos” (AAVE, French, Spanish, French slang).

These authors were interested in three central issues: (a) “the nature and function of codeswitching or ‘artistic codemixing’” in Quebec rap music; (b) the extent to which codeswitching creates a new community among the young people in Quebec; and (c) the extent to which language provides information on identity construction. This study focused on the first issue. For these authors, a central concern was the difference between this kind of codeswitching—catering to large audiences of strangers—and codeswitching in spontaneous conversations with known interlocutors. The researchers identified nine languages into which lyrics could be coded and coded the published lyrics from nine CDs that they thought were representative of Quebec rappers’ work. The authors concluded that codeswitching serves pragmatic (for example, to signal the authorship of a work or the addressee), poetic (for example, to facilitate rhyming), and performative (indicate, for example, the performer’s ability to move seamlessly between languages) functions. In addition, Quebec rappers use codeswitching to signal their multilingual identities; their links to a global culture and, at the same time, membership of a “local” community; and their construction of new identities.

Paradis and Nicoladis (2007) studied bilingual children and the nature of their interlocutor sensitivity, that is, the extent to which the bilingual child uses more of language 1 with an interlocutor who speaks that language and more of language 2 with
someone who speaks language 2 (p. 277). This does not mean that the majority of what they say has to be in the interlocutor’s language; however, a greater than usual proportion would indicate interlocutor sensitivity. The authors were especially interested in determining whether older bilingual children, as compared to two-year-old bilinguals who had been the focus of previous studies, would engage in more discourse separation of the languages they speak, in a manner similar to the patterns in their bilingual communities. They also wanted to find out if the dominant languages of these children influenced language choice for discourse and code-mixing patterns.

This study was carried out in Edmonton, Alberta (majority English-speaking city in a majority English-speaking province) and involved Canadian French-English bilinguals. The eight participants ranged in ages from 3 years and 6 months to 4 years and 11 months, with 3 of them being girls. Only one had not been regularly exposed to both English and French since birth. The participants heard the two languages from a variety of sources. The authors video-taped the children in their homes, on two occasions, each of which lasted an hour: in one session, language production was in a French-discourse context; in the other, it was an English-discourse context. Adult interlocutors who spoke each language for a given session interacted with the participants. The authors interpreted discourse context as the adult interlocutor’s choice of language. They transcribed the video tapes and then coded the utterances by both adults and children, based on whether they were English-only, French-only, or mixed. The authors found that there was little variation in language usage across the sessions and that, for the majority of the situations, the children maintained the language choice of the adults. Thus, one of their conclusions was that these children can display discourse separation as well as minimal use of intra-
utterance code-mixing. They found too that, regardless of the dominant language of the children, they were more likely to use more English in French contexts, in comparison to their usage of French in English contexts. The authors theorized that this could be a result of the combined effects of language dominance (the study took place in a setting where English was the dominant language) and children’s sensitivity to the nature of the sociolinguistic context.

Edwards and Dewaele (2007) moved beyond simply looking at bilingual speakers to looking at multilingual speakers; in this case, trilingual speakers and the nature of their conversations. They lament that only a few years ago, trilingualism was not looked upon with the same level of interest as bilingualism; however, in recent years, this has changed, and more and more research is taking place on this once “poor relation” in the field of bilingualism. They present some initial information on research on trilingualism then report on the study that they conducted regarding codeswitching among trilingual speakers. The primary issue that they wanted to explore was whether there were differences in bilingual competence and trilingual competence, in particular, whether the gap between bilingual and trilingual competence was greater or same as the gap between monolingual and bilingual competence. Some of the prior research, though limited, had suggested that trilingualism and bilingualism shared some common features, but trilingualism was more complex.

The authors conducted a study of the conversations between two members of a family living in London (a mother who was born in Lebanon, and who was schooled in Arabic and French in secondary school and English at university; her daughter, aged 8.5 years, whose first languages, Arabic and English, were acquired at home, and who started
to learn French when she turned 4). The mother was responsible for recording the conversations in the family home. Two such conversations served as the corpus for the study: a conversation during an evening meal and another during the daughter’s bath time. The authors then explored the recorded data to unearth information on the types of switches in the conversations, where these switches took place, the differences between the speakers in the use of the languages, and the level of divergence or convergence in the language choice where a switch takes place.

The results indicated a main difference in the discourse in terms of dominant language, as the mother’s dominant language was Arabic, while the language choice of the daughter was more varied, though most of her switches occurred in Arabic and English. In their conversations, the mother generally engaged in codeswitching more frequently than the daughter, and there were even differences in the elements that were switched: primarily nouns for the daughter but verbs, adverbs, nouns, adjectives, and interjections for the mother. In general, the authors concluded that mother and daughter operated in a “trilingual mode” during the course of their conversations. They also contend that the data suggest that there is intergenerational language shift, where the younger generation favors one language (usually language of the host country) and the older generation another (L1 of country of origin). A major limitation of this study is that, while it is a case study that presents interesting information, its findings are not generalizable, in view of the sample size involved.

Kouega (2008) explored the role of language and language use in religious services by the Catholic church in Yaounde, Cameroon. There, the Catholic church is the dominant church group, and the nature of the Catholic mass is such that it lends itself to
analyses of the language used during its various stages. According to the authors, the mass lasts about 90 minutes and consists of various elements: first reading, second reading, the Gospel, the sermon, the offertory, the Eucharist, communion and announcements. Thus, the aim of the author was to determine what language—the “official” language, French, or indigenous languages such as Basaa and Bulu—is used at what stage of the Catholic mass and by whom. This is against the background of different parishes having multilingual congregations.

The author had 20 research assistants attend at least three of the approximately five Sunday masses that were held in each parish. The assistants conducted observations and answered certain questions regarding language use: who uses what language and in what activities. They spoke with congregants before or after each mass to obtain additional information on what were the motivations for language use during the course of the mass. The research yielded 60 completed questionnaires, and the data were analyzed using simple counts and percentages. The results indicated that French was the dominant language used in most aspects of the Catholic mass, with Beti and Basaa being used in some parishes in conjunction with French. This could be an artifact, however, of the fact that the study took place in a predominantly Francophone part of the Cameroon. The liturgical languages—French, Beti, Basaa, and English—were used in all aspects of the mass, but minority Cameroon languages were used mainly for singing and at times for epistle reading.

The author contends that key elements of the mass were carried out in “languages that had weight” in a given parish. The principal factor influencing language choice, he argued, seemed to be the involvement of language speakers in church activities. In most
parishes, congregants prayed and recited rituals most frequently in French. The choirs in the parishes used several different languages. Bamileke, one of the Cameroon languages, was used more frequently in singing, ahead of French. Readings of the first and second epistle was done most frequently in French, Ewondo, and Bamikele. The author points out that French, being a liturgical language in the parishes, was generally used for all activities. However, language choice was also impacted by whether the priest spoke the language, or whether there are catechists (they, for example, prepared the epistles to be read) and chaplains who speak the language; the level of involvement of the community speaking the language in church activities; and whether such things as the Bible, hymnals, and other religious materials were available in the language.

The issue of codeswitching has also attracted research in other domains such as advertising and marketing. Much of that research has focused on the experiences of Hispanic Americans in the United States and their responses to ads in which codeswitching is used (Bishop and Peterson, 2010; Luna and Peracchio, 2005). Luna and Peracchio (2005) found that if a slogan uses codeswitching, it has the ability to activate positive responses in consumers if the language to which the slogan codeswitches activates positive associations. They found in one study that when slogans codeswitched from majority language to minority language, they were less persuasive; however, when the codeswitching was in the other direction, the slogans proved to be more persuasive. They concluded that the effectiveness of codeswitching in slogans depended on the direction in which the switch takes place. A second study from these researchers also found favorable reactions by bilinguals to codeswitching that they considered the norm. In essence, if bilinguals think that it is the norm for majority language to minority
language to take place, they will respond favorably to majority language to minority language codeswitching in advertising. Similarly, if they think the norm is for minority language to majority language codeswitching, they will respond favorably to this kind of codeswitching.

Bishop and Peterson (2010) studied the impact of the medium\(^3\) in which ads that use codeswitching are placed on consumers’ perceptions. They conducted their study among 122 bilingual Mexican Americans who had competence in English and Spanish. They placed either an English-to-Spanish code-switched ad or a Spanish-to-English code-switched ad in an all-English magazine or in an all-Spanish magazine (hence, 4 different ad exposures). The ads were for a fictitious cell phone service provider. The participants were then shown the ads and afterwards they answered questions related to the cultural sensitivity of the advertiser; persuasiveness of the ad; and cognitive ad involvement, that is, the extent to which they found the ad important, relevant to them, useful to them, and so on. Bishop and Peterson (2010) found, among other things, that when they placed a codeswitched ad written primarily in one language in a magazine that used that language, cultural sensitivity of the advertiser was perceived as being higher and the ad was more persuasive. They recommended, therefore, that advertisers using codeswitching in advertising should take into account the media in which their ads will be placed.

---

\(^3\) In advertising, the term medium refers to such methods of transmission of information as magazines, newspapers, television, and radio.
Codeswitching in foreign language courses: A review

Codeswitching in the foreign language classroom by the two groups involved in the process, teachers and learners of the language, has generated its fair share of debate and research. As for the definition, codeswitching (CS) in the foreign language classroom occurs when the teacher or students change from one language to another during the course of instruction. More often, in the foreign language classroom, change is from the foreign language to the mother tongue or native language (L1) of the majority of students in the classroom. Research on this issue has gone through phases: an initial phase where researchers looked at bilingual classrooms in the United States, in an effort to assess the impact of CS on students’ linguistic development; a second phase, where researchers focused on the communicative functions of using the native language in the foreign language classroom; and a third stage in which researchers also focused on the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of those involved in CS (Qian, Tian, and Wang 2009).

There are supporters and opponents of the practice of CS in foreign language classrooms. According to those who support CS, it helps students, given the difficulty of learning a foreign language. Qing (2010), for example, suggests: “… code-switching in
language classroom is not always a blockage or deficiency in learning a language, but may be considered as a useful strategy in classroom interaction, if the aim is to make meaning clear and to transfer the knowledge to students in an efficient way” (p. 113). In contrast, the argument in the opposing camp is that CS negatively affects the acquisition of language. So one school of thought supports the exclusive use of the second language; the other opposes this trend, claiming that exclusive use of the foreign language does not guarantee acquisition of the language by language learners (Macaro, 2001).

In one of the few reported studies that have looked at perceptions of CS among students and teachers, Van der Meij and Zhao (2010) investigated CS in English classes in Chinese universities. The authors wanted to compare students’ and teachers’ perceptions of the extent of their CS with actual data gathered on these students’ and teachers’ CS. (By way of note, the “norm” in China is that the native language should not be used in the foreign language classroom, though there were no written guidelines on this issue that these authors could find.) The authors also wanted to determine the general frequency of CS and whether factors such as course type and teacher and student proficiency influenced CS frequency.

In this study, Van der Meij and Zhao (2010) made a distinction between perceived (believed) and optimal (desired) presence of codeswitching by both teachers and students. They also made a distinction between short moments of CS (CS lasted for only a few seconds/words) and long moments of CS (CS that lasted for several sentences, for example). A reason for this distinction is that the researchers were also interested in the participants’ perceptions of what was an optimal level of CS.
Forty teachers and 450 students drawn from 10 classes in two universities took part in the study. The teachers completed the Teacher Codeswitching Questionnaire, which contained questions on the two types of codeswitches mentioned earlier and the extent to which teachers engaged in them. The teachers also responded to questions regarding how often they thought they should engage in CS. There were also questions on the teachers’ demographics and language proficiency. Eight teachers from this sample each had one of their classes recorded. The students completed the Student Codeswitching Questionnaire, which was similar in format to the questionnaire for the teachers; the questionnaire solicited the same kinds of information on students as the teachers’ version solicited from teachers.

Van der Meij and Zhao found that teachers did not have a problem with the extent of their CS, whether long or short, and considered the amount of CS in which they engaged optimal. The teachers claimed, however, that they aimed for short moments of CS. Students, on the other hand, wanted more and longer CS. The researchers found that there was more actual CS among teachers than the teachers thought; in fact, it was 7 times more frequent and lasted much longer than the teachers thought. It did not vary by course type, and the impact of language proficiency on teacher CS was minimal. In the case of students’ perceptions of teachers’ CS, the researchers found that students estimated teachers’ CS to be more frequent than the teachers estimated CS to be. The students also wanted more of both types of CS: short and long. In terms of the influence on course type, course type influenced students’ perceptions of CS; for example, they perceived CS to be lower in Oral English than in their Integrated English classes. However, they did not think that language proficiency should influence the amount of CS
in which both students and teachers engage. This latter point led Van der Meij and Zhao to conclude: “Apparently, both parties do not feel that there is a need or opportunity to accommodate weaker students through codeswitching during the lesson” (p. 405).

In recent research on the use of CS in the foreign language classroom, Qian, Tian, and Wang (2009) conducted a study that looked at CS in Chinese classrooms where English was the foreign language being taught. In this study, they focused their efforts on CS in English language classrooms in primary schools; they lamented the focus of previous research on CS in Chinese classrooms solely in secondary and tertiary classrooms. They collected data over a four-year period on two teachers who were involved in a curriculum innovation program in primary schools in China. Their focus was on analyzing the classroom conversations of the teachers to determine where in an interaction CS took place and its functions, for example, how it related to turn-taking in the interaction. The authors set out specifically to address the following questions: (a) “What types of CS are there in teachers’ talk in the primary English classroom?”; (b) Is there any change in the quantity of teachers’ CS as students advance from one level to the next?”; and (c) “What functions does teachers’ CS serve in classroom interactions?” (p. 721).

Qian, Tian, and Wang (2009) used ten videotapes of the teachers’ lessons over the period under study, transcribed these lessons, and then analyzed the points in the lessons where CS took place. In addition to finding out that the extent of CS was about the same between the two teachers, they also found out that there was a lot of inter-sentential CS and that CS was far more frequent in Year 1 of the period under study. They contend that CS served both methodological and social functions, for example: “to ensure maximum
effect of teaching” (p. 725) or as “a strategy to establish or re-establish certain relationships, to strengthen solidarity or authority” (p. 726). In the case of “maximum effect of teaching,” the authors make reference to the use of CS in translation. The also said CS was used in clarification or highlighting of information. In the case of social functions, teachers switched back to the L1 to praise or encourage students, ensuring that the students would understand the praise or that they would sound less intimidating to weaker students. Correspondingly, resort to the L1 was also used for disapproval.

In a similar vein, in a study in English language classrooms in China, Chen and Hird (2006) focused on CS in the context of group work in foreign language classes. They wanted to determine the nature of interactions when Chinese students who were learning English were asked to work in small groups in class. The authors found that a lot of codeswitching took place when students were asked to work in small groups, and they restrict the use of English to specific purposes. Thus, small group work in this context among students who share a common maternal language limited the use of the language that the students were learning.

Tien (2009) conducted a study in Taiwan, a context that the author claims is one in which “English-only” has been the recommended approach to teaching English to Taiwanese English learners. In the study, the author wanted to determine the functions of CS in the Taiwanese foreign language classroom and to investigate the nature of conflicts and accommodation that arose. The author used observations, field notes, and audio recordings from two English language classes at a Taiwan university in the investigation. Tien concluded that learners and teachers in the classrooms used CS to accommodate each other. It was also used for different pedagogical purposes. According to Tien:
“Codeswitching in the two classrooms predominantly served the functions of explaining linguistic forms, managing the classrooms and building solidarity in the classrooms. Subtle use of codeswitching was also adopted for arguments and disagreements between the teachers and learners and to reinforce power relationships in the classroom” (p. 179).

Moodley (2007) conducted a study of codeswitching behavior among isiZulu (Zulu) native language students in junior secondary schools in South Africa. The classrooms of these students were multilingual, given the number of different African languages that are spoken. However, English was the language of instruction. (By way of additional information, South Africa has 11 official languages, 9 of which are African languages, with the other two being English and Afrikaans. Thus there are considerable concerns regarding making education available to South Africans in a multilingual environment, where each student can feel confident in his or her native language, while becoming fluent in at least two South African languages). In light of these factors, there is a lot of emphasis on outcomes-based education in South Africa, with some of the desired outcomes in language acquisition being: (a) “Learners make and negotiate meaning and understanding”; (b) “Learners show critical awareness of language usage”; and “Learners understand, know, and apply language structures and conventions in context” (Moodley, 2007; p. 711). Therefore, the author conducted the study of CS in an effort to “demonstrate how CS between the learner’s NL (Zulu) and the language of acquisition (English) promotes the achievement of these specific outcomes” (p. 711).

Data were gathered using an ethnographic approach, whereby the authors recorded students in a school where English was studied only as a first language. The
author does point to the caveat that a limitation of this method is that student knowledge of the recording of their behavior could change their behavior. The students were Grade 9 students whose first language was either Zulu or English. The facilitator, at the request of the author, recorded (a) Group 1: only Zulu-English bilingual learners; (b) Group 2: both Zulu-English bilingual learners and English monolingual learners.

Regarding the foregoing division, the author contends that this was in an effort to explore whether the students in Group 1 used CS in their English language classes and whether there were differences in language usage and behavior between them and members of Group 2. The results showed that CS was typical behavior in group-work in the English language classroom. However, Group 1 (all Zulu-English bilinguals) used CS more often than students in Group 2, which included English monolingual learners. The use of CS also facilitated the building of vocabulary and promoted the understanding of difficult concepts. CS was also used by the students to manage the group and influence the behavior of their peers.

Macaro (2001) was interested in the extent of codeswitching that took place among teachers of second languages, in light of the opposing views that have been posited in relation to the exclusive use of the second language in a second language classroom. Macaro argued that there has not been much research centered on questions such as: How much CS is done by teachers? Is it done intentionally? What is the purpose of the CS? What influences the decision to engage in CS? As a result, he sought answers to these and other questions by conducting a case study of the CS behavior of 6 student-teachers who were teaching French to students aged 11 to 14 in the south of England. They first tried to establish the extent to which these student-teachers had been exposed
to CS in their own learning/training experiences as well as the discussions about CS in which they had engaged. They had the student-teachers look at arguments and counterarguments to the use of CS in second language instruction, and asked them to focus on how these different arguments and counterarguments may have shaped different pedagogical approaches. They also reviewed empirical data on teacher use of L1 in second language instruction.

Over a 2-month period, the researcher video-recorded 14 lessons in French taught by the student-teachers. This was after the student-teachers had gone through a 1-year training program. The data were then coded as follows: student-teacher use of the L2; student-teacher use of the L1; student use of the L2; student use of the L1; and the nature of the tasks in which students were involved (oral, reading, listening, writing, non-interactive silence). The student-teachers were then invited to interviews with the researcher where the videotapes served as stimuli. This interview provided information on the student-teachers’ decisions to use L1 and the factors influencing that use. Among the findings was relatively little use of L1 by the student-teachers; no correlation between student-teacher use of L1 and student use of L1; use of L1 to enhance understanding when students appeared clueless about meanings of L2 words or institutions (ensemble = together; SNCF, [the French rail company] = c’est comme British Rail); and use of the L1 when the teachers “just thought it would be more effective” to convey a message or a rebuke.

The foregoing discussion indicates that there has been a steady stream of research on CS in foreign language classrooms and in different environments. The stream of research has identified functions of CS in the foreign language classroom and, more
recently, frequency of use of CS. The focus of this thesis, however, represents a departure in that it explores how various individual difference factors, in particular, language anxiety, perceptions of language competence, and motivation to learn the foreign language, impact students’ perceptions of teachers’, classmates’, and their own CS in their foreign language classes.
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Theoretical background and development of hypotheses

Language anxiety

Language anxiety has been one of the factors linked to students’ acquisition of a second language. Horwitz (1986) posits that this language anxiety is “evidenced by negative performance expectations and social comparisons, psycho-physiological symptoms, and avoidance behavior” (p. 559). Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) draws parallels between language anxiety and other related performance anxieties, in particular communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation (p. 127). They found that language anxiety can be provoked from such factors as students thinking that they will not be able to understand what is being said in language classes (communication apprehension) or they will make too many mistakes or that they will not be considered as competent as their classmates (fear of negative evaluation). These authors developed the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), which contains 33 items, and which is to be used to identify those students that suffer anxiety in foreign language classes. Their suggestion is that pedagogy can then be tailored to meet the needs of students who are highly anxious. Among the items in the scale are ones such as: “I
tremble when I know that I’m going to be called on in language class”; “I get nervous when I do not understand every word the teacher of this language is saying in class”; and “I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my foreign language class” (p. 129-130).

Aida (1994) adapted the FLCAS and administered it to students enrolled in Japanese classes at a southern United States university. Her focus was on validating the FLCAS within the context of Japanese classes. In particular, she wanted to determine the extent to which the structure of the scale reflected communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation. She also looked at the relationship between language anxiety and student performance in the Japanese classes. Among her findings were that speech anxiety and fear of negative evaluation were crucial dimensions of language anxiety. She did not, however, find a link between test anxiety and language anxiety. Her results also confirmed those of an earlier study by MacIntyre and Gardner (1989), who found no link between test anxiety and language anxiety. However, the researcher found that language anxiety did exist in Japanese classes, and there was a negative relationship between language anxiety and students’ performance in these classes.

Gregersen and Horwitz (2002) conducted a study in which they wanted to assess the relationship between language anxiety and perfectionism. They interviewed and videotaped 8 students enrolled in English language classes in a Chilean university. They then had the students watch the recordings and comment on them, in an effort to assess the relationships among anxiety, perfectionism, error consciousness, and fear of negative evaluation. There were two groups of students: high anxiety and low anxiety students.
The researchers found that there were differences between the two groups in error consciousness and fear of negative evaluation. Highly anxious students feared negative peer evaluations of their performance and were also more concerned about making errors.

More recently, Liu and Jackson (2008) found that there was a link between language anxiety and students’ willingness to speak in class. Their fears were also closely linked to their perceived proficiency in English, which was the foreign language. Students feared using English in class, and some of this was driven by fears of negative evaluation. Mak (2011) applied the FLCAS to Chinese students studying English as a second language in a Hong Kong university. The aim was to determine the factors that caused language anxiety among these students. Three hundred and thirteen students took part in this study. The author found that five factors explained language anxiety in this group of students. Among them were (a) speech anxiety and fear of negative evaluation and (b) uncomfortableness when speaking with native speakers. Important to my thesis is the finding that when students were unable to use their first language (L1) in class this also contributed to speaking-in-class anxiety.

The foregoing indicates clearly that language anxiety exists and that it can impact student performance and willingness to participate in foreign language classes. However, despite the foregoing focus on language anxiety, there have been no studies that have investigated its link to codeswitching. Codeswitching involves going back to students’ L1 and has been used for a variety of pedagogical and social reasons related to students’ comfort. For example, Yang (2004) and Qing (2010) found CS was used to adapt to students’ English proficiency levels. Similarly, Rolin-lanziti & Brownlie (2002) addressed communicative uses of CS, such as motivating students to speak the foreign
language in class and “teacher joking.” Given that codeswitching means that students can speak in their first language, it should play a role in dealing with language anxiety. It is expected that students that suffer higher levels of language anxiety would feel more relaxed and less stressed if they feel that the teachers, other students, and they can communicate in the students’ L1. This leads to the following expectations, in relation to language anxiety and perceptions of and attitudes toward CS in the foreign language classroom.

**H1a.** There will be an impact of language anxiety on perceptions of teachers’ CS such that students who express higher levels of language anxiety will have more favorable perceptions of teachers’ CS than students who express lower levels of language anxiety.

**H1b.** There will be an impact of language anxiety on attitudes toward teachers’ CS such that students who express higher levels of language anxiety will have more favorable attitudes toward teachers’ CS than students who express lower levels of language anxiety.

**H1c.** There will be an impact of language anxiety on perceptions of students’ CS such that students who express higher levels of language anxiety will have more favorable perceptions of students’ CS than students who express lower levels of language anxiety.

**H1d.** There will be an impact of language anxiety on attitudes toward students’ CS such that students who express higher levels of language anxiety will have more favorable attitudes toward students’ CS than students who express lower levels of language anxiety.
In the case of whether or not students engage in CS and the frequency with which they do so, the expectation is also that if the foreign language classroom environment allows for CS, then students will respond depending on their level of language anxiety. The following are therefore hypothesized.

*H1e.* There will be an impact of language anxiety on student engagement in CS such that students who express higher levels of language anxiety will be more likely to engage in CS than students who express lower levels of language anxiety.

*H1f.* There will be an impact of language anxiety on the frequency with which students engage in CS such that students who express higher levels of language anxiety will engage more frequently in CS than students who express lower levels of language anxiety.

**Perceived language competence**

Perceived language competence in this thesis refers to students’ self-reports of their own proficiency in a foreign language. Therefore, it is not proficiency that has been determined by an independent party or grades in the foreign language courses. Students engaged in the study of a foreign language will have varying perceptions of their own competence. Perceived competence is directly correlated to a person’s attitude toward the culture in question and his motivation for studying the language (Kim 2004). Perceptions of personal competence can also be a predictor of actual proficiency. For example, Shi (2011) found that a student’s self-evaluations can be used to predict his or her actual ability to function in real-life foreign language situations.

Students’ proficiency in a foreign language is likely to impact their perceptions of and attitude toward codeswitching, because differential levels in perceived foreign
language competence should be associated with differential levels in confidence in using the foreign language. Prior research has established this link between proficiency and increased levels of confidence in a foreign language context (see, for example, Graham and Macaro 2008). The following hypotheses relate, then, to the relationship between perceived language competence and perceptions of and attitude toward CS.

H2a. There will be an impact of perceived language competence on perceptions of teachers’ CS such that students who express higher levels of perceived language competence will have less favorable perceptions of teachers’ CS than students who express lower levels of perceived language competence.

H2b. There will be an impact of perceived language competence on attitudes toward teachers’ CS such that students who express higher levels of perceived language competence will have less favorable attitudes toward teachers’ CS than students who express lower levels of perceived language competence.

H2c. There will be an impact of perceived language competence on perceptions of students’ CS such that students who express higher levels of perceived language competence will have less favorable perceptions of students’ CS than students who express lower levels of perceived language competence.

H2d. There will be an impact of perceived language competence on attitudes toward students’ CS such that students who express higher levels of perceived language competence will have less favorable attitudes toward students’ CS than students who express lower levels of perceived language competence.

A construct of interest that is likely to be linked to proficiency is willingness to communicate, a measure of a person’s eagerness to use a foreign language. Researchers
such as McCroskey and Richmond (1990) contend that a person who perceives himself or herself as not being good at communication will be less likely to be willing to communicate than someone who views himself/herself as good at communication. Thus, these researchers see a link between communication competence and willingness to communicate. They also argue that people tend to communicate or not communicate based on the communication context. Maclntyre, Babin, and Clement (1999) found that there was a link between a person’s perceived communication competence and willingness to communicate. I argue, therefore, that a person with a higher self-perception of competence in a foreign language is more likely to be willing to communicate in that language. Since students’ confidence in using a foreign language is linked to their proficiency in the language, we should expect students who see themselves as more competent in the foreign language to engage less in codeswitching. These expectations are captured in the following hypotheses.

\[ \text{H2e. There will be an impact of perceived language competence on student engagement in CS such that students who express higher levels of language competence will be less likely to engage in CS than students who express lower levels of language competence.} \]

\[ \text{H2f. There will be an impact of perceived language competence on the frequency with which students engage in CS such that students who express higher levels of language competence will engage less frequently in CS than students who express lower levels of language competence.} \]

Student motivation to learn the foreign language
Student motivation to learn a foreign language has also been the subject of prior research. Scholars have investigated the connection between students’ motivation and their ability to learn and acquire a second or foreign language. This stream of research has shown, among other things, that student motivation to learn a language influences language acquisition (see, for example, Bernaus and Gardner 2008; Engin 2009). Gardner and Lambert (1972) developed the predominant theory of foreign language learning motivation. They proposed two types of motivational orientation, instrumental and integrative orientation. Instrumental orientation stems from a desire to learn the language for practical purposes, for example, increasing job opportunities, meeting university requirements, and so on. These researchers suggested that integrative motivation refers to learning a foreign language because students want to get to know and understand native speakers of that language (Gardner and Lambert 1972). Subsequently, other researchers questioned the usefulness of this paradigm and proposed other theories, for example intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation theory (see Lei 2010 for a recent study).

Rueda and Chen (2005) define foreign language learning motivation as “the target language learner’s orientation with regard to the goal of learning a second or foreign language” (p. 210). A student’s degree of motivation is generally recognized to correspond directly to his/her success in learning and retaining a foreign language. According to Rueda and Chen (2005) and other researchers in this area (for example, Segalowitz & Freed, 2004), students with higher level language learning motivation usually do perform better than their lower language learning motivation counterparts and develop better proficiency in the target language. According to Engin (2009): “The motivation of the learners determines how ready and eager they are to get more
information and to increase their ability to understand, write, and speak the second language” (p. 1036). He found also that integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, and work avoidance motivation all played a role in impacting foreign language learning. In addition, he found that integrative motivation was more effective than instrumental motivation in impacting foreign language success.

To the best knowledge of this author, there has been no specific work in this stream of research that has looked at the impact of language learning motivation on how students or even teachers view codeswitching. However, given the aforementioned research on motivation that suggests differences between high and low motivation students in performance and proficiency, it is likely that highly motivated students will see themselves capable of using the foreign language, or being able to deal with any challenges that might arise from teachers using the foreign language throughout a class. As a result of this line of thinking, the following hypotheses are made about their perceptions and attitudes toward codeswitching.

\textit{H3a. There will be an impact of motivation to learn the foreign language on perceptions of teachers’ CS such that students who express higher levels of motivation to learn the foreign language will have less favorable perceptions of teachers’ CS than students who express lower levels of motivation to learn the foreign language.}

\textit{H3b. There will be an impact of motivation to learn the foreign language on attitudes toward teachers’ CS such that students who express higher levels of motivation to learn the foreign language will have less favorable attitudes toward...}
teachers’ CS than students who express lower levels of motivation to learn the foreign language.

H3c. There will be an impact of motivation to learn the foreign language on perceptions of students’ CS such that students who express higher levels of motivation to learn the foreign language will have less favorable perceptions of students’ CS than students who express lower levels of motivation to learn the foreign language.

H3d. There will be an impact of motivation to learn the foreign language on attitudes toward students’ CS such that students who express higher levels of motivation to learn the foreign language will have less favorable attitudes toward students’ CS than students who express lower levels of motivation to learn the foreign language.

Given that students who are motivated to learn a foreign language have motivations such as getting to know and understand native speakers of the foreign language (integrative motivation), students who are highly motivated to learn the language should be different in their codeswitching habits than students who are less motivated to learn the language. This give rises to the following predictions.

H3e. There will be an impact of motivation to learn a foreign language on student engagement in CS such that students who express higher levels of motivation to learn a foreign language will be less likely to engage in CS than students who express lower levels of motivation to learn a foreign language.

H3f. There will be an impact of motivation to learn a foreign language on the frequency with which students engage in CS such that students who express
higher levels of motivation to learn a foreign language will engage less frequently in CS than students who express lower levels of motivation to learn a foreign language.

These hypotheses formed the basis for further exploration in this thesis. The next chapter describes the study that was carried out to test them. The prevailing idea is that support for these hypotheses can lead to various recommendations for foreign language instruction.
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Methodology and study

In order to test the hypotheses developed in the previous section, a survey was conducted among students enrolled in foreign language classes at The University of Toledo, Ohio, USA. In this section, information is provided on the methodological aspects of the study. This information includes information on the design of the questionnaire for the survey, the participants, collection of the data, and coding and data entry.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire for the study was developed by me and included a number of questions on the nature of the courses in which the participants were enrolled, that is, language and the level of the course. The questionnaire also contained items regarding who engaged in codeswitching (student, classmates, and teacher), on what occasions, and for what reasons. Scales used in previous studies to assess language anxiety (Horwitz, 1986), perceived competence in the foreign language, and motivation to learn the language (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993) were also included. In addition, questions solicited demographic and psychographic information such as participant age, gender,
year in University, whether the course being taken was a required course or not, and participants’ perceptions of their level of proficiency in the language.

Participants

Participants in the study were 116 students enrolled in different language classes at The University of Toledo. This was a convenience sample, as their participation was obtained by asking professors of foreign language courses during the Spring 2011 semester to offer a few points of extra credit to their students to take part in the study. Instructors in French and Spanish classes tended to be very receptive to the idea, and they allowed data collection in their classes.

The sample consisted of 79 female students (68%) and 37 male students (32%). The majority were within the age range 18-22 years (85.3%); the others fell into the 23-32 years range (14%). Breaking students’ majors down into two broad categories (Language & Communication; Non-Language & Communication), non-language/communication majors accounted for some 70% of the participants, and language/communication majors accounted for 30%. Most were taking the language course as a required course (54.3%), and the vast majority were native speakers of English (91.4%). Most saw themselves as low intermediate (49.1%) or high intermediate (39.7%) language users of the foreign language in which they were enrolled. The majority were enrolled in 2000 level courses (37.9%), followed by 3000 level courses (35.3%). Table 1 contains information on the profile of the study participants.

Data collection

Data were collected during scheduled foreign language classes. As indicated earlier, professors of foreign language classes were approached to have their students
Table 5.1

Profile of survey participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22 years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-32 years</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Communication</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Language</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whether Required Course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Being Studied</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 level (Beginner)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 level (Intermediate)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 level (Advanced)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 level (Advanced)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 4000 level (Graduate)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participate in the study for extra credit. When these professors agreed, a class time and hour were decided on. Approval for the data collection was obtained from the Internal Review Board of The University of Toledo. Some students completed the questionnaire at the start of their class sessions, while, in some classes, students completed the questionnaire towards the end of the class. Regardless of when data were collected, students were told at the start of the study that they were being asked to take part in a study on their experiences in foreign language courses and the study would take about 15 minutes. Upon completion of the questionnaires, students were briefed about the real purpose of the study and thanked for their participation.

Data coding and entry

The data were coded by me and entered into SPSS version 17 by a research assistant. Frequency tables were used to ascertain whether any errors were made in the data entry. Where errors were detected, the original questionnaire was retrieved and the error corrected. Through this process, a useful sample of 116 was obtained. Data analysis was done using SPSS version 17.
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Results

Data were analyzed using SPSS version 17. A series of frequency tables were generated to provide general findings from the study, and several t-tests and non-parametric analyses were conducted to test the study’s hypotheses. Before discussing the results of the hypotheses testing, I explain the measures of the various independent and dependent variables in the study.

Independent variables

The major independent variables of interest in the study were language anxiety, perceived language competence, and motivations to learn the foreign language. These were seen as individual difference factors that are likely to have an impact on how students view codeswitching; however, their impact on students’ perceptions of and attitude toward codeswitching has not been studied.

Table 2 contains information on the items for these scales and their reliability measures, which all exceeded the required 0.80 level for Cronbach alpha. The items in each scale were summed and a median split of the scores was used to form low and high groups on each of the three variables.
Dependent variables

The primary dependent variables of interest were: (a) students’ perceptions of teachers’ CS; (b) students’ attitude toward teachers’ CS; (c) students’ perceptions of classmates’ CS; (d) students’ attitude toward classmates’ CS; (e) students’ engagement in CS; and (f) frequency with which students think they engage in CS. Perceptions related to students’ reactions to CS, positive or negative, and was measured by a single item 7-point scale that asked: “In general, how do you react to codeswitching by the teacher (student)?” The anchors for the scale were “Negatively” and “Positively.” In the case of Table 6.1

Scale items and reliability measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language anxiety</td>
<td>*1. I feel very confident about speaking this language in front of other students. *2. I feel confident when I speak this language in class. 3. I get nervous when I am called upon to speak in this class. 4. I get nervous when I do not understand every word the teacher of this language is saying in class. 5. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation for this class.</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language competence</td>
<td>1. I am a pretty good student in this language. 2. I could have a decent conversation with a native speaker of this language. 3. I think I am pretty competent at my level in this language.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>1. I have a strong desire to learn this language. 2. I have a positive attitude toward this language. 3. I look forward to the opportunity to use this language in class.</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These items were reverse-coded, so that the 5 items in the scale when summed would lead to higher scores indicating higher levels of language anxiety.

attitude, participants were asked: In general, how would you rate your attitude toward codeswitching by the teacher (student)? Circle a number on each of the following scales
to rate your response.” The scales were 3 7-point scales anchored by: “Negative/Positive”; “Dislike it/Like it”; and “It is unnecessary/It is necessary.” These variables are of interest to teachers in the foreign language classroom, as they can give some guidance as to how much they should engage in codeswitching and with which groups of students.

*Codeswitching in the classroom*

Prior to conducting analyses to test the major hypotheses, a series of analyses were done to get some sense of the level and nature of codeswitching perceived by students. To gauge the extent to which CS took place in the foreign language classroom, respondents were asked to indicate whether their teachers, their classes, and they engaged in CS. In response, 92% said that their teachers engaged in CS, while the other 8% said their teachers did not. Ninety-seven point four per cent (97.4%) of the respondents said that their classmates engaged in CS, and 96.6% said that they themselves engaged in CS. Respondents were also asked to indicate the frequency with which their teachers, their classmates, and they engaged in CS. This was measured on a Likert scale: Not at all; Not very frequently; Somewhat frequently; Very frequently. 8.6% of respondents reported that their teachers engaged in CS “very frequently”; 35.3% said the teachers engaged in CS “somewhat frequently”; 48.3% answered “not very frequently”; and 7.8% reported that their teachers did not engage in CS.

In the case of students’ engagement in CS, 30.2% of respondents reported that their classmates engaged in CS “very frequently”; 47.4% said their classmates codeswitched “somewhat frequently”; 20.7% answered that classmates codeswitched “not very frequently”; and 1.7% of the respondents said their classmates did not
codeswitch. When it came to their own involvement in CS, 19.8% reported that they codeswitched “very frequently”; “44.8% reported that they codeswitched “somewhat frequently”; another 32.8% answered that they codeswitched “not very frequently”; and 2.6% of respondents said they did not codeswitch. Hence, the statistics bore out that, in general, CS is a reality of the foreign language classroom and takes place far more frequently among students than among teachers of the foreign language.

A cross-tabulation between level of language (See Table 1 for levels) and whether or not teachers engaged in codeswitching revealed a significant difference in codeswitching depending on level of language. Students reported lower levels of codeswitching in 3000 level courses. Of the students who said their teachers did not engage in codeswitching, 89% reported no codeswitching in their 3000 level classes [$\chi(n =112) = 12.45, df = 4; p = 0.014$). Similar cross-tabulations were done to assess whether there were differences in language level when it came to students’ and respondents CS. The cross-tabulation revealed no differences in students’ CS based on level of language [$\chi(n =112) = 5.63, df = 4; p = 0.228$) and no differences in respondents’ CS based on level of language [$\chi(n =112) = 0.572, df = 4; p = 0.966$).

Cross-tabulations were also performed to determine whether there were differences in CS based on the foreign language of study (Arabic, French, German, Spanish). No differences in teachers’ CS based on foreign language were reported by the participants [$\chi(n =112) = 4.30, df = 3; p = 0.231$). Nor did participants report differences in students’ CS [$\chi(n =112) = 1.952, df = 3; p = 0.582$) or in respondents’ CS [$\chi(n =112) = 2.626, df = 3; p = 0.453$) based on foreign language.
The final set of cross-tabulations investigated the relationship between language level and frequency of teachers’, students’, and respondents’ CS, as well as the relationship between foreign language and the frequency of teachers’, students’, and respondents’ CS. There were differences in frequency of teachers’ CS based on language level. The frequency of teachers’ CS was greater in lower level courses (1000, 2000) and reported as “not at all” or “not very frequently” in 3000 level courses and above [χ(n = 116) = 74.77, df = 12; p = 0.000]. In contrast, however, to the findings on teachers’ CS, respondents reported no differences in students’ CS based on level of language [χ(n = 116) = 8.506, df = 12; p = 0.744] nor in their own CS [χ(n = 116) = 12.30, df = 12; p = 0.420).

In the case of the relationship between foreign language and frequency of teachers’ CS, significant differences were found, with frequency of teacher CS more likely to be reported as very frequently in Arabic classes, not very frequently in French courses, and not very frequently or not at all in Spanish classes. There were no differences in the frequency of students’ CS based on foreign language [χ(n =116) = 11.175, df = 12; p = 0.264), nor were there differences in frequency of respondents’ CS based on foreign language [χ(n =116) = 11.021, df = 12; p = 0.274).

Tests of main hypotheses

The next set of analyses involved tests of the main hypotheses. These hypotheses focused on group differences (high versus low) on the dependent variables. A series of t-tests were conducted to test Hypotheses H1a-H1d, H2a-H2d, and H3a-H3d; a series of non-parametric tests (Mann-Whitney) were done to assess Hypotheses H1e-H1f; H2e-H2f; and H3e-H3f. Table 3 contains information on the outcome of the test of the main
hypothesis. To conduct the t tests, median splits of participants’ scores on each of the independent variables (language anxiety; perceived language competence; and motivation to learn the language) were used to divide the sample into two groups, in each case: high and low. Hence, the groups were: high and low language anxiety; high and low perceived language competence; and high and low motivation to learn the language. In each case, mean scores for the high and low groups on each of the dependent variables were compared to determine whether there were any differences in the mean scores and whether these differences were significant. Significant differences in mean scores between the groups would signal support for the hypotheses. In the case of the non-parametric tests, differences in mean ranks were assessed.

Table 6.2

Outcome of hypothesis testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a.: LA and perception of teachers’ CS</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b.: LA and attitude toward teachers’ CS</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c.: LA and perception of students’ CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1d.: LA and attitude toward students’ CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1e.: LA and participant’s engagement in CS</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1f.: LA and frequency of engagement in CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a.: Language competence and perception of teachers’ CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b.: Language competence and attitude toward teachers’ CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c.: Language competence and perception of students’ CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2d.: Language competence and attitude toward students’ CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2e.: Language competence and participant’s engagement in CS</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2f.: Language competence and frequency of engagement in CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a.: Motivation and perception of teachers’ CS</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b.: Motivation and attitude toward teachers’ CS</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3c.: Motivation and perception of students’ CS</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3d.: Motivation and attitude toward students’ CS</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3e.: Motivation and participant’s engagement in CS</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3f.: Motivation and frequency of engagement in CS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By way of recapitulation, Hypotheses H1a-H1f focused on the relationship between language anxiety and the dependent variables (perceptions of teachers’ CS; attitude toward teachers’ CS; perceptions of students’ CS; attitude toward students’ CS; participants’ engagement in CS; and frequency of participants’ engagement in CS). Hypotheses H2a-H2f focused on the relationship between perceived language competence and the dependent variables, while hypotheses H3a-H3f focused on the relationship between motivation to learn the language and the dependent variables.

H1a, which posited that students who expressed higher levels of language anxiety (LA) would have more favorable perceptions of teachers’ CS than those who expressed lower levels of language anxiety, was not supported. There was no difference between the two groups (t[113] = 1.58, p = 0.117, mean score low LA = 5.91; mean score high LA = 6.25). H1b, which suggested an impact of LA on attitudes toward teachers’ CS, received partial support; students expressing higher levels of LA had more favorable attitudes toward teachers’ CS (mean score for high LA = 18.08) than those expressing lower levels of language anxiety (mean scores low LA = 16.88; t[1113] = 1.78, p = 0.079). H1c and H1d, which argued for differences in participants’ perceptions of students’ CS and attitude toward students’ CS, were supported. In the case of H1c, students expressing higher levels of LA had more favorable perceptions of students’ CS than students expressing low LA (t[114] = 2.17, p = 0.032, mean score low LA = 5.39; mean score high LA = 5.92). In the case of H1d, there were also differences between the groups in their attitude toward students’ CS (t[114] = 2.82, p = 0.006, mean score low LA = 15.30; mean score high LA = 17.42). There was no support for H1e, which predicted that engagement in CS would differ based on language anxiety; however, H1f, which
predicted differences in the frequency of CS, based on LA, was supported (Mann-Whitney U = 1323.00; p = 0.033; mean rank low LA = 52.13, mean rank high LA = 64.45).

Five of the hypotheses related to the relationship between perceived language competence (PLC) and the dependent variables were supported, and one was partially supported. H2a predicted differences in perceptions of teachers’ CS based on language competence (t[113] = 2.60, p = 0.011, mean score low PLC = 6.36; mean score high PLC = 5.81). H2b predicted differences in attitude toward teachers’ CS and was supported (t[114] = 2.38, p = 0.019, mean score low PLC = 18.29; mean score high PLC = 16.68). H2c and H2d, whose predictions focused on perceptions of and attitudes toward students’ CS were also supported. Perceptions of students’ CS differed between students high and low in PLC (t[114] = 3.20, p = 0.002, mean score low PLC = 6.03; mean score high PLC = 5.28); and attitudes also differed (t[114] = 2.36, p = 0.020, mean score low PLC = 17.27; mean score high PLC = 15.49). Partial group differences were in the case of participant engagement in CS (Mann-Whitney U = 3540.00; p = 0.075; mean rank low PLC = 60.00, mean rank high LA = 56.95). H2f predicted that students high and low in PLC would differ in the frequency in which they engaged in CS, and this was supported (Mann-Whitney U = 3939.00; p = 0.004; mean rank low LA = 66.76, mean rank high LA = 49.95).

Regarding the hypotheses related to the impact of motivation to learn the foreign language (MOV) on the dependent variables (H3a-H3f), H3a, which predicted group differences in attitudes toward teachers’ CS was partially supported (t[114] = 1.78, p = 0.078, mean score low MOV = 18.13; mean score high MOV = 16.92). H3f, which
predicted group differences in frequency in which students engaged in CS, was supported. (Mann-Whitney $U = 1284.50$, $p = 0.019$; mean rank low MOV = 65.56, mean rank high MOV = 51.91). The rest of the statistics for the hypotheses that were not supported (H3a, H3b, H3d and H3e) are not reported here.
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Discussion of Findings

The aim of this thesis was to explore students’ perceptions of and attitudes toward CS in the foreign language classroom, to obtain information that would be useful in informing foreign language pedagogy. This was against the background that, while there has been a long stream of research on CS in the foreign language classroom, very few studies have looked at students’ perceptions of and attitudes toward CS, to see whether they were favorable or unfavorable. In addition, none, to the best knowledge of the author, has looked at how individual difference factors such as language anxiety, perceived language competence, and motivation to learn the language influence those perceptions and attitudes.

The study found that language anxiety does play a role in impacting students’ perceptions of and attitudes toward CS, but more so with their classmates than with their teachers. High language anxiety students had more favorable attitudes toward their teachers’ CS. This means that teachers in the foreign language classroom should seek to reassure students and create the kind of atmosphere in which students will not feel uncomfortable about using the foreign language all the time. Anxiety could be reduced by not correcting students’ foreign language mistakes in front of the class and providing...
incentives for students to want to use the foreign language. This could be by way of using bonus points to encourage usage or even to use audio-visual materials (for example, audiotapes, videos) to show students making errors in the use of the foreign language with no negative consequences. There could be objections to this latter practice on the grounds that this would foster errors rather than re-shape attitudes. However, it would be important to teachers to impress that over time mistakes on the part of foreign language learners tend to decline.

Teachers could also orally reassure students that errors in the use of foreign languages are to be expected as people do not speak a foreign language with the same proficiency with which they speak their native languages. Teachers should also be receptive whenever students attempt to use the foreign language with them, regardless of the context in which they do so. For example, a respondent said that his/her professor only codeswitched with students outside of the classroom. In advising students outside of class, professors could take advantage of that context to encourage students’ use of the foreign language. Correcting students’ assignments could also be affected; for example, correcting for grammar versus correcting for content may have an impact on students’ language anxiety.

Language anxiety also impacted how students responded to CS by their classmates. High and low anxiety students responded differently to students’ CS. Low anxiety students had less favorable perceptions of and attitudes toward students’ CS than did their high language anxiety counterparts. Similar classroom practices as outlined above could serve to allay concerns of low language anxiety students, who may see themselves as “better off than” their peers. In assigning group work in classes, teachers
may want to sort students by their levels of language anxiety. This is so since among the
research questions in the survey was one that asked about the occasions on which
students used the L1 and among the responses were: ‘when doing group work’ and ‘when
talking to other students.’ Low anxiety students engaged less frequently in CS, and
teachers can encourage them through reward systems such as bonus points.

An overwhelming finding from the research was that perceived competence in a
foreign language had an impact on students’ perceptions of and attitudes toward CS both
by teachers and students. In addition, it also impacted student engagement in CS and the
frequency with which they engaged in it. Students who perceived that their competence
in the foreign language was high had less favorable perceptions of teachers’ and students’
CS and also had less favorable attitudes toward CS by both groups than did students who
perceived their competence in the language as low. In addition, the high perceived
language competence group was also less likely to engage in CS and did so less
frequently.

On the basis of these findings, perhaps foreign language classes, especially in
programs with large number of students, could cater to students based on their perceived
competence in the language, especially since the study also reveals that, in any event, the
vast majority of teachers engage in CS. For example, foreign language departments could
create sections of classes for students who perceived their competence in the language as
high, and there would be limited use of CS in these classes. If this is not possible, foreign
language teachers could conduct brief surveys of students in their classes at the start of a
semester, and if it is found that students’ perceive their competence in the language as
high, teachers would be advised to engage in limited or no CS with these students. CS
would be permitted in situations where students perceive that their competence in the language is low.

A surprising outcome of the study was that motivation to learn a foreign language did not have any impact on students’ perceptions of teachers’ and their classmates’ engagement in CS. Nor did it affect students’ engagement in CS. However, there was a partially significant impact on attitude toward teachers’ CS, with high motivation students having less favorable attitudes. High motivation students also engaged less in CS. The thinking going into the study was that students who were highly motivated to learn the language would prefer not to engage in CS and would also prefer that their teachers and classmates not engage in CS. From a pedagogical point, teachers should encourage students who are highly motivated to learn the language to use the foreign language all the time. Teachers may also want to make clear why they are codeswitching, so as to appease highly motivated language learners, since they have unfavorable attitudes toward CS.

The current thesis, therefore, makes a contribution to the discourse on CS in the foreign language classroom. It indicates that while CS is dominant in foreign language classes (at least in the classes from which the sample came), there are certain individual difference factors—language anxiety and perceived language competence, in particular—that help to explain students’ attitude toward this phenomenon. These factors should be taken into account when developing pedagogy for foreign language classes.
Chapter 8

Limitations and future research

While the study reported in this thesis makes a contribution to research on CS, there are certain limitations that should be borne in mind. There are also additional avenues for research arising from this research. The study reported in this thesis looked at the perceptions of and attitudes toward the use of CS in foreign language classrooms at the tertiary level in the Midwest United States. It drew on reports from students at various levels in different language classes. The sample was a convenience sample of student participants, based on professors affording access to their classes. Thus, this sample is not representative of the foreign language classes in the university where the research took place, nor of other contexts in the US where foreign languages are taught. Therefore, the results cannot be generalized to every academic level; for example, one could not conclude from these results that the perceptions of and attitudes toward CS would be the same among primary and secondary school students. The results also cannot be generalized to foreign language classes in the entire United States, as experiences in the US Midwest, where encounters with native speakers of foreign languages may be lower than in coastal states, may be different. The sample can be used nonetheless to obtain important insights on CS. However, future research should explore this issue of the
impact of individual difference factors on students’ views of CS in different contexts, such as in primary and secondary foreign languages and in other regions of the United States.

The primary languages being studied by the students in this study were Arabic, French, German, and Spanish (see Table 1). Excluded then from this study is the input of students in foreign language classes such as Chinese, Japanese, and Swahili, which are some examples of foreign languages that are taught in other universities in the United States. Students in the current study, for example, reported more frequency of CS in Arabic classes, as compared to the classes in the Romance languages, French and Spanish. Some research has indicated that students tend to struggle more with some languages and perceive them as being more difficult than others (see, for example, Everson 1998). Would students’ views of CS be different depending on whether the foreign language being studied was a Romance language versus a non-Romance language? Questions could also center on whether students have differing expectations based on the language being taught. For example, would they expect more CS in non-Romance language classes, and so factors such as perceived competence would not impact their perceptions and attitudes? Is CS more acceptable in Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese classes and less so in French and Spanish classes?

In the review of the literature on CS, in general, and CS in the foreign language classroom, in particular, references were made to research on CS that looked at the case where the foreign language being studied was English. In the case of the study reported here, English was the L1 of the majority of the participants. Future research should explore this issue of perceptions and attitudes in the context of English as the L2 and
other languages (for example, Arabic, French, Chinese) as the L1, as well as in different cultural contexts.

Even though there were findings related to perceptions and attitudes, no effort was made to determine why students felt the way they did about CS. For example, among the findings from the research was that language anxiety and perceived language competence influenced how students viewed CS by their classmates. However, no effort was made to determine from the students themselves why low anxiety students or high perceived language competence students would have unfavorable attitudes toward CS by their classmates. While the theorizing in the study suggested this, it would be interesting to hear directly from students. Worthy of future exploration, then, would be the underlying reasons for the reactions of low language anxiety students and high perceived language competence students to their peers’ and teachers’ CS. Additional questions could also focus on whether there are group differences in response to questions such as whether teachers should engage in more/less CS, the occasions on which CS is appropriate, or the reasons for which CS is appropriate.

As indicated in the results and discussion section, limited effects of motivation to learn the foreign language on the dependent variables were found. There are possible reasons for this. An abridged motivation scale consisting of three items was used, and perhaps this scale, though reliable, failed to capture the various dimensions of motivation as it relates to foreign language learning and acquisition. For example, researchers have made a distinction between integrative motivation and instrumental motivation in foreign language learning. Integrative motivation refers to being motivated to learn a language in order to be able to relate to native speakers, while instrumental motivation relates to such
end goals as getting good grades or even getting a good job (Gardner and Lambert 1972; Engin 2009). An investigation focused on integrative motivation may have better captured group differences. Students who are motivated to learn a language to get to know the native speakers or even to live or work in a country where the language is spoken may have different views of CS than students who do not have those motivations. This is another avenue for future research. By the same token, more work can be done to determine whether taking the course simply because it is required versus taking the course because it is a part of one’s major would lead to different views among students of foreign languages.

Even though perceived language competence turned out to be a major factor impacting students’ views of CS, the measure of language competence relied on students’ self-reports. Future research could replace this measure of language competence with objective measures such as students’ grades in the foreign language courses or student foreign language level as measured by foreign language proficiency tests. If research using these measures were to lead to the same or similar findings, then we could conclude that, regardless of whether perceived language competence is subjective or objective, it has an impact on students’ views of CS. In the case of research methods, methods such as observation and interviews could also be used to unearth additional information. For example, rather than relying on students’ reports of CS in the classroom, researchers could observe classroom activities and supplement these observations with interviews to assess students’ views of CS.

In this research project, no effort was made to survey teachers regarding their use of CS; their motivations for doing so; or how they think it was perceived by their
students. Nor was any effort made to assess teachers’ perceptions of and attitudes toward their own CS behaviors. Intuitively, one might think that teachers would have justification for their CS behavior and therefore would be favorably disposed to it; however, this need not be the case. Hence, this is an opportunity for future research: to investigate CS in the foreign language classroom from the teachers’ perspectives. Given the relatively small sample frame that would be available in most foreign language departments, a method such as personal interviews, rather than a survey, could be used to unearth information on teachers’ perceptions of their CS behavior.

In the discussion section, mention was made of incentives that could be offered to encourage students to use the foreign language being learned and to minimize their levels of anxiety. One proposition made was that of bonus points in class. There is no evidence regarding what kinds of reward systems are likely to minimize language anxiety, so this is still open to research. In addition, other avenues include a determination of additional individual difference factors that could impact how students view CS in the foreign language classroom. For example, individual difference factors such as cultural orientation, openness to experience, and foreign language self-efficacy are some examples of individual difference factors whose impact on students’ reactions to CS could be investigated. Finally, another constituent in the CS process is textbook authors. Students’ perceptions of CS in the textbooks they use would add to our overall understanding of how CS is viewed.
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Appendix A

Questionnaire

Foreign Language Survey

We are conducting a study on students’ experiences with the learning of foreign languages, and we are inviting you to take part. We are interested in your responses to certain questions regarding the use of language in the classroom. The only requirement for participation in this study is that you are currently enrolled in at least one foreign language course.

Thanks for taking part in this study.

**IMPORTANT**

This survey concerns *codeswitching*. We will provide you with a definition of this term and will ask you to bear this in mind as you complete this questionnaire.

*Codeswitching*: In a foreign language classroom, this occurs when the teachers of the foreign language or the learners of the foreign language switch from using the foreign language that is being taught to the native (also called first or maternal) language that is spoken by the majority of students in the class. For example, if the students in the class speak English as their native (first or maternal) language and the teacher is teaching a French or Spanish course, codeswitching occurs when the teacher or the students switch from French or Spanish back to English during class.
Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

1. First, we want you to select ONE foreign language course in which you are currently enrolled. This course will be the course of reference for this survey. That is, you will refer to this course when you are answering the questions in this survey. If you are enrolled in more than one foreign language course, select the MOST ADVANCED course in which you are enrolled. Write the name of that course on the line below.

Name of foreign language course: ___________________________________________

THE SURVEY IS BASED ON THIS ONE FOREIGN LANGUAGE COURSE. BASE YOUR RESPONSES ON THE COURSE YOU WROTE DOWN ABOVE.

2. At what level is this course?
1000 _____  2000 _____  3000 _____  4000 _____  Above 4000 _____

3. This is a course in which foreign language? Please check one.
Arabic ____  French _____  German _____  Japanese ____  Spanish ____

4. How would you describe your level of proficiency in this language?
Beginner _____  Low intermediate _____  High intermediate ____  Advanced _____

5. For this language class, is the teacher a native or non-native speaker of the foreign language? (Native means that a person speaks the language because he or she was born and grew up in a country where that language is the main language; non-native means that a person learned the language as a second or foreign language).

Native _____  Non-native _____  Not sure _____

6. Does the teacher of this class engage in codeswitching (refer to definition on the cover page)? Please check one.
Yes ___  No ___

6. With what frequency does the teacher engage in codeswitching?
Not at all ___  Not very frequently ___  Somewhat Frequently ____  Very frequently ____

7. On what occasions does the teacher engage in codeswitching? List the MAIN occasions.
8. Why do you think the teacher switches from the foreign language to the native (first or maternal) language of the students in the class? List your TOP reason.

9. In general, how do you react to codeswitching by the teacher?
   Negatively  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Positively

10. In general, how would you rate your attitude toward codeswitching by the teacher? Circle a number on each of the following scales to rate your response.
   Negative  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Positive
   Dislike it 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Like it
   It is unnecessary 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  It is necessary

11. Do the students in this class engage in codeswitching (refer to definition on the cover page)? Please check one.
   Yes ___    No ___

11. With what frequency do the students in this class engage in codeswitching?
   Not at all ____ Not very frequently ____ Somewhat Frequently ____ Very frequently ____

12. On what occasions do the students engage in codeswitching? List the MAIN occasions.

13. Why do you think students in the class switch from the foreign language to their native (first or maternal) language? List your TOP reason.

14. In general, how do you react to codeswitching by the students?
   Negatively  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Positively
15. In general, how would you rate your attitude toward codeswitching by the teacher? Circle a number on each of the following scales to rate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dislike it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Like it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unnecessary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>It is necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Do you engage in codeswitching in your foreign language class?
Yes _____ No _____

17. With what frequency do you engage in codeswitching in this class?
Not at all ___ Not very frequently ___ Somewhat Frequently ____ Very frequently _____


19. Why do you think you switch from the foreign language to your native (first or maternal) language? List your TOP reason.

20. Please answer the following general questions for us. When answering the questions, refer to the foreign language course you named in Question 1. There is no right or wrong answer to any of the questions.

Please rate your response to each of the following statements by circling a number on each scale, where “1” = Strongly disagree and “7” = Strongly agree.

**I have a strong desire to learn this language.**

| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongly agree |

**I put a lot of effort into learning this language.**

| Strongly disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongly agree |

**I have a positive attitude toward this language.**
I look forward to the opportunity to use this language in class.

I feel very confident about speaking this language in front of other students.

I feel confident when I speak this language in class.

I get nervous when I am called upon to speak in this class.

I get nervous when I do not understand every word the teacher of this language is saying in class.

I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in this class.

I am pretty good student in this language.

I could have a decent conversation with a native speaker of this language.

I think I am pretty competent at my level in this language.

21. Finally, please let us know the following demographic information:

Your Gender: Female ____ Male _____

Your Age: __________

Your Major:  ____________________

Your year in University:  Freshman ____ Soph ___ Jr ___ Sr ____ Grad student ____

22. Are you taking this course to satisfy the university's foreign language requirement?
Yes _____  No _____

23. What is your native language? ___________________

THANKS FOR TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY.